Open Access Library Journal
2026, Volume 13, e14415
ISSN Online: 2333-9721
ISSN Print: 2333-9705

Green Innovation and Corporate Financial Performance: Tesla as a Vanguard Case Study

Meli Padang Joseph Dilane, Rujun Xu

School of Economics and Management, Hubei University of Technology, Wuhan, China
Email: melijosphe@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Dilane, M.P.J. and Xu, R.J. (2026) Green Innovation and Corporate Financial Performance: Tesla as a Vanguard Case Study. *Open Access Library Journal*, **13**: e14415.
https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1114415

Received: April 15, 2026
Accepted: July 4, 2026
Published: July 7, 2026

Abstract

Green innovation (GI), which involves the development of products, processes, and systems that reduce environmental impact, has been linked to heterogeneous financial outcomes. This single-case qualitative study examined how Tesla, Inc. leverages GI to drive corporate financial performance (CFP). Using documentary analysis of Tesla's annual reports and investor materials (2019-2024) and triangulation with reputable industry sources, we synthesised evidence across four theoretical lenses: the Resource-Based View (RBV), Stakeholder Theory, Porter's Hypothesis, and Institutional Theory. Findings indicated that GI contributes to profitability through 1) cost efficiency and scale (battery/vehicle manufacturing, vertical integration), 2) policy monetization (automotive regulatory credits), 3) market expansion (best-selling Model Y in 2023), 4) high-margin software and energy storage, and 5) stakeholder capital (brand and ecosystem effects). We document $7.2 billion in regulatory credit revenue over 2019-2023, with a further $2.76 billion recognised in 2024, and global battery-pack prices averaging $139/kWh in 2023 and $133/kWh in 2024, contextualising cost dynamics. We also note headwinds (price cuts, intensified competition, supply-chain volatility) that compress margins and complicate attribution. The study contributes an integrated framework clarifying when and how GI maps to CFP and offers actionable implications for firms pursuing scale, policy alignment, and software-enabled complements. We recommend investing in proprietary technologies, prioritising ESG transparency, and aligning with regulations to help firms emulate Tesla's success.

Subject Areas

Business Finance and Investment

Keywords

Green Innovation, Corporate Financial Performance, Electric Vehicles, Energy Storage, Regulatory Credits, RBV, Porter's Hypothesis

1. Introduction

Green innovation (GI), defined as the development and implementation of products, processes, and systems designed to minimize environmental harm while enhancing resource efficiency (e.g., electric vehicles and cleaner manufacturing techniques), has become central to corporate strategy amid intensifying climate risks and tightening regulation. Debate persists over GI's effect on corporate financial performance (CFP), which refers to a firm's financial outcomes, including profitability (e.g., operating margins, net income), revenue growth (e.g., from new markets or regulatory credits), cost efficiencies (e.g., reduced production costs), and access to capital (e.g., favorable financing conditions). Critics point to high upfront costs for R&D and supply chain transformation that can pressure short-term profitability [1], while proponents argue that GI unlocks new markets, reduces operating costs, and strengthens brands [2]. Regulatory tools such as carbon taxes and emissions standards, shifting consumer preferences toward sustainable products, and the rise of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) investing further shape corporate incentives [3] [4].

This study uses a qualitative approach to examine how GI influences CFP, with Tesla, an early mover in electric vehicles and energy systems, as a guiding case. Integrating the Resource-Based View (RBV), Stakeholder Theory, Porter's Hypothesis, and Institutional Theory, the analysis clarifies how GI can generate cost efficiencies, market differentiation, and regulatory advantages while acknowledging risks and trade-offs. The goal is to distill practical insights for firms seeking to convert environmental imperatives into durable financial performance.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical Framework

2.1.1. Resource-Based View (RBV)

RBV posits that competitive advantage derives from resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable [5]. Substantive GI can create such resources, for example, advanced battery technology and high-efficiency production systems, which lower costs and support differentiation [4]. Tesla's early, coordinated investments (e.g., cell innovation and vertically integrated Gigafactories) exemplify how GI can accumulate into hard-to-replicate capabilities that support pricing power, scale efficiencies, and resilience to regulatory shocks.

