

Environmental reporting within the Romanian companies

Ienciu Alin, Muller Victor, Mătiș Dumitru

Abstract - The paper reflects the quality of environmental information voluntarily reported by Romanian listed companies. The study is conducted as a research paper which analyzes and explains using content analyses the quality of environmental reporting across Romanian listed companies. We concluded that the low quality of environmental reporting in this case of Romanian companies is showing that the environmental information provided by the Romanian companies is incomplete and irrelevant, environmental accounting and reporting remaining a challenge for the accounting profession and for researchers from Romania. Environmental reporting in the case of Romanian listed companies could be explained from legitimacy theory perspective.

Keywords – environmental, disclosure, Romania, Hungary, environmental information

I. INTRODUCTION

The deficit and degradation of natural resources, as well as the accidents related to environmental pollution emitted by multinational corporations have incited economical, political and social debates concerning these issues and generated significant concerns from many companies and governments. The industrial development, sustained by the economic and technological progress, has been criticized for its devastating impact on the environment, these companies having been urged to become responsible as far as their impact on the environment is concerned. In response, many companies have begun to report ecologic activities and environmental performance and these aspects fall under the attention of the company's management, accounting professionals, researchers, regulation bodies and media.

During this past decade, the demand for reporting environmental information within the listed companies has increased dramatically [1]. External users need relevant and credible information regarding the environmental performance of companies [15]. Due to the fact that reporting environmental information remains voluntary at the international level, there are major differences as far as quality and quantity of environmental information reported by companies from different sectors and countries are concerned.

Referring to financial accounting Gray and Bebbington [20] argued that "...there is something profoundly wrong about a system of measurement, a system that makes things visible and which guides corporate and national decisions, that can signal success in the midst of desecration and destruction", considering that financial accounting is restricted to users with a financial interest in the company, denying the access to information by users who are interested in environmental performance of the company. So there are reasons why

we can consider financial accounting inadequate or insufficient for reporting environmental information: it promotes financial performance to the detriment of environmental performance and the information supplied are mainly of financial and economic nature to the advantage of users presenting a financial interest to the company. This leads to restricting or excluding other categories of users regardless of the fact they are affected by the company's environmental impact.

Over time researchers and practitioners have proposed mechanisms and guidelines, such as Global Reporting Initiative Guidelines, Triple Bottom Line Reporting, United Nations Approach, UK Reporting Guidelines, Accounting for Externalities, Environmental Financial Statements, which can supplement financial accounting rules in providing an accurate image regarding the environmental performance of the company and responding the interests of users who have been directly or indirectly affected by the company's environmental impact. At the international level, the most representative voluntary guidebook referring to environmental information reporting is the Global Reporting Initiative [GRI] Guidelines [19] providing with a conceptual framework for environmental information reporting in a sustainable manner. Based on the environmental management accounting, this framework contains principles and guidance, qualitative characteristics of information and a series of parameters that reflect the company's environmental performance. The purpose is to use these principles to eliminate the disadvantages of financial accounting, which provides financial information tending to favor certain categories of users presenting implications on the financial performance of the company. GRI Guidelines is considered the most complete framework of reporting sustainable information. In a very large number of cases, a complete implementation of this framework is not necessary, but only certain relevant parameters for the activity performed by the company must be selected.

Using such mechanisms and guidelines and knowing the fact those environmental reporting remains voluntary at international and national level, a large number of studies have focused on measuring the quality and quantity of environmental reporting, most of them taking evidences from developed countries such as Germany [9], Spain [24] [10], Canada [25], Ireland [29], UK [18] [33], USA [22], India [6], Australia [14] [5] [17] or analysing the variation of environmental reporting between companies from different countries [16] [32] [12] [36] [4] [26] [23]. The topic of environmental reporting began to be debated and analysed by researchers and practitioners, ever since 1980 in developed countries such as USA, UK, Australia and Western European Countries but remains less familiar especially in developing countries such as

Romania.

