International Journal of Research in Finance and Management

P-ISSN: 2617-5754
E-ISSN: 2617-5762
IJRFM 2021; 4(2): 57-62
Received: 15-05-2021
Accepted: 17-06-2021

Anchal Malhotra
Assistant Professor, Guru Nanak Khalsa Institute of Technology and Management-Technical Campus, Yamuna Nagar, Haryana, India

Correspondence
Anchal Malhotra
Assistant Professor, Guru Nanak Khalsa Institute of Technology and Management-Technical Campus, Yamuna Nagar, Haryana, India

Impact of climate disclosure on firm's financial performance

Anchal Malhotra

Abstract
India is a genuine and developing player in the worldwide carbon credits showcase. This has instigated and incited the originator, dealer and designer of carbon credits, to set up their workplaces in India. Presently a day's carbon credit is rising area particularly in India however there are not very many corporate who know about this rising section of credits. The present study comprises a sample of 56 Indian firms, which report their climate change data on Carbon Disclosure Project during 2015 to 2020. Carbon Disclosure Project is a not-for-benefit organisation that runs the worldwide disclosure framework for investors, companies, urban communities, states and districts to deal with their environmental effects. Out of these 56 firms, 9 firms were from financial sector, the business exercises of financial firms vary from different firms like manufacturing, Materials, Utilities and industrial firms, so this study excluded financial firms and 3 firms were not available Capitaline database. After excluding financial firms and companies whose data were not found, the scope of this study is limited to 44 firms.

Keywords: Climate disclosure, Kyoto protocol, EUTUS, internal emission trading

Introduction
A large number of firms have executed environmental practices that go a long ways beyond environmental regulation so as to decrease their vitality consumption, to propose green items or innovations to their consumers, and to limit their biological impression. To that objective, a large portion of these organizations have embraced environmental management that envelops the specialized and organizational exercises attempted by the firm with the end goal of decreasing environmental effects and limiting their consequences for the regular habitat. Accordingly, environmental performance is the yield of environmental management, and alludes to the impacts of the association's exercises and items on the regular habitat. From these definitions, corporate environmental management (CEM) can be comprehended as a concept that grasps environmental management, environmental exposure, and environmental performance.

Literature Review
1. Salama (2004) [3] tests whether this relationship holds utilizing median regression investigation that is heartier to the nearness of anomalies and in secret firm heterogeneity. In light of board information for British organizations, He fined that the connection amongst CEP and CFP is more grounded when median regression are used. The middle outcomes announced in this paper seem to affirm that there is a positive connection amongst CEP and CFP. This proposes directors ought to dedicate significant thoughtfulness regarding ecological partners (e.g., natural controllers, natural gatherings, and natural open and different elements human or non-human over the whole regular habitat).
2. Horvathova (2010) [1] examine the heterogeneity in financial environmental performance nexus, observationally doing a meta-regression analysis of 64 results from 37 experimental reviews to reveal the fundamental variables, which can impact the watched variety in the exact outcomes. The outcomes propose both that the observational strategy utilized matters for the nexus and that the probability of finding a negative connection amongst environmental and financial performance essentially increments when utilizing basic correlation coefficients rather than more progressed econometric analysis.

