



**Műhelytanulmányok**  
**Vállalatgazdaságtan Intézet**

1093 Budapest, Fővám tér 8.  
☎ (+36 1) 482-5566, Fax: 482-5567  
[www.uni-corvinus.hu/vallgazd](http://www.uni-corvinus.hu/vallgazd)



# **Communication of CSR in Sustainability Reports in Hungarian Companies**

Judit Gáspár  
Kinga Magyar  
Júlia Schneider

**147. sz. Műhelytanulmány**  
**HU ISSN 1786-3031**

**2012. január**

Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem  
Vállalatgazdaságtan Intézet  
Fővám tér 8.  
H-1093 Budapest  
Hungary

# Communication of CSR in Sustainability Reports in Hungarian Companies

**Judit Gáspár**, Department of Decision Sciences; Institute of Business Economics,  
Corvinus University of Budapest, Budapest, Hungary;  
judit.gaspar@uni-corvinus.hu

**Kinga Magyar**, Corvinus University of Budapest, Budapest, Hungary  
magyarkinga@yahoo.com

**Júlia Schneider**, Corvinus University of Budapest, Budapest, Hungary  
julia.schneider@evk.hu

## Abstract

The present research is part of the research project Tendencies of CSR in Hungary financed by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA, No. K68769) between 2007 and 2011. Here, CSR- or CSR-related reports of Hungarian companies will be analysed. First, a 'database' of the most relevant articles and methodologies in use were compiled by employing a search process by keywords that combine 'reporting' and any of the following terms: 'social', 'sustainable development', 'sustainability', 'corporate social responsibility', 'CSR', 'social responsibility', 'corporate citizenship,' and 'triple bottom line'. Second, paper-based and online reports (sustainability reports, social reports and environmental reports) of Hungarian companies were collected and then analysed applying content analysis methods. The present working paper provides a brief summary of the relevant scientific literature on the theory and practice of CSR-reporting and highlights the main features CSR communication through sustainability and other reports by Hungarian companies. The focus of our analysis will be on what (content), how (in what form) and to whom (to which stakeholder groups) the investigated Hungarian corporations communicate in their CSR-related company reports.

**Keywords:** communication, CSR, Hungary, reporting, sustainability

## **Introduction**

This paper is the documentation of the first phases of a research project planned for four years (2007–2011). This research project aims to highlight „The tendencies of corporations’ social responsibility in Hungary” and financed by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA, No. K68769). In this research our task is to analyze CSR- or CSR-related reports of Hungarian companies.

The first part of the specific study we are presenting is aimed to summarize the international literature on CSR-related approaches, and to create a ‘database’ of the most relevant articles and methodologies in use. In order to create this ‘database’ we searched by keywords that combine ‘reporting’ and any of the following terms: ‘social’, ‘sustainable development’, ‘sustainability’, ‘corporate social responsibility’, ‘CSR’, ‘social responsibility’, ‘corporate citizenship’ and ‘triple bottom line’. This searching process is documented here, with comments on the gained results, while this also serves as a methodological background for our research.

In the second part of the study we collected reports (sustainability reports, social reports and environmental reports) from Hungarian companies and applied content-analysis on them. Under the heading ‘Hungarian companies’ we listed both Hungarian-owned companies and Hungary-based subsidiaries of multinational firms. In this paper we focus on the analysis of sustainability reports gathered from 10 companies, and we have chosen the year of 2006 as the scope of investigation – as this was the year from which the most reports were collected.

In this paper, besides presenting the international theory and practices of ‘CSR-reporting research’, we also analyse the ‘Communication of CSR in Sustainability Reports in Hungarian companies’, with the focus on what (content), how (in what form) and to whom (to which stakeholder groups) do the investigated Hungarian corporations communicate in their Sustainability Reports.

## **I. On CSR Reporting – methods and results**

### **I.1. Collecting the relevant literature**

We searched for CSR-reporting related articles in the EBSCO databases that include the following: *Business Source Premier*, *Academic Search Premier*, *Regional Business News*, *ERIC*, *MasterFILE Premier*, *Newspaper Source*, *Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts*, *GreenFILE* databases.

When searching we used keywords that combine ‘reporting’ and any of the following terms: ‘social’, ‘sustainable development’, ‘sustainability’, ‘corporate social responsibility’, ‘CSR’, ‘social responsibility’, ‘corporate citizenship’ and ‘triple bottom line’.

We considered „reporting” as an appropriate keyword, because looking at the results of our initial search we could see there are articles related to stand-alone reports (such as social, environmental and sustainability reports) and articles with only so called disclosures, paragraphs on corporate responsibility from companies’ annual reports.

We searched for articles in periodicals we considered as relevant ones. We divided them into three groups: CSR-relevant, emphasised management and other scientific periodicals. Altogether there were 15 periodicals we conducted search in, within the EBSCO databases.

Filter was not used to reduce the results, looked at the whole period of the presented periodicals (see Table 1). However we summarised our results in two groups, one group contained the articles written before 2000, the other included those written after 2000 (see Table 2).

Table 1. The periodicals and their availability

<b>CSR-relevant periodicals</b>	<b>Management focused periodicals</b>	<b>Other scientific periodicals</b>
Business Ethics: A European Review (1998-2008)	Academy of Management Journal (1958-2008)	Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal (2003-2008)
Business Ethics Quarterly (1991-2008)	Academy of Management Review (1976-2008)	Accounting, Organizations & Society (1976-2008)
Business & Society (1988-2008)	British Journal of Management (1990-2008)	Public Relations Review (1998-2008)
Journal of Business Ethics (1982-2008)	California Management Review (1958-2008)	
Journal of Corporate Citizenship (2004-2008)	European Management Journal (1997-2008)	
	Journal of Management Studies (1964-2008)	
	Organization Studies (1980-2008)	

The results of the searching process are documented in two tables (see: Appendix 1 and Appendix 2). We considered the articles written after 2000 to be relevant for our empirical research. From this year on we have access to almost all the chosen periodicals. However, we thought it was important to document all our searching results.

As it can be seen in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, we searched for word-combinations, which all had 3 components as following: 1. title of the periodical, 2. either of the terms shown in the horizontal row, 3. „reporting”. The last column of the table shows the amount of relevant articles.

Our searching process lasted from November 2007 to July 2008, we found 135 articles from the period after 2000 and 30 articles before 2000 within the EBSCO databases.

Table 2. The periodicals and the number of articles before + after 2000

<b>CSR-relevant periodicals</b>	<b>Management focused periodicals</b>	<b>Other scientific periodicals</b>
Business Ethics: A European Review (1+13)	Academy of Management Journal (1+1)	Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal (0+25)
Business Ethics Quarterly (0+7)	Academy of Management Review (2+2)	Accounting, Organizations & Society (6+4)
Business & Society (1+11)	British Journal of Management (1+0)	Public Relations Review (0+2 )
Journal of Business Ethics (11+40)	California Management Review (7+4)	
Journal of Corporate Citizenship (0+19)	European Management Journal (0+4)	
	Journal of Management Studies (0+1)	
	Organization Studies (0+2 )	

Table 2 indicates that we found the most articles in CSR-relevant periodicals – more than 50% of our results (90 articles) –, after the year 2000 are from these periodicals. In this group the three „best-performing” periodicals were: Journal of Business Ethics, Journal of Corporate Citizenship and Business Ethics: A European Review, from the management focussed periodicals we highlight Academy of Management Review, California Management Review and European Management Journal as having the most results, from other scientific periodicals Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal contained the most articles.

Table 2 shows the results before 2000 and after 2000 (after the titles the numbers given show the results before and after the year 2000). From these numbers we can see that in almost all cases we have much more results after 2000 than before. We think our basic assumption to focus on the articles after year 2000 is validated by these factors.

Within the CSR-relevant periodicals we can definitely see an increasing number of articles on CSR-reporting. Appendix 3 (which lists all the articles found, adjusted to the year of publication from the newest to the oldest) we can also see that the increasing number of articles was linked to the enrichment of covered topics: methodological background of the researches became diverse, questions contained more themes and the acquired scientific knowledge gained deeper insights.

We can also see an increasing number of articles about CSR reports within the management focused periodicals, although we cannot talk about the overwhelming abundance of these themes, still the presence and the recurrence of the topic is a sign for the fact that in the mainstream of management-literature this kind of thinking exist.

From the other scientific periodicals we chose those we had assumed to „touch” the topic of CSR reports. Considering these factors we investigated 3 periodicals indicated in the third column of Table 1 and Table 2, these periodicals cover the accountability of corporate activity toward stakeholders. Based on this assumption we included some relevant periodicals related to performance-management, accounting, management and public relations. In these fields we can see, after 2000 studies and researches have been conducted on corporate social responsibility.

The collected articles served as the database for our research from which we selected the most relevant ones according to their abstracts. Some of these studies focus on CSR reporting patterns, practices and their evaluation in a single country (Thompson – Zakaria, 2004; Karen et al, 2006; Daub, 2005) or on European-level (Perrini, 2005), while others compare two or more countries’ practice of CSR reporting (Golob – Bartlett, 2006; Hartman et al.,2007). There is a study we found that focuses partly on Hungary’s neighbour-country, Slovenia (Golob – Bartlett, 2006) we paid more attention to, since this country has a lot of similarities concerning geographical distance, political heritage, etc.

Our purpose was to build and conduct our research – to analyse the communication of CSR in sustainability reports in Hungarian companies – using former empirical research patterns.

## **I.2. Research methods and empirical findings**

We focus on researches at national level that is why we sorted the relevant articles from a geographical point of view. We listed studies on national level, on European level and comparisons on country level.

The importance of these studies is that we also conduct a country analysis in Hungary. Our research practice has some similarities with Daub (2005) in using quantitative and qualitative (in a later phase of our research) methods at the same time. Similar to Thompson – Zakaria (2004) we also presume to observe lack of drivers in motivating CSR reporting, especially by the government.

### **I.2.1. Research on national level**

Researches on national level are aimed to analyse one country's CSR reporting practices. The most relevant studies we found investigate CSR reporting in Mexico (Karen et al., 2006), in Malaysia (Thompson – Zakaria, 2004) and in Switzerland (Daub, 2005). We introduce these studies focusing on their methodology and their results.

Karen et al. (2006) assessed the situation of corporate social reporting between 2000 and 2003 in Mexico. They identified 10 companies with sufficient social reporting that showed the most CSR-readiness, which indicates the extent to which a company understands and accepts CSR-standards and is willing to communicate this understanding.

Karen et al. (2006) included publications such as social, sustainability and environmental reports, pages mentioning social performance in annual reports, in general or specific reports published by headquarters outside Mexico. They considered both Spanish and English materials.

To define social reporting they used the definition of corporate social responsibility provided by two Mexican business organisations, CEMEFI<sup>1</sup> and CESPEDES<sup>2</sup>.