As many other countries from Central and Eastern Europe, Romania inherited heavy environmental problems from the communist period. These problems were caused by the industrial policy based on high productivity that did not take into account the impact on environment and public health. The biggest issues concern sectors like: water quality, waste disposal, and air and soil pollution. In Romania the environmental policies were born during the 90s once with the former Ministry of the Environment. The national objectives regarding the environmental field were elaborated in 1992, "The National Strategy for Environmental Protection" being revised in 1996 and 2002. Starting from 1999, Romania has adopted a *National Strategy for Sustainable Development*, in accordance with the area regulations in Europe and worldwide. Since 2000 the national environmental policies try to assess the European standards and objectives, the environmental aspects becoming an important component for Romania's general policy. The year 2007 marks the integration of Romania into the European Union, the implementation of European environmental policies and the introduction of new European funding programs for environmental protection activities (structural funds). Since 2008, Romania has a new National Strategy for Sustainable Development, characterized by a new philosophy of development of the European Union and worldwide shared. The strategy sets actual targets for the transition to a generating value added development model, aimed at a continuous improvement of the quality of people life and their relations in harmony with the natural environment. However, there is, so far, no legislation in this area, requiring companies in Romania, listed or not at the capital market to provide stakeholders separate reports or specific information relating to the environmental impact. Providing such information would be useful, especially for listed companies and for those operating in industries considered highly polluting. In other words, the entity's commitment regarding the environmental impact or environmental issues remains voluntary in the case of Romanian companies. In the absence of a regulatory framework regarding environmental reporting what could be the factors that determine a company from a developing country such Romania to report environmental informations?

In 2005, Parker [30] presents two categories of theories that sit behind environmental reporting: augmentation theories and heartland theories. We did not take into consideration the second category of theories because they are deeply philosophical and less practical. In the first category we find the stakeholders theory, decision usefulness theory, the agency theory, legitimacy theory, accountability theory which we consider to be more practical than heartland theories which include political economy accounting theory, deep green, social ecology theory, and eco-feminist theory. Stakeholder theory is based on the idea that the success of a company depends on the relations with the stakeholders, environmental reporting being an answer to the stakeholder demand of environmental information [31] [11]. Decision usefulness theory considers that environmental reporting is made for decision usefulness of stakeholders [30] while the agency theory sees

environmental reporting as a consequence of the conflict between the agent and the principal [2]. Legitimacy theory brings the social contract as a response to environmental reporting, a social contract that maintain a company within the society in which it activates [13] [28] while accountability theory sustain the duty of accounting and reporting to ensure the registration and disclosure of the actions that a company is consider to be responsible for, including environmental actions [21]. All of these theories represent theoretical justifications for the process of environmental reporting.

Therefore, the main objective of the paper is represented by the description of environmental reporting at the Romanian company's level trying to find a theoretical underpinning that sits behind environmental reporting in the case of Romanian companies. For this we undertake an analysis of environmental disclosure, applied to the Romanian companies listed on the Bucharest Stock Exchange and we made a comparative analysis related to Hungarian companies regarding environmental reporting.

II. THE LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING WITHIN ROMANIAN COMPANIES

In the absence of a national or international regulation that would impose reporting certain information regarding the company's environmental impact, we have raised the following question: what is the quality of *environmental information voluntarily reported by Romanian BVB listed companies and what drives them to report such information?*

a) RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Before answering this question, we feel necessary to present certain elements related to the research methodology applied in the study:

- *Why selecting exclusively listed companies?* Most of the studies regarding environmental reporting have chosen listed companies as a sample [24] [22] [9] [33] because they provide annual reports, financial statements and other types of reports (administrator's report, environmental reports, and sustainable reports) available to the large public. Listed companies are a representative sample to reflect the environmental reporting since they are most exposed to the public and are expected to provide most information for decision making on the capital market;
- *What are the fields of activity selected for the study?* We have chosen for this study only the fields of activity that might have an environmental impact. Thus, we have had in view 101 companies from 22 fields of activity (Table1);
- *Which is the information sources used in the study?* For all companies included in the study we have conducted a content analysis regarding environmental information supplied within the different types of published reports and statements (the annual reports, financial statements, information provided on the company's website, administrator's report, environmental report or the sustainable report);

- *What is the period covered by the study?* The analysis was conducted for a period of three years, between 2006 and 2008, in order to reflect the evolution of environmental reporting;
- *What are the categories of environmental information we have monitored during the study?* In order to elaborate this study we have created a framework containing four categories of environmental information that a company should provide in order to offer users a clear image regarding their environmental impact (Table2). This framework contains four categories of environmental information that GRI Guidelines suggests for reporting by a company for the purpose of providing a clear image of its environmental impact. Also, such models related to different categories of environmental information are used by other studies [25] [29] [24] [9] [6][10];
- *What is the information encryption system used during the study (scoring system)?* In order to have a qualitative analysis of environmental information reported by the companies included in the study, a scale from 0 to 3 is to be used for each category of environmental information:
 - 0 If the company provides no information of these aspects;
 - 1 If the company provides generally described information. General information means information not-referring to the specific activities of the company's. The company does not integrate these environmental aspects within the activities it performs. There are usually standard sentences or phrases used by different companies, non-specific depending on the performed activity;
 - 2 If the company provides specifically described information. The specific information are non-financial information that present environmental aspects specific to certain activities, industries, companies;
 - 3 If the company treats aspects in terms of quantity or monetary. If the specific aspects are being presented in monetary or quantitative terms they receive maximum scoring because it provides complete environmental information.

