Business Sustainability Assessment: Comparing Results of Two Studies
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Business sustainability assessment requires data, which can be gathered from various information sources. Annual statements are frequently used as a data source, because they are considered to be one of the most important means of the company to communicate with various stakeholders. The document is signed by the management of the company, ensuring that the information in the statement is accurate, and because the statements are audited by an independent third party.

The research was intended to solve the problem of the lack of information about the content of Lithuanian companies’ annual statements from the perspective of corporate sustainability assessment. Thus, two studies were executed, first analysing annual statements of 15 companies, and the second analysing the remaining annual statements of 23 companies, to build understanding of what information is available for further studies of business sustainability assessment. The studies encompassed 38 Lithuanian companies, listed in the Baltic main and secondary lists in Vilnius market in NASDAQ OMX, which constituted 100% of companies. As the studies were done in the beginning of 2010, annual statements for 2008 were used.

The methods of the research were logical literature analysis, computer assisted quantitative content analysis, comparative analysis.

The first part of the paper reviews the research of Lithuanian scientists in the field of sustainable development, and more specifically, various business and industry sectors. The literature review also includes various business sustainability evaluation models, focusing on the structure of the models, the quantity of companies analysed and the sources of data, used in the evaluations. In the second parts of the paper, the model of business sustainability evaluation is briefly described to create the basic structure for the research of annual statements of the companies. The third part describes the methodology of the research: what data was analysed, how it was analysed, the structure of the research. In the fourth part of the article, the results of the study are presented, explaining what information was most often found in the annual statements and how frequently it was found. Eventually, the findings are discussed from the perspective of whether the availability of information is satisfactory to execute corporate sustainability assessment.

The model for business sustainability assessment, used in this study, is based on the idea, that companies have an impact on the environment. But it is not always possible to state in advance weather an impact is positive or negative, as it depends on a specific company case analysed. Thus, the model is created grouping the company impacts into positive, negative and situational.

Positive impacts cover employee training, employing disabled, employing people with no work experience and elderly ones, workplace safety, family friendly workplace, lab or union existence, taxes paid, salaries paid, profit and donations to charity. Negative impacts cover pollution, product end-of-life pollution, discrimination, corruption, resource depletion, wasted materials, child lab or and fines paid to the government. Situational impacts cover product/service itself, and the delivery of this product or service to the society.

The study showed, that the information, present in all 39 annual statements, is the information about profit, paid taxes, paid salaries, and the product or service the company produces. 82% of the annual statements had the information about employee training, 79% had the information about the materials and resources used, 72% of statements had the information about donations to charities, 69% of statements had information about fines paid, and 67% of annual statements had the information about labour unions. Among the information, that was not found at all in the annual statements is child labour and employing inexperienced, with 0% occurrence, 5% (2 annual statements out of 39) had some information about employing the disabled and corruption.

The terms “renewable” and “unrenewable” (Lithuanian equivalents) were found mentioned once each, showing, that the information about renewable resources cannot be found in the statements. From the sustainability perspective, this lack of information greatly limits the possibilities to include renewable resources, as one of the indicators, in business sustainability evaluation.

The results show, that because of the lack of some information in the annual statements, either the business sustainability assessment model should be simplified and data, that is not available, should be removed or substituted, or other sources of information (such as corporate websites, press releases or interviews) should be employed to gather the data needed for the evaluation of corporate sustainability. The third possibility is executing empirical business sustainability evaluation studies explicitly stating the limitations- what necessary information was not available during the research.
Introduction

The research problem. Business sustainability evaluation requires data, which can be gathered from various information sources, such as corporate websites, press releases, interviews, surveys, annual statements, advertising and other sources. Annual statements are frequently used as a data source because they considered to be one of the most important means of the company to communicate with various stakeholders, the document is signed by the management of the company, ensuring that the information in the statement is accurate, and because the statements are audited by an independent third party. This ensures data reliability, which is not the case while using interviews, surveys or press releases.

The research problem, that was intended to solve, was that there was no information on the availability of data, relevant for business sustainability evaluation. Before one starts evaluating business sustainability, he/she has to know if the reliable information is available, and what information is available about the companies. Thus, the studies, described in this article, were executed, first analysing the annual statements of of 15 companies, the second analysing the remaining annual statements of 23 companies, to build understanding of what information is available for further studies of business sustainability evaluation to be carried out in the future.

