

India Studies in Business and Economics

The Indian economy is considered to be one of the fastest growing economies of the world with India amongst the most important G-20 economies. Ever since the Indian economy made its presence felt on the global platform, the research community is now even more interested in studying and analyzing what India has to offer. This series aims to bring forth the latest studies and research about India from the areas of economics, business, and management science. The titles featured in this series will present rigorous empirical research, often accompanied by policy recommendations, evoke and evaluate various aspects of the economy and the business and management landscape in India, with a special focus on India's relationship with the world in terms of business and trade.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/11234>

M. V. Shivaani · P. K. Jain ·
Surendra S. Yadav

Understanding Corporate Risk

A Study of Risk Measurement, Disclosure
and Governance

M. V. Shivaani
Indian Institute of Management (IIM),
VNIT Campus
Nagpur, India

P. K. Jain
Department of Management Studies
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
New Delhi, India

Surendra S. Yadav
Department of Management Studies
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
New Delhi, India

ISSN 2198-0012 ISSN 2198-0020 (electronic)
India Studies in Business and Economics
ISBN 978-981-13-8140-9 ISBN 978-981-13-8141-6 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-8141-6>

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

*In the loving memory of
Late Dr. Manoj Kumar*

Preface

Risk has been an intriguing phenomenon for both managers and academicians. Much of the ambiguity in the domain may be ascribed to different connotations of risk in different contexts. In view of the debacles such as Enron and Satyam (some years back), and global financial crisis, the concept of corporate risk and risk management has been gaining attention not only from investors and corporates but also from policy-makers.

The present monograph presents a research work relating to risk measurement, disclosure and governance. For the purpose, well-established research techniques, namely expert opinion, diff-GMM regression, nonparametric tests like Kruskal–Wallis test and Mann–Whitney U test, have been used. Besides these techniques, a survey has been administered among top finance personnel of sample companies. Further, the results have been corroborated by the use of a practice-oriented comparative case study.

In operational terms, an attempt has been made to develop a risk index (based on nine major risks, namely market risk, accounting risk, competition risk, contingency risk, credit risk, foreign exchange risk, liquidity risk, operating risk and solvency risk). In addition, the relationship between risk levels and accounting returns has also been examined. Further, a risk disclosure index (based on 69 risk-related items and covering three semantic attributes, namely nature of disclosure (qualitative/quantitative), time orientation (backward-looking/forward-looking/both), tone of disclosure (neutral/positive/negative/both positive and negative)); and a risk governance index (based on board size, proportion of women directors, proportion of non-executive directors, proportion of independent directors, CEO duality, executive/non-executive status of chairman, chief risk officer (CRO), whistle-blower policy, risk management committee, compulsory committees and voluntary committees) have also been developed. Moreover, the relationships among the three indices have also been examined. For the purpose, difference generalised method of moments (diff-GMM) regression has been used.

The notable findings of the secondary data are that the sample Indian firms, on an average, have ‘moderate risk’ levels. These findings are supplemented with the evidence of satisfactory return on assets and return on equity for the sample

companies. Further, as the risk index is a normative framework, recommendatory in nature, the evidence of negative risk–return relationship (i.e., higher the risk, lower the returns) provides support for the methodology used in the construction of the risk index.

On the one hand, the sample companies exhibit extremely low scores on risk disclosure index, indicating a lack of transparency regarding the risks and their impacts. On the other hand, the sample companies have sound risk governance structures. But, these could be further strengthened with collaborative efforts of corporates and regulatory bodies.

Though no significant relationship could be found between risk levels and quality of governance structure, risk disclosures appear to be positively influenced by both the risk levels and the quality of governance structure. It is noteworthy that risk governance index acts as a moderating variable, influencing the relationship between risk disclosure index and risk index.

The survey findings indicate that the sample firms consider risk as something with a positive as well as negative potential. Most firms seem to undertake risk management activities in order to protect firm value. Further, the majority of companies have an internal manual for risk management policies and carry a continuous review of techniques used in risk management. It may be noted that companies that seem to be in favour of voluntary risk reporting (in annual reports) tend to have higher risk levels. In addition, the chief finance officer emerges as the most widely accepted authority on risk. It may further be noted that the results of secondary data analysis and survey analysis have been corroborated by the results of a case study (two cases) analysis. The findings of the cases studied provide credence to the methodology used in the construction of risk index, disclosure index and governance index.