Although the content analyses using this manner of encrypting the quality of environmental information can be considered subjective it was used in the studies undertaken by Wiseman [37], Cormier and Magnan [8], Comier [9] and offers following advantages [9]: allows integration of different types of information into a single figure comparable between entities in terms of relevance, allows measuring the quality of environmental information provided by each entity and eliminates irrelevant information, taking into account only relevant ones.

After having emphasized the issue of research methodology we will continue by presenting the results obtained. During a first analysis of the environmental information supplied by the 101 companies included in the study, we have made a selection of 4 categories, numbered as follows:

- A. Companies providing certain environmental information which have an environmental impact due to the performed activity;
- B. Companies providing very little environmental information, address the issue by use of a sentence, simply emphasizing they have an insignificant environmental impact;
- C. Companies that do not have an environmental impact, fact which is recorded in the annual report by using the phrase NOT THE CASE;
- D. Companies that provide no information whatsoever regarding the environment, thus being impossible for us to mention whether the company's activity has and environmental impact or not.

There are 46 companies reporting environmental impact, included in category A, presented in Table1. We have considered important for the study to reduce the sample to these 46 companies, because it would be relevant to quantify the level of environmental reporting in the case of companies with environmental impact. The content analyze has been made independently by the authors and the final results represent an average of the scoring obtained by each of them.

b) ANALYZES AND RESULTS

Analyzing the obtained we could draw conclusions on the following aspects (Table3):

- As we have noticed in the previous subchapter, the level of environmental reporting for Romanian companies is very low. The average value for 2008, the highest from the three periods covered, is of 0.84, thus resulting into a low interest manifested by the Romanian companies towards such aspects. As 0,84 is close to the qualitative level 1, showing that a company provides generally described information regarding a certain category or subcategory of environmental information, we could say that Romanian companies provide general information regarding their environmental impact, information which are incomplete and irrelevant to the users;
- From the point of view of evolution, a certain increase of environmental reporting is noticeable during the three covered periods (0,76 – 2006; 0,78 - 2007; 0,84 – 2008), which can be explained by factors such as Romanian integration in the European Union in 2007, the implementation of certain European environmental policies and introduction of new European programs for financing environmental protection activities (the structural funds). The year 2008 marks the implementation in Romania of a new Sustainable Development National Strategy. These factors could represent measures taken nation wide, determining companies to become aware, to a certain extent, of the commitment they have to make for environmental protection, of the importance of sustainable development and integration in the European Union structures. However, we were able to notice that some companies supply the same environmental information from one period to another, which demonstrate a low interest for these aspects, as they are reported by use of general, irrelevant expressions;

- The environmental information category with the highest score or environmental aspects most frequently provided by Romanian companies is the *information regarding the general environmental management aspects / corporate policies*, and the least approached aspects are *information related to environmental risk / environmental costs / environmental obligations*. Despite the fact that information related to environmental risk, costs and obligations are the most relevant for a detailed analysis of company's environmental impact, these aspects are being neglected or concealed by the Romanian companies. They confine especially to general aspects related to environmental management, environmental policies, environmental targets and objectives, without going into detail;
- The main source of environmental information is the annual report. In 44 cases, environmental information have been presented in the annual reports of the companies (generally, within section 1.1.6), which demonstrate that annual reports represent the main source of information for Romanian companies. Their websites (if any) and the explanatory notes to the financial statements also represent relevant information sources for environmental impact. We were able to observe that no Romanian company listed on the BVB issues a separate environmental report or sustainable report, which have become ordinary for a large number of companies from European developed countries or even some developing countries as well;
- It also noticeable that out of the total sentences or phrases supplied with environmental information, very few have a negative touch, which means they present certain aspects regarding incidents occurred as a result of environmental pollution or the fines received from the National Environment Guard. Environmental aspects reporting being voluntary, companies are tempted to present only positive aspects that would present an advantage in their relations with the users, regardless of the fact that this represent a breach of accurate image principle. It is also noticeable that out of the 46 monitored companies, 17 are mentioned in press articles regarding environment related accidents, excessive and uncontrollable pollution and other negative aspects with regard to environmental aspects and the company's responsibility thereof. At the same time, 12 companies from the monitored group have received fines between 2006 and 2008 from the National Environment Guard for non-observance of pollution norms and environmental regulations. Only 4 of them have presented these unfavorable aspects within their environmental reporting from the annual reports, the others simply avoiding supplying such negative information that might affect their image. Although these actions and reports do not reflect a fair picture regarding environmental performance of the company, it could be explained by legitimacy theory; Romanian companies are reflecting only that environmental information that avoid negative image upon the company, trying to prevent its legitimacy.
- From the companies analyzed, Petrom supplies the most relevant environmental information, scoring 2,2

