

[Home](#) > [Journal of Business Ethics](#) > [Article](#)

# Legitimizing Negative Aspects in GRI-Oriented Sustainability Reporting: A Qualitative Analysis of Corporate Disclosure Strategies



| Published: 09 August 2013

| Volume 123, pages 401–420, (2014) [Cite this article](#)[Journal of Business Ethics](#)[Aims and scope](#) →[Submit manuscript](#) →[Rüdiger Hahn](#) <sup>1</sup> & [Regina Lülfs](#)<sup>2</sup> 18k Accesses  288 Citations  1 Altmetric [Explore all metrics](#) →

## Abstract

Corporate sustainability reports are supposed to provide a complete and balanced picture of corporate sustainability performance. They are, however, usually voluntary and thus prone to interpretation and even greenwashing tendencies. To overcome this problem, the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) provides standardized reporting guidelines challenging companies to report positive and negative aspects of an organization's sustainability performance. However, the reporting of "negative aspects" in particular can endanger corporate legitimacy if perceived by the stakeholders as not being in line with societal norms and values. Starting from the theoretical lenses of economics-based disclosure theories and socio-political theories of disclosure, the focus of this study therefore was to

analyze the communicative legitimation strategies companies use to report “negative aspects,” i.e., negative ecological and social impact caused by corporate activity. Using qualitative content analysis of GRI-oriented sustainability reports from companies listed on the US Dow Jones Industrial Average Index and on the German DAX Index, we identified six legitimation strategies. We discuss these strategies regarding to symbolic and substantial management of legitimacy. We show that symbolic legitimation strategies aiming at modifying the perception of legitimizing stakeholders dominate in the reports at hand. Such persuasion, however, does not meet the requirement of impartiality as postulated by the GRI guidelines. Building upon this conclusion we propose a concise characterization of “negative aspects” and develop a GRI-compliant schema of reporting about them. In doing so, we offer a way to improve the overall “balance” of sustainability reporting contributing to a true and fair view in sustainability disclosure.

 This is a preview of subscription content, [log in via an institution](#)  to check access.

### Access this article

[Log in via an institution](#) →

[Buy article PDF 39,95 €](#)

Price includes VAT (Poland)

Instant access to the full article PDF.

Rent this article via [DeepDyve](#) 


[Institutional subscriptions](#) →

### Similar content being viewed by others




### **Sustainability Reporting in Croatia: The Challenges of Sustainable Business**

Chapter | © 2017



### **Perceived Importance of Corporate Sustainability Disclosure: Evidence from China**

Chapter | © 2018



### **An emerging economy perspective on corporate sustainability reporting – main**

Article | Open access

01 August 2019

## Notes

1. Corporate reports on non-financial issues offer plenty of labels, such as Corporate Citizenship Report, Corporate (Social) Responsibility Report, Sustainable Development Report, Sustainable Value Report, and Sustainability Report, while all referring to the same issues. We use the aforementioned terms interchangeably to reflect the reality of corporate non-financial reporting (see Table 3 in Appendix). This handling of terms is backed by recent characterizations of corporate sustainability and CSR that are gradually converging (see, e.g., Hahn 2011). Dyllick and Hockerts (2002) define corporate sustainability as “meeting the needs of a firm’s direct and indirect stakeholders [...], without compromising its ability to meet the needs of future stakeholders as well” (p. 131). To achieve this goal, they note that companies need “to maintain their economic, social, and environmental capital base” (p. 132). Similarly, the European Commission (2011), for example, defines CSR as “the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society [...] to integrate social, environmental, ethical, human rights, and consumer concerns into their business operations and core strategy” (p. 6). The International Organization for Standardization (2010) characterizes it as the “responsibility of an organization for the impacts of its decisions and activities on society and the environment” (p. 3) while directly referring to the maximization of the contribution to sustainable development as the “overarching objective for an organization” (p. 10).

