




# Social issue as an area of non-financial reporting in Poland on the example of selected companies listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange

HANNA CZAJA-CIESZYŃSKA

University of Szczecin, Faculty of Economics, Finance and Management, Institute of Economics and Finance, Department of Accounting, ul. Mickiewicza 64, 71-101 Szczecin, Poland

✉ [hanna.czaja-cieszynska@usz.edu.pl](mailto:hanna.czaja-cieszynska@usz.edu.pl)

 [orcid.org/0000-0002-6425-9519](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6425-9519)

## Abstract

**Motivation:** The dissemination of the concept of sustainable development has resulted in the social issue becoming an important area of non-financial reporting. However, the complexity and multidimensionality of this category mean that the indicators used for this are very diverse. The literature on this subject includes numerous publications, but there is lack of answer to the question: are the social category disclosures presented in non-financial reports comparable?

**Aim:** The aim of the paper is an assessment of the comparability of non-financial disclosures in the social area in reports of selected companies listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange. The ten largest companies listed in the WIG-20 index were selected for the study.

The study covered non-financial reports for 2019. The study was divided into five categories: (I) Human Rights, (II) Local Communities and Community Engagement, (III) Supplier Social Assessment, (IV) Customer Privacy, and (V) Other, within each, based on GRI Standards, up to three non-financial indicators have been defined.

**Results:** The conducted empirical study confirmed that the analysed non-financial reports were not fully comparable in any of the five categories of disclosures. Moreover, in many reports verbal description dominated, with a relatively small share of information expressed in numbers and/or percentages, which in turn creates a field for narration. Non-financial reporting requires an appropriate balance between descriptive reporting and quantified information. This also applies to the disclosure of information on social



issues. In this light, it seems necessary to lobby and then start legislative work aimed at increasing the comparability of non-financial reports.

*Keywords:* non-financial reports; social issue; GRI Standards; CSR; non-financial indicators  
*JEL:* M41; K30; F60

## 1. Introduction

The significance and importance of non-financial reporting, both in Poland and in the world, do not raise any major doubts. The first scientific research on this subject appeared in the early 1980s and mainly concerned findings in the environmental field (Guthrie & Parker, 1989; Wiseman, 1982). It was then that the idea of sustainable development and the concept of corporate social responsibility grew in importance. The following years saw a noticeable increase in interest in this subject, supplemented with a particularly important aspect of reporting in the social area: respect for human rights, counteracting social exclusion and equalizing opportunities, supporting the development of local communities, caring for national heritage or counteracting corruption. Realizing the fact that companies report to society for the effects of their activities created the basis for the emergence of a new accounting discipline that is social accounting (Jaglińska, 1984, p. 16).

There are many valuable publications in the literature on reporting non-financial information in the social area, which has become one of the global challenges of a modern enterprise (Gray et al., 1995; Orlitzky & Benjamin, 2001; Qiu et al., 2016). However, it should be emphasized that today the disclosure of any information of a social nature is far from sufficient for stakeholders. The responsibility of enterprises for the impact of their activities and decisions on the society and socio-economic life requires them to disclose reliable and comparable information. This is confirmed by the previous research results (Cormier et al., 2009; de Souza Gonçalves et al., 2014; Hazelton & Perkiss, 2018). And how is it in Poland, is the information presented in non-financial reports in the social area comparable? This article is an attempt to answer this research question, the aim of which is to assess the comparability of non-financial reporting regarding social issues in Poland on the example of selected companies listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, a research hypothesis was formulated with the following content: the lack of a minimum catalog of non-financial measures/indicators in reporting information in the social area may cause the comparability of reports between enterprises to be limited.

The 10 largest companies included in the WIG-20 index in terms of market capitalization were selected for the study. The study covered non-financial reports for 2019. It is worth mentioning at this point that reporting extended non-financial information has become obligatory in Poland since 2017, as a result of which the experience of Polish companies in this area is limited. For this reason, the study is of a pilot nature and is aimed at verifying the correct-

ness of the assumed research procedure: the selection of the surveyed companies and the adopted non-financial indicators. The results obtained will be used to develop research method that will be used in the main study. Then the entire population of WIG20 will be examined, and the time scope of the research will include non-financial reports for 2017–2020.

This article complements the existing scientific achievements related to reporting non-financial information regarding social issues by identifying its dysfunctional area that is comparability. The following research methods were used in the study: literature studies, in-depth analysis of secondary data in the form of non-financial reports, and the methods of induction and synthesis used when formulating conclusions. The article consists of four parts. The first part is a review of domestic and international literature on the subject of non-financial reporting regarding social issues. The second part discusses the methodology of empirical research, while the third part presents the results of research aimed at assessing the comparability of non-financial disclosures on social issues in Poland. Finally, the article ends with conclusions.

## 2. Literature review

The concept of reporting information regarding social issues appeared in the late 1980s, and since then has been the subject of many scientific studies. Examples include Belkaoui & Karpik (1989), Gray (2002), Hackston & Milne (1996), Mathews (1997), Parker (2005; 2011; 2014) and Patten (1991). There are also many publications devoted to this issue in Poland. These are mainly the works of Burzym (1993; 2008), Jarugowa (1984), Krasodomska (2014a; 2014b), Krasodomska & Dyduch (2017), Szadziwska (2014, 2015) and Szadziwska et al. (2018). These publications are very valuable studies, in which the authors focus primarily on the nature and context of reporting regarding social issues, its determinants, applied scientific theories.

