Environmental Disclosure: A Step Towards Corporate Transparency and Sustainability

Raj Laxmi Barik[1], A. K. Das Mohapatra[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Sambalpur University, Jyoti Vihar, Sambalpur, Odisha

[2]Former Vice-Chancellor, Odisha State Open University, Sambalpur, Odisha and Retired Professor, Department of Business Administration, Sambalpur University, Jyoti Vihar, Sambalpur, Odisha

Abstract

In the face of escalating environmental challenges and rising stakeholder expectations, environmental disclosure has emerged as a vital component of corporate transparency and accountability. The present study analysis the conceptual background of environmental disclosure, and describe various theories such as stakeholder, legitimacy, agency and institutional theory to explain the base for environmental disclosure. The paper also examines the key factors of environmental disclosure, including regulatory mandates, investor expectations, corporate governance practices, and global sustainability reporting standards. Despite its growing relevance, environmental disclosure faces challenges such as lack of standardization, assurance concerns, and reporting inertia in developing economies like India. The paper conclude that environmental disclosure plays a strategic role for both transparency and sustainable development.

Keywords: Environmental Disclosure, Sustainable Development, Corporate Transparency

1. Introduction

In recent decades, escalating environmental concerns and increasing awareness of climate change have significantly transformed the corporate responsibility. Stakeholders including investors, regulators, consumers, and civil society now expect businesses to operate transparently and responsibly, particularly with regard to their environmental impacts (Gray et al., 1995). In this context, environmental disclosure has emerged as a crucial mechanism for communicating a company's environmental policies, performance, and risks, thereby enhancing corporate transparency and contributing to long-term sustainability (Clarkson et al., 2008).

Environmental disclosure refers to the voluntary or mandatory reporting of information related to a firm's environmental performance, such as greenhouse gas emissions, resource consumption, pollution levels, waste management practices, and compliance with environmental regulations (Global Reporting Initiative GRI, 2021). These disclosures are often integrated within sustainability reports, ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) reports, or corporate annual reports, and are guided by frameworks such as the Global Reporting Indicators (GRI) Standards, Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), and Security Exchange Board of India mandated Business Responsibility and Sustainability Report (BRSR).

Despite various initiatives, environmental disclosure continues to face challenges such as lack of standardization, inconsistent reporting practices, and limited assurance mechanisms (Hahn & Kühnen, 2013). These issues are especially found in developing economies, where regulatory enforcement may be weaker and awareness among corporate actors relatively low (Chatterjee & Mir, 2008).
This article aims to provide a conceptual and theoretical understanding of environmental disclosure as a strategic tool for enhancing corporate transparency and sustainability. It focuses on key theories such as legitimacy theory, stakeholder theory, agency and institutional theory to explain why firms disclose environmental information. Furthermore, it explores the factors, challenges, and concludes with implications for policymakers, practitioners, and future research.

2. Review of literature

Various authors have developed and applied Environmental Disclosure Index (EDI) by incorporating a wide range of indicators that reflect the scope, quality, and depth of environmental information disclosed by companies presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Summary of Key Studies on Environmental Disclosure Indicators

Author(s)	Title of the Study	Objectives	EDI
Ahmad (2012)	Environmental accounting and reporting practices: Significance and issues: A case from Bangladeshi companies	To examine the position of environmental information in the Annual Reports	1. Expenditure in Energy 2. Waste Management 3. Tree Plantation 4. Environmental Protection 5. Future Strategy 6. Safety Related Measure
Al – Tuwaijri et al. (2004)	The relations among environmental disclosure, environmental performance and economic performance: a simultaneous equation approach	To analyse the interrelations among environmental disclosure, environmental performance and economic performance	1. the total amount of toxic waste generated and transferred or recycled 2. financial penalties resulting from violations of 10 federal environ mental laws 3. Potential Responsible Party (PRP) designation for the cleanup responsibility of hazardous-waste sites 4. The occurrence of reported oil and chemical spills
Brammer & Pavelin (2006)	Voluntary Environmental Disclosure by	To examines the patterns in voluntary environmental disclosures made by a	1. Disclosure of an environmental policy