2. I.e., offering a picture of the reporting company that provides comparative truth by complying with all relevant accounting principles. For a historical overview in financial reporting see Georgiou and Jack ([2011](#)) or Chambers and Wolnizer ([1991](#)).
3. We computed the liberal Holsti coefficient of reliability with 0.86 and the more conservative Krippendorff's alpha with 0.834 (Krippendorff [2004](#)).
4. According to the GRI, "relevant topics and Indicators are those that may reasonably be considered important for reflecting the organization's economic, environmental, and social impacts, or influencing the decisions of stakeholders, and, therefore, potentially merit inclusion in the report. Materiality is the threshold at which topics or Indicators become sufficiently important that they should be reported" (GRI [2011](#), p. 8).

## References

---

Allen, M. W., & Caillouet, R. H. (1994). Legitimation endeavors: Impression management strategies used by an organization in crisis. *Communication Monographs*, 61(1), 44–62. doi:[10.1080/03637759409376322](https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759409376322).

[Google Scholar](#)

Archambeault, D. S., DeZoort, F. T., & Holt, T. P. (2008). The need for an internal auditor report to external stakeholders to improve governance transparency. *Accounting Horizons*, 22(4), 375–388. doi:[10.2308/acch.2008.22.4.375](https://doi.org/10.2308/acch.2008.22.4.375).

[Google Scholar](#)

Ashforth, B. E., & Gibbs, B. W. (1990). The double-edge of organizational legitimation. *Organization Science*, 1(2), 177–194. doi:[10.1287/orsc.1.2.177](https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1.2.177).

Avenier, M.-J. (2010). Shaping a constructivist view of organizational design science. *Organization Studies*, 31(9-10), 1229-1255.  
doi:[10.1177/0170840610374395](https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840610374395).

[Google Scholar](#)

Bansal, P., & Clelland, I. (2004). Talking trash: Legitimacy, impression management, and unsystematic risk in the context of the natural environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(1), 93-103. doi:[10.2307/20159562](https://doi.org/10.2307/20159562).

[Google Scholar](#)

Bebbington, J., & Larrinage-González, C. (2008). Corporate social reporting and reputation risk management. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 21(3), 337-361. doi:[10.1108/09513570810863932](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570810863932).

[Google Scholar](#)

Belal, A. R., & Roberts, R. W. (2010). Stakeholders' perceptions of corporate social reporting in Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(2), 311-324.  
doi:[10.1007/s10551-010-0511-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0511-4).

[Google Scholar](#)

Benoit, W. L. (1997). Image repair discourse and crisis communication. *Public Relations Review*, 23(2), 177-186.

[Google Scholar](#)

Birnbaum, M. H., & Stegner, S. E. (1979). Source credibility in social judgment: Bias, expertise, and the judge's point of view. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(1), 48-74.

[Google Scholar](#)

Blacconiere, W. G., & Patten, D. M. (1994). Environmental disclosures, regulatory costs, and changes in firm value. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 18(3), 357–377. doi:[10.1016/0165-4101\(94\)90026-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-4101(94)90026-4).

[Google Scholar](#)

Bliege Bird, R., & Smith, E. A. (2005). Signaling theory, strategic interaction, and symbolic capital. *Current Anthropology*, 46(2), 221–248. doi:[10.1086/427115](https://doi.org/10.1086/427115).

[Google Scholar](#)

Bloomfield, R. J. (2002). The “incomplete revelation hypothesis” and financial reporting. *Accounting Horizons*, 16(3), 233–243. doi:[10.2308/acch.2002.16.3.233](https://doi.org/10.2308/acch.2002.16.3.233).

[Google Scholar](#)

Boele, R., Fabig, H., & Wheeler, D. (2001). Shell, Nigeria and the Ogoni. A study in unsustainable development: I. The story of Shell, Nigeria and the Ogoni people—Environment, economy, relationships: Conflict and prospects for resolution. *Sustainable Development*, 9(2), 74–86. doi:[10.1002/sd.161](https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.161).

[Google Scholar](#)

Bromley, P., & Powell, W. W. (2012). From smoke and mirrors to walking the talk: Decoupling in the contemporary world. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 6(1), 483–530. doi:[10.1080/19416520.2012.684462](https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2012.684462).

