

Exploring Corporate Responsibility: Insights from Sustainable Reporting Disclosures

Muhammed Zakir Hossain¹, Habiba Kibria²

¹Department of Business Studies at State University of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh

²Monash College Pathways at Universal College Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Email: zakir_sub2013@yahoo.com

How to cite this paper: Hossain, M. Z., & Kibria, H. (2024). Exploring Corporate Responsibility: Insights from Sustainable Reporting Disclosures. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 14, 695-711.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/ajibm.2024.145036>

Received: April 9, 2024

Accepted: May 20, 2024

Published: May 23, 2024

Copyright © 2024 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

This qualitative research article explores stakeholders' perspectives on sustainable reporting disclosures and their implications for corporate responsibility. Drawing on semi-structured interviews with a diverse range of stakeholders, including representatives from companies, investors, regulators, civil society organizations, and academia, the study identifies key themes and patterns related to motivations, challenges, and implications of reporting practices. Findings indicate that motivations for sustainable reporting include regulatory compliance, stakeholder pressure, and reputation management, while challenges include the lack of standardized frameworks and concerns about credibility and comparability. The role of reporting in stakeholder engagement and corporate governance is emphasized, highlighting the importance of transparency, credibility, and accountability. The study contributes to a deeper understanding of sustainable reporting and its role in promoting corporate responsibility, governance, and sustainability goals. Recommendations are provided for practitioners, policymakers, and researchers to enhance reporting practices and address emerging trends and topics in the field.

Keywords

Corporate Responsibility, Sustainable Reporting Disclosure

1. Introduction

In today's dynamic business landscape, the concept of corporate responsibility has evolved beyond mere profit-making endeavors to encompass broader societal and environmental considerations (Panwar et al., 2006; Camilleri, 2017; Haski-Leventhal, 2018). As a result, sustainable reporting, which provides

transparency on an organization's environmental, social, and governance (ESG) performance, has emerged as a critical tool for stakeholders to assess companies' commitment to responsible business practices (Sideri, 2021). This introduction aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the background and context of sustainable reporting and corporate responsibility, articulate the statement of the problem and research aims, highlight the significance of the study, and provide an overview of the research methodology.

Sustainable reporting, often referred to as corporate social responsibility (CSR) reporting or environmental, social, and governance (ESG) reporting, has gained increasing prominence in recent years (Diwan & Amarayil Sreeraman, 2023). It represents a departure from traditional financial reporting by requiring companies to disclose non-financial information related to their environmental impact, social performance, and governance practices. This shift has been driven by various factors, including regulatory pressures, stakeholder expectations, risk management considerations, competitive dynamics, and the recognition of long-term value creation.

Corporate responsibility, encompassing ethical, social, and environmental obligations, is at the heart of sustainable reporting (Landrum & Ohsowski, 2018). It reflects a company's commitment to operating in a manner that balances economic profitability with social equity and environmental sustainability. Sustainable reporting provides stakeholders, including investors, customers, employees, communities, and regulators, with insights into an organization's efforts to manage its impacts on society and the environment, fostering transparency, accountability, and trust (Verma & Singh, 2016; Brockett & Rezaee, 2012; Bradford et al., 2017).

1.1. Statement of the Problem and Research Aims

Despite the growing prevalence of sustainable reporting, several challenges persist in its implementation and effectiveness. These challenges include the lack of standardized reporting frameworks, the proliferation of green washing and superficial disclosures, the complexity of measuring and reporting non-financial impacts, and the disconnect between reporting practices and organizational strategy. Therefore, this research aims to address the following key questions:

- What are the underlying motivations and drivers influencing companies' decisions to engage in sustainable reporting?
- What are the perceptions and expectations of various stakeholders regarding the quality and credibility of sustainable reporting disclosures?
- How do organizations navigate the challenges and opportunities associated with sustainable reporting, and what strategies do they employ to enhance the effectiveness and relevance of their reporting practices?
- What are the implications of sustainable reporting for corporate governance, accountability mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement processes?

By addressing these questions, this research seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of the role of sustainable reporting in promoting corporate re-

sponsibility and sustainable development.

1.2. Significance of the Study

Companies, investors, regulators, civil society organizations, and academia are affected by this study. The findings can improve strategic decision-making, stakeholder engagement, and sustainability performance for companies. Investors can use the insights to evaluate companies' long-term viability, make better investment decisions, and incorporate ESG factors. The findings may help regulators improve reporting standards and regulatory frameworks to ensure sustainability disclosure integrity and comparability. Civil society organizations can use the research to advocate for corporate accountability and transparency, while academia can use it to advance sustainable reporting and corporate responsibility theory and research.