	large UK companies	sample of large UK companies.	2. Existence of board-level responsibility for environmental matters 3. The description of environmental initiatives 4. Reporting on environmental improvements 5. Setting of environmental targets 6. The presence of an environmental audit or assessment.
Cappuyns & Ceulemans (2015)	Economic and Environmental Performance indicators in Belgian GRI Reports	To evaluate the quality and completeness of economic and environmental performance indicators	1. Energy 2. Materials 3. Water 4. Emissions, Effluents, and Waste 5. Biodiversity 6. Emissions, Effluents, and Waste
Chakladar & Gulati (2015)	A study of corporate Environmental Disclosure practices of companies doing business in India	To Study of Corporate Environmental Disclosure Practices of Companies Doing Business in India	1. Environmental Initiatives 2. Environmental Commitments 3. Environmental Management Framework 4. Environmental Disclosure 5. Environmental Expenditure 6. Products and Technologies Contributing to Environment
Clarkson et al. (2008)	Revisiting the relation between environmental performance and environmental disclosure: An Empirical Analysis	To examine relation between environmental performance and environmental disclosure	**Hard Disclosure** 1. Governance structure and Management System 2. Credibility 3. Environmental Performance Indicators 4. Environmental Spending **Soft Disclosure** 5. Vision and Strategy Claims 6. Environmental Profile 7. Environmental Initiative

3. Conceptual Framework of Environmental Disclosure

Environmental disclosure refers to the communication of information regarding firm's environmental performance, practices, and policies to its stakeholders. This concept encompasses both qualitative and quantitative disclosures about environmental aspects such as energy usage, emissions, waste management, environmental compliance, and eco-innovation (Clarkson et al., 2008; GRI, 2021). It serves as a bridge between a corporation and its stakeholders, offering transparency and building legitimacy in the eyes of the public.

Environmental disclosure can be classified as voluntary or mandatory, depending on the regulatory context. Voluntary disclosure often stems from internal motivations such as corporate values, reputational benefits, or stakeholder pressure (Cormier & Gordon, 2001). Mandatory disclosure, on the other hand, is imposed by legal frameworks, such as the EU Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD), the U.S. SEC's climate related disclosure rules, India's SEBI BRSR framework.

4. Theories of Environmental Disclosure

The following theories provide a conceptual foundation for understanding why firms disclose environmental information and how such disclosures contribute to building legitimacy, trust, and long-term value.

4.1 Legitimacy Theory

Legitimacy theory reflects that organizations seek to ensure that their operations are perceived as legitimate by aligning with societal norms and expectations (Suchman, 1995). Environmental disclosure is a strategic response to legitimacy pressures, especially when a firm's operations pose environmental risks or when public scrutiny is high (Deegan, 2002). Through environmental reporting, firms attempt to bridge the legitimacy gap and demonstrate their commitment to sustainable practices and regulatory compliance.

4.2 Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory emphasizes that businesses have a responsibility to multiple stakeholders such as shareholders, customers, employees, regulators, and the broader community (Freeman, 1984). Environmental disclosure is used as a tool to communicate with and respond to the interests of these diverse groups. Transparent reporting helps firms align their strategies with stakeholder concerns and fosters trust, thereby improving stakeholder relationships and long-term performance (Roberts, 1992).

4.3 Institutional Theory

Institutional theory suggests that organizations are influenced by the institutional environment rules, norms, and practices in which they operate (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Firms may adopt environmental disclosure practices to conform to institutional pressures such as regulations, industry standards. Over time, such practices become institutionalized, creating legitimacy and competitive parity (Bansal, 2005).

4.4 Agency Theory

Agency theory addresses the conflict of interest between managers (agents) and shareholders (principals) due to information asymmetry (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Environmental disclosure serves as a monitoring mechanism that reduces this asymmetry and enhances managerial accountability. By voluntarily disclosing environmental performance, managers signal their competence and reduce the risk of agency costs (Cormier et al., 2011).

