

Dierkes, Meinolf

Book Part — Digitized Version

Corporate social reporting and auditing: theory and practice

Provided in Cooperation with:

WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Suggested Citation: Dierkes, Meinolf (1985) : Corporate social reporting and auditing: theory and practice, In: Klaus J. Hopt, Gunther Teubner (Ed.): Corporate governance and directors' liabilities: legal, economic and sociological analyses on corporate social responsibility, ISBN 3-11-010027-4, de Gruyter, Berlin ; New York, NY, pp. 354-379

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/122638>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.


Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



WZB-Open Access Digitalisate

WZB-Open Access digital copies

Das nachfolgende Dokument wurde zum Zweck der kostenfreien Onlinebereitstellung digitalisiert am Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH (WZB).

Das WZB verfügt über die entsprechenden Nutzungsrechte. Sollten Sie sich durch die Onlineveröffentlichung des Dokuments wider Erwarten dennoch in Ihren Rechten verletzt sehen, kontaktieren Sie bitte das WZB postalisch oder per E-Mail:

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH

Bibliothek und wissenschaftliche Information

Reichpietschufer 50

D-10785 Berlin

E-Mail: bibliothek@wzb.eu

The following document was digitized at the Berlin Social Science Center (WZB) in order to make it publicly available online.

The WZB has the corresponding rights of use. If, against all possibility, you consider your rights to be violated by the online publication of this document, please contact the WZB by sending a letter or an e-mail to:

Berlin Social Science Center (WZB)

Library and Scientific Information

Reichpietschufer 50

D-10785 Berlin

e-mail: bibliothek@wzb.eu

Digitalisierung und Bereitstellung dieser Publikation erfolgten im Rahmen des Retrodigitalisierungsprojektes **OA 1000+**. Weitere Informationen zum Projekt und eine Liste der ca. 1 500 digitalisierten Texte sind unter <http://www.wzb.eu/de/bibliothek/serviceangebote/open-access/oa-1000> verfügbar.

This text was digitizing and published online as part of the digitizing-project **OA 1000+**.

More about the project as well as a list of all the digitized documents (ca. 1 500) can be found at <http://www.wzb.eu/en/library/services/open-access/oa-1000>.

Corporate Social Reporting and Auditing: Theory and Practice*

MEINOLF DIERKES

Berlin

Contents

- I. Introduction: A Historical Survey
- II. Conceptual Bases and Assumptions
- III. Three Models for Social Reporting
 - A. The Inventory Approach
 - B. Goal Accounting and Reporting
 - C. The Social Indicator Concept
- IV. Possible Future Developments
- V. Implementation of Different Models: The Practical Experience
 - A. Quantitative Aspects
 - B. Qualitative Aspects
- VI. The Usefulness and Use of Social Reporting Information
 - A. Basic Questions in Assessing Social Reporting
 - B. Reasons for the Lack of Data on Information Needs
 - C. Some Practical Studies Identifying Information Needs
 - D. Use and Impact of Social Reports
- VII. Useful Social Performance Information: How Can It Be Institutionalized?

I. Introduction: A Historical Survey

The 1960s and 70s witnessed a re-examination of the relations between business and society, the emergence of a new awareness of the breadth of the positive and negative social impacts of business activities, and a concomitant reformulation of the concept of corporate interests and responsibilities (e. g. Vogel, 1978). An outgrowth of this development was the search for ways to expand business information systems "to enable the business corporation to be more responsive to the rapidly changing demands in its sociopolitical environment" (Dierkes and Bauer, 1973: xi). Reporting schemes, indicators of social performance, and assessment criteria were designed by business and the academic community and experimented with by innovative companies. The intention was twofold: to develop an instrument for internal manage-

* The author would like to thank Ariane Berthoin Antal for her collaboration on this article.

ment information purposes, and to provide a means to communicate aspects of business' social involvement to a wide range of constituencies.

The interest in such experiments and new ideas was high during this period. Business journals frequently carried articles on new approaches, and attempts were made to evaluate social reports and the information they provided (Toan, 1973; Dierkes and Coppock, 1978; Harvard Business Review Reprints 21220). Seminars and conferences were organized, and public statements on the importance of social reporting were made by key business leaders. Speaking for the business community, the Council on Trends and Perspectives of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States formulated the challenge as follows: "... if business corporations are to adjust to continually changing demands for social as well as economic performance, they must do something more fundamental than respond to the proposals of others. Business must restructure its perspectives so that social goals are put on a par with economic goals" (Anshen, 1980: 1; The Committee for Economic Development, 1971; also Gutman, 1979: 42). The academic literature on the subject and related issues was also significant (among the seminal works see Dierkes and Bauer, 1973; Ackerman and Bauer, 1976).

Since the early eighties, the situation has changed. Although the companies which pioneered concepts of corporate social reporting are still continuing their efforts, few are joining their ranks, except in countries where legal requirements for social reporting have been established. And methodological progress – after significant steps forward in the first decade – seems to be slower.

This loss of momentum presents a good point in time for stock-taking. What has been achieved? What is the theoretical basis from which concepts have developed, and which models appear to be most promising? What lessons have been learned in practice? How useful is corporate social reporting as a concept to reduce the negative social impacts of business activities and to foster positive behavior? The purpose of such a review and assessment of work to date is forward looking. Should further efforts be pursued in the direction of corporate social reporting – and if so, what should they look like? The aim is to contribute to answering these questions by building on the basis of past evaluations (e.g. Dierkes, 1979; 1980) with a view to establishing future perspectives.

II. Conceptual Bases and Assumptions

Even a superficial assessment of the broad spectrum of conceptual literature on corporate social reporting, accounting, and auditing¹ reveals that this

¹ Although there is a rich body of literature dealing with social accounting and reporting, the terminological ambiguity has not yet been completely resolved. The following

field does not encompass one monolithic theory. Rather, it draws on a wide variety of different theoretical and conceptual developments. Among the most important have been:

- Research on the profound changes in the business and society interface, redefining the role and tasks of the business corporation from a purely economic to a socio-economic institution accountable to a wide range of constituencies (Steiner, 1971; CED, 1971);
- concomitant studies on changes in goals and strategies of the business corporation (Anshen, 1980; Preston, 1978);
- the economic theory of externalities (Budäus, 1977; Mintrop, 1976; Siebert and Antal, 1979) as well as
- research on disclosure and its behavioral implications (Schredelseker, 1980; Vogelpoth, 1980).

The common threads to these various fields of research are that:

- corporate social responsiveness is a key task of management since “there is little merit in treating social and economic issues as though they were clearly separated from each other” (Ackerman and Bauer, 1976: 12); and
- external control of corporate social responsibility is necessary, but the legal system cannot provide all the required solutions (Stone, 1975).

The success of social reporting as a means of improving corporate social responsiveness depends on the positive establishment of a number of assumptions:

Corporate social responsiveness therefore implies a “combination of adjustment to external regulation, a long-term anticipatory philosophy of business policy and internal self-control” (Teubner *supra* this volume pp. 159 et seq.).

The concept of corporate social reporting grew out of the convergence of these views and is based on the recognition that they imply the following functions:

- to support management in integrating a wide range of social considerations into decision-making
- to provide methodologically sound and comprehensive information on the social impacts of business activities
- to permit the monitoring, evaluation – and where necessary – control of corporate social behavior by stakeholders.

definitions will be used in this article: *Social reports* (Sozialbilanz, bilan social, rendicontosociale, balance social) are efforts to describe for an internal or external audience in a comprehensive scheme, as quantitatively as possible, the broad spectrum of social benefits and costs of business behavior in a given period.