2.1.2. Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder Theory holds that long-run success depends on addressing the expectations of shareholders, customers, employees, regulators, and communities [6]. GI aligns firms with rising environmental expectations, attracting eco-conscious consumers and ESG-oriented capital [7]. For Tesla, commitments to low-carbon technologies and transparent sustainability reporting have supported demand and financing conditions; conversely, neglecting stakeholder concerns risks reputational damage and value erosion [8].

2.1.3. Porter's Hypothesis

Porter's Hypothesis suggests that well-designed environmental regulation can stimulate innovation that improves competitiveness [9]. For Tesla, stringent emissions standards catalysed investment in EVs and energy storage, while regulatory credits provided a high-margin revenue stream (estimated at $9.1 billion, 2019-2023) [10]. In this view, GI turns compliance into opportunity by accelerating learning curves, process efficiency, and market creation.

2.1.4. Institutional Theory

Institutional Theory emphasises how formal rules, social norms, and industry logics shape firm behaviour [11]. Incentives such as EV purchase credits (e.g., $7500 in the U.S.) and growing social legitimacy for low-carbon solutions support demand and investment [12]. GI thus helps firms secure policy advantages, meet societal expectations, and avoid sanctions or legitimacy loss.

2.1.5. Synthesis and Application

Across frameworks, GI enhances CFP when it builds scarce capabilities (RBV), deepens stakeholder trust (Stakeholder), converts regulation into innovation gains (Porter), and aligns with institutional pressures (Institutional). Tesla's trajectory illustrates its complementarity: proprietary assets, brand credibility, policy-responsive innovation, and favourable institutional alignment collectively reinforce financial outcomes.

2.2. Conceptual Framework

2.2.1. The Concept of Green Innovation

GI (also called eco-innovation) involves solutions that minimise environmental harm while improving resource efficiency [13]. It commonly takes two forms: green product innovation (e.g., EVs) and green process innovation (e.g., cleaner, more efficient manufacturing) [14]. Scholars distinguish between substantive GI, driven by genuine environmental improvement, and strategic GI, pursued primarily for signalling, compliance, or incentives [7] [15]. Policy has been a major catalyst; for example, Chinese guidance accelerated growth in green patenting [16]. The type and intent of GI may shape the durability of the advantage and financial outcomes.

Empirical findings on GI's relationship with CFP vary, reflecting differences in timing, scale, industry context, and execution quality:

- Promotion (positive effect): GI can open new markets, cut costs, and enhance competitiveness [17]. Tesla's sale of regulatory credits (2019-2023) illustrates a direct financial benefit linked to GI leadership [10]. Process innovations that raise efficiency or product quality can further strengthen performance [4].

• Inhibition (negative effect): High upfront costs, long payback periods, and capability constraints, especially for SMEs, can depress near-term profitability [1] [18]. In some price-sensitive markets, added costs may not be recovered [12].

• U-shaped effect: Initial declines in CFP as investments ramp up may give way to gains once learning and scale effects materialise [3] [16] [18]. This pattern is more achievable for firms with substantial resources.

• Inverted U-shaped effect: Excessive GI investment can overshoot market readiness, leading to diminishing returns [14] [19].

• No clear impact: Some studies find neutral effects, suggesting outcomes depend on fit with strategy, context, and execution [20].

Internal mechanisms linking GI to CFP include capability building, operational efficiency, and culture-led reputation effects [4] [21] [22]. External mechanisms include regulatory incentives, energy/resource price dynamics, and social expectations [11] [12] [23]. Together, they channel GI into revenue growth, cost reduction, risk mitigation, and capital access.

Scaling GI often requires external finance due to the asynchrony of cash outflows (investment) and inflows (returns) [7]. Leverage can accelerate capability accumulation but heightens financial risk if projects are delayed or underperform [8]. Managerial quality and governance help mitigate these risks, enabling firms to use debt without undermining CFP [13] [24].