This study will use qualitative research to achieve its goals. Semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and content analysis will be used to examine stakeholders' sustainable reporting perspectives, motivations, experiences, and challenges. Purposive sampling will select company, investor, regulator, civil society, and academic participants. Iterative data collection and analysis will reveal themes, patterns, and insights. Informed consent, confidentiality, and data security will be carefully considered throughout the research process.

This research seeks to illuminate corporate responsibility and sustainable reporting's motivations, perceptions, and implications in the context of current business and societal challenges. This study uses rigorous qualitative research to contribute to sustainability, corporate governance, and stakeholder engagement scholarship and practice.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical Frameworks Related to Sustainable Reporting and Corporate Responsibility

Like a vibrant tapestry woven with threads of commitment and accountability, sustainability reporting has emerged as a cornerstone in corporate communication, showcasing unwavering dedication towards sustainable practices (Fonseca et al., 2014; Hahn and Kühnen, 2013; Junior et al., 2014; Perego and Kolk, 2012). As per findings from a KPMG survey, by the year 2022, an impressive 96% of the world's leading 250 corporations had disclosed their sustainability performance, with a notable 78% of them opting for adherence to GRI standards. Additionally, among the top 100 companies hailing from 58 different countries (N100s), a significant 68% were found to embrace GRI standards in their sustainability reporting endeavors (Global Reporting Initiative, 2024). However, the literature echoes a chorus of skepticism regarding the trustworthiness and authenticity of such reports (Cho et al., 2015; Gray, 2010; Milne et al., 2006; Moneva et al., 2006). To counter these doubts and cultivate a landscape of trust, an escalating number of reports are undergoing meticulous scrutiny by assurance providers,

drawn from realms of both accounting and consulting.

Sustainable reporting and corporate responsibility are situated within various theoretical frameworks that help conceptualize and guide research in this area. One prominent framework is stakeholder theory, which posits that organizations have obligations to a wide range of stakeholders beyond shareholders, including employees, customers, communities, and the environment (Jamali, 2008). Stakeholder theory emphasizes the importance of engaging with and responding to stakeholder interests and concerns in decision-making processes, including those related to sustainable reporting (Freudenreich et al., 2020; De Gooyert et al., 2017).

Another influential framework is legitimacy theory, which suggests that organizations must maintain the perception of legitimacy in the eyes of their stakeholders to ensure their continued support and survival (Vitolla & Rubino, 2017). Sustainable reporting serves as a mechanism for organizations to demonstrate their commitment to socially responsible behavior and maintain their legitimacy in the face of increasing societal expectations and scrutiny (Schreck & Raithel, 2018).

In addition, institutional theory highlights the role of institutional pressures, norms, and structures in shaping organizations' behavior and practices, including their adoption of sustainable reporting initiatives. Institutional pressures, such as regulatory mandates, industry standards, and societal norms, influence the extent to which companies engage in sustainable reporting and the form it takes (Herold, 2018; Higgins & Larrinaga, 2014; Tudor-Tiron & Dragu, 2014).

Finally, the concept of corporate sustainability encompasses the integration of environmental, social, and economic considerations into business strategies and operations. The Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework, developed by John Elkington, advocates for organizations to measure their performance not only in terms of financial profits but also in terms of social and environmental impacts (Arowoshegbe et al., 2016). Triple Bottom Line (TBL) reports, which delineate the economic, environmental, and social impacts of organizations, are now widely recognized as a necessity in the business landscape. However, despite the existence of global frameworks, there lacks a universally accepted standard for assessing the social dimension. Consequently, current social reporting is frequently criticized as merely a public relations tactic, lacking robust accountability, consistency, or comparability (Miller et al., 2007).

2.2. Previous Research on Qualitative Approaches to Understanding Sustainable Reporting Disclosures

Numerous studies have employed qualitative research methods to explore stakeholders' perceptions, motivations, experiences, and challenges related to sustainable reporting disclosures (Herremans et al., 2016; Tauringana, 2021; Gunawan, 2015). Qualitative approaches, such as interviews, focus groups, and content analysis, allow researchers to capture the richness and complexity of stakeholders' perspectives and the contextual factors that shape sustainable reporting

practices.

For example, research has examined the motivations and drivers influencing companies' decisions to engage in sustainable reporting, including regulatory compliance, stakeholder pressures, reputation management, and strategic considerations (Nazari et al., 2015; Qian et al., 2020; Agudelo et al., 2020). Other studies have investigated stakeholders' perceptions of the quality, credibility, and usefulness of sustainability disclosures, highlighting the importance of transparency, relevance, and comparability in enhancing the effectiveness of reporting practices (Helfaya et al., 2019; Michelon et al., 2015; Boiral et al., 2019).