Very interesting empirical research on the experiences of individual countries in non-financial reporting was carried out by Ali et al. (2017). Based on a survey and content analysis of 76 empirical research articles, they reviews the factors driving Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) disclosure in both developed and developing countries. In Europe, research on non-financial reports was also conducted by Lock & Seele (2016). They focused on the credibility of CSR reports, based on both human and software-enhanced quantitative content analysis of 237 CSR reports from 11 European countries. The results show that European CSR reports do not score high on credibility, leaving much room for improvement. De Villiers & Marques (2016) found a positive relationship between the level of CSR disclosure and the strength of the institutional environment in a sample of 366 European firms. The authors used data on the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) reporting level, covering a period of four years, and noted a positive and significant association between CSR disclosure and share price.

In the case of Polish-listed companies, Krasodomska & Dyduch (2017) explored 60 annual reports to examine the level of non-financial disclosure provided according to the Directive and factors that may determine the disclosure. They find that more than half of companies do not disclose Any nonfinancial information in their annual reports. Also Waniak-Michalak (2017), tried to answer the question if companies present the same measures in successive CSR reports and whether it is possible to compare the CSR activity results for successive years. Examination of 31 CSR reports for two consecutive editions of the reporting showed that companies change the number and type of disclosed measures. Interesting research results were also presented by Czaja-Cieszyńska et al. (2021). The aim of their research was to determine to what extent the informational function of accounting is performed by non-financial reports of entities conducting socially responsible business. The 10 largest companies listed in the WIG-ESG index in terms of market capitalization were selected for the study. The study covered non-financial reports for 2018–2019. The results of the research confirm that the company's membership in the WIG-ESG index does not guarantee a comprehensive approach to non-financial reporting and comparability of information.

The demand for non-financial information on the impact of economic activity (both positive and negative) is on the rise. Stakeholders' expectations regarding the way they are presented are also growing, as they more and more often value information in quantitative terms. Disclosures in the form of measures and/or non-financial indicators help them measure progress, ensure consistency over time and make comparisons in space (Communication..., 2017, p. 13). When selecting or constructing appropriate measures, certain rules must be followed. The literature on the subject indicates that non-financial measures/indicators should be, among others (Łukasiewicz, 2013, p. 142; Uliana & Grant, 2005, p. 171):

- simple and understandable — users of information should not look for additional information and explanations about them,
- precisely formulated — each recipient of the same information should interpret it in a similar way,
- selected according to the required level of detail that allows for making decisions,
- used for observing changes in state and structure and for comparative analyses.

The most widely used reporting system for sustainable development in the world are currently the international Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Standards. In Poland, an alternative to these regulations is the Non-Financial Information Standard (SIN) published in 2017 (Fundacja Standardów Raportowania, 2017). According to them, disclosures in the social area concern, inter alia, respect for human rights, child labour, forced labour, involvement in activities for the benefit of local communities, product and customer safety, issues related to marketing communication and protection of customer personal data.

The detailed scope of disclosures in the form of non-financial measures and indicators recommended by SIN and GRI Standards, broken down into different categories, is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

It is worth mentioning that according to the European Commission's *Guidelines on non-financial reporting* (Communication..., 2017), when disclosing social issues, the following works may be useful: the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, implementing the UN framework "Protect, Respect and Remedy", OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the Tripartite declaration of principles concerning multinational enterprises and social policy. The non-financial measures/indicators listed in Tables 1 and 2, characterizing disclosures in the social area, often differ in terms of structure and level of detail. Nevertheless, reporting them is particularly important, as respect for human rights, activities for the local community, counteracting corruption or marketing communication are critical from the point of view of sustainable development, and informing about them allows building a positive and customer-friendly image of the company.

### 3. Methods

Bearing in mind the variety of non-financial measures/indicators characterizing disclosures in the social area, the aim of the research undertaken is to assess the comparability of non-financial disclosures on social issues in the reports of selected companies listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange. The implementation of such a goal required the formulation of the following research hypothesis: the lack of a minimum catalog of non-financial measures/indicators in reporting information in the social area may cause the comparability of reports between enterprises to be limited.

The study covered non-financial reports of the ten largest listed companies included in the WIG-20 index in terms of market capitalization. The selection of the sample was deliberate and resulted from the desire to research the largest listed companies in Poland. The study is a pilot study, therefore only reports for 2019 were included in the study. If the research hypothesis is verified positively, the author will conduct research on a much larger scale. The list of entities accepted for research as of May 27, 2020 is presented in Table 3. These companies represent various sectors of the economy. These are: games (1), commercial banks (3), mining and production (2), insurance companies (1), everyday goods (1), metal mining (1), telecommunications (1).

The empirical study was based on the method of analysing the content of secondary data of the surveyed companies. The study covered non-financial reports for 2019. The research material was collected from the websites of individual companies. They were mainly reports on the management board's operations and statements/reports on non-financial information. After collecting the research material, a detailed analysis of the content of the non-financial reports in terms of disclosures regarding social issues used in the study was carried out.

For the content analysis, it was necessary to prepare a coding structure that required the presence or absence of specific non-financial measures/indicators to be identified. The zero-one system was adopted for the study, where 1 confirms the disclosure — a given non-financial measure/indicator was given in the report — and 0 means its absence.

In accordance with the adopted methodology, the starting point for further considerations on non-financial disclosures regarding the social area is a preliminary analysis of non-financial reports used in the study of listed companies. The subject of the analysis was the name of the report, legal regulations and the number of pages in the report. Half of the non-financial reports accepted for audit were published in the form of a report on Management Board's operations, the other half are reports on non-financial information. The GRI Standards constituted the basic legal framework for 9 out of 10 surveyed entities. The volume of reports accepted for the study oscillated around 100–130 pages. A synthetic summary of the presented characteristics is presented in Table 4.

The study was divided into five stages (Tables 6–10), which reflect the categories of disclosure on social issues, i.e.: (I) Human Rights, (II) Local Communities and Community Engagement, (III) Supplier Social Assessment, (IV) Customer Privacy; and (V) Other. Each category, based on the GRI and SIN regulations, was assigned up to three non-financial measures/indicators characterizing the disclosures in category S (Table 5). The categories of forced labour, child labour and respect for the rights of indigenous peoples were deliberately omitted, considering these areas of disclosure to be irrelevant to Polish economic practice.