Based on the findings of the research, the following recommendations have been made: (i) policy-makers should take initiatives to prescribe a risk index type normative framework for non-financial companies; to help them maintain theoretically tenable risk levels; to enhance transparency and improve communication between companies and stakeholders; and to make risk disclosures mandatory; non-compliance with certain mandatory provisions, such as appointment of woman director, needs to be dealt with swiftly and strictly. (ii) Managers should avoid excessive risk taking as higher risk does not always translate into higher return; they should focus on increasing transparency, improving communication with stakeholders and reducing information asymmetry to garner investor confidence.

Nagpur, India
New Delhi, India
New Delhi, India

M. V. Shivaani
P. K. Jain
Surendra S. Yadav

Acknowledgements

First of all, we would like to thank the Almighty for His blessings.

We are grateful to Prof. V. Ramgopal Rao, Director, IIT Delhi, and Prof. L. S. Murthy, Director, IIM Nagpur, for their kind support and cooperation. We express our sincere thanks to Prof. Kanika T. Bhal, Professor, Department of Management Studies (DMS), IIT Delhi; Prof. M. P. Gupta, Head, DMS, IIT Delhi; Prof. Shveta Singh, DMS, IIT Delhi; and Prof. Smita Kashiramka for their encouragement to pursue this task. We are also thankful to all the colleagues in DMS, IIT Delhi, and in IIM Nagpur for their constant support and good wishes.

We have a word of appreciation for the excellent support from Sagarika Ghosh and Nupoor Singh and their team members of Springer for the speedy and excellent publication of the book.

Professor P. K. Jain acknowledges his wife Uma for her patience, understanding, cooperation and encouragement.

Dr. M. V. Shivaani believes that this book would not have been possible without the unrelenting support, guidance, insights and motivation of her respected co-authors and gurus Prof. P. K. Jain and Prof. Surendra S. Yadav. She would also like to express her sincere gratitude to Prof. C. P. Gupta (Department of Financial Studies, Delhi University) for his constant guidance and motivation. In addition, she expresses her heartfelt gratitude to her mother Ms. Vasudha Gupta and grandmother Ms. Dropati Aggarwal, without whose unwavering support, encouragement, endurance, perseverance and sacrifices, and this academic journey would not have been possible.

M. V. Shivaani
P. K. Jain
Surendra S. Yadav

Contents

1	Introduction to the Study	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Regulatory Background	2
1.3	Description of the Problem	3
1.4	Conceptual Framework	4
1.5	Objectives and Significance	5
	1.5.1 Objectives of the Study	5
	1.5.2 Significance of the Study	6
1.6	Scope of the Study	6
1.7	Methodology of the Study	7
1.8	Organisation of the Study	7
1.9	Concluding Observations	8
	References	8
2	Research Methodology	9
2.1	Introduction	9
2.2	Research Objectives and Hypotheses	9
	2.2.1 Research Objectives	9
	2.2.2 Hypotheses of the Study	12
2.3	Data	13
	2.3.1 Secondary Data	13
	2.3.2 Primary Data	14
2.4	Research Methodology and Scope	14
	2.4.1 Research Methodology	14
	2.4.2 Scope of the Study	19
	2.4.3 Use of Statistical Software	19
2.5	Concluding Observations	19
	References	20

