

Journal of Business Management and Economic Research

2022, 6 (4): 123-141 DOI: 10.29226/TR1001.2022.316

Journal Homepage: https://www.jobmer.org



Integrated Reporting and Earnings Quality Among Listed Firms in East Africa

Caroline Tirisa Bonareri *

Moi University, Eldoret Kenya *Corresponding Author: tbonareri@mubs.ac.ug

Josphat Cheboi

Moi University, Eldoret Kenya

Ronald Bonuke

Moi University, Eldoret Kenya

Abstract

Despite numerous studies on earnings quality, companies have continued to report low-quality earnings. Earnings quality has continued to attract the interest of scholars, practitioners, and policymakers due to the stakeholder's interest in earnings and the ultimate survival of the firms. Although the study on the quality of earnings has been extensively researched, the results are inconclusive or have mixed findings. Thus, the interest of the study in integrated reporting (IR) and earnings quality in East Africa. The objective of the study was to examine the relationship between integrated reporting and earnings quality among the listed firms in East Africa. The study was guided by agency, stewardship, and signaling theories. The study adopted explanatory and longitudinal research designs with panel data to establish the causal relationship between the research variables. The target population comprised 117 firms listed on East African Securities Exchanges. The inclusion/exclusion criteria was adopted, drawing a sample of 78 firms for the study period of 2014–2021. Data was collected from the firms' audited annual reports and analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings demonstrate that integrated reporting and earnings quality have a positive relationship. As a result, at the 5% significance level (β = -0.011; p<0.05), voluntary adoption of integrated reporting is related to higher earnings quality. The findings are useful for East African listed companies considering adopting and disseminating IR in their annual reports in the future, as well as understanding the value of IR in improving the quality of their earnings.

Keywords: Integrated reporting, Earnings quality, East Africa

1. Introduction

For several years, quality earnings and accounting information disclosure continue to attract the attention of academicians, practitioners, and policymakers due to increased stakeholder interest in the value of earnings and the ultimate survival of firms (Elzahaby 2021; Rezaee, Dou & Zhang 2020; Beyer, Guttman & Marinovic 2019; Sulistiawan, & Rudiawarni 2019; Arniati, Puspita, Amin & Pirzada 2019). Companies have continued to disclose low-quality earnings despite countless studies on earnings quality (Chen & Komal 2018; Levitt 2000; Debnath 2017), which is evidence by failure of many firms (Enron, WorldCom, Health South, Tyco, Waste Management, Xerox, Subeam, Uchumi, Mumias Sugar, and Trust Bank, to mention but a few). Earnings are of high quality when they accurately reflect the company's current operational performance, are reliable predictors of future operating performance, and are an effective summary measures for assessing firm value (Kamarudin & Ismail 2014).

The quality of earnings is the most robust detail in the financial statement (Dichev, Graham, Harvey, & Rajgopal, 2013), since it affects the company, investments, and managerial staff decisions (Debnath, 2017; Levitt, 2000; Alhmood, Shaari, & Al-Dhamari, 2020). Earnings have a big impact on the stock price, which affects the firm's value, and as a result, the figures are subject to potential manipulation.

When the earnings are high, they indicate an increase in the firm's value, and vice versa. Earnings manipulation has decreased investors' credibility in the accuracy of the information reported by publicly traded companies (Alhmood et al., 2020; Saleem, Alifiah, & Tahir 2016; González, & Garca-Meca 2014). Voluntary or involuntary, firms will make inestimable operating and accounting choices, and therefore they must engage in some form of earnings manipulation, even if it is by default (Fatima, Haque, & Usman 2020; Ramírez-Orellana, Martnez-Romero, & Mario-Garrido 2017; Debnath 2017).

The world has witnessed a number of corporate failures among leading entities, arising from manipulated earnings. A case in point, Tyco International lost its market value of SD 100 billion, which exceeded the total loss incurred by Enron of USD 60 billion (Troy, Smith, & Domino 2011), after the CEOs were charged with unscrupulous practices to defraud investors and other stakeholders (Dechow & Schrand, 2004). In East Africa, companies like Uchumi, Trust Bank, Imperial Bank (Central Bank of Kenya, 2016), and Mumias in Kenya, NICOL in Tanzania, and Crane Bank in Uganda, among others, have had accounting scandals. The numerous studies that have been carried out are inconclusive or have produced mixed findings, and

have been carried out mainly in developed countries, with continuous occurrences of the same. Thus, providing the need to understand how integrated reporting predicts the quality of earnings.

Integrated reporting is the presentation of financial and non-financial information in one report. The continuous financial scandals have all increased the demand for integrated reporting by stakeholders. In part, companies have responded by increasing their financial and non-financial disclosures (integrated reporting) to demonstrate transparency and accountability to stakeholders (Omran, Ramdhony, Mooneeapen, & Nursimloo, 2021; Camilleri, 2018). The accounting profession has critiqued the traditional financial reporting paradigm, stating that it does not offer stakeholders enough information to analyse the company's past and future performance (Flower, 2015). Integrated reporting is the most recent innovation in the world of corporate reporting, and it addresses the drawbacks of traditional financial reporting (IIRC, 2013). It is an important aspect of earnings quality that involves reporting both financial and non-financial information in a single report, nonetheless, it is more than a compilation of financial, environmental, social, and governance facts (Adams, 2015; IIRC 2013; Beneish, 2001; Shirabe & Nakano, 2019; Obeng, Ahmed, & Miglani, 2020), as noted in the signaling theory that signaling would help stakeholders better check the value of the company and then reach more benevolent conclusions (Whiting & Miller, 2008).