3. Rajput *et al.* (2013) [12] demonstrate that connection between the net pay and benefit is huge yet no critical relationship exists between the execution of green keeping money and bank's productivity as is uncovered in the review. This displays obviously that green managing an account and environmental activities are still in their outset organize in Indian saving money division and to procure the natural products, a major push is required in this worldview.
4. Misani & Pogutz (2015) [2] look at the parts of the result and process measurements of environmental performance in deciding financial performance as measured by Tobin's q. Results allude to the effects of the firmon the indigenous habitat, while procedures are the company's activities to decrease these results. We concentrate on a particular result carbon emanations and recommend that it influences Tobin's q non-linearly. We find that organizations accomplish the most elevated financial performance when their carbon performance is neither low nor high, however transitional.
5. Chotaliya (2013) representing carbon credits in India examined the carbon outflows patterns of six nations from 2014-2015 while the other fence was to concentrate the issues of carbon credit bookkeeping in India and their tax collection issues. The review was completed by utilizing auxiliary information from articles, diaries and books. She clarified that the percentage trend in India has developed by 8.33% in 2014-09 and it was demonstrating the expanding patterns in carbon outflows in the following five years when contrasted with its earlier years.
6. Srinivas (2014) examine expensive coal to burn carbon credit exchanging that the Punters on carbon credits have motivation to stress that is, the quick increment in worldwide coal costs. For carbon credit dealer's nations like India, the life is great in light of the fact that the organizations in Europe consume the filthy fuel and purchase carbon credits from the pitching nations to tidy up their chaos.
7. Gennaioli *et al.* (2015) utilizing information for 2009 and 2010 from the Carbon Disclosure Project review, we discover small convincing confirmation that ordinarily embraced administration practices are lessening discharges. This finding is surprising and we propose three conceivable clarifications for it. To begin with, it might be on the grounds that corporate carbon information and administration hone data have not been accounted for standardized. Second, there might be a deferral between the utilization of corporate carbon administration hones and their effect on emanations performance. Third, carbon administration practices are not adequately affect arranged, which means there is no relationship to watch.
8. Gupta & Goldar (2005) [5] direct an occasion study to analyse the effect of environmental rating of expansive mash and paper, auto, and chloral soluble base firms on their stock costs. We find that the market for the most part punishes environmentally threatening conduct in that declaration of feeble environmental performance by firms prompts negative anomalous returns of up to 30%.
9. Ranade (2015) describe that acquiring carbon credits through CFL that Carbon credits are vital segment which is assuming a crucial part in diminishing or moderating the development of greenhouse gasses. Toward this path the administration has made basic strides. The Bachat Lamp Yojanais a program which was begun by government with a specific end goal to urge the general population to move to minimal fluorescent lights. The Bachat Lamp yojana supports the different dispersion organizations to supply CFL's to the clients at low costs that are roughly at Rs 15 for every light.
10. King and Lenox (2001) [8] investigate whether it "pays to be green." We utilize longitudinal information and factual techniques that decrease the potential for surreptitiously contrasts among firms to make a deluding relationship amongst environmental and financial performance. We additionally test to see whether contamination diminishment causes financial pick up. We find proof of a relationship between contamination lessening and financial pick up, however we can't demonstrate the course of causality.
11. Heng *et al.* (2016) intends to investigate the connection between ISO 14001 confirmation and an organization's financial performance to research whether the accreditation to ISO 14001 environmental administration standard has profited the organization's financial performance or not. Utilizing Malaysia as the examination setting, the after effects of a direct relapse analysis demonstrate that organizations with better than expected performance have a more prominent propensity to seek after ISO 14001 affirmation.

Objectives of the study

1. To examine the impact of climate disclosure on firm's Return on Equity (ROE).
2. To examine the impact of climate disclosure on firm's Return on Assets (ROA).

Research methodology

The present study comprises a sample of 56 Indian firms, which report their climate change data on Carbon Disclosure Project during 2011 to 2015. Carbon Disclosure Project is a not-for-benefit organisation that runs the worldwide disclosure framework for investors, companies, urban communities, states and districts to deal with their environmental effects. Out of these 56 firms, 9 firms were from financial sector, the business exercises of financial firms vary from different firms like manufacturing, Materials, Utilities and industrial firms, so this study excluded financial firms and 3 firms were not available Capitaline database. After excluding financial firms and companies whose data were not found, the scope of this study is limited to 44 firms. Further, we use hand collected climate change disclosure data from the reports published by the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) during 2015 to 2020, as it is most popular databases for carbon emission disclosure by firms throughout the world.