As the result of their comparative case study Karen et al. (2006) gave a summary of the 10 companies including the following dimensions:

- Reporting type (stand-alone publication, unit within annual report, etc.)
- Frequency (one-time only or more than once)
- Format (anecdotal, one-time measures, longitudinal measures, etc.)
- External verification (audited by responsible third parties)
- Mention of stakeholders (reference to the concept, reference to a list of stakeholders, reference to a dialogue process with stakeholders, etc.)
- Mention of internationally recognised standards (GRI<sup>3</sup>, AccountAbility 1000, ISO 9000 or 14000, Responsible Care, Cement Sustainability Initiative, etc.)
- Mention of international organisation or industry association (Global Compact, World Business Council for Sustainable Development, etc.)
- Awards
- Topics (environment, health/safety, community, arts, philanthropy, etc.)
- Language and availability of report

Thompson – Zakaria (2004) assessed the state of corporate social responsibility reporting (CSRR) and corporate environmental reporting (CER) in Malaysia, including

---

<sup>1</sup> CEMEFI= Centro Mexicano para la Filantropía (Mexican Centre for Philanthropy, an NGO)

<sup>2</sup> CESPEDES= The Mexican chapter of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

<sup>3</sup> GRI= Global Reporting Initiative,

the country's top 250 companies. They looked at the extent, nature and form of such disclosures made by Malaysian companies.

Summarising their results Thompson – Zakaria (2004) say that CSRR is still in its infancy stage in Malaysia. This applies to CER practices more. The researchers were looking for the possible reasons for this poor state of social responsibility and environmental reporting, which may be for example: lack of a recognised reporting framework, cost of reporting and fear of how readers will react. According to them the low level of CER can be a consequence of a lack of drivers, especially a lack of government and societal pressure to report environmental issues. This pressure seems to increase step by step, but it can not be compared to how strong it is in Europe and in the US.

An interesting motivating factor we found in Thompson – Zakaria's (2004) study is an initiative called ACCA Malaysia Environmental Reporting Awards (MERA). It was launched in 2002 with the objective to encourage voluntary environmental reporting practices among organisations in Malaysia, and was endorsed by the Malaysian Department of Environment. However none of the frameworks for company reporting (legislative, corporate legal, KLSE listing requirements or the Malaysian Accounting Standards) includes strong and explicit requirements for environmental reporting, the Malaysian government seems to be taking CER seriously and expects firms to tell the public more about their environmental performance. (Thompson – Zakaria, 2004)

Daub (2005) investigated the quality of sustainability reports in Switzerland by an alternative methodological approach. His research is among the first ones that analyses the practice of sustainability reporting in a country by quantitative and qualitative methods. The sample included the top 100 Swiss companies and some others (altogether 103 companies), that issued a "real" sustainability report between 2001 and 2002.

While developing the important research aspects, Daub (2005) used GRI guidelines, which is referred by a lot of previous studies and it is the most commonly used reporting guidelines by Swiss and international companies, too.

The main concept of the methodology was a detailed list of criteria with 33 individual criteria broken down into four main categories which are the following:

- A) Context and Coverage
- B) Policies, Management Systems and Stakeholder Relations
- C) Dimensions of Performance
- D) Transparency and General View

Daub (2005) handled category C (performance indicators) as the most important from the 4 categories, it was weighted with a factor of 2, because it contained the hard factors of the company's sustainability performance.

Daub (2005) investigated a total of 124 reports then made interviews with representatives of middle and top management from top 25 Swiss companies and appointed the following:

- Concerning the methodology it was important to include companies' annual reports, too, because there were some companies, that did not issue a stand-alone social, environmental or sustainability report, but included information on social performance in their annual report.
- Performance indicators performed low in the assessment, the 76 reporting companies only achieved 33% (beside the double weight; other categories achieved 40%, 43% and 52%)

Interviews with the managers pointed to some critics about sustainability reporting. The interviewed representatives said companies still had a lot to do in order to satisfy the demand they were facing (more detailed and more frequently published reports) which ensured Daub (2005) and his research team that improving sustainability reporting must be demonstrated more heavily to companies in the future.

### **I.2.2. Research on European level**

Perrini (2005) investigated CSR-related corporate social, environmental and sustainability reports among European companies. He compared the CSR reporting practices of 90 European companies, focusing on the amount and quality of the information disclosed.

The main objective of Perrini's (2005) study was to demonstrate the current prioritization in terms of CSR behaviour. He tried to determine whether a univocal CSR portrait existed and what its dimensions and related prioritization were.

The selected 90 European companies already had advanced experience in CSR practices. They have been sorted by industry according to the FTSE™ Global Classification Systems<sup>4</sup> and all of them were publicly listed medium/large size companies that published a social, environmental or sustainability report.

The research focused on European companies with the assumption that their reports on CSR-related activities are standardized. According to Perrini (2005) social and environmental reporting techniques are tools for internal communication, primarily to support the relationship between the company and trade unions (which are key players of the European workforce).

The analysis was conducted by using a checklist instrument which was harmonised to the stakeholder theory and the triple bottom line approach<sup>5</sup>.

As a unit of the analysis Perrini (2005) used sentences, which were classified into the following stakeholder-based categories:

1. Human resources (e.g.: staff composition, turnover, equality of treatment, training, wages, etc)
2. Shareholders and Financial Community (e.g.: capital stock formation, shareholders' pay, corporate governance, investor relations, etc.)
3. Consumers (e.g.: market development, customer satisfaction, ethical & environmental products and services, privacy, etc.)
4. Suppliers (e.g.: supplier management policies, contractual conditions)
5. Financial Partners (e.g.: relations with banks, insurance companies, financial institutions)
6. Public Authorities (e.g.: taxes and duties, relations with local authorities, codes of conducts and compliance with laws, etc.)
7. Local and Global Communities (e.g.: corporate giving, relations with the media, corruption prevention, etc.)
8. Environment (e.g.: energy consumption, materials, emissions, environmental strategy, etc.)

Within the categories incidence rates of the sentences were classified into three groups, which were:

---

<sup>4</sup> FTSE is an independent global index company, jointly owned by The Financial Times and the London Stock Exchange. FTSE indices are used by a range of investors such as consultants, asset owners, fund managers, investment banks, stock exchanges and brokers. ([www.ftse.com](http://www.ftse.com))

<sup>5</sup> Triple Bottom Line= the simultaneous analysis of social, environmental and economical impacts of a company, the concept originates from Elkington (1994)



- Consensus: a topic was covered by more than 66,6% of companies in the sample
- Moderate coverage: between 33,3% and 66,6% of companies covered the topic
- Low coverage: fewer than 33,3% of companies covered the topic

Perrini (2005) says the stakeholder-based approach has a lot of benefits, for example it allows all the stakeholders to realise his/her role in the corporate strategy and operations, and their own values became comparable to those of the company. If firms adopt stakeholder-based reporting standards, they can persistently self-evaluate and organise all the aspects of their role in the multi-dimensional environment they are operating in.

The resulting CSR portrait of Perrini (2005) shows that reporting on CSR seems to be restricted to specific themes such as: operational efficiency, maximum safety, environmental protection, quality & innovation, open dialogue, skill development and responsible citizenship.

In the case of our analysis on Hungarian companies' sustainability reporting practices we faced similar restrictions.

### **I.2.3. Comparison on country level**

The following two studies compare CSR reporting in different countries, one of which seemed to be especially useful to consider and to compare to our research, since it included a neighbour country of Hungary, Slovenia. Based on the geographical closeness and similar historical roots of the two countries we emphasised the article of Golob – Bartlett (2006).

Golob – Bartlett (2006) compared CSR reporting practices in Australia and Slovenia. They aimed to assess where the differences of CSR reporting were coming from and whether there were any similarities despite the different institutional settings of the two countries.

About the state of CSR in Australia, which has one of the world's most powerful and developed economy, Golob – Bartlett (2006) say that national companies' CSR reporting activities reflect the expectations of a major part of the world economy. The Business Council of Australia was committed to excellence in managing all three dimensions (environmental, social and economic) of the corporate activities. There are principles about this commitment included in legislation and corporate strategies. The community in Australia emphasises the meeting of social obligations and establishing community partnerships. CSR reporting means a communication tool for organisations, it helps them in fulfilling their obligations and meeting the needs of stakeholders.

In Slovenia, CSR appeared relatively late in the public discourse. There might be two reasons for this: the Slovenian economy was relatively slow in restructuring toward foreign investments. This resulted that international best practices reached Slovenia later than possible, including CSR practices. The other reason is the legacy of the old Yugoslav socialist system, which emphasised the caring with employees and communities. After implementing the market economy, Slovenian companies became more profit oriented, more and more privatised corporations were not willing to conduct socially responsible business practices. Similar to other European countries, Slovenia already regulates some aspects of CSR with legislation (e.g.: employees' right, environmental protection, consumer protection). (Golob – Bartlett, 2006).

Hartman et al. (2007) conducted a comparative study among European Union and United States multinational corporations. They investigated the communication of CSR activity at altogether 16 companies. They presume to see a significant difference between CSR approaches: U.S. companies tend to justify their CSR activities through economic, bottom line terms, while European firms emphasise language, citizenship-theories, corporate accountability or moral commitment.

They apply a theoretical approach with two different types of motivations for engaging in CSR activities, these are economical and ethical motivations.

From the “dual motivations of CSR” – as Hartman et al. (2007) wrote –, the economic aspect supports that including CSR in corporate activity can lead to differentiation and competitive advantage for the company. This means that higher level of goods can sublimate the lower. According to Porter and Kramer (2002) this sublimation is not only a halo effect for the companies but it can lead to a real improvement of competitive situation, whether it is the environmental, social, political or economic situation.

Porter and Kramer (2006) emphasise the kind of relationship between a firm’s CSR-goals and the interest of communities in those activities. The characteristic of this interdependence is that companies have to integrate a social perspective into that framework it uses in order to understand the competition and follow the corporate strategy.

The other argument for CSR is the citizenship or ethical approach. According to this, companies reap the benefits while behaving as a community citizen, so they give back something to the community, which means they do the right thing.

However neither of the two approaches are universally accepted in CSR practice, they both reveal the most important motivations why companies engage in CSR. This engagement may depend on a lot of variables, for example national culture, geography, social or economic norms about which CSR perspective to adopt. Maignan (2001, in Hartman et al., 2007) found this kind of distinctions such as French and German consumers seem to support responsible businesses more than U.S. consumers, who appreciate corporate economic responsibility.

### **I.3. Reporting tools and techniques**

As it can be read in Golob – Bartlett (2006) there have been several attempts to establish a global framework for CSR reporting. The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) developed together with the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) is a well established program which “has pioneered the development of the world’s most widely used sustainability reporting framework and is committed to its continuous improvement and application worldwide. This framework sets out the principles and indicators that organizations can use to measure and report their economic, environmental, and social performance.”<sup>6</sup>

Another initiative, similar to GRI is connected to ISEA (The Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability). They have a standard called “Accountability AA1000 assurance standard”, which is not that strict concerning reporting standards, and stakeholder engagement is also more emphasised in GRI.