in 2006, 2,35 in 2007 and 2,65 in 2008. The environmental information supplied within the annual report and the company's website specifically presents both in qualitative and quantitative terms, relevant positive and negative information, related to company's environmental impact. Why Petrom presents such a high quality of environmental reporting? Nevertheless, we cannot state that the company enjoys a very high environmental performance, because it has been the subject of certain press news regarding environmental pollution, and having received sanctions from the National Environment Guard. We consider that the company tries to respond to all these negative aspects issued by the press, with the purpose of defending its legitimacy, by supplying as much environmental information as possible, as well as through a series of external initiatives undertaken for the community and environment. That is a clear evidence of the company's legitimacy principle; the company trying keeps "a social contract" with the society it which operates. Petrom is trying to preserve its legitimacy, by means of environmental reporting and campaigns for the benefit of the community.

III. COMPARATIVE STUDY REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING

To obtain substantiate conclusions regarding the quality of environmental reporting within Romanian companies we have considered relevant to conduct a comparative study in order to emphasize the quality of environmental reporting in Romania by comparison to Hungarian companies. We have considered it useful because the discrepancies between the two countries are not so pronounced due to the geographical closeness (neighboring countries) and due to the somehow similar historical background of Romania and Hungary (they were both communist countries until 1989, currently members of the European Union: Hungary since 2004, Romania since 2007).

a) RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

We have chosen a sample of six companies from each country (Table4), companies listed on the Bucharest Stock Exchange (BVB), respectively Budapest Stock Exchange (BSE). The six companies belong to heavy polluting industries which are: mining industry (one company from each country performing similar activities), chemical industry (two Romanian companies highest scored on environmental reporting and one Hungarian company, because there is only one chemical company listed on the BSE) and pharmaceutical industry (three Romanian and four Hungarian companies have been selected). We have used the same model from the previous study for the comparative analysis, and the information encryption method is the same. The analysis was undertaken for a period of three years between 2006 and 2008, and different types of published reports and statements (annual reports, financial statements, information provided on the companies' websites, administrator's report, environmental or sustainable report) have been analyzed.

a) ANALYZES AND RESULTS

We have therefore been able to draw the following conclusions regarding the differences and similarities between Romanian and Hungarian companies in terms of environmental reporting (Table5):

- As we have been able to notice in the previous subchapter, Hungarian companies present a higher qualitative level of environmental reporting than the Romanian companies (2,34 is the average score for the Hungarian companies in 2008, as for Romanian companies just 1,67). This difference can be reflected for each sector and industry in part (mining, chemical, pharmaceutical);
- The same as in the case of Romanian companies, Hungarian companies also show a certain increase in the level of environmental reporting during the three monitored periods, increased that could be explained by the introduction of new strategies regarding sustainable development and new environmental protection legislation in accordance with European one;
- Hungarian companies give a much higher importance to the financial aspects related to environmental risk, costs and debts, respectively reporting of parameters for environmental performance and sustainability, information being more relevant;
- Although annual reports remain the main source of information for both countries, we were able to notice three Hungarian companies (MOL, TVK Plc and Gedeon Richter Plc) have separate environmental reports and sustainable reports, which is not the case for any of the Romanian companies. The supply of separated environmental reports is a reflection of the accountability theory and shows the closeness of certain Hungarian companies to the ones from developed countries such as France, Germany, England, the Nordic countries etc.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

As previously mentioned, the fundamental objective of the paper is represented by the creation of added value in the field of environmental accounting, less familiar in Romania. The added value that we seek to create through this scientific desideratum consists in creating an image of how Romanian company's present information regarding their environmental responsibility and what is the explanation of this voluntary environmental reporting.

We conclude that at the national level, although an increase of environmental reporting between 2006 and 2008 can be noticed, the majority of environmental information provided by the Romanian companies is incomplete and irrelevant, the level of environmental reporting in this case being very low. The Romanian companies confine themselves to reporting certain general information regarding the environmental impact, correlated or not with the company's corporate policies, positive aspects that companies could benefit in dealing with users, although the principle of true and fair image is violated. Therefore, we can say that the legitimacy theory

is the most adequate for explaining and defining environmental reporting within Romanian companies because companies are looking only for those aspects that can ensure a positive image and a good place in the society.