The concept of "integrated thinking," which is at the heart of integrated reporting (IR), drives organisations to consider how they may create value for themselves and society (Camilleri, 2018). Using integrated thinking, the corporation can examine how the many aspects of its operations link to or affect its use of capital (IIRC, 2013). This makes clear why corporations are compelled to voluntarily provide more information than is necessary by laws and regulations (Dayanandan, Donker, & Karahan, 2017), which is to look attractive in the market, that is, to appear positively in the market (Spence, 1973; Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel 2011). IR has gained a lot of momentum recently, and the IIRC has received support from some of the world's most prestigious organisations (Barth, Cahan, Chen, & Venter, 2017; de Villiers, Rinaldi, & Unerman, 2014; Lee & Yeo, 2016). Despite this, no government, with the exception of South Africa, has made IR mandatory or even regulated. Adherence to the developing discipline of IR, according to advocates, would eliminate the flaws in traditional corporate reporting by delivering concise, holistic, and more detailed data. IR gives forward-looking information on how the organisation creates value using a variety of capitals (financial, material, human, intellectual, social, and natural), which is critical for

analysing the firm's long-term prospects (IIRC, 2013). Adopting IR lessens information asymmetry by improving the quality of information accessible to financial capital providers. Therefore, the study empirically examines if the introduction and implementation of integrated reporting affect the quality of earnings reported among listed firms in East Africa.

The remainder of the work is structured as follows: The second section of the paper examines the literature and develops the study hypotheses. The empirical models, sample, and descriptive statistics are described in Section 3. In Section 4, we present the outcomes of our empirical study, followed by our conclusions in Section 5.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

Earnings quality is the ability of reported earnings to reflect the company's true earnings as well as the usefulness of reported earnings to predict future earnings. It is the consistency, tenacity, and lack of unpredictability in reported earnings (Menicucci, 2020; Bellovwy & Don, 2005; Gissel, Giacomino, & Akers, 2005). According to Dechow and Schrand (2004), analysts are likely to view earnings as of high quality when the figure perfectly echoes the company's present operating performance, is a respectable indicator of imminent operating performance, and is a virtue-based summary measure for assessing firm value. Inversely, while earnings management is high, earnings quality is low. Earnings quality is an indicator of financial reporting quality, consisting of discretionary and non-discretionary accruals (Francis LaFond, Olsson, & Schipper, 2004). The discretionary element is grounded in the process of financial reporting, while, in contrast, the non-discretionary component is determined by the environment and business model. High-quality earnings in a firm can exactly specify the current operating performance or the firm's value. Therefore, high-quality earnings are frequently denoted as sustainable earnings, while low-quality earnings occur when the earnings are managed. Managed earnings are a result of management's intentional meddling in the financial reporting process to further any personal interests (Palacios-Manzano, Gras-Gil, & Santos-Jaen, 2021).

According to Francis et al. (2008), firm disclosure decisions have an impact on earnings quality, and disclosure is a proxy for earnings quality, indicating that if a firm can show high disclosures in the form of integrated reporting, its earnings quality is also high. Earnings quality will be good for companies with a high level of transparency. Annual reporting is made easier by transparent information in IR, hence stating

a high level of earnings quality (Tjahjadi & Narsa, 2018). The company's full disclosure through IR demonstrates its transparency and reporting reliability. Firms that report IR have integrated, thorough, and comprehensive reports that reflect the true status of the company, which affects the firm's earnings quality. According to the stewardship theory, companies seek to safeguard their reputation for future generations. As a result, firms will make disclosures that are detailed and transparent to eliminate information asymmetry. Integrated reporting will improve business reporting transparency, eliminate information asymmetry, and lower the risk of reduced capital costs. Firms that adopt IR should also provide higher-quality earnings, i.e., earnings that accurately represent the company's current situation without being falsified or manipulated (Tjahjadi & Narsa, 2018).

Conflicting arguments exist about how integrated reporting practises and decisions affect earnings quality (Francis et al., 2008). Based on agency theory, the first argument suggests that, when different information exists between insiders and shareholders, shareholders have motives to request more information from firm management (Panda, & Leepsa, 2017; Verrecchia, 1990). In the context of this argument, Francis et al. (2008); Yeh Chen, and Wu (2014) say that the relationship between integrated reporting and earnings quality is substitutive or negative, wherein firms that integrate reporting (disclose more information) will have high-quality earnings because the information asymmetry in those firms is high between management and investors and vice versa. The other argument is that increasing information quality creates motives for managers to disclose more information (Verrecchia, 1990). According to this argument, Francis et al. (2008) said that the relationship between integrated reporting and earnings quality is complementary or positive, whereby firms that have integrated reporting have high-quality earnings because stakeholders will treat such information as more dependable. Therefore, examining the effect of IR on earning quality among listed firms in East Africa could be helpful to shareholders, policymakers, and managers as this affects the stock value of the firm. Based on the above, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H0: Integrated Reporting has no significant effect on earnings quality

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Sample and Data

The sample covered all the listed firms in EA for the period 2014–2021. The sample was chosen based on inclusion and exclusion criteria, which required firms to have traded between 2014 and 2021 and have enough data to estimate discretionary accruals over that period. The data was carefully retrieved from the chosen firms' annual reports.