Social accounting is the process of collecting the relevant non-financial information. *Social audit* is defined as the effort to evaluate companies' social performance against selected standards and/or expectations.

- indicators and reporting schemes for measuring and documenting the broad spectrum of social impacts of business behavior in a comprehensive, meaningful, valid, and reliable manner can be developed;
- the usefulness of the instruments developed is recognized, and the diffusion of their application is assured;
- disclosure, linked to feedback, proves to be an efficient way of integrating social considerations into business decision-making. This assumes that in addition to its internal function of providing relevant societal information to management in order to achieve more sensitive decision-making (Epstein, 1979), corporate social reporting as disclosure can serve as a credible alternative to prescriptive regulations in some cases and as a means of supplementing the regulative process in other cases (e.g. Loss supra this volume pp. 327 et seq.).

The first two assumptions are methodological in nature, the third more basic and conceptual. It is based on the premise that the disclosure of social performance information can fulfill a control function in two ways: through self-regulation resulting from the very disclosure process; and through external pressure resulting from critical reactions from the general public, the media or specific stakeholder groups (Vogelapo, 1980: 66; Schredel-seker, 1980: 8-11). The viability of this premise for corporate social reporting is impossible to assess at this time, since the effectiveness of this method of influencing business behavior must be evaluated in a long range, historical perspective - if it can be evaluated at all. The usefulness of disclosure to achieve the goal of corporate social responsiveness with a minimum of cost to business and to society in the long run therefore can be postulated today as a goal, but not measured directly (e.g. Aldag and Bartol, 1978; Mashaw supra this volume pp. 55 et seq.). For this reason, this effort to evaluate the general concept and the development to date focuses on the assessment of the validity of the first two assumptions in the light of the experiences of the past decade. For the first, a review of methodological developments in concepts and indicators is necessary. The second requires an examination of the determinants of usefulness and an assessment of the level of use - a task which at this time can be fulfilled only partially on the basis of rather incomplete data.

III. Three Models for Social Reporting

The development thus far has witnessed a fascinating flurry of experimentation with models for social reporting. An observer in a position to take a dispassionate step back and sift through the experiments with a critical eye and at the same time able to look forward to future perspectives can distinguish three concepts of immediate and medium-term significance (for

an overview and discussion of other approaches see Bauer, 1973; Department of Commerce, 1979; as well as Preston, 1982):

- the inventory approach
- goal accounting and reporting
- the social indicator concept.

A. The Inventory Approach

The inventory approach “attempts to identify and describe either social impacts of normal business activities or special corporate programs intended to help solve social problems” (Department of Commerce, 1979: 7). It represents a cautious approach to developing social reporting in that it is a step-by-step extension of the statements on business-employee relations, philanthropy, or the social involvement often found in traditional annual corporate reports (Brockhoff, 1975). Business experimenting with the inventory approach have expanded the traditional corporate reports by broadening the scope of activities mentioned, developing more sophisticated indicators, and to some extent attempting to quantify the positive and negative impacts of corporate activities.

The majority of corporate social reports currently published can be considered to belong to this category, whereby there is great variation in the form of reporting (Dierkes, 1980: 93). This is mainly due to the fact that there is no common concept of theoretical guidelines to follow (Teubner *supra* this volume pp. 168 et seq.; Gröger and Stark, 1977: 349). In general, reports based on the inventory approach are largely narrative and do not report on social impacts in a systematic and comprehensive fashion. Attempts have been made, however, to promote systematization, comprehensiveness, and quantification in order to come closer to fulfilling the expectations of social reporting as a means of documenting and measuring corporate social responsibility. For example, in the Federal Republic of Germany a business task force “Arbeitskreis Sozialbilanzen-Praxis” established guidelines for corporate social reports in 1977, and these have achieved a certain amount of progress; but content analyses of published reports reveal that the gap between the achievements of these gradual extensions of traditional corporate reporting modes and the ideal type of the systematic and comprehensive social reports remains quite significant (Dierkes and Hoff, 1981).

B. Goal Accounting and Reporting

The goal accounting approach is followed by a small number of companies searching for a new concept to integrate social concerns into the decision-making process of business (Dierkes and Kopmann, 1974). It is based on the recognition that companies with a sophisticated management system operate on the basis of goals, both economic and social (Mintrop, 1976: 73; Stein-

mann *infra* this volume pp. 407 *et seq.*), and that social concerns are “central to decisions about corporate planning and performance” (Wilson, 1982: 226). Goals are determined by management as a function of its perception of the social and economic realities of the company, including the demands placed on it by the various stakeholder groups (Dyllick, 1982). The goal accounting concept relates the economic and social goals of the company to its activities in a given period with the use of a variety of indicators. The degree of achievement of these goals is therefore the logical subject of the corporate annual report (Dierkes and Kopmann, 1974; Gröger and Stark, 1977: 351–352; Dierkes and Coppock, 1978: 22). This approach has been used effectively by a number of companies in Germany (e.g. Deutsche Shell AG; Bertelsmann AG; Kölner Bank), Switzerland (e.g. Migros Genossenschaftsbund) and Sweden (e.g. Fortia) to achieve an internal consistency in the reporting framework for managing according to and reporting on principles of corporate social responsibility. The fact that this approach requires reporting on all areas of activity according to the established goals has stimulated experimentation in the development and sophistication of indicators in areas (e.g., company/customer relations) which are rarely found in social reports following other concepts (Dierkes and Hoff, 1981).

Goal accounting is intended to function on the principle of feedback, whereby the stakeholders are expected to contribute to the process of establishing the priorities and goals of the company, to evaluate the performance of the company in meeting these goals, and then to influence the revision of goals for the subsequent period, using their “voice option” (Hirschman, 1970). Although in practice the implementation of feedback in the goal-setting and revision process remains quite underdeveloped, it is significant that the few experiments to ascertain the information interests of stakeholders have been conducted by companies following the goal accounting concept, a point which documents the pioneering role of these companies and the usefulness of this concept as a motor for innovative developments in this field. A learning process can also be observed in the gradual improvement in the specification of individual economic and social objectives derived from the overall philosophy and general goals (Dierkes, 1980: 264). The fact remains, however, that only a few companies have had the courage to employ such an encompassing and demanding framework, and their experiments have been subjected to criticism for not meeting the high standards of comprehensiveness and objectivity which were expected, and for not permitting comparability, due to the individuality of format and scope and indicators (Fischer-Winkelmann, 1980).

C. The Social Indicator Concept

The social indicator concept attempts to come to grips with these weaknesses in the first two approaches. The social indicator concept is based on the

assumption that the achievement of objectivity and comparability are key concerns in effectively linking performance measurement to the overall quality of life in specific regions or in areas of special social concern (Dierkes, 1974: 42–44). Objectivity and comparability can be obtained only if companies – at least in a given industrial sector – report on the same areas and on the basis of the same indicators. The impetus for the development of the framework for this type of corporate social report has been largely outside the company, in contrast to the first two concepts discussed, in which the areas reported on are determined by the company with – until now, at least – more informal than formal inputs from various constituencies, and in which the indicators are also selected by management. Business constituencies (e.g., governments or unions), interested in analysing and comparing aspects of corporate social performance both between companies and over time perceive a need to establish a fixed agenda of areas to be covered and related specific measurement criteria.

