

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Corporate Environmental Reporting: A New Zealand perspective.

A thesis presented in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Philosophy
Massey University

Nicholas G. Robinson

1998

Abstract

Corporate Environmental Reporting is an environmental management practice that is gaining momentum internationally, and in New Zealand. In this study, four leading New Zealand Corporate Environmental Reports were compared on content, and disclosure, and it was found that the level of reporting was low, with the scope of reporting content very narrow. In comparison with international reporting surveys, the New Zealand reports compared very unfavourably; in most instances, the level of reporting in the international reports was double compared to the New Zealand reports. However, the New Zealand reports were following international trends in reporting, in terms of a high qualitative content, and limited reporting in financial and sustainable development issues.

A sample of stakeholders was also surveyed on the content areas of environmental reports, and the importance that they would give to each reporting area. From the analysis, it was found that there was a large gap between the performance of the reports sampled and the expectations of the stakeholders, with some stakeholder groups indicating higher information needs than others.

Through face-to-face interviews, the process that the reporting companies followed to publish their environmental report was established. This process was then compared to the narrow range of content, and to the stakeholder expectation gap found in the preceding analysis. Overall, it was concluded that the strong and pervasive environmental management legislation in New Zealand was having a considerable influence on the content of the New Zealand reports. Because of this, the practice and content of environmental reporting in New Zealand have lacked definition.

Overall, it was concluded that the level of reporting from the sample of New Zealand reports was poor, and that because of the low level of reporting there was a gap between report performance and stakeholder expectations. From these conclusions it is recommended that the Government should instigate a programme defining the role and content of Corporate Environmental Reporting in New Zealand. It was also recommended that environmental reporting becomes mandatory in New Zealand.

Acknowledgements

There are many people that I wish to thank.

I am indebted to Delyse Springett and Attahir Yusuf, my supervisors. Firstly, thank you Delyse. Your time, persistence, compassion, and uncanny ability to understand my ranting have made this year both a pleasure and a challenge. Thank you Attahir for always asking me ‘how does this relate to your research topic’?

I would also like to thank the four organisations that lent me their ear, and their staff, during the course of this year. Thank you Ken Tremaine and Justin Ensor of KPMG, your resources, comments and insights were most helpful. Thank you Stephen Hall, your assistance was invaluable. A big thank you also goes to Alistair Shanks and Peter Thomas of Watercare Services Limited; thanks guys. Also, thank you to all the staff at The New Zealand Refining Company, The Electricity Corporation of New Zealand, and Tasman Pulp and Paper Company Limited.

Thanks also goes to the Graduate Research Fund, and the Department of Management Systems for their help, guidance, and resources.

Thank you Kevin and Jenny, your unfailing love and support over the last 23 years, and the numerous long distance telephone-counselling sessions will leave me indebted forever. Catherine, thank you for being a wonderful and interested sister.

Thanks also goes to my numerous friends and colleagues who have provided laughter, humility and reality, especially, D.A., S.C., K.C., J.I., V.B., S.O'D., M.N., S.S., D.H., M.O'R. , B.P.S., J.T., B.G. and P.E. Thank you Nick Park and Glenys Patterson for all your help.

Lastly, I would like to thank all the musicians that have been in my life this year, without your music and inspiration, my life and thesis would not be the same. Thanks Massive Attack, its true; inertia creeps, moving up slowly.

Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Contents	iv
List of tables	vi
List of figures.....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction and Research Issues.....	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Research questions and objectives.	2
Chapter 2: Research Methodology	7
2.3 Methodology.....	7
2.4 Corporate Environmental Report Content Analysis	8
2.4.1 Data Analysis	11
2.4.2 International Report Comparison	12
2.5 Stakeholder Analysis	13
2.5.1 Data Analysis	16
2.6 Content analysis of Report Writer Interviews	17
2.7 Data and Methods Triangulation	18
Chapter Three: Literature Review.....	20
3.1 Sustainable Development and Agenda 21	20
3.2 Business and the Environment - An irreconcilable relationship?.....	22
3.3 Environmental Management and the Corporate Environmental Report	23
3.4 Corporate Environmental Reporting - What is it?.....	25
3.5 Corporate Environmental Reports - What do they contain?.....	27
3.6 Mandatory Reporting.....	32
3.7 The Stakeholder Challenge.....	33
3.8 Making Reports Relevant for Stakeholders.....	37
3.9 What are Stakeholders wanting in Corporate Environmental Reports?	39
3.10 How has Reporting Developed?	41
3.11 International Surveys of Corporate Environmental Reporting	44
3.12 The New Zealand Situation	49
Chapter 4: Research results	52
4.1 Report Content Analysis.....	53
4.1.1 International Report Comparison	56
4.2 Stakeholder Analysis	59
4.2.1 50 Environmental Reporting Ingredients	63
4.2.2 International Report Comparison	67
4.3 Report writer interview content analysis	68
4.3.1 Thinking.....	68
4.3.2 Planning	69
4.3.3 Doing.....	69

3.3.4 <i>Measuring</i>	70
4.3.5 <i>Thinking</i>	71
4.3.6 <i>General questions</i>	72
Chapter 5: Discussion	74
4.1 Report Content Analysis.....	74
5.2 International Comparison	80
5.3 Stakeholder Analysis	83
5.4 Report Writer Interviews	88
Conclusions	93
Recommendations	95
References	96
<u>Appendix One</u> The UNEP-SustainAbility 50 environmental reporting ingredients and their definitions	103
<u>Appendix Two</u> Report scoring rationales	107
<u>Appendix Three</u> Questionnaire covering letter and questionnaire.....	139
<u>Appendix Four</u> Report writer interview schedule.....	146
<u>Appendix Five</u> New Zealand sample report scores for each of the UNEP-SustainAbility 50 environmental ingredients.....	148
<u>Appendix Six</u> New Zealand report sample stakeholder scores of importance for each of the UNEP-SustainAbility 50 environmental reporting ingredients.	151

List of tables

<u>Table 1.</u> Example of a table used in comparing the content of the sample reports.....	52
<u>Table 2.</u> New Zealand report scores for each of the UNEP-SustainAbility reporting ingredient categories.	53
<u>Table 3.</u> New Zealand CER scores for each of the 20 essential ingredients.....	55
<u>Table 4.</u> Comparison between the sample New Zealand CERs and the top International CERs of 1996.....	58
<u>Table 5.</u> Comparison between the sample New Zealand CERs and the top International CERs of 1997.....	58
<u>Table 6.</u> Average level of stakeholder importance scores and average New Zealand report sample scores for each of the 5 UNEP-SustainAbility reporting ingredient categories.	64
<u>Table 7.</u> Comparison between New Zealand report scores, and average levels of importance for each of the 20 essential reporting ingredients, indicated by the stakeholders.....	65
<u>Table 8.</u> Comparison between the sample of New Zealand stakeholder scores of importance, and the sample New Zealand and International report content analysis results.	67

List of figures

Figure 1. Stages in corporate environmental reporting.....	45
Figure 2. Comparison of the sample New Zealand reports.....	54
Figure 3. Location of the sample New Zealand CERs on the UNEP-SustainAbility Reporting Quintiles.....	56
Figure 4. Comparison of total report scores between the New Zealand CERs, and the 4 reports from the UNEP-SustainAbility 1996 and 1997 international report surveys.	57
Figure 5. Percentage composition of stakeholder groups in respondent sample.	59
Figure 6. Frequency distribution of responses to the content of Company A's report. .	61
Figure 7. Frequency distribution of responses to the comprehension of Company A's report.	62
Figure 8. Frequency distribution of responses to the overall report.....	63
Figure 9. Comparison of the New Zealand report scores and the average total score of stakeholder importance.	66
Figure 10. Comparison of New Zealand report scores and sample stakeholder levels of importance for each of the 50 environmental reporting ingredients.....	67