3.2. Measurement of Variables

3.2.1. Dependent Variable

Earnings management is the dependent variable. Drawing from previous literature, this study uses the kotheri model (2005), also called the performance-matched discretionary accruals model (PMDAM), to estimate discretionary accruals as a measure for the extent of earnings quality as adopted by Fagbemi, Osemene, and Agbaje (2020); Moardi, Salehi, Poursasan, and Molavi (2019).

$$DA_{i_{t}} = \frac{TAC_{i_{t}}}{TA_{i_{t-1}}} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1} \times \frac{1}{TA_{i_{t-1}}} + \beta_{2} \times \frac{\Delta SALES_{i_{t}} - \Delta REC_{i_{t}}}{TA_{i_{t-1}}} + \beta_{3} \times \frac{PPE_{i_{t}}}{TA_{i_{t}}} + \beta_{4} \times ROA_{i_{t}} + \varepsilon_{i_{t}}$$

Where:

TAt – total accruals, measured as the difference between net profit and operating cash flows from activities; At-1 - total assets at the end of year t-1; Δ REVt – the difference in operating revenues in year t and year t -1; Δ RECt - the difference in net receivables in year t and year t-1; PPEt - property plant and equipment at the end of year t; ROAit is the return on asset.

3.2.2. Independent Variables

Integrated reporting was measured using the content elements in the International Integrated Reporting Framework, IIRC (2013). Similar to the approach used by Cooray, Senaratne, Gunarathne, Herath, and Samudrage (2020); Kılıc & Kuzey (2018); Lee and Yeo (2016); Stent and Dowler (2015); Marx and Mohammadali-Haji (2014), a disclosure index was constructed by focusing on the content elements of the IIRC (2013) integrated reporting framework. The disclosure index included a total of 38 items with 74 scores as shown in Appendix Ia within eight categories, including "organizational overview and external

environment," "governance," "business model," "risks and opportunities," "strategy and resource allocation," "performance," "outlook," and "basis for preparation and presentation." Appendix Ib displays the compatibility of those items with the content element as needed by the IIRC (2013) integrated reporting framework with their scores.

Content analysis was utilised in this study to examine whether a sample corporation released information that was listed in the integrated reporting and disclosure index. In this respect, all narrative sections of the annual reports and stand-alone reports (i.e., the chairman's statement, the directors' report, the operating review, the discussion, and the analysis) were examined. Unlike the commonly used form of content analysis in which the existence or absence of each item is analysed with a non-weighted disclosure approach by many prior studies (Krippendorff 2018; Haji & Anifowose, 2017; Haji & Anifowose, 2016; Setia, Abhayawansa, Joshi, & Huynh 2015; Oliveira, Frias-Aceituno, Rodrguez-Ariza, & Garcia-Sanchez 2013; Garcia-Sanchez, Rodriguez-Ariza, & Frias-Aceituno, 2013). By assigning a score of 1 if the company disclosed a certain item at least once, and 0 otherwise, this study used a score whereby a firm received a score ranging from 0 to 74, depending upon the number of items disclosed (Cooray, et al. 2020); Kılıç & Kuzey (2018); Lee & Yeo 2016; Stent & Dowler, 2015). The integrated reporting scores (IRs) were calculated by dividing the items disclosed by the maximum number of items that a firm could disclose. The IRs were mathematically represented as follows:

measured as the difference between net profit and operating cash flows from activities; At-1 - total assets at the end of year t-1; Δ REVt – the difference in operating revenues in year t and year t -1; Δ RECt - the difference in net receivables in year t and year t-1; PPEt - property plant and equipment at the end of year t; and ROAit is the return on asset.

$$IRS = \sum_{i=1}^{t} IR_{i}$$

Where: $IR_i = 1$ to 74 score; and t = the maximum number of integrated reporting disclosure items a firm could disclose like in this case they are 74 scores.

3.2.3. Control Variables

Company size (measured by the natural logarithm of total assets at the end of the period), leverage (calculated by the debt ratio, equal to total liabilities to total assets at the end of the period), and listing age (which is measured by the first listing year until 2021) were all employed as control variables in this study. The research model for this research is as follows:

EQit =
$$\beta$$
0 + β 1 FLVit + β 2 FAit + β 3 FSit + β 4 IRit + ϵ it

Where: EQ- earnings quality, FLV is the firm leverage, FS - the firm size, FA is the firm age and IR.

