

[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](#)[Save article](#)[View saved research](#) >[Journal of Business Ethics](#)[Aims and scope](#) →[Submit manuscript](#) →[Rüdiger Hahn](#) ¹ & [Regina Lülfs](#)² **23k** Accesses  **488** 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](#) →

Subscribe and save

Springer+

from €37.37 /Month

- Starting from 10 chapters or articles per month
- Access and download chapters and articles from more than 300k books and 2,500 journals
- Cancel anytime

[View plans](#) →


Buy Now

Price includes VAT (Poland)

Instant access to the full article PDF.


[Institutional subscriptions](#) →

Similar content being viewed by others



An Integrated GRI-SCOR Framework for Assessing Green Purchasing Disclosure and Implementation in...

Article | 30 March 2026



The Quality of Information of GRI Standards in an Emerging Economy: Evidence from Green Accounting Practices ...

Chapter | © 2021



Corporate uptake of the Sustainable Development Goals: Mere greenwashing or an advent of institutional...

Article | 25 January 2021

Explore related subjects

Discover the latest articles, books and news in related subjects, suggested using machine learning.

[Business Ethics](#)

[Communication of NGOs](#)

[Corporate Social Responsibility](#)

[Discourse Analysis](#)

[Public Relations](#)

[Sustainability](#)

[Corporate Sustainability Assessment and Performance Evaluation](#)

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

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.

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

Campbell, D., Shrives, P., & Bohmbach-Saager, H. (2001). Voluntary disclosure of mission statements in corporate annual reports: Signaling what and to whom?

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

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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.

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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.

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).

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).

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

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).

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).

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

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).

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).

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).

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).

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

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.

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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

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).

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).

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.

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).

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.

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

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.

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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

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).

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).

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).

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.

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).

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).

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).

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

Sydserrff, 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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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).

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

Zucker, L. G. (1987). Institutional theories of organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13(1), 443-464. doi:[10.1146/annurev.so.13.080187.002303](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.13.080187.002303).

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

Corresponding author

Correspondence to [Rüdiger Hahn](#).

Appendix

See Table [3](#).

Rights and permissions

[Reprints and permissions](#)

About this article

Cite this article

Hahn, R., Lülfs, 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

Accepted

01 July 2013

Published

09 August 2013

Issue date

September 2014

DOI

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

Keywords

[Sustainability reporting](#)

[Legitimacy](#)

[Disclosure](#)

[Global Reporting Initiative](#)

[Impression management](#)

[Reporting strategy](#)

Profiles

1. Rüdiger Hahn



[View author profile](#)

Search

Search by keyword or author



Navigation

[Find a journal](#)

[Publish with us](#)

[Track your research](#)