There are a few examples of the social indicator model in practice, the two best known being the social accounting legislation in France and the social report of the First National Bank of Minneapolis, which “has been a pioneer in the use of social indicators for internal social measurement and external reporting” (Department of Commerce, 1979: 8). Other attempts in this direction – which, however, have not been implemented – are the catalogues of indicators developed by constituencies such as unions, a most extensive example being the list proposed by the Confederation of German Unions in 1979. While the establishment of scope and indicators by actors outside the company avoids two of the pitfalls of the other approaches in assuring comparability and objectivity, the third concept still does not resolve the methodological problems faced by all social reports, nor the problem of comprehensiveness. The development of reliable and exact social indicators is still in its infancy in many areas (Gärtner, 1981: 73–74). A most serious weakness is the difficulty of measuring outputs rather than inputs, of determining the actual social impact of corporate activities (Fischer–Winkelmann, 1980). Gradual progress is being made in developing more exact indicators, and the experience of companies experimenting with corporate social reporting over the years has shown that they have been open to integrating methodological advances. In this lies one disadvantage of the social indicator concept, because by establishing a fixed catalogue of indicators it is likely to hinder the integration of new and improved indicators, a process still necessary at this stage of conceptual and methodological development.

The question of comprehensiveness assumes a different aspect in the social indicator approach. It is subject to a different kind of risk of manipulation and one-sidedness than in the case of the first two approaches. On the one hand, the obvious disadvantage in letting companies establish the scope of the social report is that the temptation to gloss over or avoid including

altogether sensitive areas is high. While particularly enlightened companies following up the inventory or goal accounting approach might fully integrate their major constituencies into the scope-setting process and thereby assure the coverage of a broad spectrum of corporate social impact issues, this is rarely the case in practice. The danger of the social indicator approach, on the other hand, is that the catalogue of indicators reflects the interests of the particular constituency most active in its development. The mechanism for achieving a comprehensive framework, for identifying and integrating the information needs of all major constituencies is a serious problem in this approach. The integration of a new area of social concern into the catalogue constantly puts into question the claim of comprehensiveness. Further, as pointed out above with respect to new indicators, the disadvantage of this fixed catalogue approach is that it is slow to adapt to new developments. This would contradict the underlying purpose of the instrument, that is, the "development of a 'responsive' corporation, one that is learning to institutionalize novelty" (Bauer, 1978: 100). The problem is two-fold: once the scope of corporate social reports is set, it is questionable how responsive most companies might be to emerging issues not covered in the catalogue. Further the machinery for changing an established and accepted concept is generally very slow and difficult to set into motion, specifically in situations where legal requirements establish the framework of social reporting.

IV. Possible Future Developments

Given these three current central approaches, what does the conceptual future of corporate social accounting look like? Will one of the models dominate? There is no basis available for providing a clearcut and simple answer. The developments of social reporting concepts are inextricably linked to the social, political, and economic environment in which business functions. It is therefore important to examine a variety of different possible scenarios.

- (1) The more pressure to report on corporate social performance is reduced, the more public debate on issues of corporate social responsibility loses importance, the more likely it is that those companies following the modest approach of expanding the traditional annual report in an inventory fashion will either maintain their current mode of reporting or tend to reduce their involvement in social reporting altogether. Without a certain amount of public and stakeholders' interest and pressure it is unrealistic to expect that business will undertake significant steps towards more comprehensive and demanding forms of documenting the social impacts of its activities. On the other hand, the use of the inventory approach will also diminish significantly (if not actually

disappear) if there is a major increase in public interest and pressure for a more comprehensive mode of reporting, specifically legally mandated standardization.

- (2) The future significance of the goal accounting and reporting concept depends largely on the climate for experimentation and social innovation. To date, the goal accounting concept has been used by a few particularly enlightened companies who see in it a tool for operationalizing corporate social responsibility by clearly establishing the link between economic and social goals and by documenting the level of achievement towards these goals. If business is further encouraged to experiment with social reporting, it is likely that this approach will appeal to more companies with an enlightened self-interest in social responsibility, because these companies will automatically develop social goals and then find the internal logic of reporting according to these goals convincing. It is unrealistic to expect that a large majority of companies will choose this model of their own accord because it requires a level of management sophistication in policy-making that is not typical of most companies. Further, if the climate for experimentation is stifled by a lack of public interest in corporate social responsiveness or by restrictive concepts for standardized reporting, the attractiveness and significance of goal accounting and reporting will be reduced.
- (3) The more external pressures are brought to bear upon business to prepare social reports, the more constituency groups define their information needs, the more legislative efforts are made, the more likely it is that the social indicator approach will prevail. If demands for corporate social reports are increased by business constituencies interested in using the information contained therein, then the trend will be towards maximizing objectivity and comparability by establishing contractual or legal requirements to publish according to a specified framework.

The question is whether it is desirable that *one* of these three models prevails. In view of the discussion of the advantages and weaknesses of the different concepts above, it appears valid to look for a mix in order to maximize the advantages of experimentation and individualization while achieving a useful level of objectivity and comparability.

V. Implementation of Different Models: The Practical Experience

In the framework of this stocktaking effort, the purpose of examining the practice of social reporting is to arrive at a general quantitative and qualitative assessment of the developments to date. Specifically, how widespread has the use of this instrument been, and how well has it been developed in practice? The data base for answering these questions is still not as com-

prehensive as desirable. However, it is possible to draw general conclusions on the basis of a number of studies which have been undertaken in the last five years to describe and evaluate developments in different countries in order to stimulate experimentation and cross-fertilization: the over-all survey of the developments in the U.S. and Western Europe by the Department of Commerce. (1979); specifically in France by Chevalier (1976); Vogelpoth (1980); and Rey (1980); Italy by De Santis and Ventrella (1980); Malaysia by the Malaysian Management Review (1981); Latin America by Uniapac (1980); the Netherlands by Schreuder (1978); and the German-speaking countries by the author (1979; 1980). A significant effort to describe the experiences in a single industry, financial institutions, must also be noted (Banco de Bilbao, 1980).

A. Quantitative Aspects

What, then, has been achieved? How extensively has the concept of social reporting been used by business? Despite the fact that "the trend towards increased – and increasingly informative – corporate social reporting is clear" (Preston, 1982: 164) and that "the amount of reporting is greater, more carefully presented, more quantitative, and in some other respects substantially improved than 20 years ago" (Toan, 1979: 104), the number of companies involved in social reporting beyond legal requirements is still a small minority. The Ernst and Ernst survey reveals that approximately 90% of the Fortune 500 firms reported in their annual reports 1977 on social performance and that almost 50% of them constantly gave social performance information for the five year period ending March 31, 1978 (Department of Commerce, 1979: 11), but only 21 industrial companies, eight commercial banks and one life insurance company, specifically mentioned in their 1977 annual report that they had published separate reports on social performance (Johnston, 1979: 117). The same is true – to use another example – for the Federal Republic of Germany: while 50% of the largest companies are reporting on their social performance, at least partially meeting some of the standards suggested by the "Arbeitskreis Sozialbilanzen-Praxis" (Dierkes and Ullmann, 1979: 96), only 40–60 can be viewed as being involved in social reporting at a methodologically quite advanced level. The situation in France is somewhat different: even before social reporting was required there by the law passed in 1977, Rey estimated a relatively high involvement in such reporting (200–300 firms). Since the law of 1977 has come into effect the level of social reporting has obviously jumped significantly: since 1978 all firms with more than 750 employees must prepare social reports according to an established catalogue of indicators, and since 1981 all firms with more than 300 employees.