Newness of the research is the research of 100% of publicly traded companies in Lithuania (38 companies), analysing the information, published in their annual statements for 2008, from the perspective of business sustainability evaluation.

The research object is the information in the annual statements of the companies.

The aim of the research is by comparing the results of two studies, conducted by the authors, to draw conclusions whether information, available in the annual statements, is enough for business sustainability evaluation.

The tasks:
- to review previous research in sustainable development, applications in various industries and business evaluations;
- to describe the theoretical model and research methodology of the two research studies executed;
- to compare the descriptive statistics and the results of the researches;
- to assess whether information in the annual statements is enough for business sustainability evaluation.

The methods of the research were logical literature analysis, computer assisted quantitative content analysis, comparative analysis.

The structure of the paper. The first part of the paper reviews the research of Lithuanian scientists in the field of sustainable development, and more specifically, various business and industry sectors. The literature review also includes various business sustainability evaluation models, focussing on the structure of the models, the quantity of companies analysed and the sources of data, used in the evaluations. In the second parts of the paper, the model of business sustainability evaluation is briefly described to create the basic structure for the research of annual statements of the companies. The third part describes the methodology of the research: what data was analysed, how it was analysed, the structure of the research. In the fourth part of the article, the results of the study are presented, explaining what information was most often found in the annual statements and how frequently it was discovered. Eventually, the findings are discussed from the perspective of whether the availability of information is satisfactory to execute business sustainability evaluation studies in the future. The results are followed by the list of references.

Sustainable development and business sustainability evaluation

Lithuanian authors analyze a wide spectrum of sustainability issues. Ciegis (2003) discusses the principles of management of society’s sustainable development with a focus on sustainable economic development and environmental indicators. Sustainable development indicators and sustainable development programs are the focus of Ciegis & Streimikiene (2005). Ciegis et al. (2005) discuss the concepts of strong and weak sustainability. The principles of sustainability in the management of universities are the focus of Grundey, Savrina & Kanapickiene (2007). Streimikiene & Girdzijauskas (2008) analyse the application of logistic growth models in sustainable growth analysis, while Grundey (2008a) analyses the application of sustainability principles at various levels of economy. The focus of a paper by Streimikiene (2008) is strategies of EU pollution reduction and the impact of policies on the slope of Kuznets curve. Ciegis et al. (2008) analyze Lithuania’s socio-economic progress in the perspective of other new EU members, while Ciegis & Ciegis (2008) in their paper discuss the relationships of the laws of thermodynamics and sustainability. The use of sustainability indicators in assessing sustainable development is the focus of Ciegis, Ramanauksieni & Startiene (2009) while in their paper, Ciegis, Ramanauksieni & Martinkus (2009) broadly discuss different definitions and interpretations of the sustainability concept.

Business and industry sustainability are also analyzed from various perspectives by Lithuanian authors. Grundey (2003) focuses the study on sustainable production and consumption, and green marketing, Grundey et al. (2004) analyze sustainable consumption patterns in food industry, in another study Grundey (2008b) analyzes the possibilities to develop sustainable energy projects in Lithuania. Lithuania’s progress in sustainable industrial development was analyzed by Staniskis et al. (2006). Krisciunas & Greblikaita (2007) discuss the impact of entrepreneurship on sustainable development with a specific focus on economic sustainability. Green marketing and eco-labeling are the focus of the studies by Grundey & Zaharia (2008) and Grundey (2009). Ruzevicius (2009) compared sustainability and socially responsible business manifestation in different countries. Tourism sector sustainability in Lithuania is the focus of a paper by
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One of the first attempts to measure business sustainability was Ragas et al. (1997). In the theoretical consideration and sustainability definition, Ragas et al. (1997) acknowledge the three pillars of sustainability, but mainly focus on the ecological dimension, explaining that “Ecological sustainability is a prerequisite for social and economic sustainability: the carrying capacity of the biosphere is limited and should not be exceeded by socioeconomic activities” (Ragas et al., 1997, p. 150). Thus, sustainability is seen as a level of impact of socioeconomic activities on the environment. For the empirical presentation of the evaluation method, Ragas et al. (1997) use a paper mill example in the Netherlands. Various indicators (energy, resources, output of white paper, emissions to air and water etc.) are calculated and compared to the environmental utility space (EUS) to create a graphical representation of the different impacts of a paper mill.