The list of non-financial measures/indicators shown in Table 5 presents the recommended, in the author's opinion, scope of non-financial disclosures in the social area. When selecting non-financial measures/indicators, the rule was that their structure should be simple and understandable to the recipient, precisely formulated and comparable in time and space.

## 4. Results

The first examined category of disclosures in the social area are: Human rights. Within this group, two basic quantitative measures were defined. These are the number of reported/confirmed human rights violations and the total number of training hours/percentage of employees trained in human rights. The conducted analysis showed that while most of the companies included in the survey declare that they have a policy of respecting human rights, the reports do not contain figures on this subject. Only three entities, i.e. PKO BP, Orlen and Dino, commented on the number of human rights violations. None of the companies surveyed disclosed the number of training hours in this area. Detailed results of the analysis of non-financial reports accepted for the study in category I: Human Rights are presented in Table 6.

In category II: Local Communities and Community Engagement, three quantitative measures were adopted, i.e. the total amount of donations/sponsorship for community purposes, the number of hours worked by employees-volunteers, including the number of volunteers and the number of complaints submitted by the local community along with their subject matter. As many as 9 companies reported quantitative data on this area. The only exception is the company Dino, which only briefly informs that it does not conduct sponsorship activities, and that charity activities are carried out through the Dino Foundation. Detailed results of the research in category II: Local Communities and Community Engagement are presented in Table 7.

The subject of the third category of disclosures is supplier social assessment. Two measures that were assigned to this group are the number of suppliers assessed in terms of social impact and the number/percentage of suppliers identified as having significant actual and potential negative social impacts. As many as half of the companies analysed did not show any non-financial measures, limiting only to a description of the supplier selection policy applied, including environmental, social and ethical criteria. Only 1 company disclosed both of these types of information — PKO BP bank. Detailed results of the assessment of non-financial reports accepted for the study in category III: Supplier's social assessment are presented in Table 8.

The fourth category of disclosures concerns the protection of customer privacy (Table 9). In this category, three basic non-financial measures were identified: the number of complaints received regarding breach of customer privacy, the number of identified leaks, theft or loss of customers' personal data, and the financial value of penalties for non-compliance with laws and regulations on issues related to the protection of personal data. As many as 6 companies disclosed in reports the number of complaints submitted by clients, five of them shared information on the number of personal data leaks, and only 3 reported the value of financial penalties imposed for violating personal data protection.

The last analyzed category of disclosures is the group "Other", within which three characteristics were defined. These are: the number of cases of violations of procedures regarding the safety of products and services, non-compliance with regulations and voluntary codes concerning marketing communication, the financial value of penalties for non-compliance with laws and regulations in matters related to customer safety, integrity and ethics of marketing communication, anti-competitive and anti-market behavior, and number of reported/confirmed cases of corruption. As many as six surveyed companies presented a complete set of information in this regard. The companies most willingly shared information on the number of identified corruption cases. This disclosure was included in as many as 9 reports. Detailed information on disclosures in category V: Other in the audited entities is presented in Table 10.

To sum up, the conducted analysis of non-financial reports of selected companies listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange confirms that the comparability of information regarding social area is limited. In none of the five disclosure cat-

egories, i.e. (I) Human rights, (II) Local Communities and Community Engagement, (III) Supplier social assessment, (IV) Customer privacy and (V) Other, the information presented by the surveyed companies was fully comparable. It was not uncommon for companies to score 0 in a given category, which means that they did not disclose any of the recommended non-financial measures/indicators in the report. The final results for all ten surveyed companies are presented in Table II.

The final results clearly indicate that the audited non-financial reports are not fully comparable. The average number of points for disclosures in the social area is 6, which means that the companies presented less than half of the recommended non-financial measures/indicators. When analysing the detailed results, two companies, i.e. PKO BP and PZU, scored 8 points, and four companies (Santander, Orlen, CD Projekt and Dino) 7 points, thanks to which it can be concluded that their reports are comparable. These are Pekao and Polsat, które are comparable only in Category II and V. The lowest points were obtained by PGNiG (2 points) and KGHM (3 points). In the case of these entities, there is a lack of comparability. Summing up, the final results of the research clearly indicate that freedom in the selection of non-financial measures/indicators in reporting information in the social area limits the comparability of reports between enterprises. Thus, the research hypothesis was positively verified.

Similar conclusions in their research on the comparability of non-financial reports in Poland were reached, among other authors. Czaja-Cieszyńska & Kochański (2019) confirmed that the freedom in the presentation of non-financial information allowed by Polish law results in a non-uniform structure of disclosures, which significantly limits their comparability. Also, the research by Waniak-Michalak (2017) shows that the scope of the measures and the disclosed non-financial information changes in individual editions of reports, which reduces the comparability of reports.

## 5. Conclusion

Non-financial reporting in Poland is constantly evolving. Initially focusing solely on disclosing environmental issues, today it is a basic communication tool on the natural environment, labour and social issues. It is the lattermost that have been the subject of these considerations. Disclosures about community involvement and human rights, as well as information relating to forced labour, child labour and supplier social assessment, and the protection of customers' personal data, are just some examples in this regard. Due to the complexity and multidimensionality of these categories, reporting regarding social issues and the non-financial measures/indicators used for this are very diverse, and the comparability of the reports themselves is very limited.

Based on the literature review and own research, the goal, which was to assess the comparability of non-financial disclosures regarding social issues in reports of selected companies listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange, was achieved.