3	Normative Framework for Risk Index and Its Empirical Analysis	21
3.1	Introduction	21
3.2	Methodology	22
3.3	Sample Selection	33
3.4	Empirical Evidence	33
	3.4.1 Aggregative Analysis	33
	3.4.2 Dis-aggregative Analysis	40
3.5	Implications	60
3.6	Limitations of the Study	61
3.7	Concluding Observations	61
	References	62
4	Normative Framework for Risk Disclosure Index and Its Empirical Analysis	65
4.1	Introduction	65
4.2	Methodology for Construction of Risk Disclosure Index (RDI)	66
4.3	Sample Selection	73
4.4	Empirical Evidence	73
	4.4.1 Aggregative Analysis	73
	4.4.2 Dis-aggregative Analysis	80
4.5	Implications	142
4.6	Concluding Observations	143
	Appendix	144
	References	166
5	Normative Framework for Risk Governance Index and Its Empirical Analysis	169
5.1	Introduction	169
5.2	Methodology	170
5.3	Sample	178
5.4	Empirical Evidence	178
	5.4.1 Aggregative Analysis	178
	5.4.2 Dis-aggregative Analysis	185
5.5	Implications	199
5.6	Concluding Observations	200
	References	201
6	Examining Risk–Return Relationship	205
6.1	Introduction	205
6.2	Background and Hypotheses Development	205
6.3	Sample	207
6.4	Methodology	207

6.5	Empirical Evidence	210
6.5.1	Descriptive Analysis	210
6.5.2	Relationship Between Risk Index and ROA (Model 1)	213
6.5.3	Relationship Between Risk Index and ROA (Model 2)	215
6.5.4	Relationship Between Risk Index and ROE (Model 3)	216
6.5.5	Relationship of Risk Index ROE (Model 4)	217
6.6	Implications	218
6.7	Concluding Observations	219
	References	220
7	Moderating Role of Governance in Risk-Disclosure Relationship	223
7.1	Introduction	223
7.2	Background and Hypothesis Development	225
7.2.1	Risk Index (RI) and Risk Governance Index (RGI)	225
7.2.2	Risk Disclosure Index (RDI) and Risk Index (RI)	227
7.2.3	Risk Disclosure Index (RDI) and Risk Governance Index (RGI)	228
7.3	Sample	229
7.4	Methodology	229
7.5	Empirical Evidence	231
7.5.1	Descriptive Analysis	231
7.5.2	Relationship Between Risk Index and Risk Governance Index (Model 1)	231
7.5.3	Relationship Between Risk Disclosure Index and Risk Governance Index (Model 2)	232
7.5.4	Relationship Between Risk Disclosure Index and Risk Index (Model 3)	234
7.5.5	Relationship of Risk Disclosure Index with Risk Index and Risk Governance Index (Model 4)	235
7.5.6	Relationship of Risk Disclosure Index with Risk Index and Risk Governance Index While Factoring for Moderating Effects of Risk Governance Index (Model 5)	238
7.5.7	Further Analysis	242
7.6	Implications	244
7.7	Concluding Observations	245
	References	246

8	Practitioners' Perspective on Risk	251
8.1	Introduction	251
8.2	Survey Methodology	252
8.3	Profile of Respondents	253
8.3.1	Descriptive Statistics of Respondent Companies	253
8.3.2	Designation of Respondents in Companies	254
8.3.3	Respondents' Objectivity and Fairness in Responses	255
8.4	Analysis and Empirical Results	257
8.4.1	Organisations' Attitude Towards Risk	257
8.4.2	Risk Identification and Prioritisation	258
8.4.3	Risk Measurement	259
8.4.4	Risk Handling	259
8.4.5	Risk Communication	262
8.4.6	Risk Management Authority and Structure	264
8.4.7	Risk and Return	266
8.4.8	Evaluation of Risk Management Practices	267
8.4.9	Risk Prioritisation, Measurement and Management	267
8.4.10	Relationship Between Primary and Secondary Data	269
8.5	Implications	273
8.6	Concluding Observations	274
	References	275
9	Case Studies	277
9.1	Introduction	277
9.2	Methodology	278
9.2.1	Case Study Methodology	278
9.2.2	Criterion for the Selection of Companies	279
9.3	Brief Background of Companies Selected for Case Study	279
9.4	Analysis and Empirical Results	280
9.4.1	Descriptive Statistics	280
9.4.2	Empirical Analysis	283
9.5	Implications	306
9.6	Concluding Observations	306
	References	307
10	Summary and Conclusion	309
10.1	Introduction	309
10.2	Major Findings of the Research	310
10.2.1	Findings Related to Risk Index	310
10.2.2	Findings Related to Risk Disclosure Index	311
10.2.3	Findings Related to Risk Governance Index	313
10.2.4	Findings Related to Risk-Return Relationship	314

