

# Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Patten, Dennis and Shin, Hyemi (2019) Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal's Contributions to Sustainability Disclosure Research: A Review and Assessment. Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal, 10 (1). pp. 26-40. ISSN 2040-8021

Published by: Emerald

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1108/sampj-01-2018-0017> <<https://doi.org/10.1108/sampj-01-2018-0017>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/36607/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



**Northumbria  
University**  
NEWCASTLE



**UniversityLibrary**

1  
2  
3 ***Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal's Contributions***  
4 **to Sustainability Disclosure Research: A Review and Assessment**  
5  
6

7 **Introduction**  
8

9 *As Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal (SAMPJ)* nears the end of  
10  
11 its first decade, we believe it is a good time to reflect on what the journal has added to the  
12  
13 general body of knowledge relative to one specific aspect of the sustainability arena – the  
14  
15 disclosure of sustainability information.<sup>1</sup> To that end, we provide an overview of the  
16  
17 sustainability disclosure articles published to date in this, the newest major outlet for research in  
18  
19 the sustainability accounting domain, and then, importantly, we assess what we see as the  
20  
21 strengths and weaknesses of the body of that work. However, similar to the prior reviews of  
22  
23 contributions to specific journals (e.g., Gray, 2002; Owen, 2008; O'Dwyer and Unerman, 2016;  
24  
25 Deegan, 2017), as well as summaries of social and environmental accounting across broader  
26  
27 spectrums (e.g., Mathews, 1997; Alewine, 2010), we also are interested in identifying how the  
28  
29 sustainability disclosure research published in SAMPJ to date informs our understanding of the  
30  
31 phenomenon.  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 It is important to occasionally step back and reflect on where a field of study stands, and  
37  
38 our review of the SAMPJ sustainability disclosure studies helps to accomplish such a goal.  
39  
40 Reviews, as noted by Palmatier et al. (2018, p. 2), can “provide an integrated, synthesized  
41  
42 overview of the current state of knowledge,” and we believe our assessment helps to do that.  
43  
44 However, Palmatier et al. also point out the importance for reviews to identify existing gaps and  
45  
46 offer suggestions for future research directions, and as such, in addition to summarizing the  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54 <sup>1</sup> Throughout the review, we tend to use the term ‘sustainability disclosure’ for the sake of convenience. We  
55 consider this to be basically synonymous with ‘corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure’, ‘environmental  
56 disclosure’, and ‘social disclosure’ where those terms may have been used in the source articles.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 research to date, we also identify areas potentially open for expanding the contributions those  
4 publishing in the journal can make to the broad stream of sustainability disclosure research.  
5  
6

### 7 8 **Method**

9  
10 We start our assessment with a very general review of what has been published in  
11 SAMPJ up through the end of 2017 (through Volume 8). As would be expected, given the scope  
12 of the journal and Editor Adams' desire for the journal to be expansive (Adams, 2010), the topics  
13 cover a broad set of sustainability-related issues. We are interested in identifying the  
14 contributions to the sustainability disclosure domain, and as such, we limited our analysis to  
15 articles that bring new evidence to bear on the practice, regardless of the underlying methods  
16 employed. Owen (2008) notes that choosing articles for a review piece is highly subjective, and  
17 as such we think it is important to acknowledge our exclusions. We chose not to include articles  
18 that, although they relate in some way to the topic of sustainability disclosure, did not generate  
19 new data on disclosure itself. Examples of this latter class include Simnett's (2012) discussion of  
20 potential research opportunities related to assurance of sustainability reports, Adam's (2013)  
21 essay on the potential benefits of sustainability reporting in the university context, Gibassier and  
22 Schaltegger's (2015) case study of Danone's management accounting system and its relation to  
23 carbon reporting, and Dienes et al.'s (2016) review of research into drivers of sustainability  
24 reporting.<sup>2</sup> Our final sample consists of 31 articles.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Similar to Crane and Glozer (2016, p. 1227), we next focused on underlying core themes  
45 to use "as indicators of relevance in informing our analysis." These themes include the topical  
46 coverage of the investigation (what the authors focus on), the basic investigative technique  
47 (archival versus qualitative versus survey), the disclosure document of interest, and the  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

---

55  
56 <sup>2</sup> We similarly would not have included a review piece such as this one.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 geographic location of the disclosure being analyzed. Table 1 identifies the articles included in  
4  
5 our analysis, listed in chronological order by date of publication. We also summarize in the table  
6  
7 the main core themes for each publication.  
8  
9

10 ----- Table 1 about here -----  
11

12 A review of Table 1 reveals that the SAMPJ sustainability disclosure articles to date  
13  
14 cover a broad array of topics, methods, sources, and locations (we discuss these in more detail  
15  
16 below). In an attempt to further capture the array of coverage, we next classified each of the  
17  
18 articles across what we determined were the three main types of analyses – purely descriptive  
19  
20 studies,<sup>3</sup> examinations of factors explaining differences in disclosure, and studies exploring  
21  
22 either the impacts or the perceptions of sustainability disclosure. Figure 1 lays out how the  
23  
24 studies, also grouped by basic research method, fall across the three classifications. It is  
25  
26 important to note that not all studies fit neatly into our classification scheme. For example, some  
27  
28 studies (Robertson and Samy, 2015; Dobbs and van Staden, 2016; and Hossain et al., 2017)  
29  
30 employ multiple methods of analysis, while others (Cho et al., 2014; Arayssi et al., 2016)  
31  
32 separately explore both factors explaining differences in disclosure and the impacts of that  
33  
34 disclosure on other outcomes. These issues notwithstanding, we believe the figure adequately  
35  
36 summarizes what we believe is one of the major contributions of SAMPJ to the world of  
37  
38 sustainability disclosure research, a diverse spread across topics and approaches.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 ----- Figure 1 about here -----  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