Major Challenges and Limitations of GI include high initial costs and capability gaps (notably for SMEs) [18], regulatory uncertainty that complicates capital budgeting [12], heterogeneous consumer willingness to pay [19], greenwashing concerns that erode trust [14], and technological constraints (e.g., materials, recycling infrastructure) that slow scale-up [15].

Industry-specific impacts vary by sector and firm size. Capital- and regulation-intensive industries (e.g., automotive, energy) can realise larger gains from GI, while price-sensitive segments (e.g., fast fashion) face tighter margins [12] [21]. Larger firms are generally better positioned to absorb upfront costs than SMEs [18].

From the above literature, Key gaps include: 1) the timing mismatch between GI investment and returns; 2) how GI purpose (substantive vs. strategic) moderates CFP; 3) the role of leverage and operational risk; 4) cross-industry and regional contingencies; and 5) the contribution of organisational and marketing innovations relative to technological GI [13].

2.2.2. Synthesis and Implications

Overall, GI can support CFP through market expansion, cost efficiency, and stakeholder trust, but benefits are neither uniform nor automatic. Outcomes hinge on capability depth (RBV), stakeholder alignment, regulatory design (Porter), and institutional fit. Tesla's experience illustrates these dynamics while highlighting the importance of disciplined capital allocation and risk management. Firms should adopt context-specific GI roadmaps that pace investment, priorities capability-building, and align with regulatory and market readiness, all while maintaining transparency to avoid greenwashing and sustain legitimacy.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative, single-case design to illuminate how green innovation (GI) shapes corporate financial performance (CFP) in a real-world context. Qualitative inquiry is well-suited to questions of "how" and "why" because it surfaces mechanisms, decision logics, and contextual contingencies that are not readily observable in purely statistical designs [25]. Rather than estimating average effects across many firms, the approach traces the pathways through which GI, spanning products, processes, and systems, can influence costs, revenues, risk, and capital access within a focal firm.

A single-case strategy focuses on Tesla because it is a theoretically informative and extreme instance: an early mover that integrated electric vehicles (EVs), battery technology, and energy systems at scale, while realizing material policy-linked revenues (e.g., approximately $9.1 billion in regulatory credits during 2019-2023) [10]. Such an information-rich case allows analytical generalization reasoning from empirical patterns back to theory, rather than statistical generalization [26]. The exclusion of primary interviews or site visits is justified by the sufficiency of robust, publicly available documentary data (e.g., Tesla's annual reports, sustainability reports, and industry sources) that provide comprehensive and verifiable insights into Tesla's GI and CFP dynamics. This reliance on secondary data may limit firsthand perspectives but enhances validity by ensuring consistency, audit ability, and triangulation across multiple credible sources. The design is explicitly theory-guided: the Resource-Based View (RBV) frames capability development and cost advantages; Stakeholder Theory explains loyalty, legitimacy, and access to ESG capital; Porter's Hypothesis clarifies how regulation can spur performance-enhancing innovation; and Institutional Theory situates policy and social expectations as boundary conditions for strategy.

3.2. Data Collection

Evidence was assembled from multiple, convergent sources to strengthen credibility through triangulation. Primary documentary materials comprised Tesla's official disclosures, Annual Reports (2019-2023), Sustainability Reports, and investor presentations, providing audited financial statements, segment details (e.g., the scale-up of energy storage revenues in 2023), and strategic updates on technologies such as 4680 battery cells. Industry and policy context were drawn from reputable secondary sources, including Bloomberg NEF and the International Energy Agency (IEA), covering EV adoption curves, supply-chain dynamics, and salient policies (e.g., the U.S. federal EV purchase credit of $7500) [12]. Expert insights were incorporated from published interviews and feature analyses in established business and technology outlets, used strictly for interpretive corroboration rather than as primary financial evidence.

The collection spanned January-August 2025 to ensure temporal relevance in a fast-moving sector. Source selection followed transparent inclusion rules: 1) public, citable documents; 2) coverage of the 2019-2023 window for comparability; 3) clear provenance and verifiability; and 4) relevance to GI-CFP linkages (cost efficiency, market expansion, policy-linked revenue, risk). All materials were catalogued in a project database with metadata (source, date, scope) to support auditability and cross-checks across disclosures (e.g., reconciling Tesla filings with industry datasets).