4. Research Findings and Discussion

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table I presents descriptive statistics for the research variables over the nine years from 2014 to 2021. The mean earnings quality was -0.522. A similar figure was reported by Hashim and Devi (2008) among non-financial companies listed on Bursa Malaysia. The standard deviation of 0.751 shows high variability in earnings quality among listed firms in East Africa. The results further show that the average overall integrated reporting represents 46.61 percent of the examined checklist items, with a minimum of 5.000 and a maximum of 61.000. This indicates that East African companies are trying to improve disclosure on IR, even though integrated reporting is still a voluntary practice. However, the IR score is relatively low compared to the mean IR scores of 60.33 in the United Kingdom and 53.10 in South Africa (Wu & Zhou, 2022). Overall, the sample consists of relatively older firms (28.50 years) with high leverage (0.733). The average size is 7.512. The average firm age is 3.354.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Earnings quality	619	522	.751	-3.739	2.447
Integrated reporting	619	46.611	10.17	5.000	61.00
Firm size	619	7.512	1.106	4.875	10.693
Leverage	619	.733	.597	.010	4.781
Firm age	619	3.354	2.688	0.000	9.580

Source: Authors, 2022

4.2. Correlation Analysis

The study explores the relationship between integrated reporting and earning quality through a Pearson rank correlation. Table II presents the results. Integrated reporting, leverage, and firm age are negatively correlated with earning quality. However, the association between firm size and earnings quality is positive and significant. The correlation coefficients show no evidence of an unacceptable level of multicollinearity. The highest correlation coefficient is -0.4816 for firm age and earnings quality. In support of the pairwise correlation results, the study further evaluated the potential multicollinearity among the variables also using a variance inflator factor (VIF) analysis. Based on table III, VIFs vary from a low figure of 1.03 to a high value of 1.71. Therefore, multicollinearity does not represent a problem in the interpretation of the findings.

Table 2. Pairwise correlation matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Earnings quality	1.0000				
2. Integrated reporting	-0.4065*	1.0000			
3. Firm size	0.1488*	0.1609*	1.0000		
4. Leverage	-0.1097*	0.1724*	0.0094	1.0000	
5. Firm age	-0.4816*	0.2116*	-0.3889*	-0.0213	1.0000
*p<0.05					

Source: Authors, 2022

4.3. Regression Results

Table III presents the regression results of the study. The results of the Hausman test confirm the suitability of the fixed effect regression in testing the hypothesis. The R2 of 24.7% shows that the regression model can explain about 24.7% of the variance in the dependent variable. First, our results show a positive association between integrated reporting and earnings quality. Therefore, voluntary adoption of integrated reporting is significantly associated with higher earnings quality at the 5% significance level (β = -0.011; ϱ <0.05). The results are consistent with those of Obeng, et al., (2020). However, Pamungkas et al. (2020) reported no association between integrated reporting and earnings quality. Firms engaging in IR can effectively reduce information asymmetries between stakeholders and are less likely to engage in earnings manipulation. In addition, demanding comprehensive disclosure of financial and non-financial information can also be

considered an extra monitoring tool used by stakeholders to reduce opportunistic management behaviour associated with earnings manipulation.

Therefore, firms that actively engage their stakeholders in identifying material matters are likely to make more prudent decisions and present a "true and fair view" of their earnings through integrated reporting. In the same token, prior empirical studies provide support for an intuitively negative relationship between earnings management and integrated reporting (Hong & Andersen, 2011; Martínez-Ferrero, Gallego-Álvarez, & García-Sánchez, 2015; Scholtens & Kang, 2013). Secondly, the results highlight a positive impact of firm size on earnings quality; however, Obeng et al. (2020) found a negative relationship. Based on the findings, large firms are more likely to report low-quality earnings. Third, the results indicate a significantly negative association between firm leverage and earnings quality. Obeng et al. (2020) found no association between leverage and earnings quality. Finally, the results show that firm age had a negative and significant effect on earnings quality.

Table 3. Regression results

EQ	Random effect	Fixed effect	VIF			
Integrated reporting	017(0.004) **	011(0.005) **	1.71			
Firm size	.086(0.027) **	.152(0.048) **	1.28			
Leverage	185(0.041) **	214(0.044) **	1.03			
Firm age	112(0.019) **	142(0.034) **	1.31			
Constant	.114(0.332) **	.333(0.438) **				
R-squared	0.291	.247				
Observations	610	610				
No of groups	79	79				
Hausman Chi ²	26.77					
Prob>chi2 = 0.0000						
**P<0.05; standard errors in parentheses						

Source: Authors, 2022

5. Conclusion, Limitations and Areas for Further Studies

This study examines the effect of integrated reporting on earnings quality among listed firms in East Africa. Data over the period 2014–2021 is gathered from 79 company-year observations using content analysis. The current study relies on the disclosure index method and a checklist to assess the sample companies' annual reports. The complete IR content element disclosure index comprises 38 items with 74 scores and 8 main sub-categories ("organizational overview and external environment"; "governance"; "business model"); "risk and opportunities"; "strategy and resource allocation"; "performance"; "outlook"; and "basis for preparation and presentation"). Although IR is still a voluntary reporting practice, East African companies seem to be trying their best to improve disclosure on IR. The results of fixed effect regression show a statistically significant relationship between integrated reporting and earnings quality.

The findings are aligned with the signaling theory, which proposes that signaling could assist stakeholders in better assessing the company's worth and making more favourable decisions (Whiting & Miller, 2008). To eliminate information asymmetry, the stewardship theory will force companies to publish extensive and transparent disclosure reports. This is supported by the agency theory, which states that when insiders and shareholders have different information, shareholders will seek more information from management (Grossman & Hart, 1980; Verrecchia, 1990). As a result, integrated reporting will reduce information asymmetry, resulting in high-quality earnings reporting.