The analysis of the companies accepted for the study showed that their reports are not a sufficient tool to obtain information about the impact of the company's activities on social issues. The analysed non-financial reports in any of the five disclosure categories, i.e. (I) Human rights, (II) Local communities and Community Engagement, (III) Supplier social assessment, (IV) Customer privacy and (V) Other, were not fully comparable. Although many companies described their policies, e.g. in the field of respect for human rights, CSR assessment of the supply chain or personal data protection system, the reports lacked information expressed in numbers and/or percentages. Without quantitative information (non-financial measures/indicators), stakeholders are unable to measure the company's progress and make comparisons over time and space.

In summary, disclosure in the social area requires a proper balance between verbal description and quantitative information (Campbell & Slack, 2008). This, in turn, requires the development of a set of mandatory non-financial indicators/measures that will contribute to increasing the comparability of reports. A similar opinion is shared by Buhr et al. (2014), Overland (2007), Stubbs & Higgs (2018), Thirarungrueang (2013 (as cited in Krasodomska & Zarzycka, 2020, p. 120).

Finally, it should be added that drawing conclusions based on the conducted empirical research aimed at assessing the comparability of non-financial disclosures in the social area in reports of selected companies listed on the WSE has certain limitations. Firstly, the study is a pilot study, as a result of which it was conducted on a small sample of 10 companies and for one reporting period only. Secondly, the selection of recommended non-financial measures/indicators is subjective and certainly cannot be generalized to the entire population. Nevertheless, it seems that the undertaken topic may be a source of inspiration for further research on a much wider scale. It may also be valuable to examine in a similar manner the comparability of all three areas of non-financial reporting, i.e. disclosures on economic, environmental and social issues together.

## References

- Ali, W., Frynas, J.G., & Mahmood, Z. (2017). Determinants of corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure in developed and developing countries: a literature review. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 24(4), 273–294. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1410>.
- Belkaoui, A., & Karpik, P.G. (1989). Determinants of the corporate decision to disclose social information. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2(1), 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513578910132240>.
- Buhr, N., Gray, R., & Milne, M.J. (2014). Histories, rationales, voluntary standards and future prospects for sustainability reporting: CSR, GRI, IIRC and beyond. In J. Bebbington, J. Unerman, B. O'Dwyer (Eds.), *Sustainability accounting and accountability* (pp. 51–71). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315848419>.

- Burzym, E. (1993). Społeczny i ekologiczny aspekt współczesnej ewolucji rachunkowości w gospodarce rynkowej. *Zeszyty Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej w Krakowie*, 401, 5–20.
- Burzym, E. (2008). Społeczna funkcja rachunkowości. *Zeszyty Teoretyczne Rachunkowości*, 45(101), 71–85.
- Campbell, D., & Slack, R. (2008). *Narrative reporting: analysts' perceptions of its value and relevance*. Retrieved 01.05.2020 from <https://www.accaglobal.com/content/dam/acca/global/PDF-technical/narrative-reporting/rr-104-001.pdf>.
- Communication from the Commission: guidelines on non-financial reporting (methodology for reporting non-financial information) C/2017/4234 (OJ C 215, 5.7.2017).
- Cormier, D., Aerts, W., Ledoux, M.J., & Magnan, M. (2009). Attributes of social and human capital disclosure and information asymmetry between managers and investors. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 26(1), 71–88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.89>.
- Czaja-Cieszyńska, H., & Kochański, K. (2019). Sustainable development reporting of selected socially responsible listed companies. *Scientific Journals of the Maritime University of Szczecin*, 60(132), 93–100.
- Czaja-Cieszyńska, H., Lulek, A., & Sadowska, B. (2021). *Informacyjna funkcja rachunkowości z perspektywy społecznej odpowiedzialności biznesu*. Uniwersytet Szczeciński.
- de Souza Gonçalves, R., de Medeiros, O.R., Weffort, E.F.J., & Niyama, J.K. (2014). A social disclosure index for assessing social programs in Brazilian listed firms. *Accounting in Latin America*, 14, 75–103. <https://doi.org/10.1108/sl479-356320140000014002>.
- De Villiers, C., & Marques, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility, country-level predispositions, and the consequences of choosing a level of disclosure. *Accounting and Business Research*, 46(2), 167–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2015.1039476>.
- Fundacja Standardów Raportowania. (2017). *Standard informacji niefinansowych 2017*. Retrieved 01.05.2020 from <https://odpowiedzialnybiznes.pl/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/SIN.pdf>.
- GPW. (2021). Retrieved 01.05.2020 from <https://www.gpw.pl>.
- Gray, R. (2002). The social accounting project and Accounting, Organisations and Society privileging engagement, imaginings, new accountings and pragmatism over critique. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 27(7), 687–708. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0361-3682\(00\)00003-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0361-3682(00)00003-9).
- Gray, R., Kouhy, R., & Lavers, S. (1995). Corporate social and environmental reporting: a review of the literature and a longitudinal study of UK disclosure. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 8(2), 47–77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513579510146996>.

