Charting A Sustainable Path: Analyzing GRI-Compliant Reporting in Indonesia's Healthcare Sector

Michael Walzer[1], Amrie Firmansyah[2]*,

[1]Polytechnic of State Finance STAN, Banten, Indonesia

[2]Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta, Special Region of Jakarta, Indonesia

***Correspondence**: amriefirmansyah@upnvj.ac.id

Research aims: This research seeks to analyze the sustainability reporting practices of private hospital companies in Indonesia, with a particular focus on a prominent hospital group, to evaluate their compliance with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Standards and identify opportunities for enhancement.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The study employs a qualitative methodology, utilizing content analysis to examine the provider's 2023 Sustainability Report thoroughly. The assessment is conducted under the GRI standards, a widely recognized framework for sustainability reporting. This comprehensive evaluation encompasses various aspects, including general disclosures, economic performance, environmental management, and social and governance dimensions.

Research findings: The healthcare group has broadly followed the GRI guidelines, especially in general disclosures, economic performance, and environmental management. However, there are still gaps in fully addressing social and governance aspects, indicating opportunities for improvement.

Theoretical contribution/Originality: This research contributes to the theoretical understanding of sustainability reporting in the healthcare sector by exploring its application within a private hospital context in Indonesia. It enriches the literature on sustainability practices in non-traditional industries such as healthcare.

Practitioner/Policy implication: This study provides practical recommendations for improving the transparency and compliance of sustainability reporting within healthcare organizations. Policymakers and regulators can use these insights to harmonize sustainability reporting standards across the sector and enhance the accountability of healthcare providers.

Research limitation/Implication: The study is exclusively centered on a specific private hospital group, restricting its applicability to other healthcare organizations or private hospital companies. Future research could examine sustainability reporting practices across a broader spectrum of domestic and international healthcare providers.

Keywords: GRI Standards; Healthcare; Sustainability; Sustainability Reporting

Classification
Research Paper

History
Submitted:
January 19, 2025

Revised:
February 20, 2025

Accepted:
February 25, 2025

DOI:
10.18196/pas.v2i1.25

Citation: Walzer, M., & Firmansyah, A. (2025). Charting A Sustainable Path: Analyzing GRI-Compliant Reporting in Indonesia's Healthcare Sector. *Public Accounting and Sustainability, 2*(1), 45-59.

Introduction

Sustainability has become essential across diverse industries, prompting organizations to integrate social, environmental, and economic responsibilities alongside their financial objectives. There is heightened interest in how these practices are disclosed and validated in the healthcare sector, particularly in private hospital operations. The Indonesian government has recognized the importance of sustainability reporting through various regulations, requiring companies, including healthcare providers, to document their environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices. For instance, Law No. 40 of 2007 on Limited Liability Companies mandates that companies operating in natural resource-related sectors incorporate corporate social and environmental responsibility into their business strategies. Additionally, Government Regulation No. 47 of 2012 further reinforces the obligation for companies to allocate and report on their sustainability initiatives. More specifically, Financial Services Authority Regulation No. 51/POJK.03/2017 requires financial institutions, issuers, and public companies, including private hospitals listed on the stock exchange, to submit annual sustainability reports. These legal frameworks establish an explicit obligation for private hospitals to report their sustainability performance transparently, ensuring compliance with national and international sustainability standards.

Against this backdrop, this study explores the extent to which a prominent private hospital group in Indonesia aligns its sustainability reporting with the GRI standards, focusing on potential gaps in social and governance dimensions that may warrant further refinement. By examining existing practices and highlighting areas for improvement, this research contributes to advancing sustainability disclosure in a field that directly affects community well-being.

Sustainable development has gained significant traction among academics, business leaders, policymakers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and other stakeholders. The World Commission on Environment and Development's 1987 definition emphasizes meeting present needs without jeopardizing future generations' capacity to meet theirs, underscores the integral balance of social, environmental, and economic imperatives within the constraints of Earth's finite resources. For the healthcare sector, this principle becomes crucial as patient care intertwines with broader societal and ecological responsibilities.

Many organizations worldwide have begun systematically monitoring, measuring, and reporting their social and environmental performance in recent years. While businesses must generate profits for shareholders, they also influence local communities through employment opportunities, resource utilization, and environmental impacts such as waste management and emissions. Ensuring a solid economic foundation remains essential for fulfilling these stakeholder responsibilities, an observation that holds for private hospitals striving to maintain both financial viability and ethical obligations.

In Indonesia, OJK Circular Letter No. 16/SEOJK.04/2021 provides additional guidance on ESG disclosures, ensuring companies communicate their sustainability efforts transparently. Moreover, the Indonesian Stock Exchange requires listed companies to disclose sustainability information, further reinforcing the need for private hospitals to integrate sustainability reporting into their corporate strategy. These regulations reflect Indonesia's commitment to aligning corporate reporting with global sustainability standards, ensuring accountability, and promoting sustainable business practices.

Increasingly, companies implement sustainability strategies evaluated by independent agencies like Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini and Thomson Reuters, aiming to balance profitability with social and environmental stewardship. By embedding sustainability principles into performance metrics, organizations strive to demonstrate accountability, supply measurable outcomes, and address stakeholder concerns. This dual focus resonates with the objectives of the present study, which seeks to assess how effectively Indonesian private hospitals adhere to global standards and identify pathways for more robust and transparent sustainability disclosures.

A growing body of research highlights the multifaceted nature of sustainability reporting. Dissanayake (2019) demonstrates the interplay between internal leadership commitment and external regulations in shaping corporate disclosure. Christensen (2021) cautions that although mandatory reporting can enhance transparency, it may lead to superficial compliance. Yang (2020) and Luo (2023) reveal how robust GRI-based frameworks can drive measurable environmental outcomes, especially in reducing carbon emissions. In a different context, Kincaid (2021) shows that while there is a growing emphasis on gender metrics and broader diversity themes, comprehensive coverage of marginalized groups remains lacking. Together, these studies underscore the importance of standardized guidelines and authentic, rather than perfunctory, reporting—principles crucial for evaluating sustainability practices in healthcare.