There are several other internationally recognised standards and reporting guidelines which the scientific literature refers to, and may strengthen the reports, Golob – Bartlett (2006) grouped them into 3 main categories:

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.globalreporting.org>

1. codes of conduct (e.g.: OECD Guidelines, ILO Declaration; define standards of corporate behaviour)
2. management standards (e.g.: SA8000, ISO14000; offer frameworks for implementing socially responsible practices)
3. screenings and rankings (e.g.: Dow Jones Sustainability Index, FTSE4Good; provide basis for responsible investing and comparing companies)

In Hungary till 2008 (in different years and with different labels and subjects) 53 companies issued non-financial reports. Thirteen of them already used GRI guidelines and this number is going to increase in the future, since 13 more companies entered the Good CSR program, this means the number of companies using GRI will double. (GOOD CSR, 2008 )

## II. Focus of our research and the method

### II.1. Why sustainability reports? – a short CSR reporting history

There are three main reporting types we found (social, environmental and sustainability reports) while searching for empirical studies, and these are the three types we are planning to investigate in our national-level research. We think it is important to have a look at the history of these reporting types, how they evolved, what their main characteristics were.

Daub (2005) wrote about the premises of sustainability reports in the introduction of his paper. According to his findings there were three main reporting types before sustainability reports became prevalent such as:

- annual reports
- environmental reports
- social reports

From the mid 1990s we can see more and more ethical, social and environmental aspects about the corporate activity in the **annual reports** (most common terms are: corporate citizenship, corporate social responsibility). This applies to companies that do not issue a stand-alone sustainability report.

The first **environmental reports** were issued at the end of the 1980s, they spread quickly, especially at multinational companies. In 1998, 35 percent of the top 250 of Fortune Global 500 had environmental reports, 32% of them disclosed environmental issues in their annual reports. Daub (2005) says the integration of social topics and the change of environmental have led to sustainability reports. (Daub 2005)

Companies demonstrate the social aspects of their activity in their **social reports**. They might have evolved in the 1970s to satisfy the need for introducing 'social accounting' or produce a 'social balance sheet'.

Since almost all companies are sticking to the „old” format of reports, it is not surprising, that so many reporting types /formats exist. All of them include the company's integration in its social and ecological environment, and many of them mention 'sustainability'. Daub (2005) considers these reports as **sustainability reports** in a broader sense.

According to KPMG's survey<sup>7</sup> four main reporting types exist (the percentage figures for each type are given in the brackets):

---

<sup>7</sup> Daub (2005) refers to KPMG 2002 International Study of Corporate Sustainability Reporting, the first one published by the company, that reviewed the reports issued by the Fortune Global top 250 companies (GFT250) and the top 100 companies in 19 countries

- Environmental reports [Health, Safety and Environment] (GFT250: 73%, a Top 100: 65%)
- Sustainability reports (GFT250: 14%, Top 100: 12%)
- Combined environmental and social reports (GFT250: 10%, Top 100: 11%)
- Social reports (GFT205: 3%, Top 100: 12%)

From the numbers above we can see companies produce considerably more environmental reports than sustainability reports. According to Daub (2005) the main reason for this is that the European Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS II) which is based on the 1995 EMAS Directive (EC) 761/2001 and is a leading regulation for environment management systems along with ISO 14001 series of standards, requires companies to publish an environmental statement.

The situation in Hungary can also be characterised by the main conclusions of Daub (2005), annual reports were the most widespread among the Hungarian companies by the end of the XX. century and in some cases a small part or an appendix was dealing with the topic of social or environmental responsibility. As we conducted our research in the year 2007 we decided to focus on the companies CSR reporting practices which not only “by the way” are included among the performance measures, but are designated to give a forum for the companies to “discuss” social, environmental and sustainability issues.

## **II.2. Process of data collection**

The construction of the database took place between October and December of the year 2007. Our research group wanted to collect as many CSR reports (social, environmental and sustainable reports) from Hungarian companies as it was possible. The method of the data collection was formalised:

First we decided to search according to industries, after enumerating the relevant companies of a given sector we searched their web pages for reports. In the case we could not find any on the homepages, we sent formalised e-mails to these companies – usually to those e-mail addresses which were indicated on the webpage as “contact person”. If there were no response we approached the companies by phone or personally.

Finally we visited – virtually or personally – 124 different companies, out of which 35 had annual reports; 16 sustainability reports; 22 environmental report and 7 social reports. We decided not to analyse annual reports and for this paper we have chosen the sustainability reports as the foci of our investigation. The list of CSR reports in the sample is shown in the Appendix 4. Here we can see how the different companies moved from environmental reporting towards sustainability reporting, and in the last two years a new wave of social reporting has also approached Hungary.

For a focused research in this paper we decided to analyse sustainable reports, the main reason was that during the data collection we discovered, that in these years (2006-2007) a new boom of sustainability reporting is approaching Hungary, environmental reports are well researched since 2000 (for more information see: Kovacs, 2000 – since this PhD dissertation a research group is investigating this topic at the Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary); and social reporting is just about to come to Hungary (see Appendix 4.).

On the process of data analysis we decided to narrow the focus of our research to the year of 2006, in many cases these reports were the most recent ones, and instead of making a longitudinal research – comparing the reporting practices in

certain companies in a given time span – we opted for giving a picture of sustainability reports published by different companies in the very same year. From the collected 16 sustainability reports we found 10 which had electronic (pdf format) reports on their webpage (see Appendix 5. for the list of companies in the sample and also the sources to download – in Hungarian – the analysed reports are indicated there). Companies are coming mainly from different industries and are the leading corporations in their field (for information on their market share, profit after taxation, number of employees, etc. see: Appendix 6.)

### II.3. Process of content analysis

After identifying the preliminary list of corporations (see in Appendix 4. – the list of companies with sustainability reports), we compiled the publicly, electronically accessible sustainability reports for the year 2006. Those corporations which did not have reports for this year or their documents were not accessible were excluded from the current study. Finally we stayed with 10 companies' sustainability reports, downloaded from the companies' homepages in pdf format.

We conducted key word and word combination searches, focusing on the stakeholder communication. First a list of stakeholders (Table 3.) was established which were searched (with their *synonyms* used in the reports) throughout the 10 sustainability reports. In this searching process major themes and topics were identified in the case of each corporations' grouped under the given stakeholder-list.

Table 3. List of stakeholders – terms used for arranging the content of the reports

Internal stakeholders	External stakeholders
Owners, <i>shareholders</i>	Costumers, <i>consumers, clients</i>
Managers, <i>chief executive officer, executives, leaders</i>	Suppliers
Employees <i>co-workers, staff, workers</i>	Strategic partners, partners
Trade unions	Banks and creditors
	Competitors
	State, government
	Foreign countries
	Media, mass media, press
	Civil organisations
	Local communities
	Future's generation
	Natural environment

In the following the findings of the research are presented in order to answer the research questions namely to whom, what and how do the companies in the sample communicate to their stakeholders in their sustainability reports in the year 2006.

### III. Findings of the research

In examining the different sustainability reports we were aware of the fact that our method of simple searching for the stakeholders and the grouping of relevant themes

for each “member” of the list preliminary set stakeholder-list, will give us only a descriptive data as an answer to our research questions. However in this phase of our research this was one of our main objective – as in the later phases of this four year long research program we are planning “to validate” these result in the everyday practices of the selected companies. In this sense now we are investigating the “exposed theory” of the firms – on how / what / to who and why are they communicating CSR in their sustainability reports –; and in the next phase – qualitative interviews and focus group discussions with different stakeholder groups, etc. – we hope to detect their actual “theories in use”.

### III.1. To who, to which stakeholder groups do the investigated Hungarian corporations communicate in their Sustainability Reports?

To answer the question *to who* these Sustainability reports are addressed we used the stakeholder-list based on the literature review. This is a “complete” list of stakeholders but we try to avoid putting the expectation on the companies of fulfilling the requirements of the stakeholder management literature (Freeman, 1982), still we know that in this case we are not working only out of these reports but putting our models of reference as a framework on them.

Table 3. shows the number of topics under which the different stakeholder groups were addressed in some issues related to social responsibility in the sustainability reports.

Far more the *employees* are the most often referred stakeholder in all cases, seemingly they are the most important stakeholders for all the companies.

*Environmental*-conscious behaviour is also widely published in these reports – on the second place – which can be thanked also to the EU directive (2003/51/EC).

Costumers were less than a half times mentioned as employees. In some cases it may also mean that the target audience of this sustainability reports are on the first place the employees?

Table 4. The appearance of stakeholder groups in the Sustainability reports in the sample

Stakeholder groups	Employees	Natural environment	Costumers	Suppliers	Managers	Owners	Strategic partners	Trade unions
frequency	161	135	71	35	28	24	23	21
Stakeholder groups	State	Civil organisations	Local communities	Foreign countries	Competitors	Future generation	Media	Banks and creditors
frequency	21	21	14	14	10	10	8	2

Financial institutions like banks were only twice mentioned (at Hocim and Magyar Telecom), but even in these cases only technical data were supported.

However the internal stakeholders were addressed in 234 times, while the external ones 366 times – and if we compare the specific number of stakeholder groups under the two label we can conclude that may the internal stakeholders are of grater importance for the analysed firms.

Usually in the different sustainability reports the companies gave different names to their stakeholders (for a detailed description of the so called “most important” stakeholders by the companies and its name-variations see: Appendix 7.).

In some reports it occurred that a company which in the first place distinguishes a few of its stakeholders as of crucial importance, and then in the following pages not mentions the name again. For instance: Pannon called the government as key stakeholder for its activities and later it is not mentioned once; TVK put local governments as stakeholders on its list, but fails to discuss their importance. MÁV Cargo was the only corporation which differentiated among stakeholders affected by their everyday activities and the target audience of their sustainability report – from this distinction we can conclude that not all the affected stakeholders are taken into account as readers.

### **III.2. On what (content) do the investigated Hungarian corporations communicate in their Sustainability Reports?**

Several different topics were touched by the reports in the following we highlight the most common or exceptional ones under the heading of the different stakeholders which they refer to.

#### *Owners (shareholders)*

In most cases the owners were mentioned as someone who beside the need for information, orientation and reference is mainly interested in the increase of the shareholder value (CIB; MVM; TVK). However the theme on regular meetings, general meetings and the continuous contact was the most common issue raised in connection with the owners.

#### *Manager (chief executive officer, executive, leader)*

Management allowances, bonuses, carrier possibilities and other privileges what a manager could have – were the most commonly raised topics in relation to the management. OTP emphasised the importance and the high ratio of the locals in the management; while MVM and MOL referred to the high percent of male managers among their executives.

#### *Employees (co-workers, staff, workers)*

The longest part was of the all reports were dealing with this stakeholder group – especially in the case CIP, OTP, Pannon and MOL. The importance of Code of Ethics – which is usually a system of norms at the workplace – was mentioned in all cases (except from MVM).