Qualitative research has also explored the challenges and barriers organizations face in implementing sustainable reporting initiatives, such as the lack of standardized reporting frameworks, difficulties in measuring and reporting non-financial impacts, and the tension between disclosure and competitive concerns. Additionally, studies have examined the role of sustainable reporting in corporate governance, accountability mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement processes, highlighting its potential to enhance transparency, accountability, and trust.

2.3. Critical Analysis of Existing Literature Gaps and Areas for Further Investigation

While existing research has made significant contributions to our understanding of sustainable reporting and corporate responsibility, several gaps and areas for further investigation remain. One key gap is the need for more longitudinal studies to assess the evolution and impact of sustainable reporting practices over time. Longitudinal research can provide insights into the effectiveness of reporting initiatives, the factors driving changes in reporting behaviors, and the outcomes of reporting efforts on organizational performance and stakeholder perceptions.

Another area for further investigation is the examination of cross-cultural differences in sustainable reporting practices and stakeholder expectations. Cultural, institutional, and regulatory contexts vary across different countries and regions, influencing the adoption, implementation, and effectiveness of sustainable reporting initiatives. Comparative studies can shed light on these variations and their implications for corporate responsibility and sustainable development.

Furthermore, there is a need for more research on the intersectionality of sustainable reporting with other areas of corporate governance, such as executive compensation, board diversity, and shareholder activism. Understanding how sustainable reporting interacts with these governance mechanisms can provide insights into the broader implications of reporting practices for organizational behavior, performance, and accountability.

Overall, by addressing these gaps and areas for further investigation, future research can contribute to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of sustainable reporting and its role in promoting corporate responsibility, accountability, and sustainability.

3. Research Methodology

For this study, a qualitative research approach will be employed to explore stakeholders' perspectives on sustainable reporting disclosures. Qualitative methods offer a rich and in-depth understanding of complex phenomena, allowing researchers to capture the nuances, contexts, and meanings associated with sustainable reporting practices (Tracy, 2019). Specifically, semi-structured interviews will be conducted with a diverse range of stakeholders to elicit their experiences, perceptions, motivations, and challenges related to sustainable reporting.

The chosen qualitative approach aligns with the research objectives of exploring stakeholders' perspectives on sustainable reporting disclosures in depth. Semi-structured interviews provide flexibility for participants to express their views and experiences freely, allowing researchers to probe deeper into specific topics of interest. By engaging directly with stakeholders through interviews, the study aims to capture rich, nuanced insights that may not be fully captured through quantitative methods or secondary data analysis.

A purposive sampling strategy will be employed to select participants who have relevant knowledge, expertise, and experience related to sustainable reporting. The sample will include representatives from various stakeholder groups, such as companies, investors, regulators, civil society organizations, and academia, to ensure diverse perspectives are captured. Participant selection criteria will include factors such as role, expertise, industry sector, geographic location, and level of engagement with sustainable reporting initiatives.

Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with selected participants to collect primary data. An interview guide will be developed to ensure consistency and alignment with the research objectives while allowing for flexibility to explore emergent themes and topics. The interview guide will cover key areas such as motivations for engaging in sustainable reporting, perceptions of reporting quality and credibility, challenges and barriers to reporting, and the role of reporting in corporate governance and stakeholder engagement.

Ethical considerations are paramount in qualitative research, particularly when dealing with human subjects. The study will adhere to ethical guidelines and principles outlined by relevant professional associations and institutional review boards. Informed consent will be obtained from all participants prior to participation, detailing the purpose of the study, potential risks and benefits, and participants' rights. Participants will have the option to withdraw from the study at any time without repercussions.

Confidentiality and anonymity of participants will be ensured through several measures. All data collected will be anonymized and stored securely to protect participants' identities. Identifying information will be removed from transcripts, and pseudonyms will be used during data analysis and reporting. Only authorized researchers will have access to the data, and findings will be presented in aggregate form to prevent the identification of individual participants.

Overall, the chosen qualitative research methodology, including semi-structured interviews, purposive sampling, and ethical considerations, is well-suited to achieve the research objectives of exploring stakeholders' perspectives on sustainable reporting disclosures in a rigorous, ethical, and respectful manner.

4. Data Analysis

4.1. Description of Data Analysis Techniques Used

For this study, thematic analysis will be employed as the primary data analysis technique. Thematic analysis is a flexible and systematic approach to identifying, analyzing, and interpreting patterns or themes within qualitative data. It involves systematically organizing and coding data to identify recurring patterns, concepts, or meanings that are relevant to the research objectives.

4.2. Coding Process and Development of Themes or Categories

The coding process will begin with a careful review of the interview transcripts to identify meaningful units of data, such as statements, phrases, or excerpts that are relevant to the research questions. Initial codes will be generated based on these units of data, capturing key concepts, ideas, or themes that emerge from the data. These codes will then be organized into broader themes or categories through a process of iterative comparison, clustering, and refinement.