[Google Scholar](#)

Brown, N., & Deegan, C. (1998). The public disclosure of environmental performance information—A dual test of media agenda setting theory and legitimacy theory. *Accounting and Business Research*, 29(1), 21–41. doi:[10.1080/00014788.1998.9729564](https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.1998.9729564).

[Google Scholar](#)

Campbell, D., Shrives, P., & Bohmbach-Saager, H. (2001). Voluntary disclosure of mission statements in corporate annual reports: Signaling what and to whom? *Business and Society Review*, 106(1), 65–87. doi:[10.1111/0045-3609.00102](https://doi.org/10.1111/0045-3609.00102).

[Google Scholar](#)

Carlisle, Y. M., & Faulkner, D. O. (2004). Corporate social responsibility: A stages framework. *European Business Journal*, 16(4), 143–151.

[Google Scholar](#)

Castelló, I., & Lozano, J. M. (2011). Searching for new forms of legitimacy through corporate responsibility rhetoric. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(1), 11–29. doi:[10.1007/s10551-011-0770-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0770-8).

[Google Scholar](#)

Chambers, R. J., & Wolnizer, P. W. (1991). A true and fair view of position and results: the historical background. *Accounting, Business & Financial History*, 1(2), 197–214. doi:[10.1080/09585209100000029](https://doi.org/10.1080/09585209100000029).

[Google Scholar](#)

Chan, C. C. C., & Milne, M. J. (1999). Investor reactions to corporate environmental saints and sinners: an experimental analysis. *Accounting and Business Research*, 29(4), 265–279. doi:[10.1080/00014788.1999.9729588](https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.1999.9729588).

[Google Scholar](#)

Cho, C. H. (2009). Legitimation strategies used in response to environmental disaster: A French case study of Total SA's Erika and AZF incidents. *European Accounting Review*, 18(1), 33–62. doi:[10.1080/09638180802579616](https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180802579616).

[Google Scholar](#)

Cho, C. H., & Patten, D. M. (2007). The role of environmental disclosures as tools of legitimacy: A research note. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 32(7-8), 639-647. doi:[10.1016/j.aos.2006.09.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2006.09.009).

[Google Scholar](#)

Cho, C. H., Roberts, R. W., & Patten, D. M. (2010). The language of US corporate environmental disclosure. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 35(4), 431-443. doi:[10.1016/j.aos.2009.10.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2009.10.002).

[Google Scholar](#)

Clarkson, P. M., Li, Y., Richardson, G. D., & Vasvari, F. P. (2008). Revisiting the relation between environmental performance and environmental disclosure: An empirical analysis. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 33, 303-327. doi:[10.1016/j.aos.2007.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2007.05.003).

[Google Scholar](#)

Clatworthy, M., & Jones, M. J. (2003). Financial reporting of good news and bad news: Evidence from accounting narratives. *Accounting and Business Research*, 33(3), 171-185. doi:[10.1080/00014788.2003.9729645](https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2003.9729645).

[Google Scholar](#)

Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2010). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 39-67. doi:[10.1177/0149206310388419](https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419).

[Google Scholar](#)

Coram, P. J., Monroe, G. S., & Woodliff, D. R. (2009). The value of assurance on voluntary nonfinancial disclosure: An experimental evaluation. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 28(1), 137-151. doi:[10.2308/aud.2009.28.1.137](https://doi.org/10.2308/aud.2009.28.1.137).



Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

[Google Scholar](#)

Deegan, C. (2002). Introduction: The legitimising effect of social and environmental disclosures—A theoretical foundation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 282–311. doi:[10.1108/09513570210435852](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210435852).

[Google Scholar](#)

Deegan, C. (2004). Environmental disclosures and share prices—A discussion about efforts to study this relationship. *Accounting Forum*, 28(1), 87–97. doi:[10.1016/j.accfor.2004.04.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2004.04.007).

[Google Scholar](#)

Deegan, C., & Rankin, M. (1996). Do Australian companies report environmental news objectively?: An analysis of environmental disclosures by firms prosecuted successfully by the Environmental Protection Authority. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 9(2), 50–67. doi:[10.1108/09513579610116358](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513579610116358).