Professional development of workers, trainings, bonuses, safety regulations, regular health care examinations and the continuous information exchange and dialogue were the topics for all firms very crucial. To secure equal rights and chances for all employees – apart from Pannon – all corporations raised this issue. The importance of social responsibility can be captured also by the employees (CIB, Pannon) if they take part in voluntary work. (From the reports it was not clear whether it is a must or a possibility for these workers.) Worker-satisfaction is regularly measured in the case of four companies (AÁK, MOL, MVM, OTP), at TVK the employees commitment is measured regularly.

#### *Trade unions*

Eight companies kept continuous discussions with trade unions – OTP for instance before important decisions consult wit the representatives of the trade union, TVK

supported its activities on a larger scale than it is ordered by law. In 2006 CIB and Pannon did not have trade unions.

#### *Costumers (consumers, clients)*

The consumers' need for information is evoked in the reports, but still not all firms found it important to inform and even to engage or involve its costumers about their activities. However MÁV Cargo kept forums for its costumers to discuss the new trends of the industry and to find way how to create mutually beneficial agreements. Even to transmit values to costumers (such as family ethics, reliability) was mentioned in relation to costumers, but still the issues on market research and the need for costumers to consume in order to create profits was the most widespread reason to refer to this stakeholder group.

#### *Suppliers*

Behind the increasing role of suppliers is the recognition how the corporations indirectly affect the natural and social environment via their suppliers. In the case of MOL for instance a supplier had to fulfil strong environmental and safety requirements, at Telekom they even expected the acceptance of their Code of Ethics. Only MÁV Cargo did not mention its suppliers in their sustainability report.

#### *Competitors*

Besides the importance of the continuously keeping an eye on the competitors, the importance of pure and clear market conditions, transparency, to obey to the rules of the competitions' law were by all firms raised. Besides competing a cooperation on environmental issues, or for a common representation of the industries rights were also mentioned. (OTP)

#### *Strategic partners (partners)*

Mutually beneficial agreements are discussed here were the link to sustainability is made how these companies choose their strategic partners – environmental-conscious behaviour and to share common values and norms (TVK, MVM). To support civil organisations with the strategic partner (CIB) or The National Gallery (Pannon) is also common.

#### *Media (mass media, press)*

Although the importance of the media is recognised of the firms only six (MÁV Cargo, Magyar Telekom, MVM, Pannon, CIB ÁAK) mentioned it as an important stakeholder – as tool of information exchange and a forum for influence.

#### *Natural environment*

The key word discussing natural environment as a stakeholder is the “sustainable development” by which partly the reduction of the negative externalities is meant, but still a “healthy”, stable, calculable business environment was also mentioned. The corporations usually highlighted how they took care of the natural environment throughout their everyday activities: MÁV Cargo emphasised the environment friendliness of travelling, transporting on railroads. The corporations from constructing or raw chemical or energy sectors are working on the reduction of their polluting activities. The reduction of noise, the creation of selective waste collection islands, supporting of nature protecting organisations and even printing the sustainability reports on reused papers – are only a few topics mentioned by the firms.



### *Future's generations (next generations)*

Although the role of future's generation is of great importance the half of the investigated companies had not even mentioned them. OTP only put them on their stakeholder map – without explanations. The Magyar Telekom – in comparison to the other firms – addressed to future's generation in three themes: emphasizing the responsibilities for their aims and interest (in general), and the importance of the internship programs for the students – the possible future workers of the company. (This last issue was also raised by MÁV Cargo) TVK – as one of the most pollutant companies in the sample – while discussing its environmental policy added a few words on their responsibilities for the sustainable development of the economy and the environment while taking into account the need of the future's generation, for whom they are responsible.

### **III.3. How (in what form) do the investigated Hungarian corporations communicate in their Sustainability Reports?**

Sustainability reports in the sample had the length of 68 pages on average, but they are largely scattered behind this average. (Table 5.) MOL had the longest report with its 101 pages – the question could be is there any ideal length for a report, is there anyone – besides the researchers – who reads through all these pages (these questions can also be answered in a later phase of our research).

Without judging or evaluating these reports – in some cases we found pages, paragraphs with hardly any information, highly generalised topics without any connections to sustainability or even CSR reporting.

Table 5. The length of sustainability reports in the sample

<b>Name of the company</b>	<b>Number of pages</b>
ÁAK	66
CIB	63
Holcim	48
Magyar Telekom	84
MVM	71
MÁV Cargo	61
MOL	101
OTP Bank	59
Pannon	43
TVK	83
<i>Mean</i>	<i>67,9</i>
<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>16,6219734</i>

90% of the corporations in the sample had used the framework of Global Reporting Initiative – which was the first step for the Hungarian companies to fulfil the “requirements” of the EU.

In the year 2006 however it was not obvious for all the companies what was meant under social responsibility or even sustainability reporting. As MÁV Cargo put it in its sustainability report: "In our corporate strategy the strategy of social responsibility is crucial that is why a significant role is given to sponsorship" (p. 54.). Sponsorship as a business motivated activity is generally excluded from CSR activities – MÁV cargo put it as an excuse for its lack of financial funds.

Five out of the ten companies worked with Hungarian consulting companies to create its sustainability reports (CIB, Magyar Telekom, MVM, MÁV Cargo, OTP).

In all of the reports in the sample a certain interaction is asked from the readers: either on an "Opinion sheet" (TVK) or just a brief question serves as encouragement to share their opinion on how to make the firm to a better actor of its environment.

#### **III.4. Why do the investigated Hungarian corporations communicate in their Sustainability Reports? – Motivation for reporting**

Important to compare why companies engage in CSR practices and reports, what are the motivating factors for that. We already mentioned some possible reasons, such as an encouraging award like MERA (Malaysia Environmental Reporting Awards, Thompson – Zakaria, 2004), the role of reports in internal communication (Perrini, 2005) or legislation, market expectations or partnership with communities (Golob – Bartlett, 2006).

Hungarian practice of awarding companies for their efficient activities towards stakeholders is very diverse. A lot of our investigated companies received such kind of -either internationally or locally recognised -awards Just to mention some examples, there are awards for brand image, best corporate website, awards from different PR committees, for workers' equal opportunities, for best corporate giving, etc. These are all in connection with the companies' stakeholders, their expectations and the way they communicate their activities to people and other organisations.

CSR reports can be mandatory, solicited or voluntary. (Van der Laan, 2004; Woodward, Edwards & Birkin, 1996 in: Golob – Bartlett, 2006). Advocates of mandatory reporting think that reporting should be regulated by the state (Doane, 2002 in: Golob – Bartlett, 2006). Solicited reporting is slowly gaining wider acceptance, focusing on the demand of information issued by a particular stakeholder group (Van der Laan, 2004 in: Golob – Bartlett, 2006). The most recognised form of CSR reporting is voluntary reporting. The KPMG 2005 international survey showed that voluntary reporting has significantly risen since 2002 (Kolk, van der Veen, Pinkse & Reeves, 2002 in: Golob – Bartlett, 2006)

When talking about mandatory, solicited and voluntary reports, we have to mention the influence of political factors. Hartman et al. (2007) wrote that U.S government support for voluntary reporting mechanism is not sufficient. Despite U.S signed the OECD Guidelines that cover human rights, environment, corruption, labour standards and other issues of corporate behaviour, little has been done to publicise this.

On the other side, European governments try to motivate the CSR initiatives (beside the EU Commission). The Belgian government is trying to create a social labelling program, the Danish government founded the Copenhagen Centre to generate CSR-based partnerships between business, society and government. France formed requirements for reporting social and environmental issues, the U.K. has a minister devoted to CSR (Brum, 2003 in: Golob – Bartlett, 2006). The Slovenian government issued a national report on CSR in 2006, which was a part of an EU report on

member states' CSR policies and a plan to support CSR on a national level. (Golob – Bartlett, 2006)

In Hungary CSR is not regulated by governmental policy, EU directives are set which are also valid for the Hungarian companies, however these directives are more proposals without real executive body supporting them.

#### **IV. Conclusion – on further research**

As we indicated in the introduction this paper documents the first phase of a longer research. In this paper we only wanted to summarise the theoretical background for our research, and start with the description of the sample we selected. The next phase will be to “validate” the findings of this research: namely how these companies act in their everyday practices.

## References

- Daub, Claus-Heinrich (2005) Assessing the quality of sustainability reporting: an alternative methodological approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2007, p75-85
- Freeman, Edward R. (1982): Stakeholder-menedzsment in Kindler József, Zsolnai László (eds) (1993) *Etika a gazdaságban*, Keraban Kiadó Budapest, 169-191 [Stakeholder Management in Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach 1984. Pitman Chapter 3.]]
- Golob, Urša; Bartlett, Jennifer L. (2007) Communicating about corporate social responsibility: A comparative study of CSR reporting in Australia and Slovenia. *Public Relations Review*, Mar2007, Vol. 33 Issue 1, p1-9, 9p
- GOOD CSR 2008. A társadalmi felelősségvállalás könyve - 25 magyarországi vállalat rövid CSR jelentése. Braun & Partners Kft. (*The book of corporate social responsibility- short CSR reports from 25 Hungarian companies*)
- Hartman, Laura; Rubin, Robert; Dhanda, K. (2007) The Communication of Corporate Social Responsibility: United States and European Union Multinational Corporations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Sep2007, Vol. 74 Issue 4, p373-389, 17p, 4 charts
- Kovács, Eszter (2000) A környezeti jelentések szerepe a vállalatok környezeti és társadalmi felelősségének előmozdításában. PhD dissertation, Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary; Faculty of Business Administration. (*The role of environmental reporting in enhancing the corporations' social and environmental responsibility*)
- KPMG International Survey of Corporate Responsibility Reporting 2008
- Paul, Karen; Cobas, Elisa; Ceron, Raul; Frithiof, Mattias; Maass, Angel; Navarro, Ivan; Palmer, Lina; Serrano, Loretta; Deaton, Lori Zalka (2006) Corporate Social Reporting in Mexico. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Summer2006 Issue 22, p67-80, 14p
- Perrini, Francesco (2005) Building a European Portrait of Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting. *European Management Journal*, Dec2005, Vol. 23 Issue 6, p611-627, 17p
- Porter, M. E. – Kramer, M. R. (2002) The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, HBR Spotlight, pp1-15.
- Porter, M. E. – Kramer, M. R. (2006) Strategy & Society – The Link Between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, HBR Spotlight, pp1-16.
- Thompson, Paul; Zakaria, Zarina (2004) Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting in Malaysia. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Spring2004 Issue 13, p125-136, 12p, 3 charts

**Appendix 1.** Documentation and results of the keyword-research – number of articles published before the year 2000 in the EBSCO databases

<b>EBSCO</b>										
<i>Results before 2000</i>										
	"reporting" AND	"social"	"sustainable development"	"sustainability"	"corporate social responsibility"	"csr"	"social responsibility"	"corporate citizenship"	"triple bottom line"	All (excluding multiple results)
Business Ethics: A European View		1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Business Ethics Quarterly		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Business & Society		1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1
Journal of Business Ethics		11	1	1	1	0	5	0	0	11
Journal of Corporate Citizenship		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academy of Management Journal		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Academy of Management Review		2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
British Journal of Management		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
California Management Review		7	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	7
European Management Journal		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Journal of Management Studies		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Organization Studies		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Accounting, Organizations & Society		1	1	0	2	0	6	0	0	6
Public Relations Review		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>All</b>										<b>30</b>