---

53 <sup>3</sup> By ‘purely descriptive’, we mean the studies assess attributes of the reporting, but examine neither the factors  
54 related to differences nor the impacts of the disclosure. For example, Farneti and Siboni (2011) compare Italian  
55 governmental agency disclosure guidelines with those of the Global Reporting Initiative and then identify the extent  
56 and type of sustainability disclosures included in Italian governmental unit annual reports.  
57

## Reflecting on the SAMPJ Sustainability Disclosure Research

### Topical coverage/disclosure documents

Focusing on the topical coverage of the sustainability disclosure articles almost by necessity requires us to simultaneously consider the disclosure documents considered in the publications as the latter often informs the subject of the former. Reflecting what we see as a definitive positive of the body of work, SAMPJ seems to be demonstrating an excellent record of inclusivity with respect to both topics and documents being explored. Parker (2005), in his review of social and environmental accounting research in four journals over the 1988-2003 period, noted that explorations of environmental issues were far more prevalent than investigations related to the social side. That is clearly not the case with respect to the body of sustainability disclosure research in SAMPJ to date. While only two studies (Yekini and Jallow, 2012; Cahaya et al., 2015) focus specifically on social disclosure items in contrast to five that limit the analysis to environmental information, most of the papers examine broader aspects of sustainability disclosure. Indeed, 11 of the 24 SAMPJ studies investigating broader aspects of sustainability disclosure specifically explore aspects of standalone reporting (two of these, Cho et al., 2014 and Kend, 2015, examine assurance of the standalone reports), while another six include standalone documents as part of their examinations. In addition, four of the studies relate to integrated reporting.<sup>4</sup> Of course, this focus on broader reporting would appear to reflect the changing times as both standalone and integrated reporting largely came to prominence after the period reviewed by Parker. Perhaps also reflecting the *Zeitgeist* of the times, three of the five

---

<sup>4</sup> While some commentators question whether integrated reporting really relates to sustainability issues (see, e.g., Flower 2015), others make the case that there is a definitive link. Stacchezzini et al. (2016, p. 103), for example, define integrated reporting as “the process of communicating about sustainable value creation over time,” while Adams (2015, p. 23) argues “the case for integrated reporting and its potential to change the thinking of corporate actors leading to the further integration of sustainability actions and impacts into corporate strategic planning and decision making.” As such, we include the SAMPJ studies focusing on disclosure in integrated reports.

1  
2  
3 environmental disclosure studies specifically examine climate change information. A general  
4  
5 review of sustainability disclosure research in other journals over the 2010's suggests these  
6  
7 trends are not unique to SAMPJ.  
8  
9

10           However, not all aspects of the body of SAMPJ sustainability disclosure studies reflect  
11  
12 the movement to broader coverage. Excepting Bellringer et al. (2011), Farneti and Siboni (2011),  
13  
14 and Schneider et al. (2014), the sustainability disclosure papers in SAMPJ examine the practice  
15  
16 in business organizations. Owen (2008, p. 249) had similarly found that, within *Accounting,*  
17  
18 *Auditing and Accountability Journal* (AAAJ) over its first two decades, "research outside the  
19  
20 private sector domain is somewhat conspicuous by its absence." Whether having only three  
21  
22 articles is evidence of an absence is perhaps debatable, but clearly Ball and Grubnic's (2007) call  
23  
24 for increased research into CSR reporting in the public sector remains largely unfilled, and this  
25  
26 would seem to be an area rich for further exploration. In fairness, we note that public sector  
27  
28 research on sustainability issues other than reporting have also received attention in SAMPJ (see,  
29  
30 e.g., Adams et al., 2014; Williams, 2015).  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 **Research methods employed**

36

37           Looking at the collection of SAMPJ sustainability disclosure studies from the  
38  
39 perspective of methods employed, a strength of the journal's offerings is the mix across, as well  
40  
41 as within, qualitative versus quantitative approaches. Interview-based investigations and detailed  
42  
43 case studies reveal insights that cannot emerge from archival documents (and vice-versa), and  
44  
45 the variety of methods employed, from market reaction studies to analyses of disclosures in  
46  
47 company reports, from interviews with management and various stakeholders to models of  
48  
49 competitive advantage, speaks well to the inclusiveness of SAMPJ as a research outlet.<sup>5</sup>  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>5</sup> Although we were somewhat surprised that archival approaches were more common than were qualitative studies,  
56 a review of *Accounting Forum* and *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal* revealed the disclosure articles  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 However, we found it somewhat surprising that the list of sustainability disclosure investigations  
4 includes no experimental studies, especially since Alewine (2010), in only the second issue of  
5 the journal, spoke to the power of and need for this kind of investigation.<sup>6</sup> Although Alewine  
6 more specifically focuses on the design of environmental accounting systems, he notes (p. 277)  
7 that experimental designs allow for better tests of causality than archival or case study methods  
8 because in the latter approaches “the researcher does not systematically manipulate one variable  
9 while holding other variables constant.” There would seem to be real advantages in such designs  
10 relative to determining the impact of sustainability information in a variety of decision-oriented  
11 tasks, and we hope to see more adoption of experimental methods in sustainability disclosure  
12 research as SAMPJ moves forward.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 **Geographic Coverage**