Regarding the first question, then, the voluntary use of corporate social reporting as an instrument of corporate social responsibility is not very

extensive. In each country there are some pioneering firms which have conducted some far-reaching experiments with the various concepts, and a small number of firms who report on social considerations in a very general fashion. Widespread reporting has only been achieved so far when mandated by law.

B. Qualitative Aspects

Regarding the second question, the quality of social reports, an overall evaluation is severely handicapped by the lack of comprehensive data. The first attempt for the U.S. (by Toan, 1973) is outdated, and the Ernst and Ernst survey is too general. Their results therefore must be supported by case studies. These reveal that the quality of reporting is quite uneven (Department of Commerce, 1979: 12; Rey, 1980: 311; Dierkes and Hoff, 1981: 58). There is considerable variation as to the scope of reporting and the sophistication of the measurement techniques. The variations within countries cannot be categorized according to specific industries: the innovators do not seem to come more from one industry than from another. On the other hand, it is possible to distinguish quite noticeable differences between the standards of social reporting practices in the United States and those in Europe, particularly Germany and France. A major difference between American and European reports is, for example, the spectrum of issues covered. While the reports by businesses in the U.S. usually focus on the external environment (consumer issues, physical environment, community relations), the European counterparts heavily emphasize the internal environment, company-employee relations (for detailed analyses see e.g. Dierkes and Hoff, 1981; Rey, 1980). This substantive focus seems to have implications for methodological developments. A major weakness of American reports is seen in the fact that they usually refer to "activities or inputs, but do not characterize impacts" (Johnston, 1979: 122); European reports make greater efforts in this direction, although often in qualitative rather than quantitative terms. This may be attributable to a certain extent to the fact that output measures can be more readily developed for employee issues – the emphasis of European reports – and to the fact that more information is traditionally available on these issues than for the external environment.

While there is still no absolute consensus within countries – let alone between them – on what should be included in social reports and how it should be measured, more attempts have been made in Europe at standardization of format and indicators than in the U.S., and more effort has been put into achieving comprehensiveness and maximizing quantitative measures. In France, for example, the law established catalogues of indicators for different industries. In Germany, the above mentioned business task force developed guidelines for social accounting. The unions

in Germany have started to take a more active role in formulating requirements as to information needs so as to achieve a more comprehensive and standardized reporting practice.

In spite of the progress that has been made, however, most proponents, as well as critics, of current social reporting practices agree that relatively few of the corporate social reports published today rate very highly in terms of the desired criteria and in terms of the expectations raised by academic research (Fischer–Winkelmann, 1980; Toan, 1979: 104). The fact remains that “much of what is reported is selective, and some of it is self-serving” although, of course, “notable exceptions to the norm do exist” (Department of Commerce, 1979: 32). It appears that there are more “exceptions to the norm”, so to speak, in Europe than in the U.S. Specifically, “European firms are more active with respect to social reporting than are their American counterparts, and in a few respects, they are more technically advanced. Among the notable steps taken in Europe are: 1. better definition achieved either voluntarily or by government action, of those elements and measures that are to comprise company profiles; 2. greater standardization of reporting measures and formats; 3. substantial increase in the number of companies reporting – in some cases voluntarily and in others in response to legal requirements.

Undoubtedly, the experience gained by European companies will lead to further improvements in social reporting in Europe, generating new models and procedures from diverse political and economic cultures that may help to answer some of the unresolved questions concerning the effect of social reporting” (Toan, 1979: 107–108).

It is interesting to note that in spite of the exchange of ideas promoted by the international diffusion of the relevant literature, so little cross-fertilization seems to have taken place thus far. Clearly the sociopolitical context significantly influences the development of social accounting. On the one hand social concerns differ in definition and emphasis across countries, and on the other the specific form of instruments differ according to sociopolitical contexts. But more intensive efforts to tap this unusual resource of a “natural laboratory” of experimentation across national boundaries should be promoted.

VI. The Usefulness and Use of Social Reporting Information

A. Basic Questions in Assessing Social Reporting

Like other information media, corporate social reporting is neither a goal in itself nor an exercise to satisfy academic research interests. It is intended to serve as a basis for the formulation, execution, and control of business social policy by management, and as a data base for dialogue with consti-

tuencies of the business corporation interested in the performance of the company in the social arena (Johnston, 1979: 113–114). Therefore, the critical questions in evaluating social reporting concepts experimented with thus far are not only whether or not social impacts can be measured and reported on in a methodologically sound manner, but also whether the information published in social reports is perceived to be useful, and, moreover, whether it is used – internally by management and externally by the various stakeholder groups. And finally is the use of the information actually changing behavior? Is corporate social reporting an effective mechanism for achieving social responsiveness?

The measurement of the usefulness and use of social reporting information is a stepwise process. In the case of such a relatively new concept, the assessment must start at the earliest stages of perception, because the process of discovering usefulness and uses is not yet as fully developed, explored, and internalized by management and constituency groups as can be expected of more traditional information tools, such as financial reporting.

- The minimum level of perception is the indication of interest in such a concept by the target groups. Do they see any purpose in the idea of collecting and publishing information on corporate social performance? Is the concept of business social responsibility important to them at all?
- Second, it is necessary to ascertain whether the way in which the concept is operationalized is considered useful. Assuming interest in principle, do the target groups consider the information which is actually collected to be useful?
- The third step in assessing the usefulness of social reporting information is the specification of the extent to which the information needs, as perceived by the target groups, are met in the social reports. What kinds of information do management and stakeholders feel to be significant for their decision-making, and are these needs satisfied in the social reports?
- Fourthly, it is necessary to investigate whether the report is considered usable. This is a two-pronged question (Sorg, 1979: 59). Is the information perceived to be reliable and trustworthy? And is it presented in such a way that the target groups can use it?
- Finally, the ultimate test for the usefulness of social reporting information is its impact on decision-making. There are two aspects to this question: the direct and the indirect impacts of corporate social reporting. On the one hand, how much do the target groups actually use the information provided in social reports? Does it indirectly influence their policies and positions? On the other hand, to what extent does the actual process of collecting and publishing the information influence the policies and decisions of management? How does the very existence of the document indirectly impact behavior?

B. Reasons for the Lack of Data on Information Needs

One of the disturbing aspects about the history of social accounting and reporting is the dearth of information from which to answer this set of questions (cf. Preston, 1982: 174). The development of corporate social reporting has been propelled by a conceptional view: the need to document corporate social responsibility and to publicly disclose this information as a basis for dialogue with business' constituencies. A great deal of work has been done, as indicated in previous sections, on operationalizing the general idea. But astoundingly little attention has been paid to answering the basic questions related to determining usefulness and use, although the author, among others, has argued for research in this field on several occasions over the years (Dierkes, 1979: 82; Dierkes and Hoff, 1981: 65). In practice, key individuals in business and academics in particular have postulated information needs and determined how to meet them, with almost no attempt to obtain inputs and feedback from the potential target groups.

