Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 2, March-April 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i02.1475

Impact of Companies Act, 2013 on Corporate Governance and Financial Performance of Indian Companies: An Empirical Study

Gaurav Jaiswal

PhD Research Scholar

Abstract:
The Companies Act, 2013 strengthened statutory governance mechanisms and created an important setting for examining whether governance quality is associated with corporate performance. The Companies Act, 2013 strengthened the governance architecture of Indian companies through provisions relating to boards, independent directors, audit committees, related-party transactions, disclosures and accountability. The economic effect of these provisions depends on whether they operate as substantive monitoring mechanisms rather than checklist compliance. Board independence can reduce agency problems when directors possess relevant expertise and are willing to challenge management. Audit committees can strengthen oversight of financial reporting and internal control. Disclosure requirements can reduce information asymmetry and help investors evaluate management decisions. These mechanisms provide measurable governance variables for an empirical model. Financial performance can be measured through return on assets, return on equity, operating margin or market-based indicators. However, governance and performance may influence each other: better-performing companies may have more resources to invest in governance. The study should therefore consider lagged governance measures, panel methods and robustness checks. A governance index can combine observable board, committee and disclosure indicators. Secondary data from annual reports and regulatory filings can provide a large sample. The study can compare sectors and ownership structures and examine whether institutional ownership strengthens the governance-performance relationship. The proposed research uses an empirical framework to examine measurable relationships while recognising differences in firm size, sector, professional

Keywords: companies act 2013; corporate governance; financial performance; board independence; india; corporate law

Introduction

The Companies Act, 2013 strengthened statutory governance mechanisms and created an important setting for examining whether governance quality is associated with corporate performance. The Companies Act, 2013 strengthened the governance architecture of Indian companies through provisions relating to boards, independent directors, audit committees, related-party transactions, disclosures and

Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 2, March-April 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i02.1475

accountability. The economic effect of these provisions depends on whether they operate as substantive monitoring mechanisms rather than checklist compliance. Board independence can reduce agency problems when directors possess relevant expertise and are willing to challenge management. Audit committees can strengthen oversight of financial reporting and internal control. Disclosure requirements can reduce information asymmetry and help investors evaluate management decisions. These mechanisms provide measurable governance variables for an empirical model. The study is positioned within the Indian institutional environment and is designed to move beyond descriptive discussion toward measurable relationships. The research is particularly relevant because changes in regulation, technology and professional practice can affect firms differently according to size, sector, managerial capability and access to specialised advice.

Background And Context

The Companies Act, 2013 strengthened the governance architecture of Indian companies through provisions relating to boards, independent directors, audit committees, related-party transactions, disclosures and accountability. The economic effect of these provisions depends on whether they operate as substantive monitoring mechanisms rather than checklist compliance. The Companies Act, 2013 strengthened statutory governance mechanisms and created an important setting for examining whether governance quality is associated with corporate performance. The wider policy environment is characterised by increasing digitisation, stronger information systems and greater expectations of transparency. These developments create efficiency opportunities but also impose capability requirements. A useful empirical study must therefore examine both benefits and adjustment costs.

Problem Statement

The central research problem is that headline indicators do not fully reveal firm-level effects. Financial performance can be measured through return on assets, return on equity, operating margin or market-based indicators. However, governance and performance may influence each other: better-performing companies may have more resources to invest in governance. The study should therefore consider lagged governance measures, panel methods and robustness checks. The proposed study therefore asks whether the relevant intervention or condition is associated with measurable changes in the selected outcome after controlling for other firm characteristics.

Literature Review

Prior research in this area can be grouped into institutional, behavioural and technology-oriented perspectives. Institutional studies examine how formal rules alter incentives and reporting practices. Behavioural studies examine how managers, professionals and investors respond to information, cost and uncertainty. Technology studies examine whether digital tools complement human capability or substitute routine work. Board independence can reduce agency problems when directors possess relevant expertise and are willing to challenge management. Audit committees can strengthen oversight of financial reporting and internal control. Disclosure requirements can reduce information asymmetry

Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 2, March-April 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i02.1475

and help investors evaluate management decisions. These mechanisms provide measurable governance variables for an empirical model. The present paper combines these perspectives.

Conceptual Framework

The proposed framework treats the main explanatory construct as an input that operates through organisational or behavioural mechanisms. Firm size, sector, age, leverage, ownership and professional capability can act as control variables. Where appropriate, digital readiness, audit quality, professional training or institutional capacity can be specified as moderators. A governance index can combine observable board, committee and disclosure indicators. Secondary data from annual reports and regulatory filings can provide a large sample. The study can compare sectors and ownership structures and examine whether institutional ownership strengthens the governance-performance relationship.

Research Objectives

The study has four broad objectives: to measure the principal explanatory construct; to examine its association with the selected economic or behavioural outcome; to identify moderating or mediating factors; and to develop evidence-based implications for policymakers, firms and professionals.

Research Questions

The research asks: What is the direction and strength of the relationship between the principal explanatory variable and the outcome? Does the relationship differ across firm size, sector or capability? Which organisational mechanisms explain the relationship? Which interventions can reduce negative effects or strengthen positive effects? A governance index can combine observable board, committee and disclosure indicators. Secondary data from annual reports and regulatory filings can provide a large sample. The study can compare sectors and ownership structures and examine whether institutional ownership strengthens the governance-performance relationship.

Research Hypotheses

The hypotheses are framed as testable propositions rather than predetermined findings. H1: The principal explanatory variable has a statistically significant relationship with the primary outcome. H2: The relationship remains significant after controlling for firm characteristics. H3: organisational capability strengthens or weakens the relationship. H4: the relationship differs across relevant firm or sector groups. H5: higher-quality professional or institutional support is associated with better outcomes.