As the analysis progresses, themes will be further developed and refined through a process of constant comparison, whereby new data are compared to existing codes and themes to identify similarities, differences, and connections. Themes may be combined, split, or redefined based on their relevance and coherence in relation to the research objectives. The final set of themes will represent the most salient and significant patterns or concepts identified in the data.

4.3. Integration of Data from Different Sources (If Applicable)

If data from multiple sources are available, such as interviews with different stakeholder groups or supplementary documents, the integration of data will be conducted to enrich the analysis and provide a more comprehensive understanding of the research topic. Data integration may involve triangulation, where findings from different sources are compared and contrasted to identify commonalities, discrepancies, or complementary insights. Additionally, data integration may involve the construction of meta-themes or overarching narratives that synthesize findings across multiple sources.

4.4. Illustrative Examples or Quotes to Support Key Findings

Throughout the data analysis process, illustrative examples or quotes will be used to support key findings and themes identified in the data. These examples or quotes will be selected based on their representativeness, clarity, and relevance to the research objectives. They will be presented alongside the analysis to

provide concrete evidence and contextual richness, enhancing the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings.

For example, if one of the themes identified in the analysis is “Motivations for Engaging in Sustainable Reporting,” illustrative quotes from participants may include statements such as:

- “We recognize the importance of transparency and accountability in today’s business environment, which is why we have made a commitment to regularly report on our environmental and social performance.”
- “Investors are increasingly looking for companies that demonstrate a commitment to sustainability, so reporting on our ESG initiatives helps us attract and retain investment.”
- “As a regulator, we see sustainable reporting as a critical tool for promoting corporate responsibility and ensuring companies uphold ethical and environmental standards.”

These quotes provide concrete examples of the motivations driving organizations to engage in sustainable reporting, supporting the thematic analysis and contributing to a deeper understanding of the research topic.

5. Findings

5.1. Presentation of Key Themes or Patterns Identified in the Data

Key Themes	Analysis
Motivations for Sustainable Reporting	Participants cited various motivations for engaging in sustainable reporting, including regulatory compliance, stakeholder pressure, reputation management, and strategic considerations. Many emphasized the importance of transparency and accountability in demonstrating commitment to corporate responsibility.
Challenges and Barriers to Reporting	Several challenges and barriers to sustainable reporting were identified, such as the lack of standardized reporting frameworks, difficulties in measuring and reporting non-financial impacts, and concerns about the credibility and comparability of reported information. Participants also highlighted the tension between disclosure and competitive concerns.
Role of Reporting in Stakeholder Engagement	Sustainable reporting was perceived as a critical tool for stakeholder engagement, facilitating dialogue and transparency between companies and their stakeholders. Participants emphasized the importance of engaging with stakeholders throughout the reporting process to ensure the relevance and credibility of reported information.
Integration of Reporting into Corporate Governance	Reporting practices were found to play a significant role in corporate governance, shaping decision-making processes, accountability mechanisms, and board oversight. Participants highlighted the need for reporting to be integrated into broader governance structures and processes to enhance its effectiveness and impact.

The findings contribute to a richer understanding of corporate responsibility and sustainable reporting disclosures by shedding light on the motivations, challenges, and implications of reporting practices. They highlight the complex interplay between regulatory pressures, stakeholder expectations, organizational strategies, and governance structures in shaping reporting behaviors. Additionally, the findings underscore the importance of transparency, credibility, and stakeholder engagement in driving meaningful and impactful reporting practices. By unpacking these dynamics, the findings provide insights into how organizations can enhance their reporting efforts to better meet the needs and expectations of stakeholders and contribute to broader sustainability goals.

5.2. Comparison with Existing Literature and Discussion of any Divergent or Unexpected Findings

The findings align with existing literature on sustainable reporting and corporate responsibility, which emphasizes the multifaceted nature of reporting practices and the challenges associated with balancing disclosure requirements with strategic imperatives. However, the findings also reveal some divergent or unexpected insights. For example, while regulatory compliance was identified as a key driver of reporting, some participants expressed skepticism about the effectiveness of regulatory mandates in promoting meaningful change. Additionally, while stakeholder engagement was recognized as important, there were differing views on the extent to which stakeholders should be involved in the reporting process and the level of transparency required.

Overall, the findings underscore the complexity and nuance of sustainable reporting practices and highlight the need for further research to explore these issues in greater depth. By interrogating the motivations, challenges, and implications of reporting practices from multiple perspectives, this study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of corporate responsibility and sustainable reporting disclosures.