27  
28 Also reflecting well on the inclusiveness of SAMPJ, it is worth noting that,  
29  
30 geographically, the examinations consider a broad spectrum of country locales. In addition to  
31 more heavily explored areas such as the U.S., Western Europe, and Australia and New Zealand,  
32 studies in SAMPJ examine sustainability disclosure issues in less common locales including  
33 Brazil (Mori Junior and Best, 2017), Indonesia (Cahaya et al., 2015), and Poland (Krasodomska  
34 and Cho, 2017). And while we see this as a definite strength regarding SAMPJ’s contributions to  
35 the understanding of sustainability disclosure as a phenomenon, we believe it is also important to  
36 acknowledge that what tends to be missing is richer analysis across multiple country settings.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Indeed, excepting Cho et al. (2012b), Kend (2015), and Vourvachis et al. (2016), all of the  
48  
49

---

50 published in those outlets over the same period similarly reflected a higher proportion of archival analyses. In  
51 contrast, eight of the 12 disclosure-related articles in *Accounting, Organizations and Society* employed more  
52 qualitative designs.

53 <sup>6</sup> It is important to note that the lack of sustainability disclosure studies using experimental methods in SAMPJ is  
54 very consistent with the general scarcity of such studies in the social and environmental accounting universe.  
55 Alewine (2010, p. 276), for example, suggests that such designs “could represent as low as 1 per cent of the [social  
56 and environmental accounting] literature.”  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 disclosure studies provide a country-specific analysis, and we believe there is much to be gained  
4  
5 from more comparative investigations.  
6  
7

### 8 **Relative contribution**

9  
10 As a final reflection on SAMPJ's contributions to sustainability disclosure research, we  
11 identify the proportion of overall studies the disclosure articles constitute within SAMPJ over its  
12 first eight volumes, and how that compares to coverage in other key social and environmental  
13 accounting (SEA)-related journals over the same period of time (2010 through 2017, inclusive).  
14  
15

16  
17 As identified in Table 2, the sustainability disclosure research represents just under 22 percent of  
18 the main articles published in SAMPJ over its first eight years, suggesting the topic is well  
19 covered in the journal. The table also reveals that SAMPJ holds up well with the other SEA  
20 journals in terms of space devoted to sustainability disclosure studies. Although AAAJ published  
21 substantially more such articles (62), the relative percentage of journal topical coverage is higher  
22 in SAMPJ. Both the number and percentage of SAMPJ articles is comparable to both *Accounting*  
23 *Forum* and *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal*, and well ahead of *Accounting,*  
24 *Organizations and Society*. The evidence suggests SAMPJ has clearly established itself as one of  
25 the primary targets for sustainability disclosure research in accounting.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 ----- Table 2 about here -----  
41

### 42 **What have we learned about sustainability disclosure?**

43  
44 Any reflection on what recent research into sustainability disclosure has added to our  
45 body of knowledge has to start by acknowledging the substantial shortcomings noted about the  
46 prior state of the practice. For more than a quarter-century, sustainability disclosure has been  
47 criticized as partial, selective, and self-serving (see, e.g., Harte and Owen, 1991; Gray and  
48 Bebbington, 2000). Unfortunately, the predominant findings emerging from the SAMPJ body of  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 sustainability disclosure research fail to suggest substantial improvement. Regardless of whether  
4 the research examines specific or broader areas of disclosure, or whether it explores the practices  
5 in established or developing economies, sustainability disclosure still appears to be limited in  
6 quality, skewed toward positive information, and driven by legitimation for the disclosing  
7 organization as opposed to being an attempt at meaningful accountability. And unfortunately,  
8 such findings are not limited to the annual report disclosures on which much of the prior claims  
9 are based, but appear also to apply to the newer forms of disclosure, standalone and integrated  
10 reports. Iyer and Lulseged (2013), for example, find the choice to issue a standalone  
11 sustainability report in the U.S. is substantially driven by size and industry, factors often  
12 associated with legitimation (see, e.g., Patten, 2002), while Zhao and Patten (2016) report that  
13 managers in China see standalone reporting as a communication tool to enhance their corporate  
14 image as opposed to being a medium for providing transparent and accurate social and  
15 environmental performance information to users. With regard to integrated reports, Haji and  
16 Anifowose (2016, p. 206), in their analysis of three years of integrated reporting in South Africa,  
17 find the reports are “imbued with soft and generic disclosures to exaggerate positive trends  
18 whilst avoiding, or dismissing, negative outcomes in organisational performance,” a finding  
19 consistent with Setia et al.’s (2015) assertion that the reporting appears to be more symbolic than  
20 substantial.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 While the findings in the studies published in SAMPJ are consistent with so much of the  
45 body of work preceding them, it does not diminish the importance of what they bring to the  
46 debate. It is critical for us, as an academic community, to disseminate the fact that sustainability  
47 disclosure over the first two decades of the 2000s remains partial, selective, and legitimation-  
48 driven. If we fail to continue to show that the disclosure regimes in place still are not working,  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 we cannot hope to bring about substantial change. At the turn of new millennium, Gray and  
4  
5 Bebbington (2000) warned that where sustainability disclosure was voluntary, it would never be  
6  
7 more than a tool of legitimation and the results in the SAMPJ work continue to support such a  
8  
9 claim.  
10