In business sustainability evaluation models, the impacts are being classified in different ways, but mostly have the structure of three sustainability dimensions of economy, society and ecology. Tyteca & Callens (1999) group measurement indicators into three dimensions, as well as Figs & Hahn (2004) in their proposed concept of sustainable value. Though Figs & Hahn (2005) in the calculations show, that the sustainable value in different dimensions can be also positive and negative. Krajnc & Glavic (2005) also use three dimensions and the measured performance indicators of a company can be either positive or negative.

On the other hand, Caporali & Tellarini (2000) use the grouping of indicators into economic and energy dimensions, and indicators are also related to input and output. Ko (2005) distinguishes the human system and the ecosystem, but these are further granulated into more dimensions. Bebbingon et al. (2006) propose using Sustainability Assessment Modeling (SAM) for business sustainability evaluation, and group the impacts into economic, environmental, resources and social, and also positive and negative. Phillis & Davis (2009) also use the grouping of impacts into human and ecological, which are further granulated into more components.

The empirical studies could be grouped into two groups according to the number of companies analyzed and the source of data. One group could consist mostly of case study analysis, where one or a few companies are evaluated. The data used for such studies is most often taken for the annual statements of these companies. Examples of such studies could be Ragas et al., (1997), Caporali & Tellarini (2000), Figge & Hahn (2005), Krajnc & Glavic (2005), Tseng et al. (2009), Phillis & Davis (2009).

Another group of studies evaluate many companies at the same time, and most often use survey data for evaluation of sustainability and company ranking. Such studies are: Tyteca (1999), Andreoli & Tellarini (2000), Van Passel et al., (2007), Gomez-Limon & Sanchez-Fernandez (2010).

Hence a conclusion can be made, that most business sustainability researchers base corporate sustainability evaluation on studying company’s impact on the environment and the society, while grouping these impact according to three sustainability pillars or in some other ways. To gather the data needed for evaluation, some studies utilize company annual statement information, mostly when case study analysis is done, or utilize survey data, when aiming at evaluation and ranking of a big number of business entities.

The model of business sustainability evaluation

The model for business sustainability evaluation, used in this study, is based on the idea, that companies have an impact on the environment. The structure of the model is analogous to the model, developed by Grunda (2010). As seen from the literature review, the idea of measuring impact, as a representation of business sustainability, is widely used in the models. From company evaluation and ranking perspective, and potential policy improvement, one would be interested in knowing on what areas does a company have positive impacts and on what areas it has negative ones. This knowledge would enable increasing the positive impacts and reducing negative ones.

But it is not always possible to state in advance whether an impact is positive or negative, as it depends on a specific company case analyzed. Thus, the model is created grouping the company impacts into positive, negative and situational. The impacts also could be grouped according to the three sustainability dimensions, similar to Tyteca & Callens (1999) proposition of calculating the overall evaluation by adding positive economic impacts (which should be maximized), subtracting negative economic impacts (which should be minimized), adding positive social impacts (which should be maximized), subtracting negative social impacts (which should be minimized), adding positive environmental impacts (which should be maximized) and subtracting negative environmental impacts (which should be minimized). In this study this is not done in order not to complicate the basic structure too much.

Positive impacts are: employee training, employing disabled, employing people with no work experience, employing elderly, workplace safety, family friendly workplace, labor union existence, taxes paid, salaries paid, profit and donations to charity. Negative impacts are: pollution, product end-of-life pollution, discrimination, corruption, resource depletion, wasted materials, child labor and fines paid to the government. Situational impacts are: product/service itself, and the delivery of this product or service to the society.

The described model of evaluating business sustainability through positive, negative and situational impacts is used further in the research of company annual statement analysis.

Methodology of the research

The study was done using content analysis as a method. To ensure the possibility to compare the results of this and a previous study, methodological procedures were
The study was carried out analyzing annual statements of Lithuanian companies, that were listed in the Baltic main list of the Vilnius market in NASDAQ OMX. At the time of the study, the main list consisted of 15 publicly traded companies, thus 15 annual statements were analyzed. The first study included 100% of the main list, what constituted 39.5% of the total number of Lithuanian companies listed in the NASDAQ OMX Vilnius market.