**Appendix 2.** Documentation and results of the keyword-research – number of articles published after the year 2000 in the EBSCO databases

<b>EBSCO</b>										
<i>Results after 2000</i>										
	"reporting" AND	"social"	"sustainable development"	"sustainability"	"corporate social responsibility"	"csr"	"social responsibility"	"corporate citizenship"	"triple bottom line"	All (excluding multiple results)
Business Ethics: A European Review		13	0	2	4	3	11	0	2	13
Business Ethics Quarterly		5	2	0	1	0	2	0	3	7
Business & Society		12	3	2	5	4	8	0	1	11
Journal of Business Ethics		37	9	10	15	10	29	2	0	40
Journal of Corporate Citizenship		15	4	6	9	6	12	19	0	19
Academy of Management Journal		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Academy of Management Review		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
British Journal of Management		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
California Management Review		4	1	0	2	1	3	0	2	4
European Management Journal		3	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	4
Journal of Management Studies		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Organization Studies		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal		25	2	4	9	4	14	0	0	25
Accounting, Organizations & Society		1	1	2	2	0	4	0	0	4
Public Relations Review		2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
<b>All</b>										<b>135</b>

**Appendix 3.** List of overall results (articles sorted by date of publishing and periodicals)

**CSR-relevant periodicals**

*Business Ethics: A European Review*

Bremer, Jennifer Ann (2008) How global is the Global Compact. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jul2008, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p227-244, 18p

Painter-Morland, Mollie (2006) Triple-bottom line reporting as social grammar: integrating corporate social responsibility and corporate codes of conduct. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Oct2006, Vol. 15 Issue 4, p352-364, 13p

Executive summaries. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Oct2006, Vol. 15 Issue 4, p313-315, 3p

Jackson, C.; Bundgard, T.(2002) Achieving quality in social reporting: the role of surveys in stakeholder consultation. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jul2002, Vol. 11 Issue 3, p253-259, 7p, 1 chart

de Colle, Simone; Gonella, Claudia (2002) The social and ethical alchemy: an integrative approach to social and ethical accountability. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jan2002, Vol. 11 Issue 1, p86-96, 11p, 3 diagrams

Executive Summaries. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jul2002, Vol. 11 Issue 3, p197-199, 3p

Owen, David; Swift, Tracey (2001) Introduction social accounting, reporting, auditing: Beyond the rhetoric? *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jan2001, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p4-8, 5p

Gray, Rob (2001) Thirty years of social accounting, reporting and auditing: what (if anything) have we learnt? *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jan2001, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p9-15, 7p

Swift, Tracey (2001) Trust, reputation and corporate accountability to stakeholders. *Ethics: A European Review*, Jan2001, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p16-26, 11p, 2 diagrams

O'Dwyer, Brendan (2001) The legitimacy of accountants' participation in social and ethical accounting, auditing and reporting. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jan2001, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p27-39, 13p, 1 chart

Cumming, Jane Fiona (2001) Engaging stakeholders in corporate accountability programmes: A cross-sectoral analysis of UK and transnational experience. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jan2001, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p45-52, 8p

Executive Summaries. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jan2001, Vol. 10 Issue 1, p1-3, 3p

Uys, Tina (2000) The politicisation of whistleblowers: a case study. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Oct2000, Vol. 9 Issue 4, p259-267, 9p

Clarke, Julia; Gibson-Sweet, Monica (1999) The use of corporate social disclosures in the management of reputation and legitimacy: a cross sectoral analysis of UK Top 100 Companies. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Jan1999, Vol. 8 Issue 1, p5-13, 9p, 5 charts

*Business Ethics Quarterly*

Phillips, Robert; Berman, Shawn L. (2007) Introduction to the special section on accountability. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Jul2007, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p449-452, 4p

Hess, David (2007) Social reporting and new governance regulation: the prospects of achieving corporate accountability through transparency. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Jul2007, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p453-476, 24p

Hess, David; Dunfee, Thomas W. (2007) The Kasky-Nike threat to corporate social reporting. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Jan2007, Vol. 17 Issue 1, p5-32, 28p

Norman, Wayne; MacDonald, Chris (2004) Getting to the bottom of „triple bottom line” . *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Apr2004, Vol. 14 Issue 2, p243-262, 20p

Hess, David (2001) Regulating corporate social performance: a new look at social accounting, auditing and reporting. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Apr2001, Vol. 11 Issue 2, p307-330, 24p, 3 charts

Pava, Moses L. (2007) A response to „Getting to the bottom of „triple bottom line”. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Jan2007, Vol. 17 Issue 1, p105-110, 6p

MacDonald, Chris; Norman, Wayne (2007) Rescuing the baby from the triple-bottom-line bathwater: a reply to Pava. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Jan2007, Vol. 17 Issue 1, p111-114, 4p

#### *Business & Society*

Fortanier, Fabienne; Kolk, Ans (2007) On the Economic Dimensions of Corporate Social Responsibility: Exploring Fortune Global 250 Reports. *Business & Society*, Dec2007, Vol. 46 Issue 4, p457-478, 22p, 5 charts

Rodríguez, Linda C.; LeMaster, Jane (2007) Voluntary Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure SEC "CSR Seal of Approval". *Business & Society*, Sep2007, Vol. 46 Issue 3, p370-385, 16p, 1 chart

Antal, Ariane Berthoin; Sobczak, André (2007) Corporate Social Responsibility in France: A Mix of National Traditions and International Influences. *Business & Society*, Mar2007, Vol. 46 Issue 1, p9-32, 24p

Robins, Fred (2006) The Challenge of TBL: A Responsibility to Whom? *Business & Society Review* (00453609), Spring2006, Vol. 111 Issue 1, p1-14, 14p

Konrad, Astrid; Steurer, Reinhard; Langer, Markus E.; Martinuzzi, André (2006) Empirical Findings on Business--Society Relations in Europe. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2006, Vol. 63 Issue 1, p89-105, 17p

Ramus, Catherine A.; Montiel, Ivan (2005) When Are Corporate Environmental Policies a Form of Greenwashing? *Business & Society*, Dec2005, Vol. 44 Issue 4, p377-414, 38p

Chapple, Wendy; Moon, Jeremy (2005) Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in Asia: A Seven-Country Study of CSR Web Site Reporting. *Business & Society*, Dec2005, Vol. 44 Issue 4, p415-441, 27p

Stittle, John (2004) UK Corporate Reporting of Human Capital: A Regulatory Failure to Evolve. *Business & Society Review* (00453609), Fall2004, Vol. 109 Issue 3, p311-337, 27p

Stittle, J. (2002) UK Corporate Ethical Reporting—A Failure to Inform: Some Evidence from Company Annual Reports. *Business & Society Review* (00453609), Fall2002, Vol. 107 Issue 3, p349-370, 22p

Mirvis, Philip H (2000) Transformation at Shell: Commerce and citizenship. *Business & Society Review* (00453609), Spring2000, Vol. 105 Issue 1, p63, 22p

Burton, Brian K.; Hegarty, W. Harvey (1999) Some Determinants of Student Corporate Social Responsibility Orientation. *Business & Society*, Jun99, Vol. 38 Issue 2, p188, 18p

Dierkes, Meinolf; Coppock, Rob (1978) Europe Tries the Corporate Social Report. *Business & Society Review* (00453609), Spring78 Issue 25

#### *Journal of Business Ethics*



Reynolds, MaryAnn; Yuthas, Kristi (2008) Moral Discourse and Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Mar2008, Vol. 78 Issue 1/2, p47-64, 18p

Quaak, Lizet; Aalbers, Theo; Goedee, John (2007) Transparency of Corporate Social Responsibility in Dutch Breweries. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Dec2007, Vol. 76 Issue 3, p293-308, 16p, 4 charts

Greenwood, Michelle (2007) Stakeholder Engagement: Beyond the Myth of Corporate Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Sep2007, Vol. 74 Issue 4, p315-327, 13p, 2 charts, 1 diagram

Hartman, Laura; Rubin, Robert; Dhanda, K. (2007) The Communication of Corporate Social Responsibility: United States and European Union Multinational Corporations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Sep2007, Vol. 74 Issue 4, p373-389, 17p, 4 charts

Jose, Anita; Lee, Shang-Mei (2007) Environmental Reporting of Global Corporations: A Content Analysis based on Website Disclosures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jun2007, Vol. 72 Issue 4, p307-321, 15p, 6 charts

Vuontisjärvi, Taru (2006) Corporate Social Reporting in the European Context and Human Resource Disclosures: An Analysis of Finnish Companies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Dec2006, Vol. 69 Issue 4, p331-354, 24p, 3 charts

Gond, Jean-Pascal; Herrbach, Olivier (2006) Social Reporting as an Organisational Learning Tool? A Theoretical Framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jun2006, Vol. 65 Issue 4, p359-371, 13p, 2 charts, 1 diagram

O'Dwyer, Brendan; Madden, Grainne (2006) Ethical Codes of Conduct in Irish Companies: A Survey of Code Content and Enforcement Procedures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Feb2006, Vol. 63 Issue 3, p217-236, 20p

Mill, Greig A. (2006) The Financial Performance of a Socially Responsible Investment Over Time and a Possible Link with Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2006, Vol. 63 Issue 2, p131-148, 18p

Molyneaux, David (2006) After Andersen: An Experience of Integrating Ethics into Undergraduate Accountancy Education. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2006, Vol. 63 Issue 2, p385-398, 14p

Pruzan, Peter (2006) From Control to Values-Based Management and Accountability<sup>1</sup>. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2006, Vol. 63 Issue 2, p1379-1394, 16p

Hummels, Harry (2006) Organizing Ethics: A Stakeholder Debate<sup>1</sup>. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2006, Vol. 63 Issue 2, p1403-1419, 17p

Zadek, Simon (2006) Balancing Performance, Ethics, and Accountability<sup>1</sup>. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2006, Vol. 63 Issue 2, p1421-1441, 21p

Raynard, Peter (2006) Coming Together. A Review of Contemporary Approaches to Social Accounting, Auditing and Reporting in Non-profit Organisations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2006, Vol. 63 Issue 2, p1471-1479, 9p

Konrad, Astrid; Steurer, Reinhard; Langer, Markus E.; Martinuzzi, André (2006) Empirical Findings on Business--Society Relations in Europe. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2006, Vol. 63 Issue 1, p89-105, 17p

Grosser, Kate; Moon, Jeremy (2005) Gender Mainstreaming and Corporate Social Responsibility: Reporting Workplace Issues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Dec2005, Vol. 62 Issue 4, p327-340, 14p

Firth, Michael; Phyllis L. L. Mo; Raymond M. K. Wong (2005) Financial Statement Frauds and Auditor Sanctions: An Analysis of Enforcement Actions in China. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Dec2005, Vol. 62 Issue 4, p367-381, 15p

Miller, Diane L.; Thomas, Stuart (2005) The Impact of Relative Position and Relational Closeness on the Reporting of Unethical Acts. *The Impact of Relative Position and Relational Closeness on the Reporting of Unethical Acts*.