- GSSB. (2016). *Consolidated set of GRI sustainability reporting standards 2016*. Retrieved 01.05.2020 from <http://www.ekvilib.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/GRI-standardi-2016.pdf>.
- Guthrie, J., & Parker, L.D. (1989). Corporate social reporting: a rebuttal of legitimacy theory. *Accounting and Business Research*, 19 (76), 343–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.1989.9728863>.
- Hackston, D., & Milne, M.J. (1996). Some determinants of social and environmental disclosures in New Zealand companies. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 9(1), 77–108. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513579610109987>.
- Hazelton, J., & Perkiss, S. (2018). How useful are CSR reports for investors: the problems of comparing environmental and social disclosures. In S. Boubaker, D. Cumming, & D. Nguyen (Eds.), *Research handbook of finance and sustainability* (pp. 93–109). Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786432636.00012>.
- Jaglińska, Z. (1984). Rachunkowość odpowiedzialności społecznej przedsiębiorstw kapitalistycznych: zarys problemu. *Zeszyty Teoretyczne Rady Naukowej Stowarzyszenia Księgowych w Polsce*, 7, 15–22.
- Jarugowa, A. (1984). Rachunkowość społeczna na tle tendencji rozwoju rachunkowości. *Zeszyty Teoretyczne Rady Naukowej Stowarzyszenia Księgowych w Polsce*, 7, 5–14.
- Krasodomska, J. (2014a). *Informacje niefinansowe w sprawozdawczości spółek*. Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Krakowie.
- Krasodomska, J. (2014b). Rachunkowość społeczna: perspektywa światowa i krajowa. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, 329, 191–197. <https://doi.org/10.15611/pn.2014.329.20>.
- Krasodomska, J., & Dyduch, J. (2017). Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure: an empirical study of Polish listed companies. *Sustainability*, 9(11), 19–34. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9111934>.
- Krasodomska, J., & Zarzycka, E. (2020). Niefinansowe kluczowe wskaźniki efektywności: regulacje i wytyczne a praktyka przedsiębiorstw. *Zeszyty Teoretyczne Rachunkowości*, 108(164), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0014.3598>.
- Lock, I., & Seele, P. (2016). The credibility of CSR (corporate social responsibility) reports in Europe: evidence from a quantitative content analysis in 11 countries. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 122, 186–200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.060>.
- Łukasiewicz, G. (2013). Sprawozdawczość kapitału ludzkiego a kształtowanie zasobów niematerialnych małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, 3–4(92–93), 139–148.
- Mathews, M. (1997). Twenty-five years of social and environmental accounting research. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 10(4), 481–531. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eum0000000004417>.

- Orlitzky, M., & Benjamin, J.D. (2001). Corporate social performance and firm risk: a meta-analytic review. *Business & Society*, 40(4), 369–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765030104000402>.
- Overland, J. (2007). Corporate social responsibility in context: the case for compulsory sustainability disclosure for listed public companies in Australia. *Macquarie Journal of International and Comparative Environmental Law*, 4(2), 1–22.
- Parker, L.D. (2005). Social and environmental accountability research: a view from the commentary box. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 18(6), 842–860. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570510627739>.
- Parker, L.D. (2011). Twenty-one years of social and environmental accountability research: a coming of age. *Accounting Forum*, 35(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2010.11.001>.
- Parker, L.D. (2014). Constructing a research field: a reflection on the history of social and environmental accounting. *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal*, 34(2), 87–92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969160x.2014.938472>.
- Patten, D.M. (1991). Exposure, legitimacy, and social disclosure. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 10(4), 297–308. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-4254\(91\)90003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-4254(91)90003-3).
- Qiu, Y., Shaikat, A., & Tharyan, R. (2016). Environmental and social disclosures: link with corporate financial performance. *British Accounting Review*, 48(1), 102–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2014.10.007>.
- Stubbs, W., & Higgins, C. (2018). Stakeholders' perspectives on the role of regulatory reform in integrated reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 147(3), 489–508. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2954-0>.
- Szadziewska, A. (2014). Rachunkowość jako źródło informacji na temat realizacji strategii społecznej odpowiedzialności biznesu. *Zeszyty Teoretyczne Rachunkowości*, 75(131), 95–123. <https://doi.org/10.5604/16414381.1098779>.
- Szadziewska, A. (2015). Przejrzystość i porównywalność informacji niefinansowych w sprawozdawczości spółek w świetle zmian regulacji unijnych. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, 396, 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.15611/pn.2015.396.15>.
- Szadziewska, A., Śnieżek, E., & Krasodomska, J. (2018). *Informacje niefinansowe w sprawozdawczości biznesowej przedsiębiorstw*. Wydawnictwo Nieoczywiste.
- Uliana, E., & Grant, P. (2005). Towards reporting human capital. *Meditary Accountancy Research*, 13(2), 167–188. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10222529200500018>.
- Waniak-Michalak, H. (2017). Porównywalność w czasie informacji o wynikach działalności społecznie odpowiedzialnej firm raportujących według zasad GRI. *Zeszyty Teoretyczne Rachunkowości*, 91(147), 129–144. <https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0009.8027>.
- Wiseman, J. (1982). An evaluation of environmental disclosures made in corporate annual reports. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 7(1), 53–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682\(82\)90025-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682(82)90025-3).



## Acknowledgements

**Author contributions:** author has given an approval to the final version of the article.

**Funding:** this research was fully funded by the University of Szczecin.

**Note:** the results of this study were presented at *11th International Conference on Applied Economics Contemporary Issues in Economy* (June 17–18, 2021, online, Poland).