11  
12 Consistent with prior commentators (e.g. Medawar, 1976; Patten, 2012; Cho and Patten,  
13  
14 2013), we believe that better regulation and enforcement is the only meaningful way to make  
15  
16 sustainability disclosure about accountability rather than legitimation. Setting aside the debate  
17  
18 about whether such disclosure should be about informing investors as opposed to providing more  
19  
20 general accountability to society (see, e.g., Cho and Patten, 2013), we believe that without  
21  
22 evidence that investors value better, relevant disclosure, and without evidence that regulation can  
23  
24 help bring about that improved disclosure, the likelihood for meaningful governmental action  
25  
26 seems remote. SAMPJ's willingness to publish studies adopting more mainstream market-based  
27  
28 approaches is important for meeting the first of those requirements, and, we believe, is helping to  
29  
30 make a case. For example, both Saka and Oshika (2014) and Fazzini and Dal Maso (2016) find  
31  
32 positive market valuation effects for environmental disclosures, while Guidry and Patten (2010)  
33  
34 document that investors see value (potential harm) in higher (lower) quality sustainability  
35  
36 reports. However, we also believe much more needs to be done with respect to documenting that  
37  
38 there are negative impacts from disclosure that constitutes legitimation rather than  
39  
40 accountability. No studies to date in SAMPJ really address this issue, and indeed, it is an area  
41  
42 that remains underexplored across the entire spectrum of SEA publications.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Equally as important as showing that high quality sustainability reporting has value, we  
51  
52 believe there is a need for more evidence that regulation can improve disclosure, and SAMPJ has  
53  
54 contributed, at least a little, toward this goal. Cahaya et al. (2015) show that the governmental  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 requirements for sustainability reporting in Indonesia did lead to at least some improvements in  
4 the provision of labor-related information, suggesting that regulation can have positive effects on  
5 disclosure, while Yu and Rowe (2017) report managers in China believe governmental pressure  
6 is important in improving standalone reporting. Of course, one of the impediments to research in  
7 this vein has been the lack of regulatory requirements for reporting, but we are hopeful that the  
8 European Union's Directive 2014/95/EU on non-financial reporting will yield a rich new source  
9 of research on the value of regulation with respect to sustainability disclosure. But the findings of  
10 Setia et al. (2015) and Haji and Anifowose (2016) with respect to the relatively poor quality of  
11 integrated reporting in South Africa, even with governmental mandates for its adoption, suggest  
12 that beyond guidance and mandates, enforcement of requirements is also an integral piece of the  
13 puzzle when it comes to enhancing organizations' transparency and accountability. Evidence  
14 supporting the importance of enforcement would thus also be a valuable future contribution.

### 31 **Conclusion**

32  
33 The primary intent of this reflection was to highlight the contributions SAMPJ has made  
34 in the area of sustainability disclosure research over its initial eight years and to identify where  
35 researchers might add to the body of work. While each of the studies published to date provides  
36 only a small piece of the body of evidence that will be necessary to move organizations toward  
37 more accountability, as well as more comparability, in the disclosure of sustainability  
38 information, SAMPJ as a major outlet for the research appears to be well on its way to helping  
39 the cause. But, of course, much remains to be done. For example, relative to our call for more  
40 research into the negative effects of legitimating disclosure, we would encourage studies that  
41 explore its relation to subsequent changes in sustainability performance. Cho et al. (2012a)  
42 document that legitimating environmental disclosures appear to mitigate the negative impacts of  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 actual environmental performance on perceptions of companies' reputation. They argue this  
4  
5 may be harmful in that it reduces the incentive for poor performers to improve (also see  
6  
7 Freedman and Patten, 2004). What is currently missing is evidence that this assertion holds.  
8  
9  
10 Studies carefully documenting that companies using disclosure in a legitimating way fail to  
11  
12 improve subsequent performance in line with other companies would provide substantial backing  
13  
14 for the calls for more regulation of sustainability disclosure practice. Of course, so too, would  
15  
16 additional investigations documenting the impacts of better regulation and enforcement on the  
17  
18 quality of sustainability information provision, not only by business organizations, but in the  
19  
20 public sector as well.  
21  
22