Palazzo, Guido; Richter, Ulf (2005) CSR Business as Usual? The Case of the Tobacco Industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Nov2005, Vol. 61 Issue 4, p387-401, 15p

Knox, Simon; Maklan, Stan; French, Paul (2005) Corporate Social Responsibility: Exploring Stakeholder Relationships and Programme Reporting across Leading FTSE Companies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Sep2005 Part 3, Vol. 61 Issue 1, p7-28, 22p

DeTienne, Kristen Bell; Lewis, Lee W. (2005) The Pragmatic and Ethical Barriers to Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure: The Nike Case. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Sep2005 Part 2, Vol. 60 Issue 4, p359-376, 18p

van den Brink, Timo W. M.; van der Woerd, Frans (2004) Industry Specific Sustainability Benchmarks: An ECSF Pilot Bridging Corporate Sustainability with Social Responsible Investments. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Dec2004 Part 1, Vol. 55 Issue 2, p187-203, 17p

Molyneaux, David (2004) After Andersen: An Experience of Integrating Ethics into Undergraduate Accountancy Education. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Nov2004 Part 1, Vol. 54 Issue 4, p385-398, 14p

Hummels, Harry; Timmer, Diederik (2004) Investors in Need of Social, Ethical, and Environmental Information. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jun2004 Part 2, Vol. 52 Issue 1, p73-84, 12p

Cormier, Denis; Gordon, Irene M.; Magnan, Michel (2004) Corporate Environmental Disclosure: Contrasting Management's Perceptions with Reality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2004 Part 2, Vol. 49 Issue 2, p143-165, 23p

Trivedi, Viswanath Umashanker; Shehata, Mohamed; Lynn, Bernadette (2003) Impact of Personal and Situational Factors on Taxpayer Compliance: An Experimental Analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Oct2003 Part 2, Vol. 47 Issue 3, p175-197, 23p

Janne Chung; Trivedi, Viswanath Umashanker (2003) The Effect of Friendly Persuasion and Gender on Tax Compliance Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Oct2003 Part 1, Vol. 47 Issue 2, p133-145, 13p

Graafland, Johan; Van de Ven, Bert; Stoffele, Nelleke (2003) Strategies and Instruments for Organising CSR by Small and Large Businesses in the Netherlands. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Sep2003 Part 3, Vol. 47 Issue 1, p45-60, 16p

van Marrewijk, Marcel (2003) Concepts and Definitions of CSR and Corporate Sustainability: Between Agency and Communion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, May2003, Vol. 44 Issue 2/3, p95-105, 11p, 3 diagrams

van Marrewijk, Marcel; Werre, Marco (2003) Multiple Levels of Corporate Sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, May2003, Vol. 44 Issue 2/3, p107-119, 13p, 6 charts, 1 graph, 3bw

van Marrewijk, Marcel; Hardjono, Teun W. (2003) European Corporate Sustainability Framework for Managing Complexity and Corporate Transformation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, May2003, Vol. 44 Issue 2/3, p121-132, 12p, 4 diagrams

Nicole; Swift, Tracey (2003) Transparency and Assurance: Minding the Credibility Gap. *Journal of Business Ethics*, May2003, Vol. 44 Issue 2/3, p195-200, 6p

Willis, Alan (2003) The Role of the Global Reporting Initiative's Sustainability Reporting Guidelines in the Social Screening of Investments. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Mar2003 Part 2, Vol. 43 Issue 3, p233-137, 5p

- Dunfee, Thomas W. (2003) Social Investing: Mainstream or Backwater? *Journal of Business Ethics*, Mar2003 Part 2, Vol. 43 Issue 3, p247-252, 6p
- Laufer, William S. (2003) Social Accountability and Corporate Greenwashing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Mar2003 Part 2, Vol. 43 Issue 3, p253-261, 9p, 1 chart;
- Von Weltzien Hoivik, Heidi (2002) Professional Ethics-- a Managerial Opportunity in Emerging Organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Aug2002, Vol. 39 Issue 1/2, p3-11, 9p, 3 charts
- Graafland, Johan J. (2002) Profits and Principles: Four Perspectives. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Feb2002 Part 2, Vol. 35 Issue 4, p293-305, 13p, 3 graphs
- Bean, David F. (2001) Equivocal Reporting: Ethical Communication Issues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Jan2001, Vol. 29 Issue 1/2, p65-76, 12p, 4 charts
- Rosthorn, John (2000) Business, Ethics Auditing -- More Than a Stakeholder's Toy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Sep2000, Vol. 27 Issue 1/2, p9-19, 11p, 9 diagrams
- Hooghiemstra, Reggy (2000) Corporate Communication and Impression Management -- New Perspectives Why Companies Engage in Corporate Social Reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Sep2000, Vol. 27 Issue 1/2, p55-68, 14p, 1 chart
- Pruzan, Peter (1998) From Control to Values-Based Management and Accountability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Oct98 Part 1, Vol. 17 Issue 13, p1379-1394, 16p
- Hummels, Harry (1998) Organizing Ethics: A Stakeholder Debate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Oct98 Part 1, Vol. 17 Issue 13, p1403-1419, 17p
- Zadek, Simon (1998) Balancing Performance, Ethics, and Accountability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Oct98 Part 1, Vol. 17 Issue 13, p1422-1441, 21p
- Raynard, Peter (1998) Coming Together. A Review of Contemporary Approaches to Social Accounting, Auditing and Reporting in Non-profit Organisations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Oct98 Part 1, Vol. 17 Issue 13, p1471-1479, 9p
- Nitkin, David; Brooks, Leonard J. (1998) Sustainability Auditing and Reporting: The Canadian Experience. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Oct98 Part 1, Vol. 17 Issue 13, p1499-1507, 9p, 2 charts
- Verschoor, Curtis C. (1998) A Study of The Link Between a Corporation's Financial Performance and Its Commitment to Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Oct98 Part 1, Vol. 17 Issue 13, p1509-1516, 8p, 1 chart
- Barnett, Tim; Bass, Ken; Brown, Gene (1996) Religiosity, Ethical Ideology, and Intentions to Report a Peer's Wrongdoing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Nov96, Vol. 15 Issue 11, p1161-1174, 14p, 4 charts, 2 diagrams
- The Working Group on Social Indicators and Social Reporting of the International Sociological Association and the International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies are holding A Joint Conference at The University of Northern British Columbia Prince Geo...(1995) *Journal of Business Ethics*, Apr95, Vol. 14 Issue 4, p328-328, 1p
- Victor, Bart; Trevino, Linda Klebe; Shapiro, Debra L. (1993) Peer Reporting of Unethical Behavior: The Influence of Justice Evaluations and Social Context Factors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Apr93, Vol. 12 Issue 4, p253-263, 11p, 4 charts, 1 diagram
- Beets, S. Douglas; Killough, Larry N. (1990) The Effectiveness of a Complaint-Based Ethics Enforcement System: Evidence from the Accounting Profession. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Feb90, Vol. 9 Issue 2, p115-126, 12p

Filiou, Vassilios P. (1984) Corporate Social Responsibility and Public Accountability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Nov84, Vol. 3 Issue 4, p305-314, 10p

*Journal of Corporate Citizenship*

Kaptein, Muel (2007) Ethical Guidelines for Compiling Corporate Social Reports. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Autumn2007 Issue 27, p71-90, 20p, 2 charts, 1 diagram

Fort, Timothy L. (2007) The Corporate Contribution to One Planet Living in Global Peace and Security. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Summer2007 Issue 26, p20-24, 5p

Ziegler, Oliver (2007) Global Compact Membership in Europe and the US. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Summer2007 Issue 26, p53-68, 16p, 2 charts

O'Dwyer, Brendan; Owen, David (2007) Seeking Stakeholder-Centric Sustainability Assurance. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Spring2007 Issue 25, p77-94, 18p, 6 charts

Baskin, Jeremy (2006) Corporate Responsibility in Emerging Markets. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Winter2006 Issue 24, p29-47, 19p

Norhayh Zulkifi; Amran, Azlan (2006) Realising Corporate Social Responsibility in Malaysia. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Winter2006 Issue 24, p101-114, 14p

Hancock, Linda (2006) The Advantages of a Proactive Business Response to Human Rights Reporting. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Autumn2006 Issue 23, p21-24, 4p

Paul, Karen; Cobas, Elisa; Ceron, Raul; Frithiof, Mattias; Maass, Angel; Navarro, Ivan; Palmer, Lina; Serrano, Loretta; Deaton, Lori Zalka (2006) Corporate Social Reporting in Mexico. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Summer2006 Issue 22, p67-80, 14p

Schmidheiny, Stephan (2006) A View of Corporate Citizenship in Latin America. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Spring2006 Issue 21, p21-24, 4p

Araya, Monica (2006) Exploring Terra Incognita. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Spring2006 Issue 21, p25-38, 14p

De Oliveira, Jose Antonio Puppim; Gardetti, Miguel Angel (2006) Analysing Changes to Prioritise Corporate Citizenship. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Spring2006 Issue 21, p71-83, 13p

Visser, Wayne (2005) Corporate Citizenship in South Africa. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Summer2005 Issue 18, p29-38, 10p, 2 charts

Fukukawa, Kyoto; Moon, Jeremy (2004) A Japanese Model of Corporate Social Responsibility? *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Winter2004 Issue 16, p45-59, 15p, 3 charts

Adams, Carol A.; Evans, Richard (2004) Accountability, Completeness, Credibility and the Audit Expectations Gap. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Summer2004 Issue 14, p97-115, 19p, 1 chart

Thompson, Paul; Zakaria, Zarina (2004) Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting in Malaysia. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Spring2004 Issue 13, p125-136, 12p, 3 charts

Waddock, Sandra (2007) On Ceres, the GRI and Corporation 20/20. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Summer2007 Issue 26, p38-42, 5p, 1bw

Grimsey, Darrin; Lewis, Mervyn K. (2004) The Governance of Contractual Relationships in Public-Private Partnerships. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Autumn2004 Issue 15, p91-109, 19p, 6 charts

Connelly, J. Thomas; Limpaphayom, Piman (2004) Environmental Reporting and Firm Performance. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, Spring2004 Issue 13, p137-149, 13p, 4 charts, 1 graph

## Management focused periodicals

### *Academy of Management Journal*

Russo, Michael V.; Harrison, Niran S. (2005) Organizational Design and Environmental Performance: Clues from the Electronic Industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, Aug2005, Vol. 48 Issue 4, p582-593, 12p, 3 charts

Trevino, Linda Klebe; Victor, Bart (1992) Peer Reporting of Unethical Behavior: A Social Context Perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, Mar1992, Vol. 35 Issue 1, p38-64, 27p

### *Academy of Management Review*

Rindova, Violina P.; Pollock, Timothy G.; Hayward, Mathew L. A. (2006) Celebrity Firms: The Social Construction of Market Popularity. *Academy of Management Review*, Jan2006, Vol. 31 Issue 1, p50-71, 22p