## Appendix

**Table 1.**  
**Social issues in non-financial report: scope of disclosures in the light of SIN**

No.	Disclosure category	Measures and non-financial indicators
I.	Human rights	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of reported human rights violations, including by subcontractors.</li> <li>2. Number of confirmed human rights violations, including by subcontractors.</li> <li>3. Percentage (%) of contracts with counterparties that include a human rights clause (in terms of value).</li> <li>4. Number of audits conducted at subcontractors' in terms of respect for human rights.</li> <li>5. Taking into account respect for human rights in the lending and investment policy (concerns the financial sector).</li> <li>6. Description of threats to human rights and human rights violations outside the supply chain.</li> </ol>
II.	Child labour and forced labour	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of reported cases of child labour or forced labour (including by subcontractors).</li> <li>2. Number of confirmed cases of child labour or forced labour (including by subcontractors).</li> <li>3. Percentage (%) of agreements with contractors which include a clause relating to human rights, including the prohibition of child labour or forced labour (in terms of value).</li> <li>4. Number of audits of subcontractors in terms of respect for human rights in the field of child labour and forced labour.</li> </ol>
III.	Local Communities and Community Engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Description of possible inconveniences that may be experienced by the local community in connection with the company's operating activities, etc.</li> <li>2. Number of complaints submitted by the local community, their subject matter and the company's actions in response to them.</li> <li>3. Description of the company's public involvement policy and directions as well as implemented pro-social activities, including those for the local community in which the activity is conducted.</li> <li>4. Total amount of donations for social purposes in the reporting period (with the biggest recipients indicated).</li> <li>5. Total amount spent on sponsorship (indicating the largest sponsored partners).</li> <li>6. Total number of hours worked by volunteer workers and number of volunteers under the voluntary service program (if any).</li> </ol>
IV.	Anti-corruption	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Business areas potentially exposed to corrupt behaviour.</li> <li>2. Number of reported cases of corruption-bearing behaviour.</li> <li>3. Number of confirmed cases of corruption.</li> </ol>
V.	Product and consumer safety	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of cases of violations of procedures regarding the safety of products and services.</li> <li>2. Administrative proceedings against the company (e.g. by UOKiK — the Office for Competition and Consumer Protection).</li> <li>3. Financial value of fines for non-compliance with the law and regulations in matters related to customer safety (broken down into final and non-final).</li> </ol>



No.	Disclosure category	Measures and non-financial indicators
VI.	Marketing communication	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of cases of non-compliance with regulations and voluntary codes concerning marketing communication (including advertising, promotion, sponsorship).</li> <li>2. Administrative proceedings against the company (e.g. by UOKiK — the Office for Competition and Consumer Protection).</li> <li>3. The financial value of penalties for non-compliance with the law and regulations on issues related to the integrity and ethics of marketing communication (broken down into legally binding and legally invalid).</li> </ol>
VII.	Privacy protection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of events related to leakage or unauthorized use of personal data (customers, employees).</li> <li>2. Administrative proceedings against the company (e.g. by GIODO — The Inspector General for the Protection of Personal Data).</li> <li>3. Financial value of penalties for non-compliance with the law and regulations in matters related to the protection of personal data (broken down into legally binding and legally invalid).</li> </ol>
VIII.	Labelling of products	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of incidents of non-compliance related to improper product labelling.</li> <li>2. Administrative proceedings against the company, e.g. by UOKiK — the Office for Competition and Consumer Protection.</li> <li>3. Financial value of penalties related to improper product labelling (broken down into legally binding and legally invalid).</li> </ol>
IX.	Other social and market issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Actual days payable period.</li> <li>2. Actual receivables turnover period.</li> <li>3. The period of days payable is normally specified in contracts with suppliers.</li> <li>4. The percentage (%) of liabilities paid within the contractual period (in terms of value).</li> <li>5. Administrative proceedings against the company by UOKiK — the Office for Competition and Consumer Protection.</li> <li>6. Financial value of penalties related to anti-competitive and anti-market behaviour (broken down into legally binding and legally invalid).</li> </ol>

Source: Own preparation based on Fundacja Standardów Raportowania. (2017, pp. 27–32).

**Table 2.**  
**Social issues in non-financial report: the scope of disclosures in the light of GRI Standards**

No.	Disclosure category	Measures and non-financial indicators
I.	GRI 408: child labour	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Operations and suppliers considered to have significant risk for incidents of child labour; young workers exposed to hazardous work.</li> <li>2. Operations and suppliers considered to have significant risk for incidents of child labour either in terms of: type of operation (such as manufacturing plant) and supplier; countries or geographic areas with operations and suppliers considered at risk.</li> <li>3. Measures taken by the organization in the reporting period intended to contribute to the effective abolition of child labour.</li> </ol>
II.	GRI 409: forced or compulsory labour	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Operations and suppliers considered to have significant risk for incidents of forced or compulsory labour either in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– type of operation (such as manufacturing plant) and supplier;</li> <li>– countries or geographic areas with operations and suppliers considered at risk.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Measures taken by the organization in the reporting period intended to contribute to the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour.</li> </ol>



No.	Disclosure category	Measures and non-financial indicators
III.	GRI 410: security practices	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Percentage of security personnel who have received formal training in the organization's human rights policies or specific procedures and their application to security.</li> <li>2. Whether training requirements also apply to third-party organizations providing security personnel.</li> </ol>
IV.	GRI 411: rights of indigenous peoples	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Total number of identified incidents of violations involving the rights of indigenous peoples during the reporting period.</li> <li>2. Status of the incidents and actions taken with reference to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– incident reviewed by the organization;</li> <li>– remediation plans being implemented;</li> <li>– remediation plans that have been implemented, with results reviewed through routine internal management review processes;</li> <li>– incident no longer subject to action.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
V.	GRI 412: human rights assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Total number and percentage of operations that have been subject to human rights reviews or human rights impact assessments, by country.</li> <li>2. Total number of hours in the reporting period devoted to training on human rights policies or procedures concerning aspects of human rights that are relevant to operations.</li> <li>3. Percentage of employees trained during the reporting period in human rights policies or procedures concerning aspects of human rights that are relevant to operations.</li> <li>4. Total number and percentage of significant investment agreements and contracts that include human rights clauses or that underwent human rights screening.</li> </ol>
VI.	GRI 413: local communities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Percentage of operations with implemented local community engagement, impact assessments, and/or development programs, including the use of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– social impact assessments, including gender impact assessments, based on participatory processes;</li> <li>– environmental impact assessments and ongoing monitoring;</li> <li>– public disclosure of results of environmental and social impact assessments;</li> <li>– local community development programs based on local communities' needs;</li> <li>– stakeholder engagement plans based on stakeholder mapping;</li> <li>– broad based local community consultation committees and processes that include vulnerable groups;</li> <li>– works councils, occupational health and safety committees and other worker representation bodies to deal with impacts;</li> <li>– formal local community grievance processes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Operations with significant actual and potential negative impacts on local communities.</li> </ol>
VII.	GRI 414: supplier social assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of suppliers assessed for social impacts.</li> <li>2. Number of suppliers identified as having significant actual and potential negative social impacts.</li> <li>3. Significant actual and potential negative social impacts identified in the supply chain.</li> <li>4. Percentage of suppliers identified as having significant actual and potential negative social impacts with which improvements were agreed upon as a result of assessment.</li> </ol>
VIII.	GRI 415: public policy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Total monetary value of financial and in-kind political contributions made directly and indirectly by the organization by country and recipient/beneficiary.</li> <li>2. If applicable, how the monetary value of in-kind contributions was estimated.</li> </ol>
IX.	GRI 416: customer health and safety	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Total number of incidents of non-compliance with regulations and/or voluntary codes concerning the health and safety impacts of products and services within the reporting period.</li> <li>2. If the organization has not identified any non-compliance with regulations and/or voluntary codes, a brief statement of this fact is sufficient.</li> </ol>