Clearly, there are good reasons for having first concentrated all efforts on conceptual and methodological aspects of social reporting, rather than on the development of a data base on the information needs to be met. One key reason is the fact that it is difficult for most people to envisage the potential usefulness and uses of a new concept until it has been developed to some extent. In most cases the awareness of needs follows rather than precedes the availability of models for the potential satisfaction of those needs. It therefore has been necessary for the pace-setters in the business and academic communities to focus first on developing concepts before confronting a larger community of constituencies with the new instrument.

A second reason was, and still is, the difficulty of collecting, evaluating, and integrating the divergent information needs of such diverse groups as shareholders, social activists, management, employees, local community groups, and government. There are a number of aspects to this problem: the identification of target groups and of their spokesmen; the level of problem awareness in the groups allowing for the articulation of concrete information needs; and the integration into a single document of diverse and potentially conflicting information needs. While some target groups are obvious and well-organized, so that business can recognize their existence, the legitimacy of their information claims, and the spokesmen to deal with (e.g., government and unions), other groups are diffuse and insufficiently organized, so that their claims for information are less well aggregated and articulated (e.g., consumers). Some groups, particularly management, and more recently employees' representatives, have a relatively clear-cut sense of their information needs, while others, such as consumers and local groups, seem to be at an earlier stage of problem awareness in which the specific articulation of information needs is still underdeveloped. To the problem of identifying information needs is added that of aggregation and integration:

the information required by shareholders has, most probably, a limited amount in common with that of environmentalists. The interests of the different constituencies not only vary significantly, they can also conflict seriously on certain issues, so that the publication of data for these distinct publics is a delicate matter (Coleman *supra* this volume pp. 69 *et seq.*). The manner in which this information should be presented so as to be useful to the various constituencies may also differ. For example, a document considered readable and useful by shareholders, or management may be unintelligible for employees. In sum, the process of identifying information needs in a specific way, and responding to them in a useful form is, therefore, not only an extremely important, but also a very difficult research task.

C. Some Practical Studies Identifying Information Needs

Two approaches can be taken to identify information needs: the most effective is to survey the stakeholders directly, obtaining inputs and feedback through questionnaires or interviews. A second approach would entail reviewing, compiling, and integrating the indicators proposed for external audits by activist groups, research teams, or the media (e.g., Dierkes and van den Berg, 1974; Dierkes and Ullmann, 1979; Preston *et al.*, 1978; Schredelseker, 1982: 12). The very fact that attempts have been made by different stakeholder groups to formulate demands shows that their interest in the concept is high. Therefore a major research effort should be undertaken to examine this, as yet, largely untapped resource. However, such work is beyond the scope of this article, which has thus to rely on efforts which have been conducted to survey the information needs of constituencies directly.

The most important, though quite limited, pilot studies are those conducted in 1979 and 1981 by Gehrman, 1979, 1981, and 1982 by Deutsche Shell AG, and in 1982/3 by the Migros Genossenschaftsbund. The research conducted by Gehrman focused on the perceptions of employees regarding social reporting; by first surveying 100 workers with no previous knowledge of social reports (1981), then 199 members of worker councils, of which half belonged to companies with no social reporting experience and the other half to companies having published at least one social report (1982). The purposes were to take a first cut at determining the general categories of employees' information needs which were perceived as possible central components of a social report, to clarify the potential significance of social indicators in such a report, to get a feeling for the possible role of social accounts in bargaining with unions, and also to obtain feedback on the mode of presentation of information.

While the Gehrman studies were conducted by an academic on the potential of social reports, the other two efforts were undertaken by companies with years of comprehensive reporting experience and were directed

at the readers of specific reports. The Deutsche Shell survey was based on the 1979 combined annual report/social report. 440 responses were received to the short questionnaire from employees, business school students, and representatives of government agencies, business associations, and the media. The questions posed aimed at establishing whether the readers found the concept of social reporting as operationalized by the company useful; whether the presentation of information was effective; whether the information was considered valuable; and what other topics should be included.

A more comprehensive feedback survey was organized by Migros in 1982/3 on its 1980 report. Responses from four target groups (employees; personnel committees; associates of the co-operative; and organizations, business and government agencies) were surveyed in written and oral form. The aim was far-reaching: to obtain reactions to the content and format of the 1980 report in order to improve the next one, and to obtain information on the general communication policy of the company regarding the social impact of its decisions. Migros also must be noted for another aspect of using social reporting information. In preparing the 1982 report it invited representatives of major stakeholder groups (unions, consumer protection groups, environmentalists) as well as the media (representatives of major newspapers and TV) to comment on the 1980 report, to assess its validity, comprehensiveness, and ability to provide the information needed. They were also asked to state their information demands and expectations on what should be included in the forthcoming report. This process represents one of the very few attempts to explicitly integrate constituencies into the process of defining the scope of the reports, and – moreover – the goals which should be a focus for policy and a basis for the reporting as suggested in the concept of goal accounting and reporting.

While these various surveys are based on relatively small samples and represent only very rough first steps toward obtaining useful feedback, some interesting general observations can be derived. All show that the concept of social reporting, the underlying philosophy of social responsibility, and its public documentation are strongly supported. The minimum level of perception identified above is definitely reflected in the response.

As regards the second step in determining usefulness, the surveys reveal that although the respondents consider the information published to be useful in that it provides more comprehensive knowledge about the companies' activities, there appears to be a general feeling that some of the information is not of priority significance while more important areas are left uncovered. In other words, a level of instrument recognition has been reached whereby the respondents can conceive of uses to which social reports can be put and can thereby judge whether the information provided is actually useful. The problem, as stressed by Gehrmann, is that the perception of usefulness is highly specific to the target group, so that the

establishment of priorities in usefulness will differ according to respondent groups. Gehrman's own respondents, for example, as it was to be expected, stressed the priority significance of work-related issues and perceived other information as being less useful. In fact, it is interesting to note that even between work council representatives and employees there was an important divergence in the ranking of issues (quality of life at the workplace: ranked 2nd and 3rd by the two groups of work council representatives, but below 10th by the employees). This result is clearly indicating the degree of target-groups' specificity of priority ranking (Gehrman, 1981: 7). In judging existing reports, both Shell and Migros respondents expressed a certain amount of criticism on the coverage of sensitive topics which were perceived as either having been played down or left out altogether.

The third step in determining perceptions of usefulness is closely related to the second: once target groups are able to evaluate the usefulness of the material provided, they can proceed to identify further information needs. Shell and Migros asked about information needs not presently covered in reports. Of the Shell respondents, about a third of the readers from major social institutions, half the students, and a sixth of the employees felt that some necessary and useful information was missing. Some of the additional information needs are listed by all three groups (e.g., environmental pollution caused by Shell, alternative energy resources, and the relationship between Deutsche Shell and the other companies in the Shell group), but as was to be expected, others are target group specific.