Bowes-Sperry, Lynn; O'Leary-Kelly, Anne M. (2005) To Act or Not To Act: The Dilemma Faced by Sexual Harassment Observers. *Academy of Management Review*, Apr2005, Vol. 30 Issue 2, p288-306, 19p, 1 chart, 1 diagram

Gordon, Michael E.; Slade, L. Allen; Schmitt, Neal (1986) The "Science of the Sophomore" Revisited: from Conjecture to Empiricism. *Academy of Management Review*, Jan1986, Vol. 11 Issue 1, p191-207, 17p, 1 chart

Post, James E.; Epstein, Marc J (1977) Information Systems for Social Reporting. *Academy of Management Review*, Jan1977, Vol. 2 Issue 1, p81-87, 7p

### *British Journal of Management*

Woodward, David G.; Edwards, Pam; Birkin, Frank (1996) Organizational Legitimacy and Stakeholder Information Provision. *British Journal of Management*, Dec96, Vol. 7 Issue 4, 1 chart, 2 diagrams

### *California Management Review*

Berger, Ida E.; Cunningham, Peggy; Drumwright, Minette E. (2007) Mainstreaming Corporate Social Responsibility: DEVELOPING MARKETS FOR VIRTUE. *California Management Review*, Summer2007, Vol. 49 Issue 4, p132-157, 26p, 3 charts, 2 graphs

Perrini, Francesco (2006) The Practitioner's Perspective on Non-Financial Reporting. *California Management Review*, Winter2006, Vol. 48 Issue 2, p73-103, 31p, 8 charts, 7 graphs

Dowling, Grahame R. (2004) Corporate Reputations: SHOULD YOU COMPETE ON YOURS? *California Management Review*, Spring2004, Vol. 46 Issue 3, p19-36, 18p, 1 diagram

Cross, Rob; Borgatti, Stephen P.; Parker, Andrew (2002) Making Invisible Work Visible: USING SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS TO SUPPORT STRATEGIC COLLABORATION. *California Management Review*, Winter2002, Vol. 44 Issue 2, p25-46, 22p, 3 diagrams

Elliott, Robert K.. (1986) Auditing in the 1990s: Implications for Education and Research. *California Management Review*, Summer86, Vol. 28 Issue 4, p89, 9p

Dierkes, Meinolf; Antal, Ariane Berthoin (1986) Whither Corporate Social Reporting: Is It Time to Legislate? *California Management Review*, Spring86, Vol. 28 Issue 3, p106, 16p

Fox, Douglas M. (1979) The Organization and the Artists: A Book Review Essay. *California Management Review*, Summer79, Vol. 21 Issue 4, p90, 5p

Sethi, S. Prakash (1977) Business and the News Media: The Paradox of Informed Misunderstanding. *California Management Review*, Spring77, Vol. 19 Issue 3, p52-62, 9p

Sihler, William H. (1971) Toward Better Management Control Systems. *California Management Review*, Winter71, Vol. 14 Issue 2, p33-39, 7p

Hawkins, David F. (1969) Behavioral Implications of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. *California Management Review*, Winter69, Vol. 12 Issue 2, p13, 10p

O'meara, Francis E. (1965) The Challenge of Operations Research. *California Management Review*, Summer65, Vol. 7 Issue 4, p19, 8p

#### *European Management Journal*

Wijk, Jeroen Van; Persoon, Winifred (2006) A Long-haul Destination:: Sustainability Reporting Among Tour Operators. *European Management Journal*, Dec2006, Vol. 24 Issue 6, p381-395, 15p

Perrini, Francesco (2005) Building a European Portrait of Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting. *European Management Journal*, Dec2005, Vol. 23 Issue 6, p611-627, 17p

Dixon, Robert; Mousa, Gehan A.; Woodhead, Anne (2005) The Role of Environmental Initiatives in Encouraging Companies to Engage in Environmental Reporting.

Knox, Simon (2004) Corporate Social Responsibility:: Moving Beyond Investment Towards Measuring Outcomes. *European Management Journal*, Oct2004, Vol. 22 Issue 5, p508-516, 9p

#### *Journal of Management Studies*

Watson, Tony J. (2003) Strategists and Strategy-making: Strategic Exchange and the Shaping of Individual Lives and Organizational Futures. *Journal of Management Studies*, Jul2003, Vol. 40 Issue 5, p1305-1323, 19p, 3 diagrams

#### *Organization Studies*

Khan, Farzad R.; Munir, Kamal A.; Willmott, Hughz (2007) A Dark Side of Institutional Entrepreneurship: Soccer Balls, Child Labour and Postcolonial Impoverishment. *Organization Studies* (01708406), 2007, Vol. 28 Issue 7, p1055-1077, 23p

Brown, Andrew D. (2004) Authoritative Sensemaking in a Public Inquiry Report. *Organization Studies* (01708406), 2004, Vol. 25 Issue 1, p95-112, 18p

News & notes. *Organization Studies* (Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.), 1997, Vol. 18 Issue 1, p167, 4p

Kugel, Yerachmiel (1974) Management Education and Development: A Case for a New Direction. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1974, p27-27, 1/2p

## Other scientific periodicals

### *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*

Bebbington, Jan; Larrinaga, Carlos; Moneva, Jose M. (2008) Corporate social reporting and reputation risk management. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2008, Vol. 21 Issue 3, p337-361, 25p, 3 charts, 1 diagram

Unerman, Jeffrey (2008) Strategic reputation risk management and corporate social responsibility reporting. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2008, Vol. 21 Issue 3, p362-364, 3p

Adams, Carol A. (2008) A commentary on: corporate social responsibility reporting and reputation risk management. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2008, Vol. 21 Issue 3, p365-370, 6p

Bebbington, Jan; Larrinaga-González, Carlos; Moneva-Abadía, Jose M. (2008) Legitimizing reputation/the reputation of legitimacy theory. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2008, Vol. 21 Issue 3, p371-374, 4p

Cho, Charles H.; Chen, Jennifer C.; Roberts, Robin W. (2008) The politics of environmental disclosure regulation in the chemical and petroleum industries: Evidence from the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, May 2008, Vol. 19 Issue 4, p450-465, 16p

Owen, David (2008) Chronicles of wasted time? *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2008, Vol. 21 Issue 2, p240-267, 28p;

Spence, Crawford (2007) Social and environmental reporting and hegemonic discourse. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2007, Vol. 20 Issue 6, p855-882, 28p

Adams, Carol A. .; Larrinaga-González, Carlos (2007) Engaging with organisations in pursuit of improved sustainability accounting and performance. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2007, Vol. 20 Issue 3, p333-355, 23p

Adams, Carol A.; McNicholas, Patty (2007) Making a difference. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2007, Vol. 20 Issue 3, p382-402, 21p

Dey, Colin (2007) Social accounting at Traidcraft plc. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2007, Vol. 20 Issue 3, p423-445, 23p

Belal, Aatur Rahman; Owen, David L. (2007) The views of corporate managers on the current state of, and future prospects for, social reporting in Bangladesh. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2007, Vol. 20 Issue 3, p472-494, 23p

Guthrie, James; Boedker, Christina (2006) Perspectives on "new" models of business reporting: a reflective note. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2006, Vol. 19 Issue 6, p785-792, 8p

Gray, Rob (2006) Social, environmental and sustainability reporting and organisational value creation? *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2006, Vol. 19 Issue 6, p793-819, 27p, 1 chart, 4 graphs

Gallhofer, Sonja; Haslam, Jim; Monk, Elizabeth; Roberts, Clare (2006) The emancipatory potential of online reporting. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2006, Vol. 19 Issue 5, p682-718, 38p

Solomon, Jill Frances; Solomon, Aris (2006) Private social, ethical and environmental disclosure. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2006, Vol. 19 Issue 4, p564-591, 28p, 1 chart, 1 diagram

Haigh, Matthew (2006) Managed investments, managed disclosures: financial services reform in practice. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2006, Vol. 19 Issue 2, p186-204, 19p, 1 chart, 1 diagram

Campbell, David; Moore, Geoff; Shrides, Philip (2006) Cross-sectional effects in community disclosure. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2006, Vol. 19 Issue 1, p96-114, 19p, 3 charts, 2 graphs

Moerman, Lee; van der Laan, Sandra (2005) Social reporting in the tobacco industry: all smoke and mirrors? *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2005, Vol. 18 Issue 3, p374-389, 16p

Abstracts and keywords. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2004, Vol. 17 Issue 5, p673-674, 2p

Adams, Carol A (2004) The ethical, social and environmental reporting-performance portrayal gap. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2004, Vol. 17 Issue 5, p731-757, 27p

Kuasirikun, Nongnooch; Sherer, Michael (2004) Corporate social accounting disclosure in Thailand. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2004, Vol. 17 Issue 4, p629-660, 32p

Abstracts and Keywords. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2003, Vol. 16 Issue 4, p521-522, 2p

Campbell, David; Craven, Barrie; Shrides, Philip (2003) Voluntary social reporting in three FTSE sectors: a comment on perception and legitimacy. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2003, Vol. 16 Issue 4, p558-581, 24p

Spira, Laura F.; Page, Michael (2003) Risk management: The reinvention of internal control and the changing role of internal audit. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2003, Vol. 16 Issue 4, p640-661, 22p

Scott, Julie E. M.; McKinnon, Jill L.; Harrison, Graeme L. (2003) Cash to accrual and cash to accrual: A case study of financial reporting in two NSW hospitals 1857 to post-1975. .. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2003, Vol. 16 Issue 1, p104-140, 37p

#### *Accounting, Organizations & Society*

Clarkson, Peter M.; Li, Yue; Richardson, Gordon D.; Vasvari, Florin P. (2008) Revisiting the relation between environmental performance and environmental disclosure: An empirical analysis. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, May2008, Vol. 33 Issue 4/5, p303-327, 25p

Cooper, Stuart M.; Owen, David L. (2007) Corporate social reporting and stakeholder accountability: The missing link. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, Oct2007, Vol. 32 Issue 7/8, p649-667, 19p

de Villiers, Charl; van Staden, Chris J. (2006) Can less environmental disclosure have a legitimising effect? Evidence from Africa. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, Nov2006, Vol. 31 Issue 8, p763-781, 19p

Herbohn, Kathleen (2005) A full cost environmental accounting experiment. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, Aug2005, Vol. 30 Issue 6, p519-536, 18p

Macintosh, John C. C. (1999) The issues, effects and consequences of the Berle-Dodd debate, 1931-1932. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, Feb99, Vol. 24 Issue 2, p139-153, 15p

Huizing, Ard; Dekker, H. Carel (1992) The Environmental Issue on the Dutch Political Market. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, Jul92, Vol. 17 Issue 5, p427-448, 22p, 4 charts, 1 diagram, 1 graph

Hai-Yap Teoh; Thong, Gregory (1984) Another Look at Corporate Social Responsibility and Reporting an Empirical Study in a Developing Country. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, Apr84, Vol. 9 Issue 2, p189-206, 18p, 15 charts