Therefore, the findings of this study have some important practical implications for several parties involved in the East African capital markets. First, the study is beneficial for financial market regulators and policymakers in that it provides a significant indication of the level and quality of IR disclosure and how firms interact in capital markets with IR practice. This may encourage them to adopt legislation, ultimately leading to greater adoption of IR initiatives and improving IR. Second, the results may potentially be valuable for East African listed firms contemplating adopting and disseminating IR in their annual reports in the future, given the importance of IR in improving the quality of their earnings. Third, the findings may also influence investors and shareholders by directing managers to implement IR disclosure strategies.

Like other empirical investigations, the findings of this study ought to be considered in light of their limitations. First, as is common for scores based on content analysis, the IR score may suffer from subjectivity. Second, the results may be valid only for integrated reports that are prepared in line with the

Framework. As a result, future research may consider examining and comparing whether alignment to different frameworks delivers comparable results. As a final disclaimer, the findings may not be generalizable to developing countries with a high level of IR disclosures. Besides, future studies may consider corporate governance dimensions such as audit committee expertise, which may moderate the link between IR and earnings quality.

Acknowledgment: The author is very grateful for the constructive comments and contributions from Dr. Peter Githaiga, Dr. Paul Muturi Kabete and Julius Samuel Opolot. A special thanks goes to my great parents, Makerere University Business School and Moi University for all the support they have rendered to the completion of this paper.

References

- Adams, C. A. (2015). The international integrated reporting council: a call to action. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 27, 23-28.
- Alhmood, M. A., Shaari, H., & Al-dhamari, R. (2020). CEO Characteristics and Real Earnings Management in Jordan. *International Journal of Financial Research*, 11(4), 255-266.
- Arniati, T., Puspita, D. A., Amin, A., & Pirzada, K. (2019). The implementation of a good corporate governance model and auditor independence in earnings quality improvement. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 7(1), 188.
- Barth, M. E., Cahan, S. F., Chen, L., & Venter, E. R. (2017). The economic consequences associated with integrated report quality: Capital market and real effects. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 62, 43-64.
- Bellovary L. Jodi; Don E Giacomino; Michael D Akers (2005). Earnings quality: It's time to measure and report. *The CPA Journal*. Vol. 75, No. 11
- Beneish, M.D. (2001), "Earnings management: a perspective", *Managerial Finance*, Vol. 27 No. 12, pp. 3-17. https://doi.org/10.1108/03074350110767411
- Beyer, A., Guttman, I., & Marinovic, I. (2019). Earnings management and earnings quality: Theory and evidence. *The Accounting Review*, 94(4), 77-101.
- Camilleri, M.A. (2018), "Theoretical insights on integrated reporting: The inclusion of non-financial capitals in corporate disclosures", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 567-581. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-01-2018-0016
- Central Bank of Kenya. (2016). Bank Supervision Annual Report. Nairobi, Kenya.
- Chen, S., & Komal, B. (2018). Audit committee financial expertise and earnings quality: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 84, 253-270.
- Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and

- assessment. Journal of Management, 37(1), 39-67.
- Cooray, T., Senaratne, S., Gunarathne, A. D., Herath, R., & Samudrage, D. (2020). Does integrated reporting enhance the value relevance of information? Evidence from Sri Lanka. *Sustainability*, 12(19), 8183.
- Dayanandan, A., Donker, H., & Karahan, G. (2017). Do voluntary disclosures of bad news improve liquidity?. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 40, 16-29.
- de Villiers, C., Rinaldi, L. and Unerman, J. (2014), "Integrated Reporting: Insights, gaps and an agenda for future research", *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 7, pp. 1042-1067. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-06-2014-1736
- Debnath, P. (2017). Assaying the impact of firm's growth and performance on earnings management: An empirical observation of Indian economy. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 4(2), 30-40.
- Dechow, P. M., & Schrand, C. M. (2004). Earnings quality. The Research Foundation of CFA Institute
- Dichev, I. D., Graham, J. R., Harvey, C. R., & Rajgopal, S. (2013). Earnings quality: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 56(2-3), 1-33.
- Elzahaby, M.A. (2021), "How firms' performance mediates the relationship between corporate governance quality and earnings quality?" *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 278-311. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAEE-09-2018-0100
- Fagbemi, T. O., Osemene, O. F., & Agbaje, O. (2020). Management entrenchment, firm characteristics and earnings management of conglomerate companies in Nigeria. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 9(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.14710/jab.v9i1.28576
- Fatima, H., Haque, A., & Usman, M. (2020). Is there any association between real earnings management and crash risk of stock price during uncertainty? An evidence from family-owned firms in an emerging economy. *Future Business Journal*, 6(1), 1-12.
- Francis, J., Huang, A. H., Rajgopal, S., & Zang, A. Y. (2008). CEO reputation and earnings quality. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 25(1), 109-147.
- Francis, J., LaFond, R., Olsson, P. M., & Schipper, K. (2004). Costs of equity and earnings attributes. *The accounting review*, 79(4), 967-1010.
- Gissel, J. L., Giacomino, D., & Akers, M. D. (2005). Earnings Quality: It's Time to Measure and Report. The CPA Journal.
- González, J. S., & García-Meca, E. (2014). Does corporate governance influence earnings management in Latin American markets? Journal of business ethics, 121(3), 419-440.
- Garcia-Sánchez, I.M., Rodríguez-Ariza, L. and Frías-Aceituno, J.V. (2013), "The cultural system and integrated reporting", *International Business Review*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 828-838.
- Grossman, S. J., & Hart, O. D. (1980). Takeover bids, the free-rider problem, and the theory of the corporation. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 42-64.
- Haji, Ahmed, A. and Anifowose, M. (2016), "The trend of integrated reporting practice in South Africa: ceremonial or substantive?" *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 190-224. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-11-2015-0106
- Haji, Ahmed, A. and Anifowose, M. (2017), "Initial trends in corporate disclosures following the introduction of integrated reporting practice in South Africa", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 373-399. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-01-2016-0020
- Hashim, A. H. and Devi, S. (2008), "Board characteristics, ownership structure and earnings quality: Malaysian evidence", Tsamenyi, M. and Uddin, S. (Ed.) Corporate Governance in Less Developed and