[Google Scholar](#)

Deegan, C., Rankin, M., & Tobin, J. (2002). An examination of the corporate social and environmental disclosures of BHP from 1983–1997: A test of legitimacy theory. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 312–343. doi:[10.1108/09513570210435861](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210435861).

[Google Scholar](#)

Dhaliwal, D. S., Radhakrishnan, S., Tsang, A., & Yang, Y. G. (2012). Nonfinancial disclosure and analyst forecast accuracy: International evidence on corporate

social responsibility disclosure. *The Accounting Review*, 87(3), 723–759.

doi:[10.2308/accr-10218](https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-10218).

[Google Scholar](#)

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.

[Google Scholar](#)

Dowling, J., & Pfeffer, J. (1975). Organizational legitimacy: Social values and organizational behavior. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 18(1), 122–136.

doi:[10.2307/1388226](https://doi.org/10.2307/1388226).

[Google Scholar](#)

Duriau, V. J., Reger, R. K., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2007). A content analysis of the content analysis literature in organization studies: Research themes, data sources, and methodological refinements. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(1), 5–34. doi:[10.1177/1094428106289252](https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106289252).

[Google Scholar](#)

Dye, R. A. (1985). Disclosure of nonproprietary information. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 23(1), 123–145.

[Google Scholar](#)

Dyllick, T., & Hockerts, K. (2002). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 11(2), 130–141.

doi:[10.1002/bse.323](https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.323).

[Google Scholar](#)

Erickson, S. L., Weber, M., & Segovia, J. (2011). Using communication theory to analyze corporate reporting strategies. *Journal of Business Communication*, 48(2), 207-223. doi:[10.1177/0021943611399728](https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943611399728).

[Google Scholar](#)

European Commission. (2011). *A Renewed EU Strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility*. Brussels: European Commission.

[Google Scholar](#)

Fortanier, F., Kolk, A., & Pinkse, J. (2011). Harmonization in CSR reporting: MNEs and global CSR standards. *Management International Review*, 51(5), 665-696. doi:[10.1007/s11575-011-0089-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-011-0089-9).

[Google Scholar](#)

Gallo, P. J., & Jones Christensen, L. (2011). Firm size matters: An empirical investigation of organizational size and ownership on sustainability-related behaviors. *Business & Society*, 50(2), 315-349. doi:[10.1177/0007650311398784](https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650311398784).

[Google Scholar](#)

Georgiou, O., & Jack, L. (2011). In pursuit of legitimacy: A history behind fair value accounting. *The British Accounting Review*, 43(4), 311-323. doi:[10.1016/j.bar.2011.08.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2011.08.001).

[Google Scholar](#)

Global Sustainable Investment Alliance. (2012). *2012 Global Sustainable Investment Review* (n.p.). Washington, DC: Global Sustainable Investment Alliance.

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(2), 47-77. doi:[10.1108/09513579510146996](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513579510146996).

[Google Scholar](#)

GRI. (2011). *Sustainability Reporting Guidelines: Version 3.1*. Amsterdam: GRI.

[Google Scholar](#)

Grunig, J. E. (2003). Constructing public relations theory and practice. In R. F. Carter, B. Dervin, S. H. Chaffee, & L. Foreman-Wernet (Eds.), *Communication, a different kind of horserace: Essays honoring Richard F. Carter* (pp. 85-115). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Guidry, R. P., & Patten, D. M. (2012). Voluntary disclosure theory and financial control variables: An assessment of recent environmental disclosure research. *Accounting Forum*, 36(2), 81-90. doi:[10.1016/j.accfor.2012.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2012.03.002).

[Google Scholar](#)

Hahn, R. (2011). Integrating corporate responsibility and sustainable development: A normative-conceptual approach to holistic management thinking. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 2(1), 8-22. doi:[10.1108/20412561111128492](https://doi.org/10.1108/20412561111128492).

[Google Scholar](#)

Hahn, R. (2012). Standardizing social responsibility? New perspectives on guidance documents and management system standards for sustainable development. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 59(4), 717-727. doi:[10.1109/TEM.2012.2183639](https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2012.2183639).