Crumbley, D. Larry; Epstein, Marc J.; Bravenec, Lorence L. (1977) Tax Impact in Corporate Social Responsibility Decisions and Reporting. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, 1977, Vol. 2 Issue 2, p131-139, 9p

Dierkes, Meinolf; Preston, Lee E. (1977) Corporate Social Accounting Reporting for the Physical Environment: A Critical Review and Implementation Proposal. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, 1977, Vol. 2 Issue 1, p3-22, 20p

Epstein, Marc; Flamholtz, Eric; McDonough, John J. (1976) Corporate Social Accounting in the United States of America: State of the Art of and Future Prospects. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, 1976, Vol. 1 Issue 1, p23-42, 20p

*Public Relations Review*

Cho, Sooyoung; Cameron, Glen T. (2007) Power to the people—health PR people that is! *Public Relations Review*, Jun2007, Vol. 33 Issue 2, p175-183, 9p

Golob, Urša; Bartlett, Jennifer L. (2007) Communicating about corporate social responsibility: A comparative study of CSR reporting in Australia and Slovenia. *Public Relations Review*, Mar2007, Vol. 33 Issue 1, p1-9, 9p

**Appendix 4.** List of CSR reports in the sample

Sustainability reports		Social reports
<p><b>Allami Autópálya Kezelő Zrt.</b> (2006) <i>National Motorway-Maintenance Company</i> BorsodChem Group (2003-2005)</p>	<p>Denso Hungary. (sust.: 2001-2005, social: 2006 )</p>	
<p><b>CIB Bank</b> (2006, 2007) Coloplast Hungary Kft. (2004-2006)</p>		<p>British American Tobacco Hungary (2001-2002, 2004, 2007) Coca Cola HBC (2003-2006)</p>
<p><b>Holcim Hungária Zrt.</b> (2005, 2006) IKEA (2003-2006) <b>MÁV Cargo</b> (2006)</p>		<p>E.ON Hungary (2007) Exxon Mobil (2006) TESCO-Global Zrt. (2006)</p>
<p><b>OTP Bank</b> (2006) <b>Pannon GSM</b> (2006, 2007)</p>		<p>Vodafone Hungary (2000-2007)</p>
<p>Budapesti Erőmű Rt. (sust.: 2001-2004; env.: 2000) <i>Power Plant of Budapest</i> <b>Magyar Telekom Csoport</b> (sust.: 2003-2007; env.: 2002) <i>Hungarian Telecom Group</i> <b>MOL Nyrt.</b> (sust.: 2002-2006, 2007; env.: 1997-1999,2001) <i>Hungarian Oil and Gas Company</i> <b>MVM Csoport</b> (sust.: 2003-2006; env.: 1999-2002) <i>Hungarian Electricity Works Group</i> Toyota (sust.:2006,2007; env.: 2002,2004,2005) <b>TVK Rt.</b> (sust.: 2003-2007; env.: 1997-2002)</p>		
<p>Paksi Atomerőmű Zrt. (2003-2006) <i>Nuclear Power Plant of Paks</i></p>		<p>Audi Motor Hungary Kft. (2000-2007)</p>
<p>Premed Pharma Kft. (2005,2006)</p>	<p>ATEL Group Csepel (2002-2007)</p>	<p>Dunapack Rt. (2000-2006)</p>
<p>Richter Gedeon Rt. (2001-2007)</p>	<p>Budapest Airport Zrt. (2006)</p>	<p>Fővárosi Vízművek Zrt. (2004, 2006) <i>Waterworks of Budapest</i></p>
<p>Tetra Pak Hungary Rt. (2003,2004) Crew Nyomdaipari Szolgáltató Kft. (2005,2006) <i>Crew Press</i></p>	<p>Büchl Hungary Kft. (2006)</p>	<p>Kinnarps Hungary Kft. (2007) Magyar Posta Zrt. (2000-2006) <i>Hungarian Post</i></p>
	<p>Chinoín Zrt. (1999, 2000)</p>	<p>NRG Csepel Energy Kft. (2001)</p>
	<p><b>Environmental reports</b></p>	

**Appendix 5.** List of documents and sources of the Sustainability Reports used in the analysis

Abbreviation of the companies used in the sample

(all document accessed during autumn/winter 2007)

Állami Autópálya Kezelő Zrt. – National Motorway-Maintenance Company

**ÁAK** : [http://www.aak.hu/resource.aspx?ResourceID=fentarthatosgai\\_jelentes\\_2006](http://www.aak.hu/resource.aspx?ResourceID=fentarthatosgai_jelentes_2006)

CIB Bank Zrt – CIB Bank Ltd.

**CIB**: [http://www.cib.hu/system/files/efserver?file=/Eves\\_jelentes/cib\\_fentarthatosagai\\_2006.pdf&type=related](http://www.cib.hu/system/files/efserver?file=/Eves_jelentes/cib_fentarthatosagai_2006.pdf&type=related)

Hocim Hungária Zrt. – Holcim Hungary Ltd.

**Holcim**: [http://www.holcim.hu/holcimweb/gc/HU/uploads/SDriport\\_20062nxjb.pdf](http://www.holcim.hu/holcimweb/gc/HU/uploads/SDriport_20062nxjb.pdf)

Magyar Telekom Csoport Nyrt. – Hungarian Telecom Group Ltd.

**Magyar Telekom**: [http://www.telekom.hu/static/sw/download/Fentarthatosagai\\_jelentes\\_2006.pdf](http://www.telekom.hu/static/sw/download/Fentarthatosagai_jelentes_2006.pdf)

MÁV Cargo Zrt. – Hungarian Railways Cargo Ltd.

**MÁV Cargo**: [http://www.mavcargo.hu/images/stories/download/mavcargo\\_csr\\_2006.pdf](http://www.mavcargo.hu/images/stories/download/mavcargo_csr_2006.pdf)

Mol Olaj- és Gázipari Nyrt. – Hungarian Oil and Gas Company Ltd.

**MOL**: <http://www.mol.hu/repository/356327.pdf>

Magyar Villamos Művek Zrt. – Hungarian Electricity Works Group

**MVM**: [http://www.mvm.hu/resource.aspx?ResourceID=fentarthatosagai\\_jelentes\\_2006](http://www.mvm.hu/resource.aspx?ResourceID=fentarthatosagai_jelentes_2006)

OTP Bank

**OTP**: [https://www.otpbank.hu/OTP\\_Portal/file/Tarsadalmi\\_Feelossegvall\\_Jelentes\\_2006.pdf](https://www.otpbank.hu/OTP_Portal/file/Tarsadalmi_Feelossegvall_Jelentes_2006.pdf)

Pannon GSM Távközlési Zrt – Pannon Ltd.

**Pannon**: [http://www.pannon.hu/letoltes/tarsadalmi\\_jelentes\\_070918.pdf](http://www.pannon.hu/letoltes/tarsadalmi_jelentes_070918.pdf)

Tiszai Vegyi Kombinát Nyrt. – TVK Ltd.

**TVK**: <http://www.tvk.hu/repository/367821.pdf>

**Appendix 6.** Some basic data of the analysed companies (Sources: Companies' annual reports, 2006)

<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Net revenue (HUF million)</b>	<b>Balance sheet total (HUF million)</b>	<b>Profit after Taxation (HUF million)</b>	<b>Number of Employees</b>	<b>Nationality</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Industrial sector</b>	<b>Market share</b>
ÁAK	192 440,10		7 037,14	1 063,00	Hungarian	State-owner	Construction	
CIB	99 595,00	1 874 000,00	28 616,00	2 878,00	Italian	Intesa Holding International S.A.	Financial Institution	0,09
Holcim	33 009,82	27 761,00		572,00	Swiss	Holcim Ltd.	Construction	
Magyar Telekom		1 131 595,00	75 453,00	12 341,00	Hungarian	MagyarCom Holding GmbH 59,21% Foreign institutional investors 33,65% Domestic institutional investors 3,70% Others 1,66% Domestic private investors 1,24% Own shares 0,24% Municipalities 0,30%	Tele-communication	0,45
MÁV Cargo	92 993,82		2 757,76	3 170,00	Hungarian	MÁV Zrt. (State-owner)	Transportation	
MOL	2 891 100,00	2 136 000,00	295 000,00	13 861,00	Hungarian	Foreign investors 58,6% OMV 10% BNP Paribas 8,2% Magnolia Finance 5,5% Domestic institutional and private investors 7,7% MOL Nyrt. (own shares) 10%	Raw chemical	0,76
MVM Group	224 748,00	383 984,00	1 795,00	8 889,00	Hungarian	ÁPV Zrt. (Ministry of Finance)	Electricity	
OTP Bank		4 470 600,00	186 187,00	8 169,00	Hungarian	Foreign investor 87,6% State-owner 0,3% Managers & employees 3,0% OTP Bank Nyrt. 0,8% Other domestic investors 8,3%	Financial Institution	0,19
Pannon			38 515,00		Norwegian	Telenor	Tele-communication	0,34
TVK	17 271,00	212 302,00	15 895,00	1 200,00	Hungarian	MOL 44,55% CE Oil & Gas AG 31,56% Slovnaft, a.s. 8,06% Others 15, Other domestic institutional investors 1,61% Other foreign institutional investors 13,18% Domestic private investors 0,77% Foreign private investors 0,02% Other shareholders 0,25%	Raw chemical	

**Appendix 7.** The most important stakeholders for the companies in the sample quoted from their Sustainability reports

<b>Company</b>		<b>Stakeholders</b>
ÁAK:	Our most important stakeholders	consumers (travelling audience), owner (state), trade unions, media, strategic partners, suppliers, people living close to railroads, employees, authorities
CIB:	Our most important stakeholders	employees, costumers, owners
Holcim:	Our partners of interest:	costumers, suppliers, employees, trade unions, owners, competitors, creditors, banks, local communities, state/local authorities, non-profit organisations
OTP:	Our most important stakeholders:	shareholders, costumers, employees, suppliers
Pannon:	"We turn to them with a special care":	costumers (clients), employees, civil organisations, media, government, broader community
MVM:	Our most important stakeholders:	owner, other member companies of the MVM Group, employees, suppliers, consumers of the competitive market, people living close to the facilities, social organisations, trade associations, government, authorities, media,
Magyar Telekom:	Partners of interest:	Stakeholders on the market: clients individuals, groups, organisations, companies, shareholders, owners, managers, employees, suppliers, other members of the telecom industry, trade unions; Non-market stakeholders: state organisations, local governments, industrial and business trade associations, research collaborations, local communities, natural and local environment
MOL:	Most important partners of interest:	shareholders, costumers, employees, business partners, civil organisations, authorities, local communities
TVK:	Due to our activities the following stakeholders are effected:	shareholders, costumers, employees, subcontractors, civil organisations, local governments and communities
MÁV Cargo:	Due to the interaction of the society and our company the following stakeholders are with great importance:	our employees, clients/costumers, authorities, trade unions, civil society
	Target audience (readers):	our future investors, clients, employees