Analysis

Table 1: Profile of Firms under Study

Company	Industry
1. Tata Consultancy Services	Information Technology
2. Wipro	Information Technology
3. Acc Cements	Materials
4. Tata Chemicals	Materials
5. Tata Global Beverages	Consumer Staples
6. Sesa Goa	Materials
7. GVK Power & Infrastructure	Utilities
8. Tata Power Co	Utilities
9. ITC	Consumer Staples
10. Mahindra & Mahindra	Consumer Discretionary
11. Larsen & Toubro	Industrials
12. Tata Steel	Materials
13. Essar Oil	Energy
14. Infosys Limited	Information Technology
15. Shree Cement	Materials
16. Tech Mahindra	Information Technology
17. Dr Reddys Laboratories	Health Care
18. Ultratech Cement	Materials
19. Indian Hotels Co.	Consumer Discretionary
20. Hcl Technologies	Information Technology
21. Ambuja Cements	Materials
22. Tata Communications	TCOM
23. Gail	Utilities
24. Indian Oil Corporation	Materials
25. Tata Motors	Consumer Discretionary
26. Hindustan Zinc	Materials
27. Godrej Consumer Products	Consumer Staples
28. Godrej Industries	Materials
29. Cairn India	Energy
30. Piramal Enterprises	Health Care
31. Hindustan Petroleum Corporation	Energy
32. JSW Steel	Materials
33. Bharat Forge	Consumer Discretionary
34. Titan Industries	Consumer Discretionary
35. Bharat Petroleum Corporation	Energy
36. ONGC	Energy
37. ABB	Industrials
38. IL & FS Transportation Networks	Industrials
39. Suzlon Energy	Industrials
40. Mahindra Satyam	Information Technology
41. Mind tree Ltd	Information Technology
42. Asian Paints	Materials
43. NMDC	Materials
44. KSK Energy Ventures Limited	Utilities

Table 2: Sample industry composition and Carbon risk profile

SN	Industrial Sector	Environmentally sensitive industry?
1.	Consumer Discretionary	No
2.	Energy	Yes
3.	Industrials	Yes
4.	Information Technology	No
5.	Materials	Yes
6.	Telecommunication	No
7.	Utilities	Yes
8.	Consumer Staples	No
9.	Health Care	No

The research consists of 44 firms from nine different industries as- Consumer Discretionary, Energy, Industrials, Information Technology, Materials, Telecommunication Services, Utilities, Consumer Staples and Health Care. Further four industries out of nine industries are from more environmentally sensitive and five are from low environmentally sensitive industries (Table 2).

Econometric Model

This paper directly interested to know at what extent voluntary carbon emission disclosure is related to the firm's financial performance? To investigate the potential impact of carbon emission on the firm's financial performance, this study developed a testing model. The general form of the econometric model we used to test our hypotheses is as follows

$$ROE = INTERCEPT_{\beta 0} + {}_{\beta 1}CEP + {}_{\beta 2}SIZE + {}_{\beta 3}BETA + {}_{\beta 4}RDINT + {}_{\beta 5}INDU + \varepsilon$$

$$ROA = INTERCEPT_{\alpha 0} + {}_{\alpha 1}CEP + {}_{\alpha 2}SIZE + {}_{\alpha 3}BETA + {}_{\alpha 4}RDINT + {}_{\alpha 5}INDU + \varepsilon$$

Where CFP is subsequent corporate financial performance of a firm; CEP is corporate
Environmental performance; SIZE is log of total assets as a measure of corporate size; BETA
Is systematic risk as measured by the company's beta factor; RDINT is R&D intensity (R&D
expenditures/assets); INDU is industry classification.

Financial Performance Measure

1. Return on equity (ROE): The Return on Equity ratio essentially measures the rate of return that the owners of common stock of a company receive on their shareholdings. Return on equity signifies how good the company is in generating returns on the investment it received from its shareholders.

Return on Equity = Net Income/Shareholder's Equity

Net income is for the full fiscal year (before dividends paid to common stock holders but after dividends to preferred stock) and Shareholder's equity does not include preferred shares.

2. Return on assets (ROA) - Return on assets (ROA) is an indicator of how profitable a company is relative to its total assets. ROA gives an idea as to how efficient management is at using its assets to generate earnings. Calculated by dividing a company's annual earnings by its total assets, ROA is displayed as a percentage. Sometimes this is referred to as "return on investment".
The formula for return on assets is:

Return on assets = Profit after tax (PAT)/ Total Assets

Total assets are calculated as add, Net Block, Work In Progress and Total Current Assets.