Though smaller in scale than other industries, the healthcare sector's sustainability efforts are increasingly pertinent. Challenges like limited resources, aging populations, and the growing burden of chronic diseases compel healthcare organizations to optimize resource allocation and align with the Sustainable Development Goals. This study, therefore, focuses on a major private hospital group in Indonesia, scrutinizing its sustainability disclosures through the GRI standards to identify areas of substantial compliance and highlight gaps that can be addressed to enhance overall reporting quality.

Theoretically, this research responds to the need for a deeper exploration of sustainability reporting in the healthcare sector, shedding light on how private hospital groups navigate established frameworks like GRI and Indonesian regulatory mandates. Ultimately, these findings aim to guide policymakers in formulating harmonized reporting policies and charting the future direction of sustainability reporting. This study aspires to fortify the credibility of sustainability reporting and encourage healthcare providers to actively contribute to sustainable development efforts by pinpointing best practices, uncovering instances of non-compliance, and suggesting improvements.

Literature Review

Sustainability Reporting: The Need for an Established Standard

Waddock (2008) conducted a comprehensive investigation into the evolution of stakeholder engagement practices by organizations. Between the 1960s and 1980s, businesses primarily implemented philanthropic programs and passive communication strategies through public relations or customer relations departments. Since the 1980s, significant changes have emerged in corporate approaches to stakeholder engagement. Companies began adopting codes of conduct and demonstrating a heightened commitment to informing stakeholders about social issues. This transparency has been recognized as a crucial factor in building trust between organizations and their stakeholders. European countries and the United States have been key players in this evolution, albeit with different regional priorities. European corporations focus on environmental concerns, while U.S. companies emphasize internal social issues and philanthropic contributions. The 1980s also saw the rise of ethical investment funds, which excluded companies involved in controversial industries, such as alcohol and tobacco.

The 1990s marked the emergence of environmental and social reporting, driven by growing ecological concerns and heightened awareness of environmental responsibilities (Peršić, 2017). Over the past decade, these fragmented reports have been consolidated into unified sustainability reports. These reports publicly disclose corporate actions on environmental and social issues and serve as managerial tools to demonstrate corporate commitments to sustainability and social accountability. Furthermore, they provide essential data for benchmarking and identify areas for improvement (Greenwood, 2007).

Despite these advances, the lack of standardized reporting formats across companies has created challenges for investors, analysts, and other stakeholders. These groups have increasingly advocated for developing universally applicable and reliable sustainability reporting standards. The GRI was established to address this need. According to Marimon et al. (2012), the GRI aims to provide informational guidance that accurately reflects an organization's social and environmental impacts. Its primary objective is to equip shareholders and stakeholders with reliable information, enabling informed decisions about investments and purchases. Additionally, the GRI framework facilitates assessing organizational sustainability performance and supports benchmarking and comparability among organizations (Ioannou & Serafeim, 2017). Implementing the GRI framework has elevated sustainability reporting to a level comparable with financial reporting.

However, like any managerial system, the GRI reporting framework has not been without criticism. Goel (2005) argues that the GRI is overly generalized and includes numerous indicators rarely utilized by companies. Conversely, Asif et al. (2013) view the GRI as a solid foundation for sustainability reporting, offering a structured approach to measuring sustainability and enabling sectoral comparisons among companies using the same indicators. Abadía (2005) adds that while the GRI framework does not encompass all relevant sustainability indicators, it provides a robust foundation for organizations seeking to disclose sustainability information. However, further domain-specific guidance may still be necessary.

The GRI has evolved into the most widely adopted standard for sustainability reporting globally. Since its establishment, the framework has undergone continuous refinement to align with the dynamic needs of stakeholders and markets. This evolution has strengthened the core principles of transparency and trust, making the GRI an indispensable tool for advancing sustainability reporting practices worldwide.

GRI Standards: Background Information

The GRI is an independent international organization that provides a set of standards for sustainability reporting, aiming to enhance transparency and accountability for organizational impacts. The primary objective of GRI is to ensure that organizations report their environmental, social, and economic impacts transparently while promoting accountability and sustainability across sectors (Alonso-Almeida, 2014). Guided by a vision of fostering a sustainable future, the GRI Global Sustainability Standards Board (GSSB) employs an autonomous, multi-stakeholder approach to establish a universal framework for impact reporting. This standardized framework enables more effective dialogue and informed decision-making regarding organizational impacts. As of 2020, the GRI standards are widely recognized as the most utilized and comprehensive global sustainability reporting framework (KPMG, 2020).

GRI began its journey in 2000 by releasing its initial guidelines, followed by iterative updates to address emerging challenges and stakeholder expectations. The G2 Guidelines were introduced in 2002, the G3 Guidelines in 2006, and the G4 Guidelines in 2013. In 2016, GRI transitioned into a global standard-setting organization by publishing the GRI Sustainability Reporting Standards, commonly called "the Standards." These Standards, based on the G4 Guidelines and Implementation Manual, provide a modular and interconnected structure. They differentiate between mandatory requirements, recommendations, and guidance. The term "shall" is used to denote requirements, "should" indicates recommendations, and "may" refers to guidance (Truant, 2017).

As principle-based standards, the GRI standards define essential concepts for sustainability reporting. Recent updates include guidance on corporate reporting related to the SDGs in 2017, sector-specific programs in 2019, tax standards in 2019, and waste standards in 2020. These developments aim to refine reporting practices and address global sustainability challenges.

GSSB is an independent body under GRI exclusively responsible for developing and updating GRI standards. Operating in the public interest, the GSSB brings together experts and representatives from various stakeholder groups to ensure the inclusivity and comprehensiveness of the Standards. Its governance structure mirrors accounting standard-setting bodies, with a Process Oversight Committee and an Independent Appointments Committee. Over time, the role of the Stakeholder Council has evolved from approving guideline changes to providing strategic oversight for the development of the Standards.