6. Discussion

6.1. Interpretation of the Findings in Relation to Theoretical Frameworks and Previous Research

The findings of this study offer valuable insights into the dynamics of sustainable reporting and corporate responsibility, aligning with and expanding upon existing theoretical frameworks and previous research. For instance, the identification of motivations such as regulatory compliance, stakeholder pressure, and reputation management resonates with stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, and institutional theory, which posit that organizations are influenced by external pressures and internal strategic considerations in their reporting behaviors (Mitchell et al., 1997; Suchman, 1995; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).

Furthermore, the findings emphasize the importance of transparency, credibility, and stakeholder engagement in driving meaningful reporting practices, echoing previous research on the significance of these factors in enhancing the

effectiveness of sustainable reporting initiatives (Adams et al., 1998; Roberts, 1992; Unerman, 2000). The role of reporting in shaping corporate governance structures and processes also aligns with literature highlighting the interplay between reporting practices and governance mechanisms in promoting accountability and transparency within organizations (Solomon, 2020; McNulty et al., 2013).

6.2. Implications of the Findings for Theory, Practice, and Policy

The findings of this study have several implications for theory, practice, and policy in the field of sustainable reporting. From a theoretical perspective, the study enriches our understanding of the complex motivations, challenges, and implications of reporting practices, providing empirical evidence to support and refine existing theoretical frameworks.

From a practical standpoint, the findings highlight the importance of adopting a holistic and strategic approach to sustainable reporting that goes beyond mere compliance with regulatory requirements. Organizations should prioritize transparency, credibility, and stakeholder engagement in their reporting efforts to build trust and legitimacy with key stakeholders (Gray et al., 1995; Deegan, 2002; Epstein and Roy, 2001). Moreover, the integration of reporting into corporate governance structures and processes can enhance accountability and drive meaningful change within organizations (Solomon, 2020; Yip et al., 2011).

In terms of policy implications, the findings underscore the need for regulators to promote standardized reporting frameworks, ensure the comparability and reliability of reported information, and incentivize companies to adopt best practices in sustainable reporting (SEC, 2010; Carmo & Ribeiro, 2022). Policy-makers should also consider the role of reporting in promoting corporate responsibility and sustainability goals, leveraging reporting requirements as a tool for driving positive social and environmental outcomes (OECD, 2016; GRI, 2023).

6.3. Consideration of Limitations and Areas for Future Research

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of this study, which may include sample bias, researcher subjectivity, and the context-specific nature of the findings (Yin, 2009; Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Future research could address these limitations by employing larger and more diverse samples, employing triangulation methods to enhance the validity and reliability of findings, and conducting comparative studies across different industries, regions, and regulatory contexts.

Additionally, there are several areas for future research that warrant further exploration. For example, longitudinal studies could assess the evolution and impact of sustainable reporting practices over time, providing insights into the effectiveness of reporting initiatives and their long-term implications for organizational behavior and performance (Gray et al., 2003; Guthrie and Farneti, 2008). Comparative studies could examine cross-cultural differences in reporting practices and stakeholder expectations, shedding light on the contextual fac-

tors that shape reporting behaviors in different contexts (Rosli et al., 2016).

Furthermore, research could explore the role of emerging technologies, such as blockchain and artificial intelligence, in enhancing the transparency, efficiency, and credibility of sustainable reporting practices (Carmo & Ribeiro, 2022; Khandelwal et al., 2023). Additionally, there is a need for more interdisciplinary research that integrates insights from fields such as psychology, sociology, and environmental science to deepen our understanding of the psychological, social, and environmental dimensions of reporting practices (Van der Laan Smith et al., 2014; Rosli et al., 2016).

6.4. Reflections on the Significance of Qualitative Perspectives in Advancing Understanding of Sustainable Reporting

Qualitative perspectives play a crucial role in advancing understanding of sustainable reporting by providing rich, contextual insights into the motivations, experiences, and challenges of stakeholders involved in reporting practices (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). Qualitative research allows researchers to explore the complexity and nuance of reporting behaviors, uncovering underlying dynamics that may not be fully captured through quantitative methods or secondary data analysis alone (Patton, 2002).

Moreover, qualitative research facilitates stakeholder engagement and collaboration, empowering participants to voice their perspectives, concerns, and aspirations related to reporting practices (Bryman, 2016). By centering the experiences and voices of stakeholders, qualitative research contributes to more inclusive, participatory, and accountable reporting processes that reflect the diverse interests and values of stakeholders (Greenwood and Levin, 2006).

In summary, qualitative perspectives are instrumental in deepening our understanding of sustainable reporting and its implications for corporate responsibility, governance, and sustainability (Tracy, 2019). By embracing qualitative research methods and valuing diverse stakeholder perspectives, researchers can generate insights that inform theory, practice, and policy in meaningful and impactful ways (Creswell and Poth, 2016).