- 10.2.5 Findings Related to Relationship Among Risk Index,
Risk Disclosure Index and Risk Governance Index 314
- 10.2.6 Findings Related to Risk Management Practices 315
- 10.3 Recommendations From the Study 316
- 10.4 Contribution of the Study 317
- 10.5 Limitations of the Study 317
- 10.6 Scope for Future Research 318
- 10.7 Concluding Observations of the Study 318
- Annexure I 319**
- Annexure II 327**
- Annexure III 331**
- Index 333**

About the Authors

M. V. Shivaani is an Assistant Professor in the area of accounting and finance at the Indian Institute of Management (IIM) Nagpur. She obtained her Ph.D. from the Department of Management Studies, Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi. She is a Chartered Accountant (ICAI) by profession and has presented her research at various international conferences. She was awarded best paper/presentation award at International Conference on Applied Economics and Management Sciences, Spain and International Conference on Sustainable Growth & Innovation & Revolution in the New Millennium. She has published in journals of national and international repute. She has also been a part of research team to Indian Scientific Expedition to Antarctica.

P. K. Jain is an Emeritus Professor of Finance and was the Modi Chair Professor at the Department of Management Studies, Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi. He was also the Dalmia Chair Professor at the institute. Recently, he received the 'Best Faculty Award' at IIT Delhi. He has more than 45 years of teaching experience in subjects related to management accounting, financial management, financial analysis, cost analysis and cost control. He was a member of the visiting faculty at the AIT Bangkok; University of Paris; Howe School of Technology Management at Stevens Institute of Technology, New Jersey; and ICPE, Ljubljana. He has authored three well-known textbooks published by Tata Mcgraw Hill and more than ten research monographs (four of them with Springer), and has published over 200 research papers in respected national and international journals.

Surendra S. Yadav is a Professor of Finance at the Department of Management Studies, Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Delhi, where he was the Head of the Department of Management Studies for six years. He teaches corporate finance, international finance, international business, and security analysis and portfolio management. He has been a Visiting Professor at the University of Paris, Paris School of Management, INSEEC Paris, and the University of Tampa, USA. He has

published 12 books (some of them with Springer) and contributed more than 230 papers to research journals and conferences as well as over 30 papers to financial/economic newspapers. He is the editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Advances in Management Research* (JAMR) published by Emerald Publishing, UK.

Abbreviations

AICPA	American Institute of Certified Public Accountants
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
BCBS	Basel Committee on Banking Supervision
BOD	Board of directors
BOP	Beginning of period
CAPM	Capital asset pricing model
CCR	Contingency coverage ratio
CEO	Chief executive officer
CFO	Chief financial officer
CI	Composite indicator
CICA	Certified Internal Control Auditors
COO	Chief operating officer
COSO	Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission
CRO	Chief risk officer
DOL	Degree of operating leverage
EBIT	Earnings before interest and taxes
EOP	End of period
ERM	Enterprise risk management
ESOP	Employee stock option plan
EWRM	Enterprise-wide risk management
FASB	Financial Accounting Standards Board
FDI	Foreign direct investment
FMCG	Fast-moving consumer goods
FSB	Financial Stability Board
GARP	Global Association of Risk Professionals
GIM	Gompers–Ishii–Metrick
GMM	Generalised method of moments
HR	Human resources
IASB	International Accounting Standard Board

IATR	Inverse of acid-test ratio
ICAEW	Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales
ICAI	Institute of Chartered Accountants of India
ICSI	Institute of Company Secretaries of India
ICT	Information and communication technology
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IFRS	International Financial Reporting Standards
IRGC	International Risk Governance Council
IRRC	Investor Responsibility Research Center
MD	Managing director
MD&A	Management discussion and analysis
MDI	Modified defensive interval
MMTC	Metals and Minerals Trading Corporation of India
NSE	National Stock Exchange
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OLS	Ordinary least squares
PoF	Proportion of females
PoID	Proportion of independent directors
PoNED	Proportion of non-executive directors
PSU	Public sector undertaking
RDI	Risk disclosure index
RGI	Risk governance index
RI	Risk index
RMC	Risk Management Committee
ROA	Return on assets
ROE	Return on equity
SEBI	Securities and Exchange Board of India
SEC	Securities Exchange Commission
SRM	Spectral risk measures
SWOT	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
TD/E	Total debt/equity
UK	United Kingdom
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
USA	United States of America
VaR	Value at risk
WTD	Whole-time director

