Environmental accounting information disclosure from the perspective of game theory

Liuxin Yang*

RCF Experimental School, 100101 Beijing, China

Abstract. In reality, environmental accounting information disclosure still faces a series of issues, such as information asymmetry and lack of transparency. This results in discrepancies in the information held by both buyers and sellers. The party with information advantage may conceal their known information as a means of profit, while the other party takes various actions to obtain information to avoid losses. This article primarily introduces the background of environmental accounting information disclosure and its importance in market operations and management. It then analyses the motives behind accounting games and the potential dynamics of decision-making processes in non-cooperative relationships and conflicts of interest.In the study, qualitative research methods were mainly employed, including literature reviews, specific case studies, and mathematical measurements. Additionally, data on environmental accounting information disclosure from typical publicly listed companies were collected to construct a model of the bargaining relationship and consider its depth quantitatively. The research results indicate that in accounting games, the factors influencing the bargaining of both parties are not singular but are affected by various situations and conditions. Because of the divergent interests pursued by both parties, the intended outcomes of environmental accounting information disclosure, such as information symmetry and transparency, are compromised. Based on these findings, this article presents some optimization suggestions and actionable plans to prevent publicly listed companies from exploiting policy loopholes and to encourage them to more actively fulfill their obligations in disclosing accounting information, thus improving the stability of the domestic market.

1 Introduction

Game theory, as a theory that analyses strategic interactions among decision-makers, has a powerful explanatory and analytical capability for the gains and losses experienced by most publicly listed companies. It also possesses a good predictive ability for their future development and trends. This strong guiding role has made game theory widely used in the business and financial sectors [1].

This article focuses on the combination of game theory and environmental accounting information disclosure, explaining how game theory elucidates how decision-makers strive for maximum rights and benefits through environmental accounting information disclosure. The article mainly employs a targeted research approach, involving literature reviews and specific business cases, to gain a deeper understanding of the motivations and outcomes of intentional environmental accounting information disclosure by publicly listed companies in different contexts. In an era of information explosion and intensifying business competition, the ability to identify the effectiveness of disclosed information not only serves as valuable guidance for companies themselves but also mitigates potential investment risks, maintains the stability of formal markets, and ensures the sustainable development of social resources [2].

The merger of game theory and environmental accounting offers a novel perspective on how companies navigate the complex landscape of information disclosure, balancing their economic objectives with environmental responsibilities. This approach is not only relevant for understanding corporate strategies in environmental management but also crucial in highlighting the role of accounting in sustainable development and ethical business practices.

2 Practial analysis of environmental accounting

2.1 Definition and scope of environmental accounting information disclosure

Environmental accounting information disclosure refers to the public presentation by publicly listed companies, through financial statements or other public information channels, of their performance in fulfilling environmental responsibilities, the real impact of their products on the environment, and other related information. These pieces of information manifest in the

* Corresponding author: yangliuxin@rdfzcygj.cn

© The Authors, published by EDP Sciences. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

specific environmental policies followed by the companies, the cost investments made to minimize environmental impacts, and the disclosure of risks along with the measurement of performance [1]. Moreover, the importance of environmental accounting information disclosure cannot be denied. For companies, having sound environmental accounting data helps establish a positive corporate image, enhance their reputation in society, and attract investors to purchase stocks, thereby increasing profits. For investors, it enables effective assessment of a company's sustainability and enhances the accuracy and scientific basis of specific investment decisions [3].

2.2 Game theory in environmental accounting information disclosure

Game theory is a discipline that studies decision problems involving conflicting interests of both parties. In the context of environmental accounting information disclosure, the key stakeholders include publicly listed companies, investors, and government regulatory authorities. These three parties have differing specific interests, but they often come into conflict and constraints. Analyzing this issue from multiple perspectives is beneficial for understanding its underlying causes and proposing solutions.

As such, when game theory is applied in the context of environmental accounting information disclosure it simplifies what seems to be an inconceivable meshwork of relationships and rivalries between different stakeholders with contrasting interests. In this world there are various players ranging from companies, shareholders and regulatory bodies all seeking their own ends. For instance, corporations are more concerned with the profit maximization; shareholders will demand all information to inform their investment decisions that would yield profits for them and not losses while government agencies strive to ensure compliance on matters like environmental conservation.