Following the undertaken study we have noticed that Hungarian companies present a higher qualitative level for environmental reporting, which is explicable by factors such as the existence of well implemented and applied environmental legislation and economic progress. Hungary's closeness to developed countries have determined certain Hungarian companies to present environmental information in a way which is common to the developed countries companies, concepts such as sustainability, sustainable development or social responsibility being much better implemented in the case of Hungarian companies.

In Romania and not only environmental accounting and reporting remains a challenge for the accounting profession and for researchers having as primary objective the knowledge and creation of added value in a field that systematically takes into account the facts related to the protection and restoration of natural environment, by observing the traditional role that accounting has to take into account the flows and risks in relation to natural environment, in order to be able to communicate an accurate image of the company to the users.

The introduction of the European Union environmental standards and the structural funds that are allocated between 2007 and 2012 from European Union for increasing environmental protection will determine Romanian companies to be more environmental responsible. Also, foreign investments on the Romanian capital market will determine Romanian companies listed at the stock exchange to be more accountable and more transparent for their environmental actions. Although there are no signs for the introduction of regulations or standards regarding environmental reporting there would be necessary such standards especially for the listed companies activating in sectors with high risk of pollution. This standards could increase the transparency and companies will be determined to be motivated to invest in environmental protection

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by CNMP, project number 92-085/2008. The project is entitled "Developing a functional model for optimizing the national strategy regarding financial reporting within Romanian private sector entities".

REFERENCES

- [1]. S. Beretta, S. Bozzolan, "A framework for the analysis of firm risk communication", *The International Journal of Accounting*, vol. 39 no.3, 2004, pp. 289-295.
- [2]. P. Booth, A. Schulz, "The impact of an ethical environment on managers' project evaluation judgments under agency problem conditions", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 29 no 5-6, 2004, pp. 473-488.
- [3]. N. Brown, C. Deegan, "The public disclosure of environmental performance information – a dual test of