It is probably unrealistic to expect companies to ask whether their readers feel that the information is reliable and trustworthy and readers to provide a valid and reliable answer. So in dealing with the fourth question, which focuses on usability, there is little data to base an assessment of the first part of the issue on. It is, however, impossible for reliability and trustworthiness to be seen to be guaranteed until an external audit of social reports is provided for. This is too complex a conceptual and methodological issue to treat in the framework of this article — a few pros and cons are beginning to be heard (e.g., v. Wysocki, 1981; Fischer-Winkelmann, 1980); a great deal more work and innovation is required here. As to the second part of this question (is the information presented in a way which is perceived to be useful?), rather more feedback has been collected. Gehrman's respondents confirmed that the more specific the information, the more obvious its relevance to the interests of the reader, the better; and that the use of social indicators should be increased. A strong warning was expressed against developing too scientific an approach to the presentation of information, thereby seriously reducing its potential usability by the key target groups. Shell concentrated more than half of the survey questions on the presentation of the information (attractiveness, clarity of structure, balance between text, graphics, photographs, and language) and received good to very good ratings on all points.

Without question, the results of these few surveys are at best sketchy, and clear and specific guidelines for the development of more useful reports probably cannot be derived from them. Suffice it for now, however, to conclude from these various forms of feedback that target groups perceive the concept of corporate social responsiveness to be significant and relevant, and see social reporting as a promising instrument in implementing this concept.² Its operationalization is largely judged positively. The studies also reveal that the level of concept awareness has developed far enough in certain target groups to permit the identification of information needs which could be satisfied by social reports, showing that the time has come for more specific and comprehensive research on detailing these needs.

D. Use and Impact of Social Reports

If, as seen, it is difficult to measure the ultimate usefulness of social reporting at this point in time, it is almost impossible to measure the actual use. Of course, the entire exercise of social reporting is sterile if it has no real impact on behavior. But how can decisions and actions be attributed to the report? Some insights can be gained from statements made by management and by stakeholders. For example, managers confirm that the process of putting together a social report is useful for exploring future policy (Bauer, 1973; Migros, 1978; Welbergen, 1978: 10). And they find the social report useful for internal performance evaluation, particularly when based on the concept of goal accounting (Brennan, 1979: 150; Migros, 1978; 1980; Welbergen, 1978: 11).

Over and above such statements, however, the indirect impact of social reporting is of central importance. While this is impossible to measure, the significance of this aspect should not be underestimated. It is logical that the very fact that companies collect and publish information on their social impacts influences their behavior. The actual process of preparing the report and the act of making it available to the public in itself have an impact on business decision-making. In this sense, the social report functions similarly to the traditional financial report — its existence serves to monitor and control business behavior, even without extensive and detailed use by the majority of target groups. Do shareholders really read conventional annual reports? Probably most do not, but the fact that they could, and that the media can analyse that data has an important impact on business behavior. This impact cannot be quantified, but it must be borne in mind in evaluating the usefulness and actual use of social reports and in developing strategies for their future.

² Similar results were obtained in a study conducted in the United States by Mirvis and Lawler (1983) who emphasize the key role of feedback processes. See their case studies for interesting insights into problem identification and behavioral change processes.

Beyond the voluntary and pro-active use of social reporting information by constituency groups, procedures for the use of social reports can be institutionalized, enforcing the actual use of such information. This has been done in France, where the 1977 law requiring social reports includes a clause providing for the discussion of the draft report in the works council, and the preparation of a statement by the works council which can imply a revision of the report. Then copies of the final report together with the works council statement must be sent to the government labor office and made available to employees and stockholders. The goal of this legislation is therefore to provide an objective information base so as to enable more rational business-employee relations (Schredelseker, 1981: 5). The establishment of a fixed list of indicators is intended to encourage a joint search for solutions and a concerted action to implement them (Vogelpoth, 1980: 190).

Do such legal requirements ensure the full use of social reporting information and the behavioral implications which are intended? The first year in which mandatory social reporting was conducted was 1979, not enough time has yet elapsed for a thorough evaluation of this approach. But the research projects (Vogelpoth, 1980; Schredelseker, 1981) taking first steps towards analyzing the extent to which the aims of the legislation in institutionalizing modes of usage have been implemented, show that the fact that the discussion of the document in the works councils is prescribed stimulated a careful examination of the information in most cases already in the first year of use. For example, of the 61 works councils' statements which Vogelpoth received, only 19 were brief and formal rather than substantive in nature. 28 involved a treatment of individual indicators and/or a criticism of the mode of measurement; and 14 represented comprehensive examinations of the draft with criticisms, suggestions, and alternative calculations (Vogelpoth, 1980: 248). On the basis of the interest and active response as evidenced in the first year, it is to be expected that, with time and experience, the works councils will learn to use the information contained in the reports to substantiate critique of business policy and will integrate it into their bargaining strategies with management (Schredelseker, 1981: 11).

The learning process instigated in companies by the law can also be observed in the media. In fact, it started a little earlier there; some journals, such as *L'Expansion*, began auditing corporate social responsibility in the early phases of the general discussion about the need for a law. Many of their indicators were later formalized into the legislation. The critical use of the information by such media to assess and compare social responsibility exerts significant public pressure on business to improve its performance (Schredelseker, 1981: 12-13).

VII. Useful Social Performance Information: How Can It Be Institutionalized?

The use of social performance data as a basis for discussing, developing, implementing, and monitoring business social policy — as the French experience seems to indicate — depends not only on meeting actual or perceived information needs but also on the way it is institutionalized (Schreldesecker, 1980). Different forms can influence the degree and direction of business' social involvement as much as the choice of indicators and specific areas of social concern. The following ways to institutionalize social reporting are theoretically conceivable or have been actually used:

- voluntary adoption of social reporting by individual companies and/or industry-wide recommendations
- reporting required by the board of directors or the shareholders
- formal agreement between industries and stakeholder groups
- requirements by law or government regulatory agencies (e.g., SEC).

The choice of the mode of institutionalizing social reporting depends on a number of factors, including the specific political culture. Of particular significance are the main features of the business-society relationship, the existing means of ensuring business' consideration of the social consequences of its activities, as well as the organization and structure of the business sector. On the basis of this evaluation of the experiences to date, however, the following criteria can be identified as essential to any system:

- the reporting process should ensure reliability, credibility, and the recognition of information needs,
- the institutionalization should not represent a sterile exercise in the gathering of information for its own sake, but it should encourage the actual use of the information in order to bring about necessary changes in business behavior and decisions, and
- the concept should allow for an easy integration of methodological progress, as well as for some degree of flexibility and adaptability to the specific situation.

As indicated in the review of social reporting practices thus far, in most countries the *voluntary adoption* of corporate social reporting has served as starting point and (often for a long time) as a main source of development. The advantage at the beginning of such a process is quite obvious: it allows for maximum flexibility and experimentation. The disadvantages are also clear: only a small group of companies involves itself in the development; there is no guarantee of the validity of the data; and information given is usually based on management's perception of interests and demands. Whether this voluntary approach to institutionalization will be satisfactory in the long run depends on how many companies will join the pioneers and to what extent common standards can be developed and implemented in

such a process. The examination of the experiments conducted to date does not seem to promise significant expansion of the number of companies voluntarily publishing social reports (Gröger and Stark, 1977). And, while a certain amount of progress in standardization³ has been achieved on the basis of recommendations of such informal groups as the "Arbeitskreis Sozialbilanzen-Praxis", it appears unlikely that major advances can be expected from this approach in the near future.