The complex dance between these entities significantly influences environmental disclosure practices, driven by government incentives and representation of environmental problems through mass media. From a game theory view of these interactions, we can be able to understand the underlying motives and limitations all parties had. This enhanced insight can enable building more efficient and cooperative environmental disclosure strategies.

Moreover, game theory can provide more in-depth analysis of strategies applied by different stakeholders concerning disclosure of environmental accounting information. For instance, corporations may be engaged in a game of “green-washing” where they strive to employ an image that suggests them as being environmentally friendly without instigating significant alterations on how businesses are performed. This can form a dilemma for investors who are seeking actual data on sustainability.

On the other hand, shareholders can adopt types of what it with Scrutiny and activism by using their economic resources to persuade corporations in reporting more transparently and responsibly concerning environmental issues. It would therefore become a strategic game in which corporations need to decide whether they should want these demands or oppose them.

Government agencies equally hold an important place within this dynamic environment. They can establish their rules and regulations kind of “rules to the game” that motivate or punish specific behaviours. In addition, the government agencies could engage in cooperative games with corporations and investors by providing rewards for responsible practices toward environment or through promoting cooperation among stakeholders.

Media portrayal makes the landscape even more complicated. Public opinion which could be influenced by media reports may influence the strategies of all parties involved. However, corporations might engage in such activities with some motives to consciously influence media narratives or the way things happen while investors will use those same reports as an analytical tool for assessing corporate performance.

Hence, by looking at these intricate game situations more profoundly we become well aware of the various strategies as well as anti-strategies that emerge in this world of concealment accounted for environmental accounts. This in-depth insight allows us to build stronger and more productive initiatives that promote collabouration, openness, as well as environmentally responsible practices for all stakeholders. So, game theory is a very helpful instrument in this important field that could provide some help to adequately analyse the intricate network of interests and interactions.

2.3 Analysing the causes of environmental accounting information disclosure issues from a game theory perspective

From the perspective of publicly listed companies, their primary objective is to maximize profits and attract more investors to increase their disposable capital and resources. Therefore, when disclosing information, company executives tend to exaggerate their compliance with relevant environmental protection policies in the primary and secondary industries and the achievement ratios [4]. They may also downplay or even conceal the extent of environmental pollution in the production process and the costs incurred in this area. Such non-genuine reporting can attract more individuals to become shareholders of the company and invest in it, even though this behaviour is detrimental to both the nation and individual shareholders' interests when the true information is not known.

Furthermore, another significant factor is that the cost of violating information disclosure policies is often too low, or the regulatory efforts of relevant government agencies are weak. In such cases, a game of mutual bargaining between publicly listed companies and regulatory authorities may occur. Some companies may engage in information disclosure with a gambling mentality because, due to the current imperfect state of

the law, they are confident that the chances of detecting false disclosures are minimal. Even if violations of relevant provisions are discovered, the substantial investments and profits generated by false disclosures far outweigh the punishment imposed by regulatory authorities. Therefore, many companies choose to ignore regulations, even repeatedly crossing the line, simply because the deterrence is too weak [5]. To enhance the standardization of public information, relevant authorities continuously strengthen and improve related laws and policies, increase penalties, and prevent further resource losses and potential risks and harm to the environment caused by false disclosures [6].

Expanded Scenario and Strategies

Strategies for Company A:

Fully Truthful (FT): Full and accurate disclosure of environmental information.

Partially Misleading (PM): Partial disclosure, some information is obscured or altered.

Completely Misleading (CM): Entirely false or misleading information.

Strategies for Regulator B:

Strict Regulation (SR): High level of scrutiny and strict enforcement.

Moderate Regulation (MR): Some oversight but not very strict.

Lenient Regulation (LR): Minimal oversight and enforcement.

Additional Payoffs

For Company A: The payoffs increase from Fully Truthful to Completely Misleading, assuming higher risks for higher gains.

For Regulator B: The payoffs are higher for stricter regulation, assuming better environmental protection but also higher costs.