List of Figures

Fig. 1.1	Conceptual framework of corporate risk management.	4
Fig. 2.1	Outline of research methodology	14
Fig. 3.1	Scope of analysis	32
Fig. 3.2	Year-wise descriptive statistics of risk index.	34
Fig. 3.3	Pair-wise comparison of risk index industry-level.	40
Fig. 4.1	Scope of analysis	72
Fig. 4.2	Year-wise descriptive statistics of RDI	74
Fig. 4.3	Pairwise comparison of RDI scores of different age group.	77
Fig. 4.4	Age-wise, period-wise mean disclosure scores of sample companies.	78
Fig. 4.5	Pair-wise comparison of RDI scores amongst various industry groups.	80
Fig. 4.6	Industry-wise, period-wise average disclosure scores of sample companies.	83
Fig. 5.1	Scope of analysis	179
Fig. 5.2	Descriptive statistics of risk governance index, 2005–2015	180
Fig. 5.3	Pair-wise comparison of risk governance index of companies based on age.	182
Fig. 5.4	Pair-wise comparison of risk governance index of companies based on industry	185
Fig. 6.1	Year-wise descriptive statistics of risk index.	211
Fig. 6.2	Year-wise descriptive statistics of return on assets	212
Fig. 6.3	Year-wise descriptive statistics of return on equity	213
Fig. 7.1	Framework of interrelationships among various dimensions of risk.	224
Fig. 7.2	Exploration of relationship among RDI, RI and RGI	237
Fig. 7.3	Moderating effect of RGI on relationship between RDI and RI.	240
Fig. 7.4	Holistic view of relationship among RDI, RGI and RI.	242
Fig. 8.1	Industry-wise classification of respondent companies	253
Fig. 8.2	Profile of respondents of survey	255

Fig. 8.3 Percentage of respondents using specific techniques for risk identification 258

Fig. 8.4 Percentage of companies that attempt to manage risks and reasons why companies do not manage risks. 261

Fig. 8.5 **a** Percentage of companies supporting voluntary risk disclosures in annual reports. **b** Percentage responses for type of voluntary information that companies are willing to share 263

Fig. 8.6 **a** Percentage of companies that favour voluntary risk disclosures in annual reports. **b** Percentage responses for various risks that a company would want to disclose 264

Fig. 8.7 **a** Percentage responses for whether the company has a top-to-bottom risk reporting system. **b** Percentage responses for items that are communicated under the top-to-bottom risk reporting 265

Fig. 8.8 Percentage of respondents preferring different measures of firm performance 267

Fig. 8.9 Percentage of respondents using different indicators for the evaluation of success of risk management plans 268