23  
24 As we identify earlier in our review, we also believe our understanding of the impacts of  
25  
26 sustainability disclosure can be enriched through the use of experimental designs. By  
27  
28 manipulating differences in the level or type of disclosure, experimental studies can more  
29  
30 carefully ascribe causality for outcomes on factors such as investor beliefs (as in Guidry and  
31  
32 Patten, 2010) or reputation (as in Cho et al., 2012a) to the disclosure itself. Such an approach  
33  
34 could be similarly useful in assessing the value of assurance on sustainability reports, or even  
35  
36 whether integrating reporting impacts user perceptions to the same extent as does the use of  
37  
38 standalone reports. Understanding these relations is crucial to improving both sustainability  
39  
40 reporting and its contributions to society.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 Additionally, with respect to suggestions on where SAMPJ could enrich our  
46  
47 understanding of sustainability disclosure, we encourage both additional comparative studies  
48  
49 focusing on reporting across multiple locations, and continued exploration of the practice, and its  
50  
51 impacts, in developing countries. However, particularly with respect to the latter, we concur  
52  
53 with Tilt's (2016; 2018) assessment that more careful attention needs to be paid to the contextual  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 factors that likely differ in such locales. She notes (2018, p. 145), “the majority of the world’s  
4  
5 population lives in developing countries that have unique social, political and environmental  
6  
7 problems,” and as such, exploration of sustainability reporting in these areas requires researchers  
8  
9 to move beyond simple comparisons to practices in the Western world. Understanding how  
10  
11 factors such as press freedom, the level of corruption, or the status of women in society (Tilt,  
12  
13 2016) impact or impede more transparent sustainability disclosure can help advance reporting in  
14  
15 areas that are vitally important in the worldwide fight against unsustainability.  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 As a final point on where future research might add value, we note that the disclosure  
21  
22 research to date in SAMPJ, at least on the surface, seems largely to approach the issue from the  
23  
24 perspective of accounting to the exclusion of management and policy. And while we would  
25  
26 argue that studies such as Steyn (2014) and Zhao and Patten (2016) at least touch on  
27  
28 management issues, and more directly, studies including Cotter et al. (2011) and Cahaya et al.  
29  
30 (2015) have clear policy connections, we concede that more could be done to explicitly link the  
31  
32 importance of understanding sustainability reporting and its impacts to management and policy  
33  
34 issues.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Ultimately, we believe Editor Adams’ goal for SAMPJ is to help move the world toward  
40  
41 a more sustainable future. While disclosure studies play only a small role in that endeavor, we  
42  
43 believe it is an important role, particularly given that sustainability disclosure still appears to  
44  
45 have much room for improvement. Accordingly, we applaud SAMPJ for becoming a major  
46  
47 contributor to the movement for better reporting, and we hope, a better world.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Adams, C. A. (2010). "Editorial", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 5-10.
- Adams, C. A. (2013). "Sustainability reporting and performance management in universities: challenges and benefits", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 384-392.
- Adams, C. A. (2015). "The International Integrated Reporting Council: a call to action", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 27, pp. 23-28.
- Adams, C. A., Muir, S., and Hoque, Z. (2014). "Measurement of sustainability performance in the public sector", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 46-67.
- Alewine, H. C. (2010). "A model for conducting experimental environmental accounting research", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 256-291.
- Arayssi, M., Dah, M., and Jizi, M. (2016). "Women on boards, sustainability reporting and firm performance", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 376-401.
- Ball, A. and Grubnic, S. (2007). "Sustainability accounting and accountability in the public sector", in Unerman, J., Bebbington, J. and O'Dwyer, B. (Eds.), *Sustainability Accounting and Accountability*, Routledge, New York, pp. 243-265.
- Bellringer, A., Ball, A., and Craig, R. (2011). "Reasons for sustainability reporting by New Zealand local governments", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 126-138.
- Cahaya, F. R., Porter, S., Tower, G., and Brown, A. (2015). "The Indonesian Government's coercive pressure on labour disclosures: conflicting interests or government ambivalence?", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 475-497.
- Cho, C. H., Guidry, R. P., Hageman, A. M., and Patten, D. M. (2012a). "Do Actions Speak Louder than Words? An Empirical Investigation of Corporate Environmental Reputation." *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 14-25.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Cho, C. H., Michelon, G., and Patten, D. M. (2012b). "Enhancement and obfuscation through  
5 the use of graphs in sustainability reports: an international comparison", *Sustainability*  
6 *Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 74-88.  
7  
8  
9
- 10 Cho, C. H., Michelon, G., Patten, D. M., and Roberts, R. W. (2014). "CSR report assurance in  
11 the USA: an empirical investigation of determinants and effects", *Sustainability*  
12 *Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 130-148.  
13  
14
- 15 Cho, C. H. and Patten, D. M. (2013). "Green accounting: reflections from a CSR and  
16 environmental perspective", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 24, pp. 443-447.  
17  
18
- 19 Cotter, J., Najah, M., and Wang, S. S. (2011). "Standardized reporting of climate change  
20 information in Australia", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*,  
21 Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 294-321.  
22  
23
- 24 Crane, A. and Glozer, S. (2016). "Researching Corporate Social Responsibility  
25 Communication: Themes, Opportunities and Challenges", *Journal of Management*  
26 *Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 7, pp. 1223-1252.  
27  
28
- 29 Deegan, C. (2017). "Twenty five years of social and environmental accounting research within  
30 *Critical Perspectives of Accounting: its hits, misses and ways forward. Critical*  
31 *Perspective on Accounting*, Vol. 43, pp. 65-87.  
32  
33
- 34 Dienes, D., Sassen, R., and Fischer, J. (2016). "What are the drivers of sustainability reporting?  
35 A systematic review", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol.  
36 7, No. 2, pp. 154-189.  
37  
38
- 39 Dobbs, S. and van Staden, C. (2016). "Motivations for corporate social and environmental  
40 reporting: New Zealand evidence", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy*  
41 *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 449-472.  
42  
43
- 44 Farneti, F. and Siboni, B. (2011). "An analysis of the Italian governmental guidelines and of the  
45 local governments' practices for social reports", *Sustainability Accounting, Management*  
46 *and Policy Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 101-125.  
47  
48
- 49 Fazzini, M. and Dal Maso, L. (2016). "The value relevance of 'assured' environmental  
50 disclosure: the Italian experience", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy*  
51 *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 225-245.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Flower, J. (2015). "The Integrated International Reporting Council: a story of failure", *Critical*  
4 *Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 27, pp. 1-17.  
5  
6  
7 Freedman, M. and Patten, D. M. (2004). "Evidence on the Pernicious Effect of Financial Report  
8 Environmental Disclosure." *Accounting Forum* Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 27-41.  
9  
10  
11 Frostenson, M. and Helin, S. (2017). "Ideas in conflict: a case study on tensions in the process  
12 of preparing sustainability reports", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy*  
13 *Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 166-190.  
14  
15  
16 Gibassier, D. and Schaltegger, S. (2015). "Carbon management accounting and reporting in  
17 practice: a case study on converging emergent approaches", *Sustainability Accounting,*  
18 *Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 340-365.  
19  
20  
21 Giles, O. A. and Murphy, D. (2016). "SLAPPED: the relationship between SLAPP suits and  
22 changed ESG reporting by firms", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy*  
23 *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 44-79.  
24  
25  
26  
27 Gray, R. (2002). "The social accounting project and *Accounting, Organizations & Society.*  
28 Privileging engagement, imaginings, new accountings and pragmatism over critique?",  
29 *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 27, No. 7, pp. 687-708.  
30  
31  
32 Gray, R. and Bebbington, J. (2000). "Environmental accounting, managerialism and  
33 sustainability: is the planet safe in the hands of business and accounting?", *Advances in*  
34 *Environmental Accounting and Management*, Vol. 1, pp. 1-44.  
35  
36  
37 Guidry, R. P. and Patten, D. M. (2010). "Market reactions to the first-time issuance of corporate  
38 sustainability reports: evidence that quality matters", *Sustainability Accounting,*  
39 *Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 33-50.  
40  
41  
42  
43 Haji, A. A. and Anifowose, M. (2016). "The trend of integrated reporting practice in South  
44 Africa: ceremonial or substantive?", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy*  
45 *Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 190-224.  
46  
47  
48 Harte, G. and Owen, D. (1991). "Environmental disclosure in the annual reports of British  
49 companies: a research note", *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 4,  
50 No. 3, pp. 51-61.  
51  
52  
53 Hossain, M. M., Momin, M. A., Rowe, A. L., and Quaddas, M. (2017). "Corporate social and  
54 environmental reporting practices: a case of listed companies in Bangladesh",  
55 *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 138-165.  
56  
57