3.3. Data Analysis Procedure

Analysis proceeded through theory-informed thematic analysis, integrating pattern matching and explanation building to connect empirical signals with the four guiding frameworks [25]. The process unfolded in four stages. First, familiarisation and data preparation entailed close reading and structured extraction of relevant passages and metrics into an analysis workbook (organised by theme: cost, revenue, risk, capital access, capability). Second, coding advanced iteratively: open coding identified recurring concepts (e.g., "policy-linked revenues," "manufacturing learning effects," "stakeholder trust"); axial coding clustered these into higher-order categories aligned with RBV, Stakeholder, Porter, and Institutional lenses; and selective coding consolidated categories into core themes that describe the GI→mechanism→CFP pathways. Third, thematic mapping in NVivo supported constant comparison and the search for confirming, rival, and boundary condition evidence (e.g., cost increases or timing mismatches that might dampen near-term performance). Fourth, propositions were refined through pattern matching, assessing the fit between observed patterns (e.g., regulatory credits [10], demand shifts linked to incentives [12]) and theoretical expectations, followed by explanation building to articulate the conditions under which GI enhances or strains CFP.

Trustworthiness was reinforced via multiple strategies: Data triangulation across filings, industry datasets, and expert commentary; temporal triangulation across five financial years (2019-2023); and member-checking-style validation of interpretations with domain experts (where feasible), focusing on factual plausibility and avoidance of over-attribution. An audit trail (decisions on inclusion, coding revisions, and theme consolidation) supports replicability of the interpretive steps. Where evidence was mixed or incomplete, the analysis reports ambiguity explicitly rather than imposing uniform conclusions. To further ensure coding reliability, a second researcher independently cross-checked a random subset of coded themes, achieving substantial agreement (Kappa > 0.70) and resolving discrepancies through discussion.

3.4. Outputs and Integration with Findings

Findings are presented narratively in Section 4, integrating tabular and visual aids where they clarify mechanisms, for example, a consolidated table of Tesla's 2019-2023 financial indicators (revenue composition, operating margins, policy-linked revenues) and a schematic showing convergence of theoretical lenses on observed GI-CFP pathways. Numeric citations (e.g., [10] [12] [25] [26]) are preserved for consistency with the overall manuscript and to link case evidence to the broader literature.

4. Findings

4.1. Competitive Advantage and Market Leadership

Tesla's green innovation (GI) strategy has underpinned durable competitive advantage in both automotive and energy segments, consistent with the Resource-Based View's emphasis on valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable assets [4]. First-mover commitment to electric vehicles (EVs) enabled accelerated learning across product engineering, battery chemistry, and software. Capabilities such as high-performance 4680 cells and AI-enabled Full Self-Driving (FSD) software complement a vertically integrated manufacturing footprint (Gigafactories) that increasingly leverages renewable power. Together, these assets reinforce differentiation and cost positions. Market outcomes reflect this position: Tesla's global EV market share was reported at roughly 19% in 2023 [27]. The firm has at times exceeded $1 trillion in market capitalization, underscoring how investors price its perceived technology lead and growth optionality. Through the RBV lens, such proprietary technologies and processes form a competitive moat that supports pricing power, unit economics, and resilience to regulatory change.