No.	Disclosure category	Measures and non-financial indicators
X.	GRI 417: marketing and labelling	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The reporting organization shall report the following information:</li><li>2. Whether each of the following types of information is required by the organization's procedures for product and service information and labelling:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– the sourcing of components of the product or service;</li><li>– content, particularly with regard to substances that might produce an environmental or social impact;</li><li>– safe use of the product or service;</li><li>– disposal of the product and environmental or social impacts;</li><li>– other (explain).</li></ul></li><li>3. Percentage of significant product or service categories covered by and assessed for compliance with such procedures.</li><li>4. Total number of incidents of non-compliance with regulations and/or voluntary codes concerning product and service information and labelling.</li><li>5. If the organization has not identified any non-compliance with regulations and/or voluntary codes, a brief statement of this fact is sufficient.</li><li>6. Total number of incidents of non-compliance with regulations and/or voluntary codes concerning marketing communications, including advertising, promotion, and sponsorship.</li><li>7. If the organization has not identified any non-compliance with regulations and/or voluntary codes, a brief statement of this fact is sufficient.</li></ol>
XI.	GRI 418: customer privacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Total number of substantiated complaints received concerning breaches of customer privacy.</li><li>2. Total number of identified leaks, thefts, or losses of customer data.</li><li>3. If the organization has not identified any substantiated complaints, a brief statement of this fact is sufficient.</li></ol>
XII.	GRI 419: socioeconomic compliance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Significant fines and non-monetary sanctions for non-compliance with laws and/or regulations in the social and economic area.</li><li>2. If the organization has not identified any non-compliance with laws and/or regulations, a brief statement of this fact is sufficient.</li><li>3. The context against which significant fines and non-monetary sanctions were incurred.</li></ol>

Source: Own preparation based on GSSB (2016, pp. 312–422).



**Table 3.**  
**List of the 10 largest companies in the WIG-20 index in terms of market capitalization, as of 27.05.2020**

No.	Company name	Sector	Market value (in billion PLN)
1.	CD Projekt	games	39.69
2.	PKO Bank Polski	commercial banks	28.175
3.	PKN Orlen	mining and production	28.17
4.	PZU	insurance companies	25.91
5.	PGNIG	exploration and production	22.89
6.	Dino Polska	everyday goods	18.06
7.	KGHM	metal mining	17.04
8.	Santander Bank Polska	commercial banks	16.94
9.	Cyfrowy Polsat	communication	15.79
10.	Bank Pekao	commercial banks	14.03

Source: Own preparation based on GPW (2021).

**Table 4.**  
**Basic characteristics of non-financial reports of 10 surveyed listed companies included in the WIG-20 index (data for 2019)**

No.	Company name	Report name	Regulations	Number of pages
1.	CD Projekt	Report on management board's operations	GRI Standards	137
2.	PKO Bank Polski	Report on management board's operations	GRI Standards	183
3.	PKN Orlen	Report on non-financial information, Integrated on-line report	GRI Standards	71
4.	PZU	Report on non-financial information	GRI Standards	88
5.	PGNIG	Report on non-financial information	GRI Standards	68
6.	Dino Polska	Report on management board's operations	No data	77
7.	KGHM	Report on non-financial information	GRI Standards ISO 26000	126
8.	Santander Bank Polska	Management report on activities, Social Responsibility Report (on-line)	GRI Standards	158
9.	Cyfrowy Polsat	Report on non-financial information	GRI Standards	116
10.	Bank Pekao	Statement on non-financial information	GRI Standards	69

Source: Own preparation based on non-financial reports of individual companies available on the websites.



**Table 5.**  
**List of non-financial measures/indicators adopted for the assessment in the social area**

No.	Disclosure scope	Measures and non-financial indicators
I.	Human rights	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of reported/confirmed human rights violations, including by subcontractors.</li> <li>2. Total training hours/percentage of staff trained in human rights.</li> </ol>
II.	Local Communities and Community Engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Total amount of donations/sponsorship for community causes.</li> <li>2. Number of hours worked by employee volunteers and number of volunteers.</li> <li>3. Number of complaints submitted by the local community and their subject.</li> </ol>
III.	Supplier Social Assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of suppliers assessed in terms of social impact.</li> <li>2. Number/percentage of suppliers identified as having significant actual and potential negative social impacts.</li> </ol>
IV.	Customer Privacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of complaints received regarding breach of customer privacy.</li> <li>2. Number of identified leaks, theft or loss of customers' personal data.</li> <li>3. The financial value of penalties for non-compliance with laws and regulations in relation to personal data protection.</li> </ol>
V.	Other	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of cases of violations of procedures regarding the safety of products and services, non-compliance with regulations and voluntary codes concerning marketing communication.</li> <li>2. The financial value of penalties for non-compliance with the law related to customer safety, ethics, marketing communication, anti-competitive and anti-market behaviour.</li> <li>3. Number of reported/confirmed cases of corruption.</li> </ol>

Source: Own preparation.