- Emerging Economies (Research in Accounting in Emerging Economies, Vol. 8), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 97-123. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3563(08)08004-3
- Hong, Y., & Andersen, M. L. (2011). The relationship between corporate social responsibility and earnings management: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104(4), 461-471.
- IIRC (2013), "International <IR> framework", available at: www.theiirc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/13-12-08-THE-INTERNATIONAL-IR-FRAMEWORK-2-1.pdf (accessed 29 December 2013).
- Kamarudin, K. A., & Ismail, W. A. W. (2014). The risk of earnings quality impairment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 145, 226-236.
- Kılıç, M. & Kuzey, C. (2018), "Assessing current company reports according to the IIRC integrated reporting framework", *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 26(2), pp. 305-333. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-04-2017-0138
- Kothari, S. P., Leone, A. J., & Wasley, C. E. (2005). Performance matched discretionary accrual measures. *Journal of accounting and economics*, 39(1), 163-197.
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Sage publications.
- Lee, K. W., & Yeo, G. H. H. (2016). The association between integrated reporting and firm valuation. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, 47(4), 1221-1250.
- Levitt, A. (2000). *Renewing the covenant with investors*. Remarks delivered at NYU Center for Law and Business, New York, NY, May, 10.
- Martínez-Ferrero, J., Gallego-Álvarez, I., & García-Sánchez, I. M. (2015). A bidirectional analysis of earnings management and corporate social responsibility: the moderating effect of stakeholder and investor protection. *Australian Accounting Review*, 25(4), 359-371.
- Marx, B., & Mohammadali-Haji, A. (2014). Emerging trends in reporting: An analysis of integrated reporting practices by South African top 40 listed companies. *Journal of Economic and Financial Sciences*, 7(1), 231-250.
- Menicucci, E. (2020). Earnings quality: How to define. In Earnings Quality (pp. 1-22). Palgrave Pivot, Cham.
- Moardi, M., Salehi, M., Poursasan, S. and Molavi, H. (2020), "Relationship between earnings management, CEO compensation, and stock return on Tehran Stock Exchange", *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 23(1), pp. 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-12-2018-0133
- Obeng, V. A., Ahmed, K., & Miglani, S. (2020). Integrated reporting and earnings quality: The moderating effect of agency costs. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 60, 101285.
- Oliveira, L., Lima Rodrigues, L. and Craig, R. (2010), "Intellectual capital reporting in sustainability reports", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 11(4), pp. 575-594. https://doi.org/10.1108/14691931011085696
- Omran, M., Ramdhony, D., Mooneeapen, O. and Nursimloo, V. (2021), "Integrated reporting and board characteristics: evidence from top Australian listed companies", *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 732-758. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-04-2020-0077
- Palacios-Manzano, M., Gras-Gil, E., & Santos-Jaen, J. M. (2021). Corporate social responsibility and its effect on earnings management: an empirical research on Spanish firms. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 32(7-8), 921-937.
- Pamungkas, P. A., Firmansyah, A., Qadri, R. A., Dinarjito, A., & Arfiansyah, Z. (2021). The role of integrated reporting in emerging market: earnings quality and debt maturity. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 25(3), 380-399.
- Panda, B., & Leepsa, N. M. (2017). Agency theory: Review of theory and evidence on problems and perspectives. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 10(1), 74-95.