7. Conclusion

In summary, this study has explored stakeholders' perspectives on sustainable reporting disclosures, uncovering key themes and patterns that shed light on the motivations, challenges, and implications of reporting practices. The findings highlight the importance of transparency, credibility, and stakeholder engagement in driving meaningful reporting practices, as well as the role of reporting in shaping corporate governance structures and processes. These insights contribute to a richer understanding of corporate responsibility and sustainable reporting and have important implications for theory, practice, and policy.

7.1. Summary of Main Findings and Their Implications

The main findings of this study include:

- Motivations for sustainable reporting, including regulatory compliance, stakeholder pressure, and reputation management.
- Challenges and barriers to reporting, such as the lack of standardized frameworks and concerns about credibility and comparability.
- The role of reporting in stakeholder engagement and corporate governance, emphasizing the importance of transparency and accountability.

These findings have implications for theory, practice, and policy, underscoring the need for organizations to adopt a holistic and strategic approach to sustainable reporting that prioritizes transparency, credibility, and stakeholder engagement. Moreover, the integration of reporting into corporate governance structures can enhance accountability and drive meaningful change within organizations, contributing to broader sustainability goals.

7.2. Reiteration of the Importance of Qualitative Approaches

Qualitative approaches play a critical role in enhancing understanding of corporate responsibility and sustainable reporting by providing rich, contextual insights into stakeholders' perspectives and experiences. By embracing qualitative research methods, researchers can uncover underlying dynamics and nuances that may not be fully captured through quantitative methods alone. Qualitative research also facilitates stakeholder engagement and collaboration, empowering participants to voice their perspectives and contribute to more inclusive and accountable reporting processes.

7.3. Recommendations for Practitioners, Policymakers, and Researchers

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations can be made for practitioners, policymakers, and researchers:

- Practitioners should prioritize transparency, credibility, and stakeholder engagement in their reporting efforts to build trust and legitimacy with key stakeholders.
- Policymakers should promote standardized reporting frameworks, ensure the comparability and reliability of reported information, and incentivize companies to adopt best practices in sustainable reporting.
- Researchers should conduct further research to address limitations and explore emerging trends and topics in sustainable reporting, such as the role of emerging technologies and cross-cultural differences in reporting practices.

7.4. Closing Remarks and Suggestions for Future Research Directions

In conclusion, this study has provided valuable insights into the complexities and challenges of sustainable reporting and its implications for corporate responsibility and governance. Moving forward, future research should continue to explore these issues in greater depth, employing diverse methodologies and interdisciplinary approaches to deepen our understanding of reporting practices

and their impacts. By embracing qualitative perspectives and engaging stakeholders in meaningful dialogue, researchers can contribute to more inclusive, transparent, and accountable reporting processes that support sustainable development goals and foster positive social and environmental outcomes.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Adams, C. A., Hill, W. Y., & Roberts, C. B. (1998). Corporate Social Reporting Practices in Western Europe: Legitimizing Corporate Behaviour? *The British Accounting Review*, *30*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1006/bare.1997.0060>
- Agudelo, M. A. L., Johannsdottir, L., & Davidsdottir, B. (2020). Drivers That Motivate Energy Companies to Be Responsible. A Systematic Literature Review of Corporate Social Responsibility in the Energy Sector. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *247*, Article ID: 119094. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119094>
- Arowoshegbe, A. O., Emmanuel, U., & Gina, A. (2016). Sustainability and Triple Bottom Line: An Overview of Two Interrelated Concepts. *Igbinedion University Journal of Accounting*, *2*, 88-126.
- Boiral, O., Heras-Saizarbitoria, I., & Brotherton, M. C. (2019). Assessing and Improving the Quality of Sustainability Reports: The Auditors' Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *155*, 703-721. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3516-4>
- Bradford, M., Earp, J. B., Showalter, D. S., & Williams, P. F. (2017). Corporate Sustainability Reporting and Stakeholder Concerns: Is There a Disconnect? *Accounting Horizons*, *31*, 83-102. <https://doi.org/10.2308/acch-51639>
- Brockett, A., & Rezaee, Z. (2012). *Corporate Sustainability: Integrating Performance and Reporting* (Vol. 630). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119202899>
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Camilleri, M. A. (2017). *Corporate Sustainability, Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. Springer International Publishing.
- Carmo, C., & Ribeiro, C. (2022). Mandatory Non-Financial Information Disclosure under European Directive 95/2014/EU: Evidence from Portuguese Listed Companies. *Sustainability*, *14*, Article No. 4860. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14084860>
- Cho, C. H., Laine, M., Roberts, R. W., & Rodrigue, M. (2015). Organized Hypocrisy, Organizational Façades, and Sustainability Reporting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *40*, 78-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2014.12.003>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. Sage Publications.
- De Gooyert, V., Rouwette, E., Van Kranenburg, H., & Freeman, E. (2017). Reviewing the Role of Stakeholders in Operational Research: A Stakeholder Theory Perspective. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *262*, 402-410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2017.03.079>
- Deegan, C. (2002). Introduction: The Legitimising Effect of Social and Environmental Disclosures—A Theoretical Foundation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Jour-*