Another option would be the formulation of reporting demands by the *board of directors* or *shareholders*. These could provide – specifically if pursued on a rather large scale – some impetus to expand significantly the number of companies regularly providing social performance information. First steps in this direction have been suggested by the Business Roundtable. In a 1978 statement it discussed the responsibilities of the board with respect to social impacts of business activities. "It is the board's duty to consider the overall impact of the activities of the corporation on 1. the society of which it is a part, and on 2. the interests and views of groups other than those immediately identified with the corporation." It has been suggested that either the entire board or a public policy committee of the board could review corporate social measurement activities in general and social reporting in particular, because review and approval by the board could improve the quality of reporting and enhance its credibility with the public at large and affected groups (*The Business Roundtable*, 1978). The need for disclosure of socially relevant information has also been expressed by certain types of shareholders, such as ethical investors (e.g., Wokutch, 1982). While more research should be done on ways of integrating considerations of corporate social concern into board and shareholder decision-making and monitoring functions, efforts to increase the over-all expansion of corporate social responsiveness must define approaches which are applicable to all kinds and sizes of business enterprise. The concentration on boards of directors and shareholders is too limited.

A broader based approach could be found in the establishment of formal agreements between *business and its constituencies*. Allowing for characteristic differences in modes and results of production, reporting requirements could be agreed upon between business and constituencies on an industry-specific basis. One could envisage the organization of committees from the different constituencies of business in a given industry for the purpose of determining the format, indicators, and auditing process for social reports to be published by the firms in that sector. However, as discussed above, this would probably result in uneven representation of issues, since it appears that the best organized and most articulate constituency is usually the union. As is to be expected, the German experience with the proposal of the Association of German Unions shows that the focus of their interests

³ For a discussion of the importance of standardization see e.g. Preston (1982: 166–175).

is business-employee relations, leaving the remaining important aspects of corporate social responsibility largely unrepresented.⁴

In view of the disadvantages of the voluntary and quasi-voluntary, relatively decentralized approaches suggested above, one might consider *mandatory social reporting* in order to ensure the wide practice and standardization of social reporting. France has passed legislation requiring social reporting; the British Parliament considered legislation several years ago, and the Italian Parliament is presently discussing a proposal. Learning from the French experience, however, there are some dangers inherent in a detailed law which establishes not only the requirement but also determines the specific indicators to be covered. This freezes reporting to the present state of the art, making the integration of methodological progress over time very difficult. It tends to stifle experimentation using different, possibly more valuable indicators and modes of reporting. Changing legally prescribed indicators to adapt to methodological and conceptual advances or changing perceptions and social concerns is too complicated a process to allow for the necessary flexibility (Arrow, 1978: 92). Further, a detailed law such as that passed in France would probably limit the scope of business attention to those areas of social concern defined in the law. A law specifying a list of indicators therefore would not encourage companies to pay attention to emerging areas of social concern or to those areas of social concern which are characteristic only of their own environment.

How then can the advantages of the various options sketched above be combined and their disadvantages be minimized? One could envision the establishment of a requirement for social reporting which determines the over-all scope of the report and outlines general guidelines to be followed. This would ensure a broad practice of social reporting, rather than the limited success of implementing the voluntary approach. The requirement could be mandated by a parliamentary body, or by a government regulatory agency such as the SEC. In order to ensure flexibility over time and between industries, the operationalization of the concept, specifically the development of appropriate indicators, could be delegated to specific committees (somewhat parallel to the delegation of specific accounting rule definitions by the SEC to the FASB). Such committees composed of representatives from business and its constituencies differentiated according to industries could be charged with determining the exact format, choosing valid and comparable indicators specific to the given industrial sector and with establishing

⁴ For a discussion of the significance of corporate social reporting in collective bargaining in issues of low or no economic growth, when qualitative demands as opposed to quantitative demands may play an increasingly important role in labor negotiations, see my paper presented at the workshop on social reporting held at the Science Center Berlin, Oct. 1981. Also my presentation to the Conference Board on "Corporate Governance: Issues for the 1980s", Oct. 1981. The interest in developing social reporting as an information tool for this purpose is confirmed in Gehrman's studies (1979; 1981).

auditing procedures. Such an approach would encourage further experimentation where desirable, and permit the integration of the results of the experimentation into practice in an unbureaucratic fashion. It would therefore not stifle the current explorations being conducted by innovative businesses, but rather ensure that more companies and their constituencies become involved in the process.

A great deal of more careful examination of the modalities of mandatory social reporting must be conducted. The most appropriate agent for mandating the requirements will differ according to existing arrangements and socio-economic structures. However, the time has come for such a step. Enough experimentation has been conducted with concepts and models in different countries to allow one to conclude that social reporting is a useful tool for integrating social considerations into decision-making by business and its constituencies, and sufficient methodological progress has been made to provide a solid basis on which to establish the framework for a requirement and on which to begin operationalizing in terms of specific indicators.

Bibliography

- ALDAG, Ramon, and Kathryn M. BARTOL (1978) "Empirical Studies of Corporate Social Performance and Policy: A Survey of Problems and Results," in Lee E. Preston (ed.), *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy, Vol. I*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
- ARROW, Kenneth J. (1978) "Organizational Goals and Control Systems: Internal and External Considerations," in Lee E. Preston (ed.), *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy, Vol. I*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
- BANCO DE BILBAO (1982) *El Balance Social de la Empresa y las Instituciones Financieras*. Madrid: Banco de Bilbao.
- BAUER, Raymond A. (1973) "The State of the Art of Social Auditing," in Meinolf Dierkes and Raymond A. Bauer (eds.), *Corporate Social Accounting*. New York, Washington, London: Praeger.
- (1978) "The Corporate Response Process" in Lee E. Preston (ed.), *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy, Vol. I*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
- BRENNAN, Donald P. (1979) "Managing Social Issues by Objectives" in US Department of Commerce, *Report of the Task Force on Social Performance. Corporate Social Reporting in the United States and Western Europe*. Washington: US-Department of Commerce.
- BROCKHOFF, Klaus (1975) *Zur externen gesellschaftsbezogenen Berichterstattung deutscher Großunternehmen*. Köln: Haustein.
- BUDÄUS, D. (1977) "Sozialbilanzen: Ansätze gesellschaftsbezogener Rechnungslegung als Ausdruck einer erweiterten Umweltorientierung?," 3 *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft* 184.
- CHEVALIER, Alain (1976) *Le Bilan Social de l'Entreprise*. Paris, New York, Barcelona, Milan: Masson.
- COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (CED) (1971) *Social Responsibilities of Business Corporations*. New York: Committee for Economic Development.