Empirical finding and discussions of the study

Descriptive Statistics of the sample firms are reported in table. Panel A, shows descriptive statistics of the dependent variables and Panel B shows descriptive statistics of the independent variables.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of sample firms

Variable	Observation	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean	SD
Panel A						
ROE	220	-0.061600	0.495300	0.144800	0.160401	0.126051
ROA	216	-0.547541	0.870543	0.119516	0.141090	0.165664
Panel B						
Cdp score	143	32.00000	100.0000	77.00000	75.16808	18.54065
m.cap	217	1448.130	498890.7	26517.88	53855.01	74895.15
beta	219	0.150700	2.179100	0.845400	0.872267	0.373867
r &d	177	0.000000	1305.390	4.550000	46.09345	155.4612
industry	220	0.000000	1.000000	1.000000	0.590909	0.492787

Table 4: Correlation matrix for a sample of 44 Indian firms over the period 2015–2020

variables	CDP score	m.cap	beta	R & d	Industry	ROE	ROA
Cdp score	1	0.2686	-0.0451	-0.1536	-0.1836	0.1519	0.1310
m.cap		1	-0.1889	0.0029	-0.4102	0.5640	0.3661
beta			1	0.1991	0.2810	-0.3984	-0.2733
R & d				1	-0.2204	-0.0530	-0.0130
industry					1	-0.4637	-0.3079
roe						1	0.6542
roa							1

A correlation matrix is shown in Table, which presents inter-correlation between independent variables. The results in Table exhibit a significant positive correlation between net profits and size of the firm and the rest of independent variables were found not statistically related to each other.

Testing Model

Table 5: Regression Analysis of the estimated impact of environmental performance on the return on equity (ROE).

Variable	Expected Sing	MODEL (I) Cross-Section Fixed Effect Coefficient (*p-value*)	MODEL (II) Cross-Section Random Effect Coefficient (*p-value*)
C		-0.308784 (0.0015)	-0.006805 (0.9546)
CDP SCORE		0.001360 (0.0223)	-0.000698 (0.0961)
M.CAP LOG		0.108225 (0.0000)	0.074636 (0.0049)
BETA		-0.082887 (0.0012)	-0.086752 (0.0003)
R & D		-7.09E-05 (0.1452)	4.62E-05 (0.2944)
INDUSTRY		-0.067369 (0.0005)	-0.060534 (0.0322)
Adjusted R-Squared		0.496487	O.193278
F-statistic		14.03771	6.702092
Prob (F-statistic)		0.000000	0.000016

Table 6: Regression Analysis of the estimated impact of environmental performance on the return on assets (ROA).

Variable	Expected Sing	MODEL (I) Cross-Section Fixed Effect Coefficient (*p-value*)	MODEL (II) Cross-Section Random Effect Coefficient (*p-value*)
C		-0.235127 (0.1585)	-0.148900 (0.4071)
CDP score		0.001226 (0.2336)	-0.000215 (0.7927)
M.CAP LOG		0.090202 (0.0054)	0.085144 (0.0247)
BETA		-0.081964 (0.0629)	-0.080762 (0.0707)
R & D		-3.13E-05 (0.7108)	1.59E-05 (0.8569)
INDUSTRY		-0.057926 (0.0820)	-0.045724 (0.2303)
Adjusted R-Squared		0.159059	O.084971
F-statistic		3.500897	3.210094
Prob(F-statistic)		0.000768	0.009498

Conclusion

This paper utilizes vigorous relapse strategies in investigation of the relationship between CEP and CFP. Given that scientists are indeterminate with respect to whether the suspicions utilized to legitimize their decision of estimator are legitimate, it is enticing to ensure oneself against infringement of these suppositions by utilizing vigorous estimators whose properties are harsh to infringement of the suspicions made about the way in which the information are produced (Kennedy,1998). For instance, a vast mistake when squared turns out to be huge, so while limiting the whole of squared blunders OLS gives a high weight to this extensive perception, bringing on the OLS estimator to swing towards this perception, covering the reality it is an exception. This clarifies why OLS performs inadequately within the sight of fat-followed blunder conveyances. The middle outcomes detailed in this paper seem to affirm that there is a positive relationship between CEP and CFP. This recommends chiefs ought to dedicate significant regard for environmental stakeholders (e.g., environmental controllers, environmental bunches, environmental open, and different elements human or non-human over the whole common habitat). Partnerships hoping to venture themselves as solid, dynamic firms having both good honesty and the sort of advancement that will push them fiscally, have another weapon: fabricating notoriety for initiative in environmental undertakings. Given current environmental objectives, it speaks to the following imperative stage in corporate environmental administration, and thus, corporate notoriety administration. Organizations hoping to recapture trust with financial specialists and different stakeholders can make strides now to distribute a few assets toward environmental plan.