Multiple Payoff Matrices are shown below (see Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3):

Table 1. Company A vs. Strict Regulation

	SR	MR	LR
FT	(2, 4)	(3, 3)	(4, 2)
PM	(0, 4)	(4, 3)	(5, 2)
CM	(-4, 4)	(1, 3)	(6, 2)

Table 2. Company A vs. Moderate Regulation

	SR	MR	LR
FT	(1, 3)	(2, 2)	(3, 1)
PM	(-1, 3)	(3, 2)	(4, 1)
CM	(-5, 3)	(0, 2)	(5, 1)

Table 3. Company A vs. Lenient Regulation

	SR	MR	LR
FT	(0, 2)	(1, 1)	(2, 0)
PM	(-2, 2)	(2, 1)	(3, 0)
CM	(-6, 2)	(-1, 1)	(4, 0)

Nash Equilibrium: For each matrix, identify the Nash Equilibrium by looking for cells where neither player can unilaterally improve their payoff. For example, in Matrix 1, (CM, LR) might be a Nash Equilibrium if Company A values potential gains more than the risks of penalties.

Company A's expected payoff for a strategy can be calculated as the weighted sum of payoffs under different regulator strategies, considering the probability of each regulatory approach.

Example: If the probabilities of SR, MR, and LR are 0.2, 0.5, and 0.3 respectively, and Company A chooses FT, the expected payoff = 0.2*(2) + 0.5*(3) + 0.3*(4).

Mixed Strategy Nash Equilibrium: If no pure strategy Nash Equilibrium exists, we may consider mixed strategies where players randomize over their strategies. The equilibrium can be found by equating the expected payoffs of different strategies for each player and solving the resulting equations. This expanded model with multiple matrices and more strategies offers a deeper understanding of the strategic interactions between Company A and Regulator B. By examining the payoffs under different scenarios, we can identify potential Nash Equilibrium and predict how changes in strategy or external factors (like changes in regulatory environment) might shift these Equilibrium. Keep in mind, however, that these models are simplifications and real-world scenarios may require more complex considerations.

2.4 Impacts of game theory models applied in environmental accounting

Using such game theory models as discussed through the payoff matrices presentation gives not only a theoretical foundation for understanding interactions between corporations and regulatory bodies but also practical stiffness. These models focus on the subtle balance it holds concerning strategies that create revelation of disclosure towards environmental accounting contriteness. For instance, high levels of transparency in the disclosure plus differential imposition ranging from tight to loose regulatory measures can create solid reasons behind a move towards balancing strategy as one implements an environmental policy [6].

Furthermore, such game theory models illuminate possible consequences of strategic decisions made not only by companies but also regulators. By reviewing a variety of situations and approaches, they help in identifying the potential strengths and weaknesses. This data can be useful in shaping policies and regulations that promote more accurate and comprehensive accounting of the environment. Further, the use of game theory models helps in understanding motivations and behaviours better from various stakeholders concerned with environmental accounting. It elucidates the logical decisions that entities could make while pursuing their self-interest and can impact overall environmental disclosure environment [7].

In conclusion, the usage of game theory models in environmental accounting brings not only theoretical benefits but also makes it possible for policymakers and practitioners to utilize these helpful instruments while operating on such a complicated land side related to the practise of environment disclosure that is developing

better-informed yet more effective policies aimed at safeguarding our planet from harmful human activity.

3 Strategic recommendations based on game theory analysis

Further from the possible Nash Equilibrium identified, it is a crystal clear fact that if there are higher level of regulatory stringency (SR), increased climate transparency in disclosure always improves. Hence, it is necessary for regulatory authorities to introduce more comprehensive and enhanced regulator frameworks that accentuate punishment towards companies. However, this strategy would create strong pressure on companies that will force them to adopt more explicit disclosure practises. This enhanced regulatory framework should incorporate various elements to enhance its effectiveness. These may include tougher enforcement strategies, larger punishment fees and a stronger focus on proactive surveillance. Considering the above considerations, it is evident that regulators must address problems from various sides and use a range of punitive incentives in regulatory frameworks.