After the first study was executed, to increase the reliability of the findings, the second study was carried out. This was done with several aims in mind: the original sample was only 15 companies, so to increase the reliability of the findings, the study was decided to repeat including the remaining Lithuanian companies from the secondary list, so that all Lithuanian companies would be studied. So the second study consisted of 23 companies, that were listed in the Secondary list in Vilnius market of NASDAQ OMX. Because of the availability of multiple annual statements (company’s annual statement and annual statement of a group, that is consolidated report) the final number of annual statements analyzed was 24. This constituted the remaining of 100% annual statements of Lithuanian companies, so the results of both studies can be interpreted more reliably.

Another aim of carrying out the second study was to be able to compare the results with the intention of finding out similarities and differences in both samples. And the congruence of the methodological procedures allows interpreting the results of both studies as one, consisting of a bigger data sample.

In the second sample of companies, similarly as in the first study, some companies had additional special statements (e.g. social responsibility statement, of a statement, that is created more for the representation purposes with pictures and illustrations inside). These additional annual statements were not used in the study. It can be seen as a future study possibility to carry out a study using more diverse sources of information, such as special purpose annual statements, press releases or corporate websites.

The study was carried out analyzing annual statements, that were prepared for the year 2008, because newer statements were not all yet published. Thus, the study has also more possibilities to be expanded using annual statements of several years to increase the data sample and at the same time employ a historical perspective of changing corporate behaviour.

The study was carried out utilizing computer-assisted content analysis. As Milne, Adler (1999) states, “The research method that is most commonly used to assess organizations’ social and environmental disclosures is content analysis”. As a method, content analysis can be employed to analyze various content: text, images, sounds and video, but for this study, words and phrases were used as coding units.

The ultimate goal of evaluating business sustainability cannot be achieved through content analysis as a method, because measurement and evaluation is done though various indicators. As this procedure requires calculation, using content analysis with the coding units as words and phrases, it is not possible to gather such information. Consequently, this study is intended to find out what information is available in the annual statements for business sustainability evaluation, so that a rough estimate of future possibilities for sustainability evaluation would be clearer.

As the annual statements were in Lithuanian language, both studies were carried out in this language. Thus the dictionary was composed also in Lithuanian. The second study was carried out utilizing the dictionary, developed in the first study (Grunda, 2010), according to the structure of business sustainability evaluation model, described in the first section.

The dictionary had these quantities of terms:

- Among the positive impacts, employee training was represented by 7 terms, employing disabled – 3 terms, employing inexperienced – 1 term, employing elderly – 1 term, work safety/health – 8 terms, family friendly workplace – 6 terms, labour unions – 4 terms, taxes paid – 4 terms, salaries paid – 2 terms, profit term group – 4 terms, charity donations – 4 terms;
- Among the negative impacts, pollution term group had 6 terms, discrimination – 7 terms, corruption – 3 terms, Material use – 9 terms, child labour – 2 terms, fines paid – 1 term.
- Among the situational impacts, product or service (value) term group consisted of 4 terms.

Results of the empirical research

To measure and evaluate business sustainability, certain information is needed. One of the aims of this study was to find out whether this information is present in the companies’ annual statements. This calculation did not calculate the frequencies of occurrence, only the existence of at least one mention in the statement.

Certain groups of terms, needed for sustainability evaluation, were in some of the analyzed annual statements. There were some term groups, that were present in all of the annual statements, but it was also found that some of the information is not present at all neither in the first 15 statements, nor in the second 24 annual statements.

Table 1 shows the number of statements of the two studies, that had certain term group information- the number of statements carrying certain information, its conversion into percentage points, and a combination of two studies in percentage points.

From Table 1 it can be seen, that information about paid taxes, paid salaries, profit and product/service was found in all annual statements of both studies. In both studies there was no information found about employing inexperienced and child labor, which is shown as 0 % in both studies in Table 1. All the other term groups were found at least one or several times in the annual statements, some of them more often than others.
Among the most frequent information in the annual statements there was information about employee training, found in 82% of all (34/39) annual statements, in 72% of all the annual statements charity donations were mentioned (in 28 of 39 statements). Information about fines was mentioned in 69% of the annual statements, information about labour unions was present in 67% of statements and 64% of statements had at least some information about pollution. These earlier mentioned term groups were found in the most of the annual statements analyzed.

To find out which topics can be found most often in the annual statements, a method “frequency counting” was utilized. The results of frequency counting in the two studies are presented in Table 2.