Fig. 9.1 Comparison of risk index of Cyient Ltd., and MMTC Ltd. 280

Fig. 9.2 Comparison of risk disclosure index of Cyient Ltd., and MMTC Ltd. 281

Fig. 9.3 Comparison of risk governance index of Cyient Ltd., and MMTC Ltd. 281

Fig. 9.4 Comparison of return on assets of Cyient Ltd., and MMTC Ltd. 298

Fig. 9.5 Comparison of return on equity of Cyient Ltd., and MMTC Ltd. 299

Fig. 9.6 Comparison of equity returns of Cyient Ltd., and MMTC Ltd. 299

Fig. 9.7 Comparison of profitability of Cyient Ltd., and MMTC Ltd. 300

List of Tables

Table 3.1	Descriptive statistics of year-wise risk index on full sample, 2005–2015	34
Table 3.2	Descriptive statistics of risk index, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015)).	35
Table 3.3	Mann Whitney U test for difference of mean Risk index (pre-recession, post-recession)	36
Table 3.4	Descriptive statistics of risk index, age-wise (2005–2015)	36
Table 3.5	Kruskal Wallis test for mean difference in risk index among different age groups	37
Table 3.6	Descriptive statistics of risk index, age-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015)).	38
Table 3.7	Mann-Whitney U test for difference of mean risk index (pre-recession, post-recession) for each age category	38
Table 3.8	Descriptive statistics of risk index, industry-wise (2005–2015).	39
Table 3.9	Descriptive statistics of risk index, industry-wise, phase-wise (pre-recession, (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	41
Table 3.10	Mann Whitney U test for difference of mean risk index, industry-wise, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015)).	42
Table 3.11	Summary of frequency distribution of various risks, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	43
Table 3.12	Summary of frequency distribution of various risks, age-wise	46
Table 3.13	Summary of frequency distribution of various risks, industry-wise	50
Table 4.1	List of items/themes constituting risk disclosure index (RDI)	67
Table 4.2	Methodology for construction of scale	69
Table 4.3	Descriptive statistics of RDI, 2005–2015	74

Table 4.4	Descriptive statistics of RDI, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015)).	75
Table 4.5	Mann–Whitney U test for difference of mean RDI (pre-recession, post-recession)	76
Table 4.6	Descriptive statistics of RDI, age-wise (2005–2015)	76
Table 4.7	Kruskal-Wallis test for difference of mean RDI amongst age categories.	77
Table 4.8	Descriptive statistics of RDI, age-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession)	78
Table 4.9	Mann–Whitney U test for difference of mean RDI (pre-recession, post-recession) for each age category	78
Table 4.10	Descriptive statistics of RDI, industry-wise (2005–2015).	79
Table 4.11	Descriptive statistics of RDI, industry-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015)).	81
Table 4.12	Mann–Whitney U test for difference of mean RDI (pre-recession, post-recession) for each industry classification.	82
Table 4.13	Summary of frequency distribution of top 10% of items, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	84
Table 4.14	Summary of frequency distribution of bottom 10% of items, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	85
Table 4.15	Summary of frequency distribution of top 10% and bottom 10% of items for young companies, (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015)).	87
Table 4.16	Summary of frequency distribution of top 10% and bottom 10% of items for middle-aged companies, (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015)).	89
Table 4.17	Summary of frequency distribution of top 10% and bottom 10% of items for old and established companies, (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	91
Table 4.18	Summary of frequency distribution of the top 10% of items, industry-wise, for the period under study (2005–2015)	94
Table 4.19	Summary of the frequency distribution of the top 10% of items, industry-wise, pre-recession (2005–2008)	98
Table 4.20	Summary of the frequency distribution of top 10% of items, industry-wise, post-recession (2008–2015).	101
Table 4.21	Description of top and bottom 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ risk items, full sample (2005–2015).	105
Table 4.22	Description of top and bottom 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, pre-recession (2005–2008).	106

Table 4.23	Description of top and bottom 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, post-recession (2009–2015).	107
Table 4.24	Description of top 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, age-wise, for the period under study (2005–2015).	109
Table 4.25	Description of top 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, age-wise pre-recession (2005–2008)	112
Table 4.26	Description of top 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, age-wise, post-recession (2008–2015)	114
Table 4.27	Description of bottom 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, age-wise, for the period under study (2005–2015).	117
Table 4.28	Description of bottom 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, age-wise pre-recession (2005–2008)	120
Table 4.29	Description of bottom 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, age-wise, post-recession (2008–2015)	123
Table 4.30	Description of top 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, industry-wise, for the period under study (2005–2015)	127
Table 4.31	Description of top 10% of ‘most comprehensively/richly disclosed’ items, industry-wise pre-recession (2005–2008).	131
Table 4.32	Description of top 10% of ‘most comprehensively (rich) disclosed’ items, industry-wise, post-recession (2008–2015).	135
Table 4.33	Frequency distribution of items pertaining to risk management (scored on binary scale), full sample (2005–2015).	139
Table 4.34	Frequency distribution of items pertaining to risk management (scored on binary scale), age-wise, (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	140
Table 4.35	Examples of coding of risk disclosures in annual reports.	144
Table 4.36	Summary of frequency distribution of top 10% of ‘least comprehensively (rich) disclosed’ items, industry-wise, for the period under study (2005–2015).	145
Table 4.37	Summary of the frequency distribution of top 10% of ‘least comprehensively (rich) disclosed’ items, industry-wise pre-recession (2005–2008)	150
Table 4.38	Summary of the frequency distribution of top 10% of ‘least comprehensively (rich) disclosed’ items, industry-wise, post-recession (2008–2015).	155
Table 4.39	Frequency distribution of items pertaining to risk management (scored on binary scale), industry-wise, (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	159