- media agenda setting theory and legitimacy theory”, *Accounting and Business Research*, vol. 29 no. 1, 1998, pp. 21–41.
- [4]. N. Buhr, M. Freedman, ”Culture, institutional factors and differences in environmental disclosure between Canada and the United States”, *Critical Perspectives in Accounting*, vol. 12 no. 3, 2001, pp. 293–312.
- [5]. R.L. Burritt, ”Environmental Reporting in Australia: Current Practices and Issues for the Future Business”, *Strategy and the Environment*, vol. 11 no. 6, 2002, pp. 391–406.
- [6]. B. Chatterjee, M. Mir, ”The current status of environmental reporting by Indian companies”, *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 23 no. 6, 2008, pp. 609–629.
- [7]. D. Cormier, M. Magnan, ”Investors’ assessment of implicit environmental liabilities: An empirical investigation”, *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, vol. 16 no. 2, 1997, pp. 215–241.
- [8]. D. Cormier, M. Magnan, ”Environmental reporting management: A continental European perspective”, *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, vol. 22 no. 1, 2003, pp. 43–62.
- [9]. D. Cormier, M. Magnan, B. Van Velthoven, ”Environmental Disclosure Quality in Large German Companies: Economic Incentives, Public Pressures or Institutional Conditions?”, *European Accounting Review*, vol. 14 no. 1, 2005, pp. 3–39.
- [10]. I. Criado-Jimenez, M. Fernandez-Chulian, F. Husillos-Carques, C. Larrinaga-Gonzalez (2007), ”Compliance with Mandatory Environmental Reporting in Financial Statements: The Case of Spain (2001–2003)”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 79 no. 3, 2007, pp. 245–262.
- [11]. K. Davenport, ”Corporate Citizenship: A Stakeholder Approach for Defining Corporate Social Performance and Identifying Measures for Assessing It”, *Business and Society*, vol. 39 no. 2, 2000, pp. 210–219.
- [12]. P. Davis-Walling, S. Batterman, ”Environmental Reporting by the Fortune 50 Firms”, *Environmental Management*, vol. 21 no. 6, 1997, pp. 865–875.
- [13]. C. Deegan, ”The legitimising effect of social and environmental disclosures – a theoretical foundation”, *Accounting Auditing and Accountability Journal*, vol. 15 no. 3, 2002, pp. 282 – 311.
- [14]. C. Deegan, M. Rankin, ”Do Australian companies report environmental news objectively? An analysis of environmental disclosures by firms prosecuted successfully by the Environmental Protection Authority”, *Accounting Auditing and Accountability Journal*, vol. 9 no. 2, 1996, pp. 50–67.
- [15]. S.A. Di Piazza, R.G. Eccles, *Building Public Trust – The Future of Corporate Reporting* John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, NY, 2002.
- [16]. Fekrat, M.A., Inclan, C. and Petroni, D., ”Corporate environmental disclosures: Competitive disclosure hypothesis using 1991 annual report data”, *The International Journal of Accounting*, vol. 31 no. 2, 1996, pp. 175–195.
- [17]. G. Frost, ”The Introduction of Mandatory Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Australian Evidence”, *ABACUS*, vol. 43 no. 2, 2007, pp. 23–45.
- [18]. G.O. Gamble, K. Hsu, D. Kite, R.R. Radtke, ”Environmental disclosures in annual reports and 10Ks: An examination”, *Accounting Horizons*, vol. 9 no. 3, 1995, pp. 34–54.
- [19]. Global Reporting Initiative, Sustainability Reporting Guidelines. Amsterdam, Netherlands, www.globalreporting.org, 2006.
- [20]. R. Gray, J. Bebbington, Can the grey man go green, Discussion Paper, Center for Social and Environmental Accounting Research, University of Dundee, 1992.
- [21]. R. Gray, C. Dey, D. Owen, R. Evans, S. Zadek, ”Struggling with the praxis of social accounting: stakeholders, accountability, audits and procedures”, *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, vol. 10 no. 3, 1997, pp. 325–364.
- [22]. L. Holland, Y.B. Foo, ”Differences in environmental reporting practices in the UK and the US: the legal and regulatory context”, *The British Accounting Review*, vol. 35 no. 1, 2003, pp. 1–18.
- [23]. A. Jose, S.M. Lee, ”Environmental Reporting of Global Corporations: A Content Analysis based on Website Disclosures”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 72 no. 4, 2006, pp. 45–60.
- [24]. C. Larrinaga-Gonzalez, F. Carrasco-Fenech, F.J. Caro-Gonzalez, C. Correa-Ruiz, J.M. Paez-Sandubete, ”The role of environmental accounting in organisational change: an exploration of Spanish companies”, *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, vol. 14 no. 2, 2002, pp. 213–239.
- [25]. D. Neu, H. Warsame, K. Pedwell, ”Managing public impressions: environmental disclosures in annual reports”, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 23 no. 3, 1998, pp. 265–282.
- [26]. S. Nyquist, ”The legislation of environmental disclosures in three Nordic countries—A comparison”, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SLU, Sweden, vol. 12, 2003, pp. 12–25, http://teaching.fec.anu.edu.au/busn2007/Nyquist_2003.pdf.
- [27]. G. O’Donovan, ”Environmental disclosures in the annual report: extending the applicability and predictive power of legitimacy theory”, *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, vol. 15 no. 3, 2002, pp. 344–371.
- [28]. B. O’Dwyer, ”Managerial perceptions of corporate social disclosure: an Irish story”, *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, vol. 15 no. 3, 2002, pp. 406–436.
- [29]. B. O’Dwyer, ”Corporate environmental reporting”, *Accountancy Ireland*, Vol. 33 No. 2, 2001, pp. 18–19.
- [30]. L. Parker, ”Social and environmental accountability research. A view from the commentary box”, *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, vol. 18 no. 6, 2005, pp. 842–860.
- [31]. R.W. Roberts, ”Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure: an application of stakeholder theory”, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 17 no. 6, 1992, pp. 595–612.
- [32]. J. Stittle, M.M. Blas, I.M. Conesa, ”Environmental reporting in Europe: an analysis of UK and Spanish developments”, *European Business Review*, vol. 97 no. 2, 1997, pp. 215–223.
- [33]. S. Stray, ”Environmental Reporting: The U.K. Water and Energy Industries: A Research Note”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 40 no. 4, 2007, pp. 697–710.
- [34]. Y. Sumiani, Y. Haslinda, G. Lehman, ”Environmental Reporting in a Developing Country: A Case Study on Status and Implementation in Malaysia”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 5 no.3, 2007, pp. 34–56.
- [35]. W.D. Walden, B.N. Schwartz, ”Environmental disclosures and public policy pressure”, *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, vol. 16 no. 2, 1997, pp. 125–154.
- [36]. S.M. Williams, ”Voluntary environmental and social accounting disclosure practices in the Asia-Pacific region: An international empirical test of political economy theory”, *The International Journal of Accounting*, vol. 34 no. 2, 1998, pp. 209–238.
- [37]. J. Wiseman, ”An evaluation of environmental disclosures made in corporate annual reports”, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 7 no. 4, 1982, pp. 53–64.

Ienciu Ionel Alin

Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Cluj Napoca, Romania, Address: Teodor Mihali Street, No. 58-60, Cluj Napoca, Romania, 400591, Phone number: 004.0264.418.655, Email address: alin.ienciu@econ.ubbcluj.ro. Alin Ionel Ienciu is an assistant professor at Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Accounting and Audit Department. He currently completed his PhD. Thesis. His research is concentrated especially in the field of environmental accounting.