The GRI standards consist of three universal components that organizations must adhere to. The first component delineates reporting principles, including accuracy, balance, clarity, comparability, completeness, timeliness, and verification. The "sustainability context" principle requires organizations to report their impacts within the broader sustainable development framework, considering future generations' needs, scientific perspectives on natural resource limitations, alignment with the SDGs, and societal expectations. The second component focuses on general disclosures, covering information related to organizational operations, governance structures, strategies, policies on sustainable development, and approaches to stakeholder engagement. The third component outlines the identification and management of material topics, emphasizing the most significant economic, environmental, and social impacts of organizational activities.

The GRI Sector Program created standards for 40 specific industries, prioritizing sectors with substantial environmental, social, and economic impacts. These standards identify key sectoral impacts and align stakeholder expectations for sustainability reporting. They provide a comprehensive overview of sustainability within a sector, highlight essential topics, and specify relevant disclosures. For instance, the initial sector standard, GRI 11: Oil and Gas Sector 2021, was publicly available in October 2021 (Machado, 2021). Other sectors, such as coal, agriculture, aquaculture, and fisheries, have also been prioritized under this program.

As the GRI standards evolve, they address the changing needs of stakeholders and markets while strengthening transparency and trust in sustainability reporting processes. By providing a structured and universally accepted framework, the GRI facilitates consistency, comparability, and reliability in sustainability disclosures, enabling stakeholders to make informed decisions that support sustainable development.

The Future of Sustainable Healthcare: Transparency and Innovation

Private hospitals in Indonesia operate under business models that prioritize efficiency, accessibility, and technological advancement. While these models focus on financial sustainability, they are inherently linked to ESG responsibilities. Regulatory frameworks, such as OJK Regulation No. 51/POJK.03/2017, mandate sustainability reporting, requiring hospitals to disclose their environmental impact, social contributions, and governance practices.

A key aspect of private hospital expansion is the managed service model, where hospitals collaborate with investors while maintaining operational control. It enables rapid growth but also amplifies challenges related to waste management, energy consumption, and healthcare accessibility. Sustainability reports are a transparency tool to ensure hospital growth aligns with sustainable development principles. Adopting digital transformation and AI in hospital management enhances efficiency while reducing waste and energy consumption. AI-driven predictive analytics help optimize resource use, cutting redundant medical testing and improving healthcare outcomes. Sustainability reports provide measurable insights into how these technological advancements contribute to reducing environmental footprints.

Furthermore, economies of scale help private hospitals lower costs, but they must balance this with ethical practices, such as fair labor policies, responsible procurement, and medical waste management. Compliance with Indonesia's sustainability reporting regulations ensures that cost-cutting measures do not compromise ESG commitments. Hospitals are also integral to public-private partnerships under Indonesia's universal health coverage (JKN). While these partnerships expand healthcare access, sustainability reports must address how hospitals manage equitable service distribution and financial sustainability.

Sustainability reporting bridges business strategies and ESG commitments, ensuring hospitals integrate renewable energy, workforce sustainability, and community engagement. More than a compliance requirement, it is a tool for enhancing stakeholder trust and aligning hospital growth with Indonesia's sustainable development goals. Private hospitals can ensure long-term accountability while delivering responsible healthcare services by embedding sustainability into business strategies and transparently reporting progress.

Methodology

This study examined how effectively a leading Southeast Asian healthcare provider aligns its 2023 sustainability reporting with globally recognized standards. A qualitative approach was adopted, using content analysis of the organization's publicly available sustainability report. This method was chosen for its capacity to interpret non-numeric information and to shed light on the nuances of corporate disclosure practices, particularly when revealing ESG strategies.

Drawing on prior research (Khan et al., 2011), GRI standards were employed as the evaluative framework for this analysis. With 118 criteria spanning General Disclosures to Material Topics, the GRI standards allowed for a comprehensive review of how thoroughly the healthcare provider adhered to recommended reporting practices. Each criterion was scored on a scale from zero to four, where higher scores indicated more substantial alignment with GRI guidelines. Sections earning three or four scores suggested robust compliance and clarity in disclosures, while lower scores pinpointed areas that warrant more attention or elaboration.

Focusing on just one prominent organization gave the study a deep and contextualized view of sustainability reporting in the private healthcare sector. By concentrating on a single, influential provider, the investigation aimed to highlight best practices and expose gaps that could be relevant to other industry players. It is similar to the approach by Kochalski et al. (2017) used in their analysis of sustainability reporting in the Polish energy sector. The findings are structured to guide the reader from the highest-scoring areas of the sustainability report—illuminating where disclosures most closely followed GRI criteria—down to the lower-scoring segments, which reveal room for further development.

In areas that received favorable scores, the healthcare provider clearly articulated its social initiatives, environmental commitments, or governance structures, offering an example for comparable institutions seeking to refine their reporting. As the GRI standards (Global Reporting Initiative, 2021) highlight, leading organizations provide comprehensive disclosures, setting a benchmark for others in their sector. Meanwhile, sections with limited disclosures or missing elements represent opportunities for strengthening future reports and elevating transparency. Identifying these gaps can serve as a roadmap for this provider and others striving to meet international standards and stakeholder expectations. Ultimately, continuous improvement in sustainability reporting is essential for building trust, demonstrating accountability, and driving progress toward a more sustainable healthcare system.

The study offers practical and academic insights into how companies, especially healthcare companies, can enhance sustainability reporting. Underscoring strengths and weaknesses encourages ongoing improvements and positions the organization's practices within the broader context of global ESG accountability. The alignment with recognized guidelines such as the GRI underscores the findings' broader relevance and confirms this qualitative inquiry's credibility.

Results and Discussions

This section outlines the findings from an independent assessment of a healthcare organization's sustainability report, focusing on how comprehensively it aligns with the GRI standards. A structured scoring system, ranging from 0 (no disclosure) to 4 (full disclosure), was employed to evaluate the extent and accuracy of the report's disclosures. The sections below explore the assigned scores for categories such as General Disclosures, Economic Performance, Environmental Impact, Social Responsibility, etc. This analysis highlights both areas of strength and opportunities for enhanced clarity or depth. By presenting the findings impartially, this overview offers a comprehensive understanding of the organization's current reporting practices while inspiring actionable improvements.