[Google Scholar](#)

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*. doi: [10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.005).

[Google Scholar](#)

Haniffa, R., & Cooke, T. E. (2005). The impact of culture and governance on corporate social reporting. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 24(5), 391–430. doi:[10.1016/j.jaccpubpol.2005.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccpubpol.2005.06.001).

Higgins, C., & Walker, R. (2012). Ethos, logos, pathos: Strategies of persuasion in social/environmental reports. *Accounting Forum*, 36(3), 194–208. doi:[10.1016/j.accfor.2012.02.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2012.02.003).

[Google Scholar](#)

Holder-Webb, L., Cohen, J. R., Nath, L., & Wood, D. (2009). The supply of corporate social responsibility disclosures among U.S. firms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(4), 497–527. doi:[10.1007/s10551-008-9721-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9721-4).

[Google Scholar](#)

Hooghiemstra, R. (2000). Corporate communication and impression management: New perspectives why companies engage in corporate social reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27, 55–68. doi:[10.1023/A:1006400707757](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006400707757).

[Google Scholar](#)

Hrasky, S. (2012). Carbon footprints and legitimation strategies: Symbolism or action? *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 25(1), 174–198. doi:[10.1108/09513571211191798](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513571211191798).

[Google Scholar](#)

Hughes, S. B., Anderson, A., & Golden, S. (2001). Corporate environmental

disclosures: Are they useful in determining environmental performance? *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 20(3), 217-240. doi:[10.1016/S0278-4254\(01\)00031-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4254(01)00031-X).

[Google Scholar](#)

International Organization for Standardization. (2010). *ISO 26000—Guidance on Social Responsibility*. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.

[Google Scholar](#)

Johansen, T. R. (2010). Employees, non-financial reports and institutional arrangements: A study of accounts in the workplace. *European Accounting Review*, 19(1), 97-130. doi:[10.1080/09638180902989392](https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180902989392).

[Google Scholar](#)

Joseph, G. (2012). Ambiguous but tethered: An accounting basis for sustainability reporting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 23(2), 93-106. doi:[10.1016/j.cpa.2011.11.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2011.11.011).

[Google Scholar](#)

Kahneman, D., & Frederick, S. (2002). Representativeness revisited: Attribute substitution in intuitive judgment. In T. Gilovich, D. W. Griffin, & D. Kahneman (Eds.), *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgement* (pp. 49-81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Kim, J.-N., Bach, S. B., & Clelland, I. J. (2007). Symbolic or behavioral management? Corporate reputation in high-emission industries. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(2), 77-98. doi:[10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550042](https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550042).

[Google Scholar](#)

KPMG. (2011). *KPMG International Survey of Corporate Responsibility Reporting 2011* (n.p.). New York: KPMG.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

[Google Scholar](#)

Lang, M., & Lundholm, R. (1993). Cross-sectional determinants of analyst ratings of corporate disclosures. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 31(2), 246-271.

[Google Scholar](#)

Lindblom, C. K. (2010). The implications of organizational legitimacy for corporate social performance and disclosure. In R. Gray, J. Bebbington, & S. Gray (Eds.), *Social and environmental accounting: Developing the field* (pp. 51-63). Los Angeles: Sage.

[Google Scholar](#)

Lougee, B., & Wallace, J. (2008). The corporate social responsibility (CSR) trend. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 20(1), 96-108. doi:[10.1111/j.1745-6622.2008.00172.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6622.2008.00172.x).

[Google Scholar](#)

Manetti, G. (2011). The quality of stakeholder engagement in sustainability reporting: Empirical evidence and critical points. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 18(2), 110-122. doi:[10.1002/csr.255](https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.255).

[Google Scholar](#)

Manetti, G., & Becatti, L. (2009). Assurance services for sustainability reports: Standards and empirical evidence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, 289-298. doi:[10.1007/s10551-008-9809-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9809-x).

Marshall, R. S., & Brown, D. (2003). Corporate environmental reporting: What's in a metric? *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 12(2), 87–106.  
doi:[10.1002/bse.354](https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.354).