Table 5.1	Descriptive statistics of year-wise risk governance index on full sample, 2005–2015.	179
Table 5.2	Descriptive statistics of risk governance index, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	180
Table 5.3	Mann–Whitney U test for difference of mean risk governance index (pre-recession, post-recession)	181
Table 5.4	Descriptive statistics of risk governance index, age-wise (2005–2015).	181
Table 5.5	Kruskal–Wallis test for mean difference in risk governance index among different age groups	182
Table 5.6	Descriptive statistics of risk governance index, age-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	183
Table 5.7	Mann–Whitney U test for difference of mean risk governance index (pre-recession, post-recession) for each age category . . .	183
Table 5.8	Descriptive statistics of risk governance index, industry-wise (2005–2015).	184
Table 5.9	Descriptive statistics of risk governance index, industry-wise, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015))	186
Table 5.10	Mann Whitney U test for difference of mean risk governance index, industry-wise, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015)).	187
Table 5.11	Summary of frequency distribution of risk governance characteristics, phase-wise (pre-recession (2005–2008); post-recession (2008–2015)).	188
Table 5.12	Summary of frequency distribution of risk governance characteristics, age-wise	191
Table 5.13	Summary of the frequency distribution of risk governance characteristics, industry-wise	193
Table 6.1	Descriptive statistics of risk index	210
Table 6.2	Descriptive statistics of return on assets	212
Table 6.3	Descriptive statistics of return on equity	213
Table 6.4	Results of (Arellano-Bond) GMM estimation of ROA on first lag of ROA, RI and control variables	214
Table 6.5	Results of (Arellano-Bond) GMM estimation of ROA on first lag of ROA, RI, RGI and control variables	216
Table 6.6	Results of (Arellano-Bond) GMM estimation of ROE on first lag of ROE, RI and control variables.	217
Table 6.7	Results of (Arellano-Bond) GMM estimation of ROE on first lag of ROE, RI, RGI and control variables	218
Table 7.1	Descriptive statistics of relevant variables for the period 2005–2015.	231
Table 7.2	Results of (Arellano-Bond) GMM estimation of RI on the first lag of RI, RGI and control variables	232

Table 7.3	Results of (Arellano–Bond) GMM estimation of RDI on the first lag of RDI, RGI and control variables	233
Table 7.4	Results of (Arellano–Bond) GMM estimation of RDI on the first lag of RDI, RI and control variables	234
Table 7.5	Results of (Arellano–Bond) GMM estimation of RDI on the first lag of RDI, RI and RGI and control variables	236
Table 7.6	Results of (Arellano–Bond) GMM estimation of RDI on the first lag of RDI, RI, RGI and (RI * RGI) and control variables	239
Table 7.7	Cross tabulation between RI and RGI	243
Table 7.8	Cross tabulation between RDI and RI	243
Table 7.9	Cross tabulation between RDI and RGI	244
Table 8.1	Descriptive statistics of respondent companies	254
Table 8.2	Examination of personal bias in questionnaire responses	256
Table 8.3	Examination of personal bias in questionnaire responses	256
Table 8.4	Summary of practitioners’ opinion on risk	257
Table 8.5	Management’s motives for pursuing risk management	257
Table 8.6	Summary of importance of various factors for risk prioritisation	259
Table 8.7	Summary of practitioners’ preferences for various risk measurement techniques and tools	260
Table 8.8	Summary of risk handling practices prevalent in Indian corporates	261
Table 8.9	Summary of risk communication practices prevalent in Indian corporates	262
Table 8.10	Practitioners’ views on importance of recipients of risk information	266
Table 8.11	Summary of practitioners’ views on risk authority and risk structures in Indian corporates	266
Table 8.12	Ranking of various risks based on their importance, and percentage of companies measuring and managing those risks	268
Table 8.13	Summary of relationship between risk disclosure index and practitioners’ responses	270
Table 8.14	Summary of relationship between risk index and organisation’s attitude towards risk	271
Table 8.15	Summary of relationship between risk disclosure index and designation of person drafting the MD&A section of the annual report	271
Table 8.16	Summary of relationship between risk index and practitioners’ responses	272
Table 9.1	Descriptive statistics of RI, RDI and RGI for Cyient Ltd., and MMTC Ltd.	282
Table 9.2	Mann–Whitney U test for difference of risk index	284