References

1. Horváthová E. Does environmental performance affect financial performance? A meta-analysis. Ecological Economics 2010;70(1):52-59.
2. Misani N, Pogutz S. unraveling the effects of environmental outcomes and processes on financial performance: A non-linear approach. Ecological Economics 2015;109:150-160.
3. Salama A. A note on the impact of environmental performance on financial performance. Structural change and economic dynamics 2005;16(3):413-421.
4. Doda B, Gennaoli C, Gouldson A, Grover D, Sullivan R. Are corporate carbon management practices reducing corporate carbon emissions? Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management 2016;23(5):257-270.
5. Gupta S, Goldar B. Do stock markets penalize environment-unfriendly behaviour? Evidence from India. Ecological economics 2005;52(1):81-95.
6. Albertini E. Does environmental management improve financial performance? A meta-analytical review. Organization & Environment 2013;26(4):431-457.
7. Albertini E. Does environmental management improve financial performance? A meta-analytical review. Organization & Environment 2013;26(4):431-457.
8. King AA, Lenox MJ. Does it really pay to be green? An empirical study of firm environmental and financial performance: An empirical study of firm environmental and financial performance. Journal of Industrial Ecology 2001;5(1):105-116.
9. Stefan A, Paul L. Does it pay to be green? A systematic overview. The Academy of Management Perspectives 2008;22(4):45-62.
10. Lioui A, Sharma Z. Environmental corporate social responsibility and financial performance: Disentangling direct and indirect effects. Ecological Economics 2012;78:100-111.
11. San Onga T, Tehb BH, Ngc SH, Sohd WN. Environmental management system and financial performance. Environmental Management 2016;8(2):26-52.
12. Rajput N, Arora MS, Khanna MA. An Empirical Study of Impact of Environmental Performance on Financial Performance in Indian Banking Sector. International Journal of Business and Management Invention 2013;2(9):19-24.
13. Ruben Dario perez arroyave. Environmental managements and firms performances 2007.
14. Yadav PL, Han SH, Rho JJ. Impact of environmental performance on firm value for sustainable investment: evidence from large US firms. Business Strategy and the Environment 2015.
15. Chemwile P, Namusonge G, Iravo M. Relationship between Strategic Environmental Relations Practice and Organizational Performance of Companies Listed in Nairobi Securities Exchange. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences 2016;6(10):339-355.
16. Qian W. Revisiting the link between environmental performance and financial performance: who cares about private companies 2012.
17. Trebucq S, d'Arcimoles CH. The corporate social performance-financial performance link: Evidence from France 2002.

18. Dobre E, Stanila GO, Brad L. The influence of environmental and social performance on financial performance: Evidence from Romania's listed entities. Sustainability 2015;7(3):2513-2553.
19. Peloza J. The challenge of measuring financial impacts from investments in corporate social performance. Journal of Management 2009;35(6):1518-1541.
20. Tang Q. Framework for and the Role of Carbon Accounting in Corporate Carbon Management Systems: A Holistic Approach 2017.
21. Brouwers R, Schoubben F, Van Hulle C, Van Uytbergen S. The initial impact of EU ETS verification events on stock prices. Energy Policy 2016;94:138-149.
22. O'Mara M, Bates S. Why invest in high-performance green buildings. VP high performance green buildings solutions and Shan Bates, LEED AP, Global Segment Lead–Education & Smart Campus Solutions. White paper 2012.
23. Luft Mobus J. Mandatory environmental disclosures in a legitimacy theory context. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal 2005;18(4):492-517.
24. Patten DM. The relation between environmental performance and environmental disclosure: a research note. Accounting, organizations and Society 2002;27(8):763-773.
25. Dowell G, Hart S, Yeung B. Do corporate global environmental standards create or destroy market value? Management science 2000;46(8):1059-1074.