In summary, the study of Nash Equilibrium highlights that one way to strengthen regulatory systems baselines truthful disclosure practices by corporations. Through the conscious blending of these interventions, regulators can guide environmental accounting to a future where it is ethically and responsibility-aware.

There is a chance for regulatory bodies to introduce new incentive structures that would allow moving this equilibrium towards the state of Full Truthful FT disclosure. For instance, the provision of tax reductions to firms that maintain high levels of accuracy in disclosure might be one such reward. Through reductions in the taxes owed by such compliant entities, regulators would encourage responsible behaviour while giving financial reward to businesses that make a point of correct reporting. Public recognition system for firms that do well every time about their environmental accounting could also be initiated by the regulatory bodies, but in addition to tax incentives. This could involve the giving out of awards or certifications, even a publication that lists those companies which do more than simply pay lip service to transparency. Acknowledgment of this type is not only an advantage for companies that comply with it but also proves to be a strong reputation booster.

Furthermore, these incentives could be enhanced when linked to long term performance. For example, companies that make truthful disclosures in every reporting period might qualify for more tax advantage or higher ratings of public recognition. This approach would promote long-term interest in the conduct of open accounting practises. If regulators use these incentive structures strategically, they can make the balance tip towards Full Truthful disclosure and create a rule structure that encourages ethical reporting when corporate interests do not conflict with larger agendas of environmental transparency and accountability. This in turn also contribute to a more responsible and sustainable corporate atmosphere as far as environmental accounting is concerned. These models do not only give the notion on what can be made for effective regulation but they also raise a cautionary note against over-regulation. Investors may also prevent investors and stifle innovation if they view the regulations in place as being stringent. Thus, it is very attractive that there should be managed a fine balance between the opportunities of economic growth and compliance. Firstly, it must be noted that an over stringent regulating environment may lead to a number of negative outcomes. It may prevent firms from adopting environment friendly technologies or practices for the fear of strict compliance requirements. This, in turn slows down the progress to achieve sustainability goals as well prevents developing eco-friendly practices [8].

Another aspect is that over-regulation can impose financial burdens on businesses especially smaller ones which may not be in the position to satisfy compliance with high cost requirements. This may lead to less competitiveness of industries affected, job losses and economic slowdowns. Regulators, therefore, have the challenge of forming laws that encourage truthful disclosure and environmentally prudent businessmen without unnecessarily crippling their businesses [9]. A responsive regulatory framework that changes with changing situations in the industry and fosters an interactive relationship between regulators and businesses can make this possible. In a field where markets are frequently changing, it is crucial to find that balance between innovation and taking business forward with calls for sustainability whilst providing strong benefits which will motivate compliance without stifling development [10].

4 Conclusion

These models identify Nash Equilibrium and possible changes in strategic behaviour as a result of adjustments that occur within the regulatory environment. Such research, however implies that regulators should prescribe an integral and well rounded approach between punitive sanctions and incentives to encourage truthful disclosure. Acknowledging the dangers of over-regulation, it highlights that regulatory framework should be dynamic and balanced to encourage compliance without stifling economic growth[10]. Potential areas of future research include incorporation behavioural game theory, empirical validation studies tests, design dynamic games models and international comparative analyses to improve understanding environmental accounting practices globally.

References

1. X. Kan, H. Yan, J. Xiong, Front Busi, Econo Mana **4(3)**, 59-63 (2022).
2. R. Sellah, Inter J Econo Perfor **6(01)**, (2023).
3. S. Schilizzi, J. B. Lesourd, Aus Aus Agricu Reso Econo Socie, (2001).

4. P. K. Ray, Spring Scien Busi Med, (2012).
5. N. Avogadro, R. Redondi, Rese Trans Econo **100**, 101304 (2023).
6. W. H. Kloezen, Wagen Uni Res, (2002).
7. M. S. Siddiqui, Uni Ottawa (Canada), (2011).
8. T. P. Zis, H. N. Psaraftis, Sustain Ship, 249-284 (2019).
9. D. Hess, T.W. Dunfee, Busi Eth Quar **17(1)**, 5-32 (2007).
10. M. Malheiros, S. Preibusch, M.A. Sasse, In Trust and Trustworthy Computing: 6th International Conference, June 17-19, 250-266 (2013).