As indicated in Table 1, a thorough list of disclosures was methodically assessed in alignment with the GRI standards, culminating in a perfect score of "4" across various GRI Standard Titles. This outcome signifies comprehensive compliance with the established GRI reporting guidelines. The disclosures encompass a broad array of information, including fundamental organizational details. This comprehensive approach reflects a profound commitment to transparency and accountability in sustainability reporting.

Table 1 Disclosure Quality Score “4” for GRI Standards

GRI Standard Number	GRI Standard Title	Disclosure Number
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-1; 2; 3; 7; 9; 14; 22; 24; 26; 27; 28; 29
GRI 3	Material Topics	3-1; 2; 3
GRI 201	Economic Performance	201-1
GRI 202	Market Presence	202-1
GRI 203	Indirect Economic Impacts	203-1
GRI 302	Energy	302-1; 3; 4
GRI 303	Water and Effluents	303-3; 4; 5
GRI 305	Emissions	305-1; 2; 3; 4
GRI 306 (2020)	Waste	306-1; 4; 5
GRI 401	Employment	401-1; 2
GRI 403	Occupational Health and Safety	403-1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 9
GRI 404	Training and Education	404-1; 2
GRI 405	Diversity and Equal Opportunity	405-2
GRI 408	Child Labor	408-1
GRI 409	Forced or Compulsory Labor	409-1
GRI 413	Local Communities	413-1
GRI 414	Social Assessment of Suppliers	414-1
GRI 416	Customer Health and Safety	416-1; 2
GRI 417	Marketing and Labeling	417-2
GRI 418	Customer Privacy	418-1

Table 2 concisely represents the disclosures assigned a "3" score across various GRI Standard Titles. These disclosures signify substantial compliance with GRI guidelines, yet they demonstrate the potential for enhancement to achieve full compliance. These disclosures offer valuable insights into the organization's sustainability performance while highlighting areas where reporting could be enhanced to comply fully with the GRI standards.

Table 2 Disclosure Quality Score “3” for GRI-Standards

GRI Standard Number	GRI Standard Title	Disclosure Number
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-13
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-25
GRI 204	Procurement Practices	204-1
GRI 405	Diversity and Equal Opportunity	405-1
GRI 417	Marketing and Labeling	417-1

Table 3 provides a detailed breakdown of disclosures that have received a score of "2" across various GRI Standard Titles. A score of "2" denotes partial compliance with the GRI guidelines, indicating that certain aspects are reported, yet there are opportunities for enhanced completeness and transparency. Of particular note is the predominance of 'General Disclosures' in this table, underscoring the necessity for enhanced reporting in these areas. This table functions as a roadmap, guiding the identification of specific disclosures where enhancements can be made to better align with GRI standards.

Table 4 presents a detailed breakdown of disclosures that scored "1" across various GRI Standard Titles. These disclosures indicate partial compliance with GRI reporting guidelines. The disclosures, which range from communication of critical issues to maternity leave policies, generally lack the depth or clarity required for comprehensive reporting. This table highlights areas where improvements can significantly enhance transparency and stakeholder engagement.

Table 3 Disclosure Quality Score “2” for GRI-Standards

GRI Standard Number	GRI Standard Title	Disclosure Number
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-5
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-8
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-12
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-15
GRI 205	Anti-corruption	205-1
GRI 306 (2020)	Waste	306-2

Table 5 offers a disconcerting synopsis of disclosures that received a score of '0' across various GRI Standard Titles, signifying an absence of reporting in these domains. Of particular note, "General Disclosures" account for the highest number of zero-scoring disclosures, underscoring the imperative for substantial enhancement in providing fundamental organizational information. This paucity of reporting could be interpreted as a lack of transparency or insufficient commitment to certain GRI aspects. Addressing these gaps is imperative for enhancing the organization's sustainability reporting and comprehensively adhering to GRI standards.

Table 4 Disclosure Quality Score “1” for GRI Standards

GRI Standard Number	GRI Standard Title	Disclosure Number
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-16; 23
GRI 302	Energy	302-5
GRI 303	Water and Effluents	303-2
GRI 305	Emissions	305-5
GRI 306 (2020)	Waste	306-3
GRI 308	Environmental Assessment of Suppliers	308-1
GRI 401	Employment	401-3
GRI 406	Non-discrimination	406-1

The findings comprehensively assess the healthcare organization's adherence to GRI standards, highlighting its strengths in transparent reporting across several categories, such as General Disclosures and Material Topics. However, the results also reveal critical gaps in Anti-Corruption, Biodiversity, and Supplier Assessments, which hinder a complete alignment with GRI guidelines. By addressing these deficiencies and enhancing the depth of reporting in weaker areas, the organization has the potential to establish itself as a leader in sustainable practices within the healthcare sector. These insights underscore the importance of continuous improvement in sustainability reporting and offer actionable pathways for the organization to meet stakeholders’ expectations better and align with global standards of accountability and transparency.

Table 5 Disclosure Quality Score “0” for GRI Standards

GRI Standard Number	GRI Standard Title	Disclosure Number
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-4; 6; 10; 11; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 30
GRI 201	Economic Performance	201-2; 3; 4
GRI 202	Market Presence	202-2
GRI 203	Indirect Economic Impacts	203-2
GRI 205	Anti-corruption	205-2; 3
GRI 206	Anti-competitive Behavior	206-1
GRI 207	Tax	207-1; 2; 3; 4
GRI 301	Materials	301-1; 2; 3

Table 5 Disclosure Quality Score "0" for GRI Standards (Cont.)