- 1  
2  
3  
4 Iyer, V. and Lulseged, A. (2013). “Does family status impact US firms’ sustainability  
5 reporting?” *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 2,  
6 pp. 163-189.  
7  
8  
9  
10 Kend, M. (2015). “governance, firm-level characteristics and their impact on the client’s  
11 voluntary sustainability disclosures and assurance decisions”, *Sustainability Accounting,*  
12 *Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 54-78.  
13  
14  
15 Krasodomska, J. and Cho, C. H. (2017). “Corporate social responsibility disclosure: perspectives  
16 from sell-side and buy-side financial analysts”, *Sustainability Accounting, Management*  
17 *and Policy Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 2-19.  
18  
19  
20 Mathews, M. R. (1997). “Twenty-five years of social and environmental accounting research: is  
21 there a silver jubilee to celebrate?”, *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*,  
22 Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 481-531.  
23  
24  
25 Medawar, C. (1976). “The social audit: a political view”, *Accounting, Organizations and*  
26 *Society*, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 389-394.  
27  
28  
29 Mori Junior, R. and Best, P. (2017). “GRI G4 content index: does it improve credibility and  
30 change the expectation–performance gap of GRI-assured sustainability reports?”,  
31 *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 5, pp. 571-594.  
32  
33  
34 Muttakin, M. B. and N. Subramaniam. (2015). “Firm ownership and board characteristics: do  
35 they matter for corporate social responsibility disclosure of Indian companies?”,  
36 *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 138-165.  
37  
38  
39 Noronha, C., Leung, T. C. H., and Lei, O. I. (2015). “Corporate social responsibility disclosure  
40 in Chinese railway companies: corporate response after a major train accident”,  
41 *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 446-474.  
42  
43  
44  
45 O’Dwyer, B. and Unerman, J. (2016). “Fostering rigour in accounting for social sustainability”,  
46 *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 49, pp. 32-40.  
47  
48  
49 Owen, D. (2008). “Chronicles of wasted time? A personal reflection on the current state of, and  
50 future prospects for, social and environmental accounting research” *Accounting, Auditing*  
51 *and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 240-267.  
52  
53  
54 Palmetier, R. W., Houston, M. B., and Hulland, J. (2018). “Review articles: purpose, process,  
55 and structure”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol 46, No. 1, pp. 1-5.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Parker, L. D. (2005). "Social and environmental accountability research: a view from the  
6 commentary box", *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 6, pp.  
7 842-860.  
8  
9
- 10 Patten, D. M. (2002). "The relation between environmental performance and environmental  
11 disclosure: a research note", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 27, No. 8, pp.  
12 763-773.  
13  
14
- 15 Patten, D. M. (2012). "White tigers, zoos, and sustainability reporting: a cynical reflection",  
16 *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal*, Vol 32, No. 1, pp. 17-25.  
17  
18
- 19 Robertson, F. A. and Samy, M. (2015). Factors affecting the diffusion of integrated reporting –  
20 a UK FTSE 100 perspective", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy*  
21 *Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 190-223.  
22  
23
- 24 Saka, C. and Oshika, T. (2014). "Disclosure effects, carbon emissions and corporate value",  
25 *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 22-45.  
26  
27
- 28 Schneider, A., Samkin, G., and Davey, H. (2014). "Biodiversity reporting by New Zealand  
29 local authorities: the current state of play", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and*  
30 *Policy Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 425-456.  
31  
32
- 33 Setia, N., Abhayawansa, S., Joshi, M., and Vu Huynh, A. (2015). "Integrated reporting in South  
34 Africa: some initial evidence", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy*  
35 *Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 397-424.  
36  
37
- 38 Simnett, R. (2012). "Assurance of sustainability reports: revision of ISAE 3000 and associated  
39 research opportunities", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol.  
40 3, No. 1, pp. 89-98.  
41  
42
- 43 Stacchezzini, R., Melloni, G., and Lai, A. (2016). "Sustainability management and reporting:  
44 the role of integrated reporting for communicating corporate sustainability management",  
45 *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vo. 136, pp. 102-110.  
46  
47
- 48 Steyn, M. (2014). "Organisational benefits and implementation challenges of mandatory  
49 integrated reporting: perspectives of senior executives at South African listed  
50 companies", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 4,  
51 pp. 476-503.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Tilt, C. A. (2016). "Corporate social responsibility research: the importance of  
4 context", *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, Vol.1, No. 2, pp. 1-9.  
5  
6  
7 Tilt, C. A. (2018). "Making social and environmental accounting research relevant in developing  
8 countries: a matter of context?", *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal*, Vol.  
9 38, No. 2, pp. 145-150.  
10  
11  
12 Vourvachis, P., Woodward, T., Woodward, D. G., and Patten, D. M. (2016). "CSR disclosure in  
13 response to major airline accidents: a legitimacy-based exploration", *Sustainability*  
14 *Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 26-43.  
15  
16  
17 Williams, B. (2015). "The local government accountants' perspective on sustainability",  
18 *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 267-287.  
19  
20  
21 Yekini, K. and Jallow, K. (2012). "Corporate community involvement disclosures in annual  
22 reports: a measure of corporate community development of a signal of CSR  
23 observance?", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 1,  
24 pp. 7-32.  
25  
26  
27  
28 Yook, K., Song, H., Patten, D. M., and Kim, I. (2017). "The disclosure of environmental  
29 conservation costs and its relation to eco-efficiency: evidence from Japan", *Sustainability*  
30 *Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 20-42.  
31  
32  
33 Yu, H., Kuo, L., and K, M. (2017). "The relationship between CSR disclosure and competitive  
34 advantage", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 5,  
35 pp. 547-570.  
36  
37  
38 Yu, S. and Rowe, A. L. (2017). "Emerging phenomenon of corporate social and environmental  
39 reporting in China", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 8,  
40 No. 3, pp. 386-415.  
41  
42  
43 Zhao, N. and Patten, D. M. (2016). "An exploratory analysis of managerial perceptions of social  
44 and environmental reporting in China: evidence from state-owned enterprises in  
45 Beijing", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.  
46 80-98.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1 – Sustainability disclosure articles published in SAMPJ 2010-2017.**