Matten, D., & Moon, J. (2008). “Implicit” and “explicit” CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 404–424.  
doi:[10.5465/AMR.2008.31193458](https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2008.31193458).

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social research*, 1(2), Article 20.

Mayring, P. (2010). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken* (11th ed.). Weinheim: Beltz.

Merkel-Davies, D. M., & Brennan, N. M. (2007). Discretionary disclosure strategies in corporate narratives: Incremental information or impression management? *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 26, 116–196.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363.



Milne, M. J., & Patten, D. M. (2002). Securing organizational legitimacy: An experimental decision case examining the impact of environmental disclosures. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 372–405.  
doi:[10.1108/09513570210435889](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210435889).

[Google Scholar](#)

Mruck, K., & Breuer, F. (2003). Subjectivity and reflexivity in qualitative research —The FQS issues. *Forum: Qualitative Social research*, 4(2), Article 23.

Muralidharan, S., Dillistone, K., & Shin, J.-H. (2011). The Gulf Coast oil spill: Extending the theory of image restoration discourse to the realm of social media and beyond petroleum. *Public Relations Review*, 37(3), 226–232.  
doi:[10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.04.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.04.006).

[Google Scholar](#)

Neu, D., Warsame, H., & Pedwell, K. (1998). Managing public impressions: Environmental disclosures in annual reports. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 23(3), 265–282. doi:[10.1016/S0361-3682\(97\)00008-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682(97)00008-1).

[Google Scholar](#)

O'Donovan, G. (2002). Environmental disclosures in the annual report: Extending the applicability and predictive power of legitimacy theory. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 344–371. doi:[10.1108/09513570210435870](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210435870).

[Google Scholar](#)

Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies*, 24(3), 403–441.  
doi:[10.1177/0170840603024003910](https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840603024003910).

[Google Scholar](#)

Palazzo, G., & Scherer, A. G. (2006). Corporate legitimacy as deliberation: A communicative framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(1), 71–88. doi:[10.1007/s10551-006-9044-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9044-2).

[Google Scholar](#)

Patten, D. M. (1992). Intra-industry environmental disclosures in response to the Alaskan oil spill: A note on legitimacy theory. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 17(5), 471–475. doi:[10.1016/0361-3682\(92\)90042-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682(92)90042-Q).

[Google Scholar](#)

Patten, D. M. (2002). The relation between environmental performance and environmental disclosure: A research note. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 27(8), 763–773. doi:[10.1016/S0361-3682\(02\)00028-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682(02)00028-4).

[Google Scholar](#)

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.

[Google Scholar](#)

Philippe, D., & Durand, R. (2011). The impact of norm-conforming behaviors on firm reputation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(9), 969–993. doi:[10.1002/smj.919](https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.919).

[Google Scholar](#)

Potter, W. J., & Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999). Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27(3), 258–284. doi:[10.1080/00909889909365539](https://doi.org/10.1080/00909889909365539).

[Google Scholar](#)

Reimsbach, D., & Hahn, R. (2013). The effects of negative incidents in sustainability reporting on investors' judgments - An experimental study of third-party versus self-disclosure in the realm of sustainable development. *Business Strategy and the Environment, Early View*. doi:[10.1002/bse.1816](https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.1816).

[Google Scholar](#)

Roome, N. (1992). Developing environmental management strategies. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 1*(1), 11-24. doi:[10.1002/bse.3280010104](https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3280010104).

Skinner, D. J. (1994). Why firms voluntarily disclose bad news. *Journal of Accounting Research, 32*(1), 38-60.

[Google Scholar](#)

Smith, J. A., Morreale, M., & Mariani, M. E. (2008). Climate change disclosure: Moving towards a brave new world. *Capital Markets Law Journal, 3*(4), 469-485. doi:[10.1093/cmlj/kmn021](https://doi.org/10.1093/cmlj/kmn021).

[Google Scholar](#)

Smith, M., & Taffler, R. J. (2000). The chairman's statement—A content analysis of discretionary narrative disclosures. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 13*(5), 624-647. doi:[10.1108/09513570010353738](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570010353738).

[Google Scholar](#)

Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87*(3), 355-374. doi:[10.2307/1882010](https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010).