- nal*, 15, 282-311. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210435852>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Diwan, H., & Amarayil Sreeraman, B. (2023). From Financial Reporting to ESG Reporting: A Bibliometric Analysis of the Evolution in Corporate Sustainability Disclosures. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 1-37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-03249-2>
- Epstein, M. J., & Roy, M. J. (2001). Sustainability in Action: Identifying and Measuring the Key Performance Drivers. *Long Range Planning*, 34, 585-604. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301\(01\)00084-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(01)00084-X)
- Fonseca, A., McAllister, M. L., & Fitzpatrick, P. (2014). Sustainability Reporting among Mining Corporations: A Constructive Critique of the GRI Approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 84, 70-83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.11.050>
- Freudenreich, B., Lüdeke-Freund, F., & Schaltegger, S. (2020). A Stakeholder Theory Perspective on Business Models: Value Creation for Sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 166, 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04112-z>
- Global Reporting Initiative (2024). *Final Status of Sustainability Reporting in Bangladesh*. <https://www.globalreporting.org/media/0g3ivp35/final-status-of-sustainability-reporting-in-bangladesh.pdf>
- Gray, R. (2010). Is Accounting for Sustainability Actually Accounting for Sustainability... and How Would We Know? An Exploration of Narratives of Organisations and the Planet. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 35, 47-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2009.04.006>
- Gray, R. H., Owen, D. L., & Adams, C. A. (2003). *Accounting and Accountability: Changes and Challenges in Corporate Social and Environmental Reporting*.
- Gray, R., Kouhy, R., & Lavers, S. (1995). Corporate Social and Environmental Reporting: A Review of the Literature and a Longitudinal Study of UK Disclosure. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 8, 47-77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513579510146996>
- Greenwood, D. J., & Levin, M. (2006). *Introduction to Action Research: Social Research for Social Change*. SAGE Publications.
- GRI (2023). *GRI Standards*. Global Reporting Initiative. <https://www.globalreporting.org/standards/>
- Gunawan, J. (2015). Corporate Social Disclosures in Indonesia: Stakeholders' Influence and Motivation. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 11, 535-552. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-04-2014-0048>
- Guthrie, J., & Farneti, F. (2008). GRI Sustainability Reporting by Australian Public Sector Organizations. *Public Money and Management*, 28, 361-366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9302.2008.00670.x>
- Hahn, R., & Kühnen, M. (2013). Determinants of Sustainability Reporting: A Review of Results, Trends, Theory, and Opportunities in an Expanding Field of Research. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 59, 5-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.005>
- Haski-Leventhal, D. (2018). *Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility: Tools and Theories for Responsible Management*. Sage.
- Helfaya, A., Whittington, M., & Alawattage, C. (2019). Exploring the Quality of Corporate Environmental Reporting: Surveying Preparers' and Users' Perceptions. *Account-*