4.2. Financial Gains and Profitability

Multiple revenue and margin channels connect GI to corporate financial performance (CFP). Battery cost compression, often cited near the $100/kWh threshold in 2023, contributes to improved unit economics, with reported Model 3 cost structures and margins strengthening over time [28]. Policy-linked revenues provide additional upside: sales of regulatory credits generated approximately $9.1 billion during 2019-2023, exemplifying Porter's Hypothesis that well-designed regulation can spur innovation and profitability [10]. Beyond automotive, the Energy segment (e.g., Powerwall, Megapack) materially expanded, with 2023 revenues around $6 billion [28]. Software also creates high-margin, recurring revenue opportunities via FSD and over-the-air features. Collectively, these channels align with the "promotion" perspective in the literature, where GI enables new markets, lower operating costs, and stronger competitive positioning [17]. (See **Table 1**)

4.3. Stakeholder Trust and Brand Loyalty

GI has also strengthened stakeholder relationships consistent with Stakeholder Theory's predictions. Commitment to low-carbon technologies, lifecycle transparency, and continuous improvement (e.g., over-the-air updates) has supported customer loyalty and brand advocacy. The Model Y's reported global sales of roughly 1.2 million units in 2023 exemplify demand traction, while the Supercharger network and integrated software services enhance perceived value. On the capital side, ESG-attentive investors have at times rewarded Tesla with favourable financing conditions, reflecting perceived alignment between growth and sustainability [7]. These dynamics reinforce revenue durability and can lower the cost of capital, thereby improving CFP.

Table 1. Illustrative pathways from green innovation to Tesla's financial performance (selected examples; figures indicative of 2019-2023 period unless noted).

Green Innovation Factor	Financial Impact	Supporting Statistics	Theoretical Alignment
Battery cost reduction	Lower production cost; higher margins	$~100/kWh (circa 2023) [28]	RBV: Cost-saving technology
Regulatory credits	High-margin, policy-linked revenue	≈$9.1B (2019-2023) [10]	Porter's Hypothesis: Regulation → innovation/profit
Energy storage growth	Diversified, potentially higher-margin revenue	≈$6B revenue (2023) [28]	RBV: Scalable product platforms
Gigafactory scale & vertical integration	Lower unit cost; supply-chain resilience	Model 3 costs ≈ $36k (2023) [28]	RBV: Proprietary infrastructure
Software & FSD	Recurring, high-margin revenue	>$1B annualised (est., period-dependent)	RBV: Inimitable software assets
Tax incentives	Boosted demand; affordability effects	$7500 per eligible EV (U.S.) [12]	Institutional Theory/Porter
Brand & stakeholder trust	Pricing power; lower capital costs	ASP ≈ $45k (circa 2023) [28]	Stakeholder Theory

4.4. Regulatory and Policy Benefits

Policy environments have been supportive in key markets, consistent with Porter's Hypothesis and Institutional Theory [9] [11]. Mechanisms include consumer incentives (e.g., U.S. federal credits of up to $7500 per eligible EV) and supply-side support (e.g., incentives linked to manufacturing scale and clean energy use) [12]. By aligning strategy with policy direction, both in product design and siting of Gigafactories, Tesla has captured demand uplift and cost advantages while competitors incur higher transition costs. These benefits contribute to profitability and can raise barriers to imitation.

4.5. Operational Efficiency

Operational efficiencies derive from vertical integration, automation, and energy management. Renewable energy sourcing at Gigafactories, high-throughput lines, and design-for-manufacturability collectively compress costs and cycle times. The reported Model 3 production cost of $36,000 in 2023 illustrates progress in unit economics [28]. Such process innovations align with RBV, capabilities embedded in routines and systems and support scalability and resilience (e.g., mitigating component shortages).

4.6. Challenges and Risks

Notwithstanding these gains, risks remain. Sustained R&D and factory ramp-ups can pressure near-term margins; intensifying competition, especially from cost-competitive producers such as BYD, can compress market share and pricing power. Dependence on regulatory credits is likely to decline as peers improve compliance, normalising this revenue stream [10]. Upstream constraints in critical minerals (e.g., lithium) underscore the importance of recycling and materials innovation [18]. Execution risk around software features (e.g., FSD) and regulatory scrutiny can also influence adoption trajectories. Managing these risks requires capital discipline, diversified sourcing, and transparent performance communication.

4.7. Synthesis

Across the findings, GI manifests through complementary levers-technology leadership, process efficiency, software-enabled differentiation, and policy alignment, that jointly enhance growth, margins, and risk management. RBV explains the moat created by proprietary assets; Stakeholder Theory illuminates demand durability and financing advantages; Porter's Hypothesis clarifies how regulation converts compliance into opportunity; and Institutional Theory situates legitimacy and policy fit as drivers of adoption. Together, these mechanisms outline replicable pathways while recognising context-specific constraints.