5. Factors influencing Environmental Disclosure

Environmental disclosure is influenced by both internal and external factors that motivate or compel companies to report on their environmental performance. The following are the key factors:

Regulatory and Legal Requirements

One of the most important factors of environmental disclosure is the presence of mandatory regulatory frameworks. For instance, in India, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) has mandated the Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) framework for the top 1,000 listed entities (SEBI, 2021). Globally, the EU Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD) and the US SEC's climate-related proposals reflect growing regulatory involvement.

Stakeholder Pressure

Stakeholders such as investors, customers, employees, civil society, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) exert significant influence on corporate disclosure decisions (Freeman, 1984; Roberts, 1992). As stakeholder awareness about environmental issues grows, companies face greater pressure to disclose accurate and relevant environmental information to maintain their legitimacy and social license to operate.

Market and Investor Expectations

Firms are motivated to disclose environmental information to attract socially responsible investors and improve their market valuation (Dhaliwal et al., 2011). Transparent environmental reporting reduces information asymmetry and is often associated with enhanced investor confidence, lower capital costs, and improved stock performance.

Corporate Governance and Board Characteristics

Companies with strong corporate governance frameworks such as independent boards, sustainability committees, and CEO duality separation tend to disclose more environmental information (Haniffa & Cooke, 2005). Governance mechanisms promote transparency and align corporate practices with stakeholder interests.

Industry Type and Environmental Sensitivity

Firms in environmentally sensitive sectors (e.g., oil & gas, mining, chemicals, textiles) face greater scrutiny and therefore tend to disclose more comprehensive environmental data (Clarkson et al., 2008).

Reputation and Competitive Advantage

Environmental disclosure can be used strategically to build a positive public image, improve brand value, and differentiate the company in the marketplace (Brammer & Pavelin, 2006).

6. Challenges of Environmental Disclosure

Despite growing awareness and regulatory efforts, environmental disclosure continues to face several challenges, particularly in developing economies. These challenges stem from institutional, technical, and organizational constraints that hinder the quality, consistency, and credibility of disclosed information.

1. Lack of Standardization (KPMG, 2022).
2. Voluntary Nature of Disclosure (Chatterjee & Mir, 2008; SEBI, 2021)
3. Limited Awareness and Expertise (Pramanik, Shil & Das, 2007)
4. Greenwashing (Delmas & Burbano, 2011)
5. Measurement and Valuation Issues (Clarkson et al., 2008)
6. High Cost of Reporting (Jain & De Mello, 2020)

7. Conclusion

In the contemporary business environment, transparency is no longer a voluntary ethical choice it is a strategic imperative. Environmental disclosure serves as a vital tool for enhancing corporate transparency by publicly communicating a firm's environmental performance, sustainability initiatives, and compliance with environmental regulations (Adams, 2004; Hahn & Kühnen, 2013). This transparency not only reduces information asymmetry between firms and their stakeholders but also strengthens trust, accountability, and long-term stakeholder relationships.

Environmental disclosure plays a vital role in promoting corporate accountability, enhancing transparency, and guiding stakeholders toward informed decision-making. However, despite growing global emphasis on sustainability and ESG integration, several challenges continue to hinder the effectiveness of environmental reporting. These include lack of standardization, voluntary compliance, limited awareness, weak regulatory enforcement, and risks of greenwashing.

For environmental disclosure to become a robust and reliable component of corporate reporting, it is essential to strengthen regulatory frameworks, promote the adoption of globally recognized standards, and build organizational capacity. Additionally, active stakeholder engagement and the use of digital and AI-based tools can help overcome information asymmetries and ensure that environmental disclosures are credible, comparable, and actionable. Addressing these challenges will not only improve the quality of reporting but also support broader goals of environmental sustainability and responsible corporate governance.