Table1. Romanian companies analyzed

| Company | Category | Company | Category | Company | Category |
|---|----------|--------------------------------------|----------|---|----------|
| 1. Agromec Tractorul Cuza Voda | B | 35. Mechel | A | 69. Biofarm | A |
| 2. Avicola Iasi | A | 36. Oteluri pentru Scule | C | 70. Sintofarm | C |
| 3. Avicola | B | 37. T.M.K. Artrom | A | 71. Zentiva | A |
| 4. Pajisti | D | 38. Zimtub | B | 72. Mj Maillis | B |
| 5. International Caviar Corporation | B | 39. Agrana Romania | A | 73. Romcarbon | A |
| 6. Petrom | A | 40. Albalact | B | 74. Teraplast | A |
| 7. Dafora | A | 41. Boromir Pan | D | 75. Carbochim | A |
| 8. Rompetrol Well Services | A | 42. Carmeco | C | 76. Helios | A |
| 9. Foraj Sonde | A | 43. Lacta | D | 77. Matcon | D |
| 10. Comrep | B | 44. Nutricom | A | 78. Smc Prefabricate pentru Constructii | D |
| 11. Transelectrica | A | 45. Pajura | B | 79. Vulturul | A |
| 12. Vest Energo | A | 46. Select Nutricomb Crevedia | B | 80. Electroputere | A |
| 13. Protan | A | 47. Titan | A | 81. Grupul Industrial Electrocontact | A |
| 14. Icsim | D | 48. Toneli Nutrition Titu | B | 82. Relee | C |
| 15. Imotrust | C | 49. Bega Tehnomet | C | 83. Armatura | A |
| 16. Impact Developer&Contractor | A | 50. Felam | D | 84. Balanta | B |
| 17. Lcs Imobiliar | C | 51. Muntenia SA Filipestii de Padure | D | 85. Comexip | A |
| 18. Pentaco | A | 52. Ves | A | 86. Comelf | A |
| 19. Recorom Dorobanti | D | 53. Amonil | A | 87. Icco Metal | B |
| 20. Trust Constructii | B | 54. Azomures | A | 88. Mecanica Ceahlau | B |
| 21. Ventilatorul Real Estate | C | 55. Olchim | A | 89. Titan Echipamente Nucleare | A |
| 22. Condmag | A | 56. Sinteza | A | 90. Ucm Resita | B |
| 23. Constructii Feroviare | D | 57. Victoria | A | 91. Uztel | D |
| 24. Energopetrol | B | 58. Bermas | B | 92. Altur | B |
| 25. Constructii Cai Ferate si Alte Cai de Comunicatie | B | 59. Haber | C | 93. Compa | A |
| 26. Ismrs | B | 60. Zarea | C | 93. Compa | A |
| 27. Molduvulcan | D | 61. Siderma | C | 94. Mefin | B |
| 28. Agrottransport | C | 62. Siretul Pascani | A | 95. Uamt | A |
| 29. Atm-Construct | C | 63. Romimplet | B | 96. Aerostar | A |
| 30. Azur Tc | C | 64. Sef Petroforest | A | 97. Mecanica 94 | B |
| 31. Transgaz | A | 65. Sylvania Forest | B | 98. Santierul Naval Orsova | A |
| 32. Oil Terminal | B | 66. Publirom | D | 99. Turbomecanica | B |
| 33. Socep | C | 67. Rompetrol Rafinare | A | 100. Vae Aparcom | A |
| 34. Alro | A | 68. Antibiotice | A | 101. Automatica | B |

Table2. Framework containing categories of environmental information surveyed

| Categories of environmental information surveyed | |
|--|---|
| 1. | Information regarding environmental management and corporate environmental policy (corporate environmental policy, structure and organization of environmental management, environmental objectives, companies engagement regarding external environmental initiatives, environmental audit). |
| 2. | Information on environmental regulations and legislation (litigation, fines, corrective, remedial and improvement actions regarding the environmental impact, environmental legislation) |
| 3. | Information on environmental pollution, resource consumption, water and energy consumption (pollution release in water, air and soil, material, water, energy consumption) |
| 4. | Information on environmental risk / environmental costs / environmental obligations (investments, expenditure, savings and avoided costs regarding the environment, environmental externalities, environmental obligations and provisions) |