GRI Standard Number	GRI Standard Title	Disclosure Number
GRI 302	Energy	302-2
GRI 303	Water and Effluents	303-1
GRI 304	Biodiversity	304-1; 2; 3; 4
GRI 305	Emissions	305-6; 7
GRI 308	Environmental Assessment of Suppliers	308-2
GRI 402	Labor/Management Relations	402-1
GRI 403	Occupational Health and Safety	403-6; 7; 8; 10
GRI 404	Training and Education	404-3
GRI 407	Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining	407-1
GRI 410	Security Practices	410-1
GRI 411	Indigenous Rights	411-1
GRI 412	Indigenous Rights	412-1
GRI 413	Local Communities	413-2
GRI 414	Social Assessment of Suppliers	414-2
GRI 415	Public Policy	415-1
GRI 417	Marketing and Labeling	417-3

Discussion

A leading Indonesian healthcare provider, founded in August 1996, launched its first hospital in partnership with an international group. It went public in September 2013 and has since expanded to 39 hospitals—9 in Greater Jakarta and 30 across Java, Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Bali, and Nusa Tenggara. Of these, 26 serve patients under the national health insurance program, with plans for further expansion. The company also operates 30 standalone clinics nationwide. As a major healthcare provider, it faces environmental risks from chemical drug use and medical waste. Healthcare facilities are known contributors to pollution (Phengxay et al., 2013), making sustainable management essential. In line with growing industry transparency, sustainability reports have become more common since 2019 (Halkos, 2021), allowing stakeholders to assess corporate responsibility. The company's 2023 Sustainability Report details its policies, initiatives, and challenges, adhering to Financial Services Authority regulations (POJK-51/2017, SEOJK-16/2022) and GRI standards. It highlights four key focus areas: economic performance, environmental impact, societal well-being, and human rights, reinforcing its commitment to ethical and sustainable growth.

The initial assessment entails a quantitative evaluation of the company's disclosure, which has been designated a value of 4. This score indicates the company disclosing information precisely, comprehensively, and in detail, demonstrating close alignment with the GRI standards guidelines. The company's compliance with these standards is evident by its adherence to 50 key requirements.

The company's adherence to GRI standards is a significant advantage, as evidenced by the comprehensive and transparent presentation of information related to its organizational profile, identity, market served, scale, values promoted, approach to engaging with stakeholders, and administrative components in its sustainability report. Providing comprehensive and consistent disclosures can facilitate an enhanced comprehension of the company's identity, operational scope, and values in its business activities among those who utilize the report. Such disclosures can facilitate the construction of an image and sense of proximity between the company and its stakeholders. Furthermore, comprehensive disclosures in a well-structured sustainability report can foster greater investor and state confidence in the company, facilitating a more nuanced understanding of its operations.

Furthermore, the company has demonstrated compliance with numerous standards in diverse areas, including energy, water, and waste management; emissions; occupational health and safety (OHS); training and education; local communities; and customer health and safety, aligning with key principles outlined in sustainability reporting frameworks like ISO 26000 and the GRI standards. Such topics are closely related to the entity's operational activities as a public health services provider within the community, a sector increasingly scrutinized for its environmental and social impacts (Du Pisani, 2006). Therefore, the company's management must pay close attention to the environmental conditions that pertain to this topic.

Several special topics, like research by (Clarkson et al., 2011), have been presented with satisfactory clarity and transparency, supporting research that links clear disclosure with enhanced stakeholder engagement. Some of these relate to energy consumption, OHS, as well as explanations of material topics about training and education, as well as customer health and safety. Such transparency may foster public trust in the entity, particularly concerning OHS matters, a key factor in corporate social responsibility initiatives (Hahn & Lülfs, 2014). As a publicly listed company, the entity needs to gain investor confidence in its business processes' safe and sustainable running, especially as sustainability metrics increasingly influence investment decisions.

This section delineates the criteria employed to evaluate sustainability reports that have been assigned a score of 3. A score of 3 indicates disclosures that meet the majority, or approximately 75%, of the criteria outlined in the GRI standards guidelines. In assessing materiality, it is imperative to acknowledge that the subject matter predominantly exhibits qualitative characteristics rather than quantitative attributes. This characteristic introduces challenges in the quantification of report content. Notwithstanding this challenge, the GRI standards delineate conceptual boundaries that serve as a framework for the assessment process.

In the General Disclosure, the company does not provide a comprehensive account of the delegation of responsibility for managing impacts to whom. While the document does address the issue of delegation of responsibility in general, the lack of specificity regarding the identity of the responsible party may lead to confusion in the event of an adverse occurrence. The company attempts to deflect responsibility by failing to identify the relevant individual or entity. Furthermore, the company has articulated the procedure for rectifying adverse effects, as outlined in the General Disclosure, but it remains lacking in specificity. It applies equally to the proportion of expenditure on local suppliers in the Procurement Practices area and the diversity of governance bodies and employees in the Diversity and Equal Opportunities area. The situation is markedly different regarding the requirements for labeling and product and service information, as outlined in the Marketing and Labelling area. In this disclosure, the company has provided a comprehensive and detailed explanation. However, the company has failed to include the GRI standards guideline number in its reporting, as if it had not disclosed it. Although this may appear to be a trivial matter, it can have significant implications. Suppose an individual were to view the sustainability report based solely on the numbering of the GRI standards guidelines. In that case, they might assume that the company does not disclose information.

What recourse does the company have in this situation? A score of 3 may still be perceived as satisfactory and sufficient for the company. In theory, a company must reveal all aspects of its internal sustainability performance, as well as the impact of its activities on the sustainability of external parties. Should companies merely attempt partial disclosure, this will inevitably lead to queries and adverse sentiments from various stakeholders, significantly impairing the company's reputation. The company must prioritize the aforementioned aspects, as they signify domains of concern within the disclosure process. The assessment concluded that the company only partially disclosed, or, at most, disclosed up to 50% of the criteria stipulated in the GRI standards.

The initial topic of discussion will be the General Disclosure area, which is guided by four fundamental principles: the necessity of external assurance, the role of non-direct employees in this context, the function of the highest governance body in impact management oversight, and the management of conflicts of interest. In its sustainability report, the company states that the report has been subjected to external assurance, yet there are no indications of such external assurance upon examination. This discrepancy with the guidelines indicates that the company's sustainability report cannot be independently recognized as fully compliant upon further examination. It represents a loss for the company, particularly given its reputation as one of the leading hospitals in Indonesia. However, the absence of external assurance has led to a lack of independent recognition of the company's sustainability report as fully compliant.

Furthermore, the company only discloses the issue of workers who are not direct employees in the form of a single image, lacking sufficient detail. It aligns with critiques in the literature regarding superficial disclosures that fail to capture the complexity of workforce dynamics, particularly in industries reliant on non-employee labor. Providing more comprehensive information on this matter could align with best practices for workforce reporting, as suggested by the International Labour Organization's guidelines on decent work.