- Ramírez-Orellana, A., Martínez-Romero, M. J., & Mariño-Garrido, T. (2017). Measuring fraud and earnings management by a case of study: Evidence from an international family business. *European Journal of Family Business*, 7(1-2), 41-53.
- Rezaee, Z., Dou, H., & Zhang, H. (2020). Corporate social responsibility and earnings quality: Evidence from China. *Global Finance Journal*, 45, 100473
- Saleem, F., Alifiah, M. N., & Tahir, M. S. (2016). The effectiveness of monitoring mechanisms for constraining earnings management: A literature survey for a conceptual framework. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 6(3S), 209-214.
- Scholtens, B., & Kang, F. C. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and earnings management: Evidence from Asian economies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 20(2), 95-112. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1286
- Setia, N., Abhayawansa, S., Joshi, M. and Huynh, A.V. (2015), "Integrated reporting in South Africa: some initial evidence", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 397-424. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-03-2014-0018
- Shirabe, Y., & Nakano, M. (2019). *Integrated Reporting and Earnings Management*. Available at SSRN 3427705. Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling the quarterly journal of economics, 87 (3). *MIT Press*, August, 355, 374.
- Stent, W. and Dowler, T. (2015), "Early assessments of the gap between integrated reporting and current corporate reporting", *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 23(1), pp. 92-117. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-02-2014-0026
- Sulistiawan, D., & Rudiawarni, F. A. (2019). Industrial competition and earnings quality in Indonesia. *International Journal of Economic Policy in Emerging Economies*, 12(2), 121-129.
- Tjahjadi, B., & Narsa, I. (2018). The Effect of Integrating Reporting on Earnings Quality: A Study of Family Firms in Indonesia. *Journal of Finance and Banking Review*, Vol. 3 (3).
- Troy, C., Smith, K. G., & Domino, M. A. (2011). CEO demographics and accounting fraud: Who is more likely to rationalize illegal acts? *Strategic Organization*, 9(4), 259-282.
- Verrecchia, R. E. (1990). Information quality and discretionary disclosure. *Journal of accounting and Economics*, 12(4), 365-380.
- Whiting, R.H. and Miller, J.C. (2008), "Voluntary disclosure of intellectual capital in New Zealand annual reports and the "hidden value"", *Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 26-50. https://doi.org/10.1108/14013380810872725
- Wu, Y., & Zhou, S. (2022). Do firms practicing integrated reporting engage in less myopic behavior? International evidence on opportunistic earnings management. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 30(3), 290-310.
- Yeh, Y. M. C., Chen, H. W., & Wu, M. C. (2014). Can information transparency improve earnings quality attributes? Evidence from an enhanced disclosure regime in Taiwan. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 50(4), 237-253.

Appendix 1a: Summarised Content Elements of Integrated Reporting

Content Element	No. of Disclosed Items	Score
Organizational overview and external environment	7	16
Governance	7	12
Business model	5	10
Risk and opportunities	3	8
Strategy and resource allocation	4	6
Performance	6	13
Outlook	3	4
Basis of preparation and presentation	3	5
	38	74

Appendix 1b: Detailed Content Elements of Integrated Reporting

Content Element		Disclosure Item	Marking guidelines	Score
Organizational	1	Vision and mission	0= Not Disclosed; 1=Vision;	2
overview and			1=Mission	
external		Value, ethics and culture	0= Not disclosed; 1= general	
environment			comments on the adherence to	
			ethical values mentioned; 2= Code of	2
	2		conduct reference, list of values, etc., provided.	
	3	Ownership and operating structure	0 = Not disclosed; 1 = Ownership and	
			operating structure described	1
	4	Principal activities, markets,	0 = No specifics on principal	
		products, services	activities disclosed; 1=	1
		•	Activities/markets/products services	
			listed	
	5	Competitive landscape, market		
		positioning, and positioning within	1 mark for each	3
		the value chain		
	6	Key quantitative information	[Employees, revenues, locations and	
			changes]	2
			1 = 1-2 elements; $2 = 3-4$ elements	
	7	Significant factors affecting	[Legal, commercial, social,	
		external environment and the	environmental, political] maximum	5
		organization's response	of 5 points, 1 for each context	
		Sub - Score		16
	1	Leadership structure, diversity,	1 = Members of the BoD listed;	
		and skill set of those charged with	2 = Their experience and skills are	2
		governance	listed as well	
	2	Processes used to make strategic	0 = Not explained; 1 = Role of	
		decisions and monitor culture	board/executive committee in	
		including its attitude to risk and	making strategic decisions	