Table 1

Term occurrence in annual statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive impact:</th>
<th>Term group</th>
<th>I study (15)</th>
<th>II study (24)</th>
<th>I study</th>
<th>II study</th>
<th>Sum(39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing disabled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing inexperienced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing elderly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work safety/health</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family friendly workplace</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor unions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes paid</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries paid</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity donations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material use</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child labor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines paid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product (value)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Term frequencies in annual statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Term group</th>
<th>I study</th>
<th>II study</th>
<th>I study</th>
<th>II study</th>
<th>Sum(39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee training</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.012%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.026%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing disabled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing inexperienced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing elderly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work safety/health</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.004%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.016%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family friendly workplace</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor unions</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.012%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.019%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes paid</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.198%</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.285%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries paid</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.288%</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.404%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>7760</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>1.536%</td>
<td>9745</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>1.929%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity donations</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.009%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.013%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10312</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>2.042%</td>
<td>136213</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>2.697%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.101%</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.062%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material use</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.020%</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.041%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child labor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines paid</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.005%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.007%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.035%</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product (value)</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>505115</td>
<td>0.235%</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>636213</td>
<td>0.369%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the perspective of positive, negative and situational impacts, the results of the two studies show that there is more positive information in the annual statements, which constitutes 2.042% of the content in the first study, and 2.697% of content in the second study. The situational impact information frequency is second in the row, constituting 0.235% of information in the first, and 0.369% of information in the second study. The last group of information, which is found least frequently, is negative impact information, constituting 0.035% and 0.114% of the two studies.

While comparing frequencies of the separate term groups of the two studies, the results are very similar. The four most frequent term groups, as in the first study, were profit, salaries, product/service and taxes. Term group “material” ranked the 5th in the first study, and the 6th in the second, where the 5th place in the rank was taken by pollution information. The 6th and the 7th ranks in the first study were split by labour union information and training, while training was also the 7th in the second study and trade unions were in the 8th place. These similar ranking results show that there is consistency in the information frequency in both studies and that the same information is more prevalent in both studies.

Among the differences of the two studies, the term group “employing elderly” should be mentioned, as in the first study this term group was not found at all, but in the second study 13 occurrences have been found in 7 annual statements. Elder people can be seen as a problematic group, as it is generally more difficult for them to get a job before or during pension age. This is why employing elderly can be seen as a positive activity of a company. But one of the companies in the second study mentioned elder age of the employees not from the social responsibility perspective, but also as a potential threat to the company, as employees that are near the pension age might leave the company, and the company will lose most of experienced workers. This could create problems because of the lack of qualified younger workers in the labour market.

From the perspective of business sustainability, certain terms, such as “renewable” and “unrenewable” can be seen as fundamental for evaluation. The first study showed, that the term “unrenewable” (in Lithuanian language) was used once, and the term “renewable” was not found in the 15 annual statements. The second study shows that the term “renewable” was found mentioned one in 24 annual statements and the term “unrenewable” was not found at all. The results could be defined as: “out of 39 annual statements of Lithuanian listed companies in 2008, the terms “renewable” and “unrenewable” were found once for each term”. This shows, that terminology of renewable and unrenewable resources is not common, and that such analysis of the type of materials used is not performed, or at least not presented in the annual statements. But it does not mean, that the companies depend only on unrenewable materials and resources- in the list there are agricultural, diary, furniture, food companies, that clearly depend on renewable resources, as well as there are energy companies, that depend mostly on unrenewable resources, such as oil. Thus, there are various companies, only the analysis of renewable and unrenewable materials and resources in not done or presented.

The study shows that some types of information are presented in every annual statement, while some of the information, necessary for the business sustainability evaluation, is not present at all. A conclusion can be drawn, that according to the proposed sustainability evaluation model, the information in the annual statements is not completely present, and either the model of evaluation should be modified according the availability of the data, or other information sources should be also used to gather the missing data, or both.

Conclusions

The literature review showed, that Lithuanian scientist analyse a wide spectrum of sustainability issues: sustainable economic development, sustainability indicators, strong and weak sustainability, sustainable development definitions. Lithuanian scientific literature analyse sustainability of such industries, as food, energy, tourism, universities, construction industry.

Business and industry sustainability evaluation studies can be grouped according to two criteria: the number of companies analysed and the source of research data. On group of studies concentrate on case studies, focusing on a small number of companies, and often gathering data from the annual statements. The second group mostly researches ranking of companies, thus focusing on a large number of companies and gathering data from surveys and available statistic databases.