Table3. Scoring obtained for each category of environmental information within Romanian companies

| Categories of environmental information surveyed | Period | Score |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Information regarding environmental management and corporate environmental policy | 2006 | 1,14 |
| | 2007 | 1,2 |
| | 2008 | 1,29 |
| 2. Information on environmental regulations and legislation | 2006 | 0,7 |
| | 2007 | 0,73 |
| | 2008 | 0,78 |
| 3. Information on environmental pollution, resource consumption, water and energy consumption | 2006 | 0,76 |
| | 2007 | 0,76 |
| | 2008 | 0,8 |
| 4. Information on environmental risk / environmental costs / environmental obligations | 2006 | 0,44 |
| | 2007 | 0,44 |
| | 2008 | 0,48 |
| Final score | 2006 | 0,76 |
| | 2007 | 0,78 |
| | 2008 | 0,84 |

Table4. Romanian and Hungarian companies analyzed

| Romanian companies | Hungarian companies |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Zentiva | 1. MOL |
| 2. Antibiotice | 2. TVK Plc |
| 3. Biofarm | 3. EGIS Plc |
| 4. Azomures | 4. Gedeon Richter Plc |
| 5. Olchim | 5. Humet Plc |
| 6. Petrom | 6. Philaxia Pharma |

Table5. Scoring obtained for each category of environmental information within Romanian companies and Hungarian companies

| | | ROMANIA | | | | | | | HUNGARY | | | | | | |
|---|------|---------|----------|----------|-------------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|----------|--------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | | Petrom | Azomures | Oltechim | Antibiotice | Biofarm | Zentiva | Total score | MOL | TVK Plc | EGIS Plc | Gedeon Richter Plc | Hunmet Plc | Philaxia Pharma | Total score |
| 1. Information regarding environmental management and corporate environmental policy | 2006 | 2,4 | 1,6 | 1,6 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 1,4 | 1,76 | 2,8 | 3 | 1,8 | 2,8 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 2,52 |
| | 2007 | 3 | 1,6 | 1,6 | 1,4 | 1,2 | 1,4 | 1,98 | 3 | 3 | 1,8 | 2,8 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 2,58 |
| | 2008 | 3 | 1,8 | 1,8 | 1,6 | 1,2 | 1,4 | 2,07 | 3 | 3 | 1,8 | 2,8 | 1,6 | 1,2 | 2,62 |
| 2. Information on environmental regulations and legislation | 2006 | 2 | 1,2 | 1,4 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 1,6 | 1,46 | 2,6 | 2,4 | 2 | 2,2 | 1 | 0,6 | 2,15 |
| | 2007 | 2 | 1,4 | 1,4 | 0,6 | 0,8 | 1,6 | 1,47 | 2,6 | 2,4 | 2,2 | 2,2 | 1 | 0,6 | 2,17 |
| | 2008 | 2,6 | 1,4 | 1,4 | 0,8 | 0,8 | 1,6 | 1,69 | 2,6 | 2,4 | 2,2 | 2,4 | 1 | 0,6 | 2,18 |
| 3. Information on environmental pollution, resource consumption, water and energy consumption | 2006 | 2 | 0,8 | 1,8 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,2 | 1,26 | 2,8 | 2 | 1,4 | 2,2 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 1,97 |
| | 2007 | 2 | 0,8 | 1,8 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 0,2 | 1,26 | 2,8 | 2,2 | 1,4 | 2,2 | 0,4 | 0,4 | 2,03 |
| | 2008 | 2,4 | 0,8 | 1,8 | 0,8 | 0,6 | 0,2 | 1,41 | 2,8 | 2,6 | 1,8 | 3 | 0,6 | 0,4 | 2,28 |
| 4. Information on environmental risk / environmental costs / environmental obligations | 2006 | 2,4 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 0,8 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 1,42 | 2,6 | 2,6 | 2,2 | 2,4 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 2,22 |
| | 2007 | 2,4 | 1,2 | 1,2 | 0,8 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 1,42 | 2,6 | 2,6 | 2,2 | 2,4 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 2,22 |
| | 2008 | 2,6 | 1,4 | 1,2 | 0,8 | 0,6 | 0,6 | 1,52 | 2,6 | 2,6 | 2,2 | 2,6 | 1 | 0,8 | 2,28 |
| Total score | 2006 | 2,2 | 1,2 | 1,5 | 0,85 | 0,8 | 0,95 | 1,47 | 2,7 | 2,5 | 1,85 | 2,4 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 2,21 |
| | 2007 | 2,35 | 1,25 | 1,5 | 0,85 | 0,8 | 0,95 | 1,53 | 2,75 | 2,55 | 1,9 | 2,4 | 0,8 | 0,7 | 2,25 |
| | 2008 | 2,65 | 1,35 | 1,55 | 1 | 0,8 | 0,95 | 1,67 | 2,75 | 2,65 | 2 | 2,7 | 1,05 | 0,75 | 2,34 |