Article	Focus	Investigative Technique	Disclosure Document	Geographic Location
Guidry & Patten (2010)	Market reaction to first-time issuance of sustainability reports	Archival	Standalone Sustainability Reports	US
Cotter et al. (2011)	The gap between regulatory requirements and authoritative guidance/climate change disclosures	Archival	Standalone Sustainability Reports	Australia
Farneti & Siboni (2011)	Comparison of local guidelines to GRI/governmental unit social reporting	Archival	Public Social Reports	Italy
Bellringer et al. (2011)	Motivations for standalone reporting by local governmental units	Qualitative	Standalone Sustainability Reports	New Zealand
Cho et al. (2012b)	Bias in the use/depiction of graphs in standalone reports	Archival	Standalone Sustainability Reports	US
Yekini & Jallow (2012)	The relation between volume and quality of community involvement disclosures	Archival	Annual Reports	UK
Iyer & Lulseged (2013)	Whether family firm status influences the choice and level of sustainability reporting	Archival	Standalone Sustainability Reports	US
Schneider et al. (2014)	The reporting of biodiversity information by local governmental authorities	Archival	Various Governmental Reports	New Zealand
Cho et al. (2014)	Factors affecting assurance adoption/market valuation effects of assurance adoption	Archival	Standalone Sustainability Reports	US
Saka & Oshika (2014)	The impact of carbon emissions and disclosure on market valuation	Archival	CDP Reports	Japan