A different issue arises concerning disclosing the highest governance body's role in overseeing impact management and conflicts of interest. While the company lists a disclosure number in this case, it provides no accompanying information, an omission that reflects gaps often observed in governance reporting within private organizations (Hahn & Lülfs, 2014). Such discrepancies are concerning, as they may lead to the perception that the company has falsified its report to present a favorable image, a phenomenon discussed in studies on greenwashing and its implications for corporate legitimacy (Lyon & Montgomery, 2015). Addressing these shortcomings is critical for maintaining transparency and fostering stakeholder trust.

Furthermore, the anti-corruption area, with its pivotal guidelines on operations deemed to have potential risks related to corruption, also faces challenges in disclosure. The company's approach to this issue is again lacking in thoroughness, as evidenced by the failure to include the disclosure number, despite its clear mention in the sustainability report. Similarly, the waste management guidelines were not adequately disclosed, creating potential bias regarding the company's transparency. It can occur, in general, primarily due to the absence of external assurance, as previously discussed. External assurance can potentially mitigate the issues regrettably absent in many companies. It can adversely affect the company's reputation, financial stability, and social standing.

In this context, a rating of one indicates that the company has disclosed only a limited proportion of the criteria stipulated in the GRI standards, with the disclosed information constituting no more than 25% of the total criteria. The assessment identified eight problem areas that received this score. The following section presents a concise overview of these areas and their key guidelines.

In this assessment, scores were assigned to these key areas and guidelines because, in general, companies do not provide sufficient disclosure. In the case of the key guideline "Communication of key issues," for instance, the information disclosed by the company is not aligned with the fundamental guidelines and criteria outlined in the GRI standards. It is challenging to ascertain whether this is a consequence of input errors or a lack of diligence on the part of the report preparer in presenting the data, given that the company has a reputation for excellence in sustainability reporting, as previously discussed. In the absence of external assurance (as presented in Table 3), the potential for negative assumptions about the company has emerged. In other areas, the company provides an overview of the key guidelines, but this overview is not accompanied by an explanation that would elucidate the underlying rationale. This ambiguity and bias, if interpreted negatively, indicate that the company is not attempting to adhere to the guidelines set forth by the GRI standards. The concept of the GRI standards, comprising three "universal standards," is not aligned with the company's approach, leading to a decision not to disclose.

An evaluation of the company's disclosures reveals a failure to align with the fundamental guidelines outlined in the GRI standards. Specifically, the company has not disclosed any information pertinent to the disclosure guidelines, and the disclosed concepts are deemed inappropriate. This particular evaluation of the company's performance determined that it failed to adhere to a minimum of 50 key guidelines. This finding is indicative of a disclosure level of merely 40.7%.

Ensuring transparency in corporate sustainability reporting is vital for earning stakeholder trust and demonstrating genuine accountability. This study highlights five core disclosure areas—economic, environmental, social, legal/governance, and marketing—and emphasizes that falling short in any of them can lead to severe reputational damage, legal troubles, and financial risks. Understanding these vulnerabilities is essential for organizations striving to meet stakeholder expectations and global reporting standards.

A lack of economic transparency deprives stakeholders of key insights into a company's long-term financial stability and broader contributions to the community (Eccles et al., 2014; Porter, 1985). Obscured or incomplete data on market presence, fiscal responsibility, and tax practices raises questions about corporate ethics and accountability while lowering investor confidence and limiting access to capital—especially in industries reliant on public funding or policy incentives. Future research could investigate how financial openness influences investor behavior across different sectors, including emerging markets where disclosure regulations can be inconsistent.

Similarly, incomplete social reporting undermines an organization's claims of responsibility and diminishes stakeholder confidence (Global Reporting Index, 2021). Omissions around labor conditions, workplace safety, and employee development impede equity and human capital investment assessments, while failing to disclose freedom of association or indigenous rights raises doubts about fair labor practices (International Labour Organization, 2014). From a theoretical standpoint, Stakeholder Theory suggests such oversights jeopardize a company's legitimacy and competitive edge. Further investigation into whether heightened social transparency correlates with stronger employee engagement and reduced turnover could be especially illuminating.

Inadequate legal and governance disclosures hinder stakeholders from evaluating an organization's ethical stance, compliance mechanisms, and integrity (OECD, 2015). Without clarity on anti-corruption measures, competitive practices, or public policy involvement, it becomes impossible to identify potential conflicts of interest or gauge regulatory influence (Hillman & Hitt, 1999). This study finds that many governance-related disclosures remain inconsistent, posing particular challenges in sectors where public-private partnerships and regulatory oversight are prevalent. Future research should compare the effects of mandatory legal requirements versus voluntary frameworks on governance transparency and corporate accountability.

Likewise, disclosure and marketing transparency shortfalls exacerbate information gaps, making it harder for stakeholders to judge a company's sustainability initiatives and ethical marketing (Michelon et al., 2015). Vague or misleading claims about CSR, product labeling, and sustainability efforts can foster skepticism and allegations of greenwashing (Hahn & Lülfs, 2014). As ethical consumerism gains momentum, inadequate marketing disclosures risk eroding consumer trust and damaging brand loyalty (Toppinen et al., 2015). From the perspective of Signaling Theory, firms use sustainability reports to showcase credibility; however, shallow disclosures can backfire and tarnish reputations. Further inquiry might explore how transparency in reporting influences consumer choices in markets where CSR heavily affects brand positioning.

Overall, companies that openly communicate their sustainability practices are more likely to earn long-term stakeholder trust, avoid reputational pitfalls, and stay financially resilient (Dawkins & Fraas, 2011). This study underscores the idea that sustainability reporting is not merely a compliance formality but a strategic instrument for building accountability and securing enduring success. With heightened scrutiny from regulators, investors, and civil society (Hahn & Lülfs, 2014), organizations that neglect transparency risk legal liabilities, dwindling consumer confidence, and restricted access to sustainable funding. These findings align with earlier research showing that firms with robust disclosure protocols tend to outperform competitors in ESG performance and social responsibility metrics (Ioannou & Serafeim, 2017).