The model of business sustainability evaluation, used in most studies, is based on the idea, that companies have impact in the environment. Business impacts in the model are grouped into three groups: positive, negative and situational. To ensure the possibility to compare the results of two studies, both of them were executed using the same methodology. The first study analysed annual statements of 15 companies, the second study analysed annual statements of 23 companies, thus, both studies analysed 38 companies, which constituted 100 % of Lithuanian companies, listed in the Vilnius market in NASDAQ OMX.

The comparison of the two studies has shown, that the information availability in the annual statements of the companies in both studies is similar with the same groups of information appearing most often in most of the annual statements. The information, present in all the 39 annual statements, is the information about profit, paid taxes, paid salaries, and the product or service the company produces.

82% of the annual statements had the information about employee training, 79% had the information about the materials and resources used, 72% of statements had the information about donations to charities, 69% of statements had information about fines paid, and 67% of annual statements had the information about labour unions.

Among the information, that was not found at all in the annual statements is child labour and employing inexperienced, with 0% occurrence, 5% (2 annual statements out of 39) had some information about employing disabled and corruption.
The terms “renewable” and “unrenewable” (Lithuanian equivalents) were found mentioned once each, showing, that the information about renewable resources cannot be found in the statements. From the sustainability perspective, this lack of information greatly limits the possibilities to include renewable resources, as one of the indicators, in business sustainability evaluation.

The results show, that because of the lack of some information in the annual statements, either the business sustainability evaluation model should be simplified and data, that is not available, should be removed or substituted, or other sources of information (such as corporate websites, press releases or interviews) should be employed to gather the data needed for evaluation of business sustainability. This conclusion also proposes another possibility- an empirical research with certain limitations. It is common in scientific research to execute empirical researches, that often are limited by the lack of necessary data. Nevertheless, further empirical business sustainability evaluation researches could be executed with explicit and clear statements about what kind of information is necessary, but not available during the research.
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Tyrimas išplėtė tyrinėtojų metinių apdoros struktūrą. Paskutinė tyrinėtojų metinių apdoros struktūrą, kurią siekia, yra tyrinėti, kaip dažnai informacijos yra paskelbta ataskaitose, ar informacijos, prie kurios galima prieiti, yra patikimi. Šios tyrinos rezultatai padėjo įvertinti, kokia informacija buvo dažniausiai rasta ataskaitose ir kaip dažnai ji buvo rasta.
Galiausiai rezultatai yra vertinami iš verslo darnumo perspektyvos, siekiant atsakyti į klausimą, ar pateikiamą informaciją yra pakankama įmonių darnumui įvertinti.

Tyrimo taikytas verslo darnumo vertinimo modelis yra pagrįstas idėja, kad įmonės daro įtaką aplinkoje. Aptariant literatūrą, matyti, kad įtakos vertinimas yra plačiai naudojamas modeliuose. Iš įmonės ir politikos tulpinamo perspektyvos norėtų įžinoti, kokiose srityse įmonės įtaka teigiama, o kokiose smarkiai - neigamią. Taip įmonė patarba arba naudodama politikos pakeitimus teigiamą įtaką didinu, o neigiamą įtaką mažinu.

Tačiau ne visada įmonės į anksto įvardyti, ar tam tikra įtaka yra teigiama, ar ji yra neigiami, nes tai priklauso nuo tuo metu vertinamos įmonės. Todėl sūlulomame modelyje įtakos yra sugrupuotos į teigiamą, neigiamą ir situacinę. Teigiamai įtaka: darbuotojų mokymai, neįgaliųjų įdarbinimas, darbuotojų be darbo patirties įdarbinimas, priežiūros taisyklės atliekant, nuo to metu saugumas ir politika. Tačiau, nors yra įmonės metinių ataskaitų, neatsižvelgiant į tai, kad informacijos apie įmonių įtaką yra retai naudojama. Taip, neatsižvelgiant į tai, kad informacijos apie įmonių įtaką yra retai naudojama, tolygiai yra teigiama, o neigiami įtakos yra retai naudojamos. Taip, neatsižvelgiant į tai, kad informacijos apie įmonių įtaką yra retai naudojama, tolygiai yra teigiama, o neigiami įtakos yra retai naudojamos.