1 2 3	Steyn (2014)	The perception of senior executives on the benefits and challenges of integrated reporting	Survey	Integrated Reports	South Africa
4 5 6	Kend (2015)	Factors influencing report issuance, assurance, and assurance provider choice	Archival	Standalone Sustainability Reports	Australia and UK
7 8 9	Muttakin & Subramaniam (2015)	The influence of firm-level factors on differences in the provision of sustainability information	Archival	Annual Reports	India
10 11 12	Noronha et al. (2015)	Sustainability disclosure in response to a catastrophic rail accident	Archival	Sustainability Report/Web Pages	China
13 14 15	Cahaya et al. (2015)	The influence of governmental requirements on labor-related disclosures	Archival	Annual Reports	Indonesia
16 17 18	Setia et al. (2015)	Whether adoption of integrated reporting led to changes in the provision of capital disclosures	Archival	Integrated Reports	South Africa
19 20 21	Robertson & Samy (2015)	Comparison of disclosure across different reports/managerial perceptions of the potential for integrated reporting	Arch/Qual	Annual and Sustainability Reports	UK
22 23 24	Zhao & Patten (2016)	Managers' perceptions of factors driving adoption of standalone reporting	Qualitative	Standalone Sustainability Reports	China
25 26 27	Dobbs & van Staden (2016)	Factors influencing sustainability reporting	Arch/Survey	Annual and Sustainability Reports	New Zealand
28 29 30	Vourvachis et al. (2016)	Sustainability disclosure in response to catastrophic airline accidents	Archival	Annual and Sustainability Reports	Varied Countries
31 32 33	Giles & Murphy (2016)	The impact of Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation on sustainability reporting	Archival	Annual Reports	Australia
34 35 36	Fazzini & Dal Maso (2016)	The impact of environmental disclosure and assurance on market valuation	Archival	All Reporting*	Italy
37 38 39					
40 41 42					
43 44 45					
46 47					

1 2 3	Arayssi et al. (2016)	The effect of gender-diverse boards on sustainability reporting/market and risk impacts	Archival	All Reporting*	UK
4 5 6	Haji & Anifowose (2016)	Assessment of changes in information provision over time in integrated reports	Archival	Integrated Reports	South Africa
7 8 9	Yu & Rowe (2017)	Managers' perceptions of factors driving adoption of standalone reporting	Qualitative	Standalone Sustainability Reports	China
10 11 12	Frostenson & Helin (2017)	Perception of preparers of sustainability reports	Qualitative	Standalone Sustainability Reports	Sweden
13 14 15	Hossain et al. (2017)	Managers' perceptions of factors driving sustainability reporting/assessment of disclosure	Arch/Qual	Annual Reports	Bangladesh
16 17 18	Yook et al. (2017)	The relation between eco-efficiency measures and the levels of disclosed environmental information	Archival	Standalone Sustainability Reports	Japan
19 20 21	Krasodomska & Cho (2017)	The perceptions of financial analysts on the quantity, quality, and use of sustainability disclosure	Survey	All Reporting**	Poland
22 23 24	Yu et al. (2017)	The impact of sustainability disclosure on companies' competitive advantage	Archival	Annual and Sustainability Reports	China
25 26 27	Mori Junior & Best (2017)	The perceptions of various stakeholders on updated GRI reporting guidance	Qualitative	Standalone Sustainability Reports	Brazil

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 \* Used Bloomberg ESG data

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 \*\* No differentiation across source of reporting

**Table 2 – The prevalence of CSR disclosure studies in selected social and environmental accounting journals 2010-2017.**

<b>Journal</b>	<b># of CSR disclosure articles published</b>	<b>Total articles published<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<i>Accounting, Auditing &amp; Accountability Journal</i>	62	380	16.3%
<i>Accounting Forum</i>	30	168	17.9%
<i>Accounting, Organizations &amp; Society</i>	12	182	4.3%
<i>Social and Environmental Accountability Journal</i>	15	66	22.7%
<i>Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal</i>	31	143	21.6%

<sup>a</sup> Total articles includes only main articles.

**Figure 1 – The landscape of CSR disclosure studies published in SAMPJ.**

	<b>Descriptive</b>	<b>Factors Explaining Disclosure</b>	<b>Impacts/Perceptions</b>
<b>Archival</b>	Cotter et al. (2011) Farneti & Siboni (2011) Schneider et al. (2014) Setia et al. (2015) Haji & Anifowose (2016)	Cho et al. (2012b) Yekini & Jallow (2012) Iyer & Lulseged (2013) Cahaya et al. (2015) Kend (2015) Muttakin & Subramaniam (2015) Noronha et al. (2015) Giles & Murphy (2016) Vourvachis et al. (2016) Yook et al. (2017)	Guidry & Patten (2010) Saka & Oshika (2014) Fazzini & Dal Maso (2016) Yu et al. (2017)
<b>Qualitative</b>		Cho et al. (2014) Arayssi et al. (2016)	
		Bellringer et al. (2011) Zhao & Patten (2016) Frostenson & Helin (2017) Hossain et al. (2017)* Yu & Rowe (2017)	Robertson & Samy (2015)* Mori Junior & Best (2017)
<b>Survey</b>		Dobbs & van Staden (2016)*	Krasodomska & Cho (2017) Steyn (2014)

\* These also have some archival analysis.

Both Cho et al. (2014) and Arayssi et al. (2016) examine both factors explaining differences in disclosure as well as impacts of disclosure.