A central challenge is determining how organizations can provide reliable external assurance for sustainability reporting while honoring GRI standards. From a conceptual perspective, comprehensive disclosures uphold stakeholder and legitimacy theory tenets, showcasing accountability to societal and environmental demands. In practice, robust reporting deepens stakeholder trust, mitigates reputational risks, and fortifies a company's social license to operate, demonstrating why transparency is vital for long-term business resilience.

For the economic dimension, organizations should offer clear and detailed reports on economic performance, market presence, indirect impacts, and tax obligations. By doing so, they fulfill the social contract principle of illustrating how they both shape and rely on broader socioeconomic systems. Practically, presenting full financial statements, risk assessments, and data on indirect economic impacts enhances investor confidence and strengthens stakeholder relationships. Transparent tax contributions, in particular, signal accountability and ethical conduct, bolstering a firm's legitimacy among communities and regulators.

Turning to environmental responsibilities, companies are encouraged to systematically track and disclose materials usage, energy and water consumption, waste handling, and emissions (Schaltegger & Burritt, 2010). These steps, aligned with GRI guidelines, reflect a commitment to environmental stewardship and responsible corporate citizenship. Practically, such metrics enable goal-setting, performance evaluation, and clearer accountability. Including supplier environmental assessments also helps ensure sustainability throughout the value chain, meeting stakeholder and regulatory expectations. Evidence suggests that initiatives like energy efficiency and waste management shrink ecological footprints and enhance corporate reputation (de Oliveira et al., 2018).

Social disclosures are equally crucial. Firms are responsible for being candid about labor-management relations, workforce safety, training programs, freedom of association, Indigenous rights, and community engagement (Kolk, 2016). This approach resonates with ideas of corporate citizenship and human rights (United Nations, 2011). Practically, transparent policies on worker welfare and development contribute to goodwill, lower turnover, and improve organizational outcomes (Jabbour & Santos, 2008). Supply chain considerations are increasingly important, too, as careful communication of social impacts underlines a firm's dedication to fair labor practices, meeting both stakeholder expectations and regulatory demands (Yawar & Seuring, 2017).
Openness about anti-corruption policies, fair competition measures, and public policy engagement signals an organization's commitment to ethical standards within legal and governance spheres. In real-world terms, thorough disclosures of governance structures and integrity practices can reduce regulatory scrutiny and foster credibility with investors, governments, and the wider public.

Finally, honest communication around products, services, and marketing strengthens brand trust and competitive positioning (Eccles et al., 2014). Consistent and accurate messaging supports signaling theory, proving a company's commitment to ethical conduct and long-range sustainability (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). In practice, adherence to reputable standards (Global Reporting Initiative, 2021) minimizes the risk of greenwashing and preserves stakeholder confidence. By blending conceptual insights—like legitimacy and stakeholder theories—with practical motivations—such as risk mitigation and reputational benefit—businesses can make the most of their sustainability reporting (Du et al., 2010; Kotler & Lee, 2011).

Organizations should uphold transparency and responsibility across all operations to meet GRI standards and related guidelines. These recommendations bolster sustainability reports in both theory, evidencing alignment with societal and stakeholder expectations, and practice, enhancing public trust, clarifying economic and social impacts, and emphasizing sound governance. Ultimately, thorough and credible disclosures nurture stakeholder confidence and demonstrate a genuine dedication to ethical, sustainable business practices.

Conclusion

This study explores how private hospitals in Indonesia report on sustainability, focusing on compliance with GRI standards and identifying areas for refinement. It examines whether hospitals meet regulatory obligations, such as GRI standards, and whether those disclosures reflect substantive ESG commitments. Although the featured hospital publishes sustainability reports, some disclosures lack depth, especially given its prominence as a publicly listed entity with a broad societal impact.

While the research relies on qualitative methods and a single case study, limiting its generalizability, it underscores the critical need for greater transparency, stakeholder engagement, and accountability. Recommendations include clarifying responsibilities, strengthening governance disclosures, and improving reporting on environmental and social dimensions. Adding external assurance, adopting standardized ESG metrics, and offering frequent updates would bolster credibility and public trust.

Because the study centers on one hospital group and publicly available data, some sustainability efforts may not have been captured. Future research should broaden its scope to multiple hospitals, integrate quantitative measures of sustainability outcomes, and investigate how reported commitments shape actual hospital policies. Exploring Indonesia's regulatory efficacy in enforcing sustainability reporting would highlight compliance hurdles and potential sector-wide improvements, helping hospitals and regulators formulate more transparent and impactful sustainability strategies.

References

Abadía, J. M. M. (2005). Información sobre responsabilidad social corporativa: Situación y tendencias. *RAE: Revista Asturiana de Economía*, (34), 43-67.

Alonso-Almeida, M. D. M. (2014). A closer look at the "Global Reporting Initiative" sustainability reporting as a tool to implement environmental and social policies: A worldwide sector analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 21(6), 318–335. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1318

Asif, M., Searcy, C., Zutshi, A., & Fisscher, O. A. M. (2013). An integrated management systems approach to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 56, 7–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.10.034

Christensen, H. B. (2021). Mandatory CSR and sustainability reporting: economic analysis and literature review. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 26(3), 1176–1248. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-021-09609-5

Clarkson, P. M., Overell, M. B., & Chapple, L. (2011). Environmental reporting and its relation to corporate environmental performance. *Abacus*, 47(1), 27–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6281.2011.00330.x

Dawkins, C., & Fraas, J. W. (2011). Coming clean: The impact of environmental performance and visibility on corporate climate change disclosure. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *100*, 303–322.

de Oliveira, U. R., Espindola, L. S., da Silva, I. R., da Silva, I. N., Rocha, H. M. (2018). A systematic literature review on green supply chain management: Research implications and future perspectives. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 187,* 537-561. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.083

Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review, 54*(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64

Dissanayake, D. (2019). Factors influencing sustainability reporting by Sri Lankan companies. *Pacific Accounting Review*, 31(1), 84–109. https://doi.org/10.1108/PAR-10-2017-0085

Du Pisani, J. A. (2006). Sustainable development – historical roots of the concept. *Environmental Sciences*, 3(2), 83–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/15693430600688831

Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2010). Maximizing business returns to corporate social responsibility (CSR): The role of CSR communication. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 12*(1), 8–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00276.x

Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The Impact of Corporate Sustainability on Organizational Processes and Performance. *Management Science*, 60(11), 2835–2857. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24550546

Global Reporting Initiative. (2021). *GRI Standards*. https://www.globalreporting.org/standards/

Goel R. (2005). Guide to Instruments of Corporate Responsibility: An Overview of 16 Key Tools for Labour Fund Trustees. *Schulich Business School, York University: Toronto*.