**Table 6.**  
**Social issues in non-financial reports accepted for the study: scope of disclosures in category I: Human rights (data for 2019)**

No.	Non-financial report	Measure or non-financial indicator		Total (max. 2 pts.)
		Number of reported/confirmed human rights violations, including by subcontractors	Total training hours/percentage of staff trained in human rights	
1.	CD Projekt	0	0	0
2.	PKO BP	1	0	1
3.	PKN Orlen	1	0	1
4.	PZU	0	0	0
5.	PGNIG	0	0	0
6.	Dino	1	0	1
7.	KGHM	0	0	0
8.	Santander	0	0	0
9.	Polsat	0	0	0
10.	Pekao	0	0	0
total (max. 10 pts.):		3	0	–

Notes:

(1) confirms disclosure, (0) means no disclosure.

Source: Own preparation.



Table 7.

**Social issues in non-financial reports accepted for the study: scope of disclosures in category II: Local Communities and Community Engagement (data for 2019)**

No.	Non-financial report	Measure or non-financial indicator			Total (max. 3 pts.)
		Total amount of donations/sponsorship for community causes	Number of hours worked by employee volunteers and number of volunteers	Number of complaints submitted by the local community and their subject	
1.	CD Projekt	1	0	0	1
2.	PKO BP	1	1	0	2
3.	PKN Orlen	1	1	0	2
4.	PZU	1	1	0	2
5.	PGNIG	1	0	0	1
6.	Dino	0	0	0	0
7.	KGHM	1	0	0	1
8.	Santander	1	1	0	2
9.	Polsat	1	1	0	2
10.	Pekao	1	1	0	2
total (max. 10 pts.):		9	6	0	–

Notes:

(1) confirms disclosure, (0) means no disclosure.

Source: Own preparation.

Table 8.

**Social issues in non-financial reports accepted for the study: scope of disclosures in category III: Supplier Social Assessment (data for 2019)**

No.	Non-financial report	Measure or non-financial indicator		Total (max. 2 pts.)
		Number of suppliers assessed in terms of social impact	Number/percentage of suppliers identified as having significant actual and potential negative social impacts	
1.	CD Projekt	0	0	0
2.	PKO BP	1	1	2
3.	PKN Orlen	1	0	1
4.	PZU	1	0	1
5.	PGNIG	0	0	0
6.	Dino	0	0	0
7.	KGHM	1	0	1
8.	Santander	1	0	1
9.	Polsat	0	0	0
10.	Pekao	0	0	0
total (max. 10 pts.):		5	1	–

Notes:

(1) confirms disclosure, (0) means no disclosure.

Source: Own preparation.



**Table 9.**  
**Social issues in non-financial reports accepted for the study: scope of disclosures in category IV: Customer Privacy (data for 2019)**

No.	Non-financial report	Measure or non-financial indicator			Total (max. 3 pts.)
		Number of complaints received regarding breach of customer privacy	Number of identified leaks, theft or loss of customers' personal data	The financial value of penalties for non-compliance with laws and regulations in relation to personal data protection	
1.	CD Projekt	1	1	1	3
2.	PKO BP	0	0	0	0
3.	PKN Orlen	1	1	0	2
4.	PZU	1	1	0	2
5.	PGNIG	0	0	0	0
6.	Dino	1	1	1	3
7.	KGHM	0	0	0	0
8.	Santander	1	0	0	1
9.	Polsat	1	0	0	1
10.	Pekao	0	1	1	2
total (max. 10 pts.):		6	5	3	–

Notes:

(1) confirms disclosure, (0) means no disclosure.

Source: Own preparation.

**Table 10.**  
**Social issues in non-financial reports accepted for the study: scope of disclosures in category V: Other (data for 2019)**

No.	Non-financial report	Measure or non-financial indicator			Total (max. 3 pts.)
		Number of cases of violations of procedures concerning the safety of products and services, and marketing communication	The financial value of penalties for non-compliance with the law related to customer safety, ethics, marketing communication, etc.	Number of reported/confirmed cases bearing the hallmarks of corruption	
1.	CD Projekt	1	1	1	3
2.	PKO BP	1	1	1	3
3.	PKN Orlen	1	0	0	1
4.	PZU	1	1	1	3
5.	PGNIG	0	0	1	1
6.	Dino	1	1	1	3
7.	KGHM	0	0	1	1
8.	Santander	1	1	1	3
9.	Polsat	1	1	1	3
10.	Pekao	0	1	1	2
total (max. 10 pts.):		7	7	9	–

Notes:

(1) confirms disclosure, (0) means no disclosure.

Source: Own preparation.

**Table 11.**  
**Social issues in non-financial reports accepted for the study: final results**

No.	Non-financial report	Category					Total (max. 13 pts.)
		I. Human rights (max. 2 pts)	II. Local Communities and Community Engagement (max. 3 pts)	III. Supplier Social Assessment (max. 2 pts)	IV. Customer privacy (max. 3 pts)	V. Other (max. 3 pts)	
1.	CD Projekt	0	1	0	3	3	7
2.	PKO BP	1	2	2	0	3	8
3.	PKN Orlen	1	2	1	2	1	7
4.	PZU	0	2	1	2	3	8
5.	PGNIG	0	1	0	0	1	2
6.	Dino	1	0	0	3	3	7
7.	KGHM	0	1	1	0	1	3
8.	Santander	0	2	1	1	3	7
9.	Polsat	0	2	0	1	3	6
10.	Pekao	0	2	0	2	2	6
total:		3	15	6	14	23	–

Notes:

(1) confirms disclosure, (0) means no disclosure.

Source: Own preparation.