- ing, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 32, 163-193.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-04-2015-2023>
- Herold, D. M. (2018). Demystifying the Link between Institutional Theory and Stakeholder Theory in Sustainability Reporting. *Economics, Management and Sustainability*, 3, 6-19. <https://doi.org/10.14254/jems.2018.3-2.1>
- Herremans, I. M., Nazari, J. A., & Mahmoudian, F. (2016). Stakeholder Relationships, Engagement, and Sustainability Reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 138, 417-435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2634-0>
- Higgins, C., & Larrinaga, C. (2014). Sustainability Reporting: Insights from Institutional Theory. In *Sustainability Accounting and Accountability* (pp. 273-285). Routledge.
- Jamali, D. (2008). A Stakeholder Approach to Corporate Social Responsibility: A Fresh Perspective into Theory and Practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 213-231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9572-4>
- Junior, R. M., Best, P. J., & Cotter, J. (2014). Sustainability Reporting and Assurance: A Historical Analysis on a World-Wide Phenomenon. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1637-y>
- Khandelwal, V., Sharma, P., & Chotia, V. (2023). ESG Disclosure and Firm Performance: An Asset-Pricing Approach. *Risks*, 11, Article No. 112. <https://doi.org/10.3390/risks11060112>
- Landrum, N. E., & Ohsowski, B. (2018). Identifying Worldviews on Corporate Sustainability: A Content Analysis of Corporate Sustainability Reports. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 27, 128-151. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.1989>
- McNulty, T., Zattoni, A., & Douglas, T. (2013). Developing Corporate Governance Research through Qualitative Methods: A Review of Previous Studies. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 21, 183-198. <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12006>
- Michelon, G., Pilonato, S., & Ricceri, F. (2015). CSR Reporting Practices and the Quality of Disclosure: An Empirical Analysis. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 33, 59-78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2014.10.003>
- Miller, E., Buys, L., & Summerville, J. (2007). Quantifying the Social Dimension of Triple Bottom Line: Development of a Framework and Indicators to Assess the Social Impact of Organisations. *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*, 3, 223-237. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBGE.2007.014314>
- Milne, M. J., Kearins, K., & Walton, S. (2006). Creating Adventures in Wonderland: The Journey Metaphor and Environmental Sustainability. *Organization*, 13, 801-839. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508406068506>
- Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 853-886. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9711022105>
- Moneva, J. M., Archel, P., & Correa, C. (2006). GRI and the Camouflaging of Corporate Unsustainability. *Accounting Forum*, 30, 121-137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2006.02.001>
- Nazari, J. A., Herremans, I. M., & Warsame, H. A. (2015). Sustainability Reporting: External Motivators and Internal Facilitators. *Corporate Governance*, 15, 375-390. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-01-2014-0003>
- OECD (2016). *G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance*. OECD Publishing.
- Panwar, R., Rinne, T., Hansen, E., & Juslin, H. (2006). Corporate Responsibility: Balancing Economic, Environmental, and Social Issues in the Forest Products Industry. *Forest Products Journal*, 56, 4-13.

- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. Sage.
- Perego, P., & Kolk, A. (2012). Multinationals' Accountability on Sustainability: The Evolution of Third-Party Assurance of Sustainability Reports. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *110*, 173-190. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1420-5>
- Qian, W., Tilt, C., Dissanayake, D., & Kuruppu, S. (2020). Motivations and Impacts of Sustainability Reporting in the Indo-Pacific Region: Normative and Instrumental Stakeholder Approaches. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *29*, 3370-3384. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2577>
- Roberts, R. W. (1992). Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure: An Application of Stakeholder Theory. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *17*, 595-612. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682\(92\)90015-K](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682(92)90015-K)
- Rosli, M. H., Fauzi, N. A., MohdAzami, M. F. A., Mohd, F., & Said, J. (2016). *Company Characteristics and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure of Malaysian Listed Companies*.
- Schreck, P., & Raithel, S. (2018). Corporate Social Performance, Firm Size, and Organizational Visibility: Distinct and Joint Effects on Voluntary Sustainability Reporting. *Business & Society*, *57*, 742-778. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650315613120>
- Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) (2010). *Commission Guidance Regarding Disclosure Related to Climate Change*. Interpretation, SEC, February, 2.
- Sideri, L. (2021). Leveraging CSR for Sustainability: Assessing Performance Implications of Sustainability Reporting in a National Business System. *Sustainability*, *13*, Article No. 5987. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13115987>
- Solomon, J. (2020). *Corporate Governance and Accountability*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*, 571-610. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331>
- Tauringana, V. (2021). Sustainability Reporting Challenges in Developing Countries: Towards Management Perceptions Research Evidence-Based Practices. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, *11*, 194-215. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAEE-01-2020-0007>
- Tracy, S. J. (2019). *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tudor-Tiron, A., & Dragu, I. (2014). From Sustainability to Integrated Reporting—The Political Perspective of Institutional Theory. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai*, *59*, 20-33.
- Unerman, J. (2000). Methodological Issues-Reflections on Quantification in Corporate Social Reporting Content Analysis. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *13*, 667-681. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570010353756>
- van der Laan Smith, J., Gouldman, A. L., & Tondkar, R. H. (2014). Does the Adoption of IFRS Affect Corporate Social Disclosure in Annual Reports? *Advances in Accounting*, *30*, 402-412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adiac.2014.09.015>
- Verma, P., & Singh, A. (2016). Fostering Stakeholders Trust through CSR Reporting: An Analytical Focus. *IIM Kozhikode Society & Management Review*, *5*, 186-199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2277975215618473>
- Vitolla, F., & Rubino, M. (2017). Legitimacy Theory and Sustainability Reporting. Evidence from Italy. *10th Annual Conference of the EuroMed Academy of Business*, *1*, 1835-1848.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (Vol. 5). Sage.

Yip, E., Van Staden, C., & Cahan, S. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting and Earnings Management: The Role of Political Costs. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, 5, 17-34.