Greenwood J. (2007). Organized civil society and democratic legitimacy in the European Union. *British Journal of Political Science*, 37(2), 333–357. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123407000166

Hahn, R., & Lülfs, R. (2014). Legitimizing negative aspects in GRI-oriented sustainability reporting: A qualitative analysis of corporate disclosure strategies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123(3), 401–420. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1801-4

Halkos, G. (2021). Corporate social responsibility: Trends in global reporting initiative standards. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 69, 106–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2020.11.008

Hillman, A. J., & Hitt, M. A. (1999). Corporate Political Strategy Formulation: A Model of Approach, Participation, and Strategy Decisions. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 825–842. https://doi.org/10.2307/259357

International Labour Organization. (2014). *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2017). The consequences of mandatory corporate sustainability reporting. *Harvard Business School Research Working Paper*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1799589

Jabbour, C. J. C., & Santos, F. C. A. (2008). The central role of human resource management in the search for sustainable organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(12), 2133–2154. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190802479389

Khan, H., Azizul Islam, M., Kayeser Fatima, J., & Ahmed, K. (2011). Corporate sustainability reporting of major commercial banks in line with GRI: Bangladesh evidence. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 7(3), 347–362. https://doi.org/10.1108/17471111111154509

Kincaid, C. (2021). Diversity and inclusion in mining: An analysis of indicators used in sustainability reporting. *Extractive Industries and Society*, 8(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2021.100981

Kochalski, C., Mikołajewicz, G., Nowicki, J., & Ratajczak, P. (2017). Sustainability reporting in Poland: an in-depth analysis with reference to the Respect index companies. *Sustainability Reporting in Central and Eastern European Companies: International Empirical Insights*, 109-127. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-52578-5_7

Kolk, A. (2016). The social responsibility of international business: From ethics and the environment to CSR and sustainable development. *Journal of World Business*, 51(1), 23–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2015.08.010

Kotler, P., & Lee, N. (2011). *Corporate Social Responsibility: Doing the Most Good for Your Company and Your Cause*. Wiley.

KPMG. (2020). *The Time Has Come: The KPMG Survey of Sustainability Reporting*. KPMG International.

Luo, L. (2023). The real effects of ESG reporting and GRI standards on carbon mitigation: International evidence. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 32(6), 2985–3000. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3281

Lyon, T. P., & Montgomery, A. W. (2015). The means and end of greenwash. *Organization & Environment*, 28(2), 223–249. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575332

Machado, B. A. A. (2021). Transparency of materiality analysis in GRI-based sustainability reports. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 28(2), 570–580. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2066

Marimon, F., Alonso-Almeida, M. del M., Rodríguez, M. del P., & Cortez Alejandro, K. A. (2012). The worldwide diffusion of the global reporting initiative: what is the point? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 33, 132–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.04.017

Michelon, G., Pilonato, S., & Ricceri, F. (2015). CSR reporting practices and the quality of disclosure: An empirical analysis. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 33, 59–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2014.10.003

OECD. (2015). *G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance*. OECD Publishing.

Peršić, M., Janković, S., & Krivačić, D. (2017). Sustainability accounting: upgrading corporate social responsibility. *The Dynamics of Corporate Social Responsibility: A Critical Approach to Theory and Practice*, 285-303. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39089-5_15

Phengxay S, Okumura J, Miyoshi M, Sakisaka K, Kuroiwa C, Phengxay M. (2013). Health-care waste management in Lao PDR: a case study. *Waste Management & Research*. 2005;23(6):571-581. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X05059802

Porter, M. E. (1985). The Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance. *NY: Free Press*, https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=193

Schaltegger, S., & Burritt, R. (2010). Sustainability accounting for companies: Catchphrase or decision support for business leaders? *Journal of World Business*, 45(4), 375–384. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2009.08.002

Toppinen, A., Li, N., Tuppura, A., & Xiong, Y. (2015). Corporate responsibility and strategic groups in the forest-based industry: Exploratory analysis based on the global reporting initiative (GRI) framework. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 93, 257–271. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.256

Truant, E. (2017). Sustainability and risk disclosure: An exploratory study on sustainability reports. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 9(4). https://doi.org/10.3390/su9040636

United Nations. (2011). Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/guidingprinciplesbusinesshr_en.pdf

Waddock S. (2008). Building a new institutional infrastructure for corporate responsibility. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 22(3), 87–108. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2008.34587997

Yang, L. (2020). Changing trends of corporate social responsibility reporting in the world-leading airlines. *PLoS ONE*, 15(6). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234258

Yawar, S. A., & Seuring, S. (2017). Management of social issues in supply chains: A literature review exploring social issues, actions, and performance outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141(3), 621–643. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2719-9

About the author(s)

Michael Walzer (M.W.) is currently a graduate student at public sector accounting department, Polytechnic of State Finance STAN. His research interests are Energy Alternatives, Sustainability, and Behavioural Finance.

Amrie Firmansyah (A.F.) is an associate professor at the Department of Accounting, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta, Indonesia. His areas of expertise include Financial Accounting, Public Sector Accounting, and Sustainability Accounting.

Author(s) contributions

Conceptualization, M.W. and A.F.; Methodology, A.F.; Investigation, M.W.; Analysis, M.W.; Original draft preparation, M.W.; Review and editing, A.F.; Visualization, M.W.; Supervision, A.F.; Project administration, A.F.; Funding acquisition, A.F.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.