- DE SANTIS, Gustavo, and Anna Maria VENTRELLA (1980) *Il Bilancio Sociale dell'Impresa*. Milano: Franco Angeli Editore.
- DIERKES, Meinolf (1974) *Die Sozialbilanz – ein gesellschaftsbezogenes Informations- und Rechnungssystem*. Frankfurt, New York: Herder und Herder.
- (1979) "Corporate Social Reporting in Germany: Conceptual Developments and Practical Experience," 1–2 *Accounting Organizations and Society* Vol. IV.
- (1980) "Corporate Social Reporting and Performance in Germany," in Lee E. Preston (ed.), *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy*, Vol. II. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
- DIERKES, Meinolf, and Rob COPPOCK (1978) "Europe Tries the Corporate Social Report," 25 *Business and Society Review* 21.
- DIERKES, Meinolf, and Andreas HOFF (1981) "Sozialbilanzen und gesellschaftsbezogene Rechnungslegung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland," in Hans-Joachim Hoffmann-Nowotny (ed.), *Sozialbilanzierung – Soziale Indikatoren VII*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- DIERKES, Meinolf, and Udo KOPMANN (1974) "Von der Sozialbilanz zur gesellschaftsbezogenen Unternehmenspolitik – Ansätze zu einem Managementsystem für Social Goals," 4 *Betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung und Praxis* 295.
- DIERKES, Meinolf, and Arie ULLMANN (1979) "Sozialenquète: Wird die Offensive blockiert?," 7 *Managermagazin* 15.
- DYLLICK, Thomas (1982) *Gesellschaftliche Instabilität und Unternehmensführung*. Bern, Stuttgart: Paul Haupt.
- EPSTEIN, Edwin M. (1979) "Societal, Managerial, and Legal Perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility – Product and Process," 30 *The Hastings Law Journal* 1287.
- FISCHER-WINKELMANN, Wolf (1980) *Gesellschaftsorientierte Unternehmensrechnung*. München: Franz Vahlen.
- GÄRTNER, Hans J. (1981) "Indikatoren in der gesellschaftsbezogenen Unternehmensberichterstattung," in Hans-Joachim Hoffmann-Nowotny (ed.), *Sozialbilanzierung – Soziale Indikatoren VII*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- GEHRMANN, Friedhelm (1981) "Sozialbilanzen und Informationsbedürfnisse von Betriebsräten," Paper presented at a workshop on Corporate Social Reporting, Science Center Berlin, (29–30 Oct., 1981).
- GEHRMANN, Friedhelm, and Wolfgang K. LEMMBACH (1981) "Erwartungen von Arbeitnehmern an Sozialbilanzen – Ergebnisse einer empirischen Erhebung," in Hans-Joachim Hoffmann-Nowotny (ed.), *Sozialbilanzierung – Soziale Indikatoren VII*. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.
- GONCALVES, E. Lima (1980) *Balanco Social da Empresa na America Latina*. Sao Paulo.
- GRÖGER, Jan-Erik, and Agneta STARK (1977) "Social Accounting: A Swedish Attempt," 4 *Accounting, Organizations and Society* Vol. 2.
- GUBMAN, Irwin L. (1979) "Strengthening Public Confidence in Business Through Voluntary Disclosure and Codes of Conduct," in US Department of Commerce, *Report of the Task Force on Social Performance. Corporate Social Reporting in the United States and Western Europe*. Washington: US Department of Commerce.
- HIRSCHMAN, Albert O. (1970) *Exit, Voice and Loyalty. Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- JOHNSTON, David C.-H. (1979) "The Management and Measurement of Corporate Social Performance," in US Department of Commerce, *Report of the Task Force on Social Performance. Corporate Social Reporting in the United States and Western Europe*. Washington: US Department of Commerce.
- MIGROS GENOSSENSCHAFTSBUND (1978) *Sozialbilanz 1978*.
- (1980) *Sozialbilanz 1980*.

- MINTROP, Angelika (1976) *Gesellschaftsbezogene Rechenschaftslegung*. Zürich: Schulthess Polygraphischer Verlag.
- MIRVIS, Philip, and Edward E. LAWLER III (1983) "Systems are not Solutions," 2-3 *Accounting, Organizations and Society* Vol. 8.
- PICOT, Arnold (1977) *Betriebswirtschaftliche Umweltbeziehungen und Umweltinformation*. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot.
- PRESTON, Lee E. (1978) (ed.) *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy, Vol. I*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
- (1980) (ed.) *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy, Vol. II*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
- (1982) "Analysing Corporate Social Performance: Methods and Results," in Kenneth Midgley (ed.), *Management Accountability and Corporate Governance*. London: Macmillan.
- PRESTON, Lee E., F. REY and Meinolf DIERKES (1978) "Comparing Corporate Social Performance, Germany, France, Canada, and the US," 4 *California Management Review* Vol. XX.
- REY, Francoise (1980) "Corporate Social Performance and Reporting in France," in Lee E. Preston (ed.), *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy, Vol. II*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
- SCHREDELSEKER, Klaus (1980) *Kritische Publizität und soziale Rechnungslegung in Frankreich*. Wuppertal: Fachbereich Wirtschaftswissenschaft der Gesamthochschule Kassel, Heft Nr. 45.
- (1981) "Die französische Sozialbilanz – ein Vorbild für Deutschland?," Paper presented at a workshop on Corporate Social Reporting, Science Center Berlin, (29-30 Oct. 1981).
- SCHREUDER, H. (1978) "Facts and Speculations on Corporate Social Reporting in France, Germany and Holland. "Papers submitted to the Social Science Research Council, Study Group on 'Social and Political Aspects of Accounting'. Amsterdam.
- DEUTSCHE SHELL AG, *Geschäftsberichte, Sozialbilanzen 1979, 1980, 1981*.
- SIEBERT, Horst, and Ariane Berthoin ANTAL (1979) *The Political Economy of Environmental Protection*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
- SORG, Peter (1979) *Aufgabe der innerbetrieblichen Information für Mitarbeiter und Messung ihrer Wirksamkeit*. Berlin: Dissertation at the Technical University, Dec. 1983.
- STEINER, George A. (1973) *Selected Major Issues in Business' Role in Modern Society*. Los Angeles: Graduate School of Management, UCLA.
- STONE, Christopher (1975) *Where the Law Ends: The Social Control of Corporate Behavior*. New York: Harper and Row.
- THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE (1978) *The Role and Composition of the Board of Directors of Large Publicly Owned Corporations*. New York: The Business Round Table.
- TOAN, Arthur B. (1973) "Public Reporting on Social Impact" in Meinolf Dierkes and Raymond A. Bauer (eds.), *Corporate Social Accounting*. New York Washington London: Praeger.
- (1979) "Corporate Social Reporting. Past, Present and Future," in US Department of Commerce, *Report of the Task Force on Social Performance. Corporate Social Reporting in the United States and Western Europe*. Washington: US Department of Commerce.
- US DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (1979) *Report of the Task Force on Social Performance. Corporate Social Reporting in the United States and Western Europe*. Washington: US Department of Commerce.
- VOGEL, David (1978) *Lobbying the Corporation: Political Protest and Corporate Accountability*. New York: Basic Books.
- VOGELPOTH, Norbert (1980) *Die französische Sozialbilanz*. Frankfurt: Haag und Herder.

- WELLBERGEN, Johannes C. (1978) "Sozialbilanz: Das Konzept einer unternehmensziel-bezogenen Berichterstattung," 3-4 *Der Volks- und der Betriebswirt* 10.
- WILSON, Jan H. (1982) "Sociopolitical Forecasting: The General Electric Experience," in Brian C. Twiss (ed.), *Social Forecasting for Company Planning*. London: Macmillan.
- WOKUTCH, Richard E. (1982) "Ethical Investment Policies and Activities of Catholic Religious Orders," in Lee E. Preston (ed.), *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy Vol. 4*, Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.
- YAP, Theo Hai, and Gregory THONG TIN SIN (eds.) (1981) "An Empirical Research on Corporate Social Responsibilities Undertaken by Malaysian Companies," *Malaysian Management Review* Supplement.