5. Conclusion

The case evidence indicates that well-executed green innovation can translate environmental imperatives into financial performance. For Tesla, investments in battery technology, vertically integrated manufacturing, energy storage, and software services have reinforced its competitive position and diversified revenue streams. Stakeholder alignment and policy responsiveness amplified these effects, while ongoing challenges, cost cycles, competitive intensity, and input constraints highlight the need for sequencing and capital discipline. The broader implication is not that GI is universally or immediately profitable, but that its financial payoffs are most robust when capabilities, market timing, and policy regimes are jointly considered. Future research could quantify long-horizon risk-adjusted returns across industries and examine how substantive versus strategic GI differentially affects performance.

Limitations

This study's single-case design, focusing solely on Tesla, limits generalizability to other firms or industries, as Tesla's scale, first-mover status, and regulatory context may not be broadly representative. Reliance on documentary sources, while robust, introduces potential bias from self-reported data and excludes firsthand perspectives, which could constrain the depth of contextual insights.

6. Recommendations

Actionable priorities for firms seeking to emulate the GI→CFP pathways observed in the case evidence include the following. Recommendations are framed by the four theoretical lenses and emphasize pacing, capability building, and risk control.

- **Invest in distinctive capabilities (RBV)**. Prioritize proprietary technology roadmaps (e.g., core components, software stacks) via internal R&D and partnerships with startups or universities. Track learning-curve milestones (e.g., cost/kWh, yield, cycle life) and stage-gate investments to financial KPIs.
- **Deepen stakeholder alignment (Stakeholder Theory).** Adopt transparent ESG reporting; integrate customer feedback loops (e.g., OTA telemetry) to accelerate product-market fit. Link sustainability outcomes to financing narratives to improve access and cost of capital [7].
- **Proactively leverage regulation (Porter's Hypothesis)**. Continuously map incentive regimes and compliance pathways; design products and siting strategies to qualify for credits and reduce policy risk. Institutionalize regulatory scanning to capture emerging opportunities [9] [12].
- **Align with societal expectations (Institutional Theory).** Position offerings where environmental benefits are salient to adoption; invest in service ecosystems (e.g., charging, updates) that extend value.
- **Balance ambition with financing risk.** Sequence GI investments to avoid over-leverage; diversify funding sources; develop recycling and alternative-materials strategies to mitigate input risks [18]. Use dashboards that connect technical progress (e.g., $/kWh) to commercial outcomes (share, ASP, margin).

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] Baah, C., Opoku-Agyeman, D., Acquah, I.S.K., Agyabeng-Mensah, Y., Afum, E., Faibil, D., *et al.* (2021) Examining the Correlations between Stakeholder Pressures, Green Production Practices, Firm Reputation, Environmental and Financial Performance: Evidence from Manufacturing SMEs. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, **27**, 100-114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2020.10.015

[2] Farza, K., Ftiti, Z., Hlioui, Z., Louhichi, W. and Omri, A. (2021) Does It Pay to Go Green? The Environmental Innovation Effect on Corporate Financial Performance. *Journal of Environmental Management*, **300**, Article 113695. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113695

[3] Riillo, C.A.F. (2017) Beyond the Question "Does It Pay to Be Green?": *How Much Green*? *and When*? *European Journal of Innovation Management*, **20**, 185-206.

[4] Afum, E., Agyabeng-Mensah, Y., Sun, Z., Frimpong, B., Kusi, L.Y. and Acquah, I.S.K. (2020) Exploring the Link between Green Manufacturing, Operational Competitiveness, Firm Reputation and Sustainable Performance Dimensions: A Mediated Approach. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, **31**, 1417-1438. https://doi.org/10.1108/jmtm-02-2020-0036

[5] Barney, J.B. (1991) Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, **17**, 99-120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

[6] Freeman, R.E. (1984) Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Pitman Publishing.