[Google Scholar](#)

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571-610.

[Google Scholar](#)

Sydserff, R., & Weetman, P. (2002). Developments in content analysis: A transitivity index and scores. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(4), 523–545. doi:[10.1108/09513570210440586](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210440586).

[Google Scholar](#)

Tost, L. P. (2011). An integrative model of legitimacy judgments. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(4), 686–710. doi:[10.5465/amr.2010.0227](https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0227).

[Google Scholar](#)

Ulmer, R. R., & Sellnow, T. L. (2000). Consistent questions of ambiguity in organizational crisis communication: Jack in the box as a case study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 25(2), 143–155. doi:[10.1023/A:1006183805499](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006183805499).

[Google Scholar](#)

Vaara, E. (2006). Pulp and paper fiction: On the discursive legitimation of global industrial restructuring. *Organization Studies*, 27(6), 789–810. doi:[10.1177/0170840606061071](https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840606061071).

[Google Scholar](#)

Våland, T., & Heide, M. (2005). Corporate social responsiveness: Exploring the dynamics of “bad episodes”. *European Management Journal*, 23(5), 495–506. doi:[10.1016/j.emj.2005.09.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2005.09.005).

[Google Scholar](#)

van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication*, 1(1), 91–112. doi:[10.1177/1750481307071986](https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481307071986).

[Google Scholar](#)

Verrecchia, R. E. (1983). Discretionary disclosure. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 5, 179-194. doi:[10.1016/0165-4101\(83\)90011-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-4101(83)90011-3).

[Google Scholar](#)

Walster, E., Aronson, E., & Abrahams, D. (1966). On increasing the persuasiveness of a low prestige communicator. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2(4), 325-342. doi:[10.1016/0022-1031\(66\)90026-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(66)90026-6).

[Google Scholar](#)

Williams, D. E., & Olaniran, B. A. (1994). Exxon's decision-making flaws: The hypervigilant response to the Valdez grounding. *Public Relations Review*, 20(1), 5-18. doi:[10.1016/0363-8111\(94\)90110-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0363-8111(94)90110-4).

[Google Scholar](#)

Yang, K. (2007). Examining perceived honest performance reporting by public organizations: Bureaucratic politics and organizational practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(1), 81-105. doi:[10.1093/jopart/mum042](https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum042).

[Google Scholar](#)

Yuthas, K., Rogers, R., & Dillard, J. F. (2002). Communicative action and corporate annual reports. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 41(1/2), 141-157. doi:[10.1023/A:1021314626311](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021314626311).

[Google Scholar](#)

Zadek, S. (2004). The path to corporate responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(12), 125-132.

[Google Scholar](#)

Zucker, L. G. (1987). Institutional theories of organization. *Annual Review of*

## Acknowledgements

---

We thank Christine Wagner and Michael Kühnen for their input when conducting this study. We also thank the four anonymous reviewers of the *Journal of Business Ethics* for their valuable comments on earlier versions of this paper.

## Author information

---

### Authors and Affiliations

**Faculty of Business and Economics, Universität Kassel, 34109, Kassel, Germany**

Rüdiger Hahn

**Faculty of Business and Economics, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, 40204, Düsseldorf, Germany**

Regina Lülfs

### Corresponding author

Correspondence to [Rüdiger Hahn](#).

## Appendix

---

See Table [3](#).

## Rights and permissions

---

[Reprints and permissions](#)

# About this article

---

## Cite this article

Hahn, R., Lülfes, R. Legitimizing Negative Aspects in GRI-Oriented Sustainability Reporting: A Qualitative Analysis of Corporate Disclosure Strategies. *J Bus Ethics* **123**, 401–420 (2014).

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1801-4>

Received

27 December 2012

Issue Date

September 2014

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1801-4>

Accepted

01 July 2013

Published

09 August 2013

## Keywords

[Sustainability reporting](#)

[Legitimacy](#)

[Disclosure](#)

[Global Reporting Initiative](#)

[Impression management](#)

[Reporting strategy](#)

## Search

Search by keyword or author



## Navigation

Find a journal

Publish with us

Track your research