Reference

1. Adams, C. A. (2004). The ethical, social and environmental reporting-performance portrayal gap. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 17(5), 731–757.
2. Ahmad, A. (2012). *Environmental Accounting Reporting Practices Significance and Issues A Case from Bangladeshi Companies Environmental Accounting & Reporting Practices: Significance and Issues: A Case from Bangladeshi Companies*.
3. Al-Tuwaijri, S. A., Christensen, T. E., & Hughes, K. E. (2004). The relations among environmental disclosure, environmental performance, and economic performance: A simultaneous equations approach. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *29*(5–6), 447–471. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682(03)00032-1
4. Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA). (2013). *Environmental Reporting Matters*. Retrieved from https://www.accaglobal.com/
5. Bansal, P. (2005). Evolving sustainably: A longitudinal study of corporate sustainable development. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(3), 197–218.
6. Bebbington, J., Larrinaga, C., & Moneva, J. M. (2008). Corporate social reporting and reputation risk management. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 21(3), 337–361.
7. Brammer, S., & Pavelin, S. (2006). Voluntary environmental disclosures by large UK companies. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, 33(7–8), 1168–1188.
8. Brammer, S., & Pavelin, S. (2006). Voluntary environmental disclosures by large UK companies. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, *33*(7–8), 1168–1188. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5957.2006.00598.x

9. Cappuyns, V., Vandenbulcke, C., & Ceulemans, K. (2015). Economic and Environmental Performance Indicators in Belgian GRI Reports. *Environmental Management and Sustainable Development*, *4*(1), 206. https://doi.org/10.5296/emsd.v4i1.7410
10. Chaklader, B., & Gulati, P. A. (2015). A Study of Corporate Environmental Disclosure Practices of Companies Doing Business in India. *Global Business Review*, *16*(2), 321–335. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150914564430
11. Chatterjee, B., & Mir, M. (2008). The current status of environmental reporting by Indian companies. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 23(6), 609–629. https://doi.org/10.1108/02686900810880299
12. Cho, C. H., Laine, M., Roberts, R. W., & Rodrigue, M. (2015). Organized hypocrisy, organizational façades, and sustainability reporting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 40, 78–94.
13. Clarkson, P. M., Li, Y., Richardson, G. D., & Vasvari, F. P. (2008). Revisiting the relation between environmental performance and environmental disclosure: An empirical analysis. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 33(4–5), 303–327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2007.05.003
14. Cormier, D., & Gordon, I. M. (2001). An examination of social and environmental reporting strategies. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 14(5), 587–616.
15. Cormier, D., Magnan, M., & Velthoven, B. V. (2005). Environmental disclosure quality in large German companies. *European Accounting Review*, 14(1), 3–39.
16. Deegan, C. (2002). The legitimising effect of social and environmental disclosures – A theoretical foundation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 282–311.
17. Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The Drivers of Greenwashing. *California Management Review*, 54(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64
18. Dhaliwal, D. S., Li, O. Z., Tsang, A., & Yang, Y. G. (2011). Voluntary nonfinancial disclosure and the cost of equity capital. *The Accounting Review*, 86(1), 59–100.
19. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
20. Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science*, 60(11), 2835–2857.
21. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman.
22. Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) (2021) *GRI Standards*. https://www.globalreporting.org
23. Gray, R., Kouhy, R., & Lavers, S. (1995). Corporate social and environmental reporting: A review of the literature and a longitudinal study of UK disclosure. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 8(2), 47–77.
24. Hahn, R., & Kühnen, M. (2013). Determinants of sustainability reporting: A review of results, trends, theory, and opportunities in an expanding field of research. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 59, 5–21.
25. Haniffa, R. M., & Cooke, T. E. (2005). The impact of culture and governance on corporate social reporting. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 24(5), 391–430.
26. Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2015). The consequences of mandatory corporate sustainability reporting. *Harvard Business School Research Working Paper No. 11-100*.
27. Jain, T., & De Mello, L. (2020). Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Disclosure in India. *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 1627. https://doi.org/10.1787/d0416f8a-en
28. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360.
29. KPMG. (2020). *The KPMG Survey of Sustainability Reporting 2020*.

30. KPMG. (2022). *KPMG Survey of Sustainability Reporting 2022*. Retrieved from https://home.kpmg/xx/en/home/insights/2022/11/sustainability-reporting.html
31. Pramanik, A. K., Shil, N. C., & Das, B. (2007). *Environmental Accounting and Reporting*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.
32. Roberts, R. W. (1992). Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 17(6), 595–612.
33. SEBI. (2021). *Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting by Listed Entities*. Securities and Exchange Board of India.
34. Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610.