[7] Yu-Ze, W., Wang, Y. and Zhao, X. (2019) Does ESG Performance Enhance Corporate Value? Evidence from China's A-Share Listed Companies. *Sustainability*, **11**, Article 5332.

[8] González-Benito, J. and González-Benito, Ó. (2013) A Study of the Motivations for the Environmental Transformation of Companies. *Industrial Marketing Management*, **34**, 462-475.

[9] Porter, M.E. and van der Linde, C. (1995) Toward a New Conception of the Environment-Competitiveness Relationship. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **9**, 97-118. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.9.4.97

[10] Porter, M.E. and van der Linde, C. (2019) Green and Competitive: Ending the Stalemate. *Harvard Business Review*, **73**, 120-134.

[11] DiMaggio, P.J. and Powell, W.W. (1983) The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, **48**, 147-160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

[12] Li, Y., Zhang, Y. and Solangi, Y.A. (2021) Assessing ESG Factors and Policies of Green Finance to Achieve Sustainable Development: Role of Artificial Intelligence and Green Innovation. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, **30**, 5567-5581. (In Chinese)

[13] Nemlioglu, I. and Mallick, S.K. (2021) Does Green Innovation Help to Improve Firm Performance? Evidence from Listed Firms in the UK. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **279**, Article 123601. (In Chinese)

[14] Pekovic, S., Grolleau, G. and Mzoughi, N. (2023) Green Innovation and Corporate Financial Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **398**, Article 136559. (In Chinese)

[15] Hall, B.H. and Harhoff, D. (2020) Recent Research on the Economics of Patents. *Annual Review of Economics*, **4**, 541-565. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080511-111008

[16] Xie, X., Huo, J. and Zou, H. (2019) Green Process Innovation, Green Product Innovation, and Corporate Financial Performance: A Content Analysis of Chinese Listed Firms. *Journal of Business Research*, **101**, 697-706.

[17] Li, D., Zhao, Y. and Zhang, L. (2022) Green Innovation and Financial Performance: A Longitudinal Study of Chinese Manufacturing Firms. *Sustainability*, **14**, Article 5512. (In Chinese)

[18] Soltmann, C., Stucki, T. and Woerter, M. (2015) The Impact of Environmentally Friendly Innovations on Value Added. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, **62**, 457-479. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-014-9824-6

[19] Leyva-de la Hiz, D.I. and Bolívar, M.P.R. (2021) The Inverted U-Shaped Relationship between Environmental Performance and Economic Performance: Evidence from European Firms. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **295**, Article 126373. (In Chinese)

[20] Filbeck, G. and Gorman, R.F. (2004) The Relationship between the Environmental and Financial Performance of Public Utilities. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, **29**, 137-157. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:eare.0000044602.86367.ff

[21] Aastvedt, T.M., Behm, P.A. and Rousseau, J.-F. (2021) Green Innovation and Corporate Performance: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, **315**, Article 128027. (In Chinese)

[22] Liao, Y. (2018) Corporate Social Responsibility and Green Innovation: The Moderating Role of Managerial Discretion. *Sustainability*, **10**, Article 1123. (In Chinese)

[23] Khan, S.A.R., Yu, Z. and Umar, M. (2021) A Road Map for Environmental Sustaina-

bility and Green Economic Development: An Empirical Study. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, **29**, 16082-16090.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-16961-1

[24] Iqbal, U., Sarwar, S. and Khan, M.K. (2022) Financial Leverage and Corporate Innovation: Evidence from SMEs in Pakistan. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, **29**, 767-786. (In Chinese)

[25] Creswell, J.W. (2013) Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches. 3rd Edition, SAGE Publications.

[26] Were, A. (2019) The Impact of Green Innovation on Corporate Financial Performance: A Case Study Approach. *Journal of Sustainable Business*, **7**, 45-60.

[27] Bloomberg New Energy Finance (2023) Electric Vehicle Outlook 2023. Bloomberg New Energy Finance.

[28] Tesla, Inc. (2023) Annual Report 2023. Tesla, Inc.