Research Methodology

A mixed-method empirical design is proposed. The quantitative component can use firm-level survey data, secondary financial data or regulatory records depending on the topic. The qualitative component can use interviews with relevant professionals to understand mechanisms and implementation barriers. A governance index can combine observable board, committee and disclosure indicators. Secondary data from annual reports and regulatory filings can provide a large sample. The study can compare sectors

Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 2, March-April 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i02.1475

and ownership structures and examine whether institutional ownership strengthens the governance-performance relationship.

Sampling Design

The sample should include sufficient variation in firm size, sector and geography. A stratified design is preferable when the population is heterogeneous. The final sample size should be determined using power analysis rather than convenience alone. Where a regional focus is required, the selected region should be treated as an analytical sub-sample unless the sampling frame supports broader generalisation.

Variables And Measurement

The dependent variable should be measured using more than one indicator where possible. The principal explanatory variable should have a transparent operational definition. Perceptual constructs can use multi-item Likert scales, while financial variables can be calculated from audited statements. All coding rules, missing-data treatment and transformations should be documented.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics should be followed by reliability and validity testing where perceptual scales are used. Correlation analysis can identify initial associations, while multiple regression, logistic or ordinal models can be selected according to the dependent variable. Interaction terms can test moderation. Panel or lagged models should be considered where longitudinal data are available. Robustness tests should use alternative measures and specifications.

Expected Results And Interpretation

The study should not assume a positive or negative result before data analysis. Financial performance can be measured through return on assets, return on equity, operating margin or market-based indicators. However, governance and performance may influence each other: better-performing companies may have more resources to invest in governance. The study should therefore consider lagged governance measures, panel methods and robustness checks. A meaningful contribution can arise even if a hypothesis is not supported because non-significant or opposite relationships can identify boundary conditions. Effect size and practical significance should be reported alongside statistical significance.

Managerial And Professional Implications

Board independence can reduce agency problems when directors possess relevant expertise and are willing to challenge management. Audit committees can strengthen oversight of financial reporting and internal control. Disclosure requirements can reduce information asymmetry and help investors evaluate management decisions. These mechanisms provide measurable governance variables for an empirical model. Managers and professionals should focus on capability building, internal controls, process redesign and evidence-based adoption rather than technology or regulation in isolation. Training should be linked to actual workflow requirements.

Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 2, March-April 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i02.1475

Policy Implications

Policy recommendations should be proportional to the evidence. Regulators can improve clarity, data quality, transparency and institutional capacity. Professional bodies can develop guidance and continuing education. Smaller firms may require targeted support because fixed compliance or technology costs can be disproportionately high.

Limitations

Cross-sectional evidence may limit causal inference, while self-reported responses can create social-desirability bias. Secondary data may contain missing observations or changes in definitions across years. Regulatory and economic outcomes can also be affected by macroeconomic shocks. These limitations should be stated clearly and addressed through robustness checks where feasible.

Future Research

Future studies can use longitudinal datasets, district-level comparisons, sector-specific samples, matched control groups and qualitative case studies. Greater availability of digital records may allow researchers to combine survey responses with anonymised administrative indicators, subject to privacy and access requirements.

Conclusion

The Companies Act, 2013 strengthened the governance architecture of Indian companies through provisions relating to boards, independent directors, audit committees, related-party transactions, disclosures and accountability. The economic effect of these provisions depends on whether they operate as substantive monitoring mechanisms rather than checklist compliance. Board independence can reduce agency problems when directors possess relevant expertise and are willing to challenge management. Audit committees can strengthen oversight of financial reporting and internal control. Disclosure requirements can reduce information asymmetry and help investors evaluate management decisions. These mechanisms provide measurable governance variables for an empirical model. Overall, the companies act, 2013 strengthened statutory governance mechanisms and created an important setting for examining whether governance quality is associated with corporate performance. The proposed research provides a structured path for testing the relationship empirically and for separating formal compliance or adoption from substantive economic and professional outcomes.

Proposed Analytical Model

Construct	Indicative Measures	Expected Relationship
companies act 2013	adoption, implementation or exposure score	primary explanatory variable
Outcome	financial, behavioural or professional indicators	dependent variable
Capability	skills, training, digital	moderator

Advanced International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research
E-ISSN: 2584-0487
editor@aijmr.com
Volume 4, Issue 2, March-April 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.62127/aijmr.2026.v04i02.1475

	maturity or governance	
Controls	size, age, sector, leverage and ownership	control variables

REFERENCES:

1. Government of India. Relevant Acts, rules, notifications, annual reports and official statistical releases for the subject area.
2. Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India. Corporate law, accounting-standard and company filing resources, where applicable.
3. Income Tax Department, Government of India. E-filing, taxpayer services and tax-administration resources, where applicable.
4. Goods and Services Tax Council / GST authorities. Official GST statistics, notifications and compliance resources, where applicable.
5. Reserve Bank of India. Annual Report and publications on banking, credit, MSMEs and financial stability, where applicable.
6. Securities and Exchange Board of India. Regulatory circulars, corporate disclosures and investor-related publications, where applicable.
7. Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India. Annual reports, process statistics and insolvency resources, where applicable.
8. Institute of Chartered Accountants of India. Professional standards, accounting guidance and technical publications, where applicable.
9. Peer-reviewed journal literature should be added after database verification and formatted according to the target journal's reference style.

Originality statement: The manuscript is newly drafted for this research project. No original survey observations, regression coefficients, p-values or other empirical results are fabricated. A plagiarism percentage cannot be certified without running the final manuscript through the journal's designated similarity-detection system.