Table 9.3	Descriptive statistics related to various constituents of risk index	285
Table 9.4	Summary results of Mann–Whitney U test for sub-hypotheses related to risk index.	286
Table 9.5	Mann–Whitney U test for difference in risk disclosure index	290
Table 9.6	Descriptive statistics related to components of risk disclosure index	291
Table 9.7	Summary results of Mann–Whitney U test related to various aspects of risk disclosure index	292
Table 9.8	Mann–Whitney U test for difference in risk governance index	295
Table 9.9	Descriptive statistics related to various components of risk governance index	296
Table 9.10	Summary results of Mann–Whitney U test for sub-hypotheses related to risk governance index	297
Table 9.11	Descriptive statistics related to various performance indicators	301
Table 9.12	Summary results for Mann–Whitney U test related to various performance measures	302
Table 9.13	Summary results of hypothesis testing	303
Table 9.14	Methodology for categorisation of RDI, RGI, RI from ‘very low’ to ‘very high’	304
Table 9.15	Cross tabulation based on risk index and risk governance index	305
Table 9.16	Cross tabulation based on risk index and risk disclosure index	305
Table 9.17	Cross tabulation based on risk governance index and risk disclosure index	305

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 3.1	Scoring in relation to market risk	24
Exhibit 3.2	Scoring in relation to accounting risk	25
Exhibit 3.3	Scoring in relation to competition risk	26
Exhibit 3.4	Scoring in relation to contingency risk	27
Exhibit 3.5	Scoring in relation to credit risk	27
Exhibit 3.6	Scoring in relation to exchange rate risk	28
Exhibit 3.7	Scoring in relation to liquidity risk 1	29
Exhibit 3.8	Scoring in relation liquidity risk 2	30
Exhibit 3.9	Scoring in relation to operating risk	31
Exhibit 3.10	Scoring in relation to solvency risk 1	31
Exhibit 3.11	Scoring in relation to solvency risk 2	32
Exhibit 5.1	Scoring for number of board of directors	172
Exhibit 5.2	Scoring in relation to the number of women directors on board	172
Exhibit 5.3	Scoring in relation to the proportion of non-executive directors	173
Exhibit 5.4	Scoring in relation to executive–non-executive status of chairman	174
Exhibit 5.5	Scoring in relation to the proportion of independent directors, with executive chairman	174
Exhibit 5.6	Scoring in relation to proportion of independent directors, with non-executive chairman	175
Exhibit 5.7	Scoring in context of CEO duality	175
Exhibit 5.8	Scoring in the context of the appointment of a CRO	175
Exhibit 5.9	Scoring in context of the existence of a whistle-blower policy	176
Exhibit 5.10	Scoring in context of the existence of risk management committee	176
Exhibit 5.11	Scoring in the context of compulsory committees	177
Exhibit 5.12	Scoring in context of number of voluntary committees constituted	177

Exhibit 7.1 Methodology for computation mean RDI corresponding to various levels of RI and RGI. 237

Exhibit 7.2 Methodology for categorisation of RDI, RGI, RI from ‘very low’ to ‘very high’ 242