integrity and ethical issues management committee in monitoring the strategic direction explained. 3 Actions taken to monitor and influence strategic direction and its approach to risk management 4 Reflection of culture and ethical 4 values in use of and effect on the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 and etherminable of the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 and etherminable of the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 and etherminable of the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 and etherminable; 2 and etherminable; 2 and etherminable of the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 and etherminable; 2 and etherminable; 2 and etherminable; 2 and effects on capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 and etherminable; 2 and etherminable; 2 and effects on capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 and etherminable; 2 and etherminable; 2 and effects on the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 and etherminable; 3 and etherminable; 4 and etherminable;		1	T	T	
monitoring the strategic direction explained. 3 Actions taken to monitor and influence strategic direction and its approach to risk management supproach to risk management supproach to risk management strategic direction is determinable; 2 2= Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 2= Actions taken to manage risks is determinable values in use of and effect on the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 2= Actions taken to manage risks is determinable from narrative; 2 2= Culture and values determinable from narrative; 2 2= Culture and values reflect in the use of and effects on capitals/stakeholders Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents nemtioned 0= No disclosure; 1 = Responsibility for promoting innovation is narrative; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation provided; 1 = Compensat			mechanisms for addressing	explained; 1 = Role of risk	2
Actions taken to monitor and influence strategic direction and influence strategic direction and is approach to risk management 2			integrity and ethical issues	~	
3 Actions taken to monitor and influence strategic direction and its approach to risk management sport of the strategic direction is determinable; 1 = Actions taken to monitor the strategic direction is determinable; 2 = Actions taken to manage risks is determinable values in use of and effect on the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Actions taken to manage risks is determinable (approach) and the sport of the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Compensation policies and plans Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 3 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 4 = Compensation policies and plans are deter				monitoring the strategic direction	
Influence strategic direction and its approach to risk management 2				explained.	
Approach to risk management Strategic direction is determinable; 2 2 Actions taken to manage risks is determinable 2 2 Actions taken to manage risks is determinable 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		3	Actions taken to monitor and	0 = No actions determinable; 1 =	
Approach to risk management Strategic direction is determinable; 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2			influence strategic direction and its	Actions taken to monitor the	
Reflection of culture and ethical values in use of and effect on the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation is mentioned O = No disclosure; 1 = Explanations provided. 1 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable from provided. 1 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable in provided. 2 Key elements of the business model 2 Key elements of the business model A Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies Sub - Score 1 Explicit stakeholder engagement described 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub - Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 2 = 3-4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described; 4 = Copportunities described; 1 = Copportunities described; 1 = Copportunities described; 1 = Copportunities described; 1 = Copportunities described; 2 = 3-4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described; 2 = Assessment of the likelihood and impact impact in the response of the promoting and enabling values; the				strategic direction is determinable;	2
Reflection of culture and ethical values in use of and effect on the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders 2 Culture and values determinable from narrative; 2 2 = Culture and values determinable from narrative; 2 2 = Culture and values reflect in the use of and effects on capitals/stakeholders 2 Culture and values reflect in the use of and effects on capitals/stakeholders 2 Culture and values reflect in the use of and effects on capitals/stakeholders 2 Culture and values reflect in the use of and effects on capitals/stakeholders 2 Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 Compensation provided. 1 Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 Compensation provided 2 Compensation provided 1 Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 Compensation provided 2 Compensation provided 1 Compensation provided 2 Compensation provided 1 Compensation provided 2 Compensation provided 1 Compensation provided 2 Compensation 2 Compe				~	
Reflection of culture and ethical values in use of and effect on the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation is amentioned Promoting innovation is amentioned are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation Sub - Score 1 Diagrammatic presentation Provided 1 each for input, business activities, output and outcome. 2 Key elements of the business model Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies Provided 1 each for input, business activities, output and outcome. 0 = No explanation provided; 1 = Cood flow of explanation provided. 1 o = No stakeholder engagement described Cood flow of explanation provided; 1 = Explicit stakeholder engagement described Sub - Score 1 Key risks and opportunities and performance) Sub - Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 2 = 3-4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described. 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact in provided in the council of the risk likelihood, explanation of the risk				_	
Governance 4 values in use of and effect on the capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents 6 Governance practices exceeds legal requirements 7 Compensation policies and plans 1 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Counter and values reflect in the use of and effects on capitals/stakeholders 0 = No disclosure; 1 = Responsibility for promoting inmovation is mentioned 1 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation 1 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation 2 = Key elements of the business model 1 = Diagrammatic presentation 2 = Key elements of the business model 3 = Narrative flow based on the business model 4 = Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies 5 = Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) 5 = Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) 1 = Risks described; 1 = Copportunities described; 2 = 3-4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described; 1 = Copportunities described; 1 = Copportuni			Reflection of culture and ethical		
Capitals, relationship with key stakeholders Culture and values determinable from narrative; 2 = Culture and values reflect in the use of and effects on capitals/stakeholders 0 = No disclosure; 1 = Responsibility for promoting and eagents 0 = No disclosure; 1 = Responsibility for promoting innovation by governance agents 0 = No disclosure; 1 = Explanations in the mentioned 0 = No disclosure; 1 = Explanations provided. 1 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are de		1		*	
stakeholders Stakeholders From narrative; 2 2 2 Culture and values reflect in the use of and effects on capitals/stakeholders	Covernance	1			
Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents	Governance				2
Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents			stakeholders	,	2
Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents 6 Governance practices exceeds legal requirements 7 Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation 8 Sub - Score 1 Diagrammatic presentation 2 Key elements of the business model 1 each for input, business activities, output and outcome. 4 Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies 4 Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) 5 Sub - Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and 1 for each; explanation of the risk likelihood, explanation of the					
Responsibility for promoting and enabling innovation by governance agents 6 Governance practices exceeds legal requirements 7 Compensation policies and plans 8 Sub – Score 1 Diagrammatic presentation Business model 1 Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score 1 Eesplanations 1 mentioned 0 = No disclosure; 1 = Explanations in mentioned 1 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation 1 Diagrammatic presentation 0 = No disclosure; 1 = Explanations 1 provided. 1 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 3 = Diagram are determinable; 3 = Diagram are determinable; 4 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 3 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 3 = Compensation policies and plans are de					
5 enabling innovation by governance agents 6 Governance practices exceeds legal requirements 7 Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation 1 Diagrammatic presentation 2 Key elements of the business model 3 Narrative flow based on the business model 4 Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) 8 Sub - Score 1 Explicit stakeholder engagement described; 2 = 3-4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects and performance) 1 Key risks and opportunities 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact likelihood, explanation of the likelihood.				-	
agents mentioned 6 Governance practices exceeds legal requirements provided. 7 Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation 8 Sub – Score 1 Diagrammatic presentation 0 = No diagram; 1 = Diagram provided 2 Key elements of the business model 1 each for input, business activities, output and outcome. 4 3 Narrative flow based on the business model Good flow of explanation provided. 1 4 Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies Good flow of explanation provided. 1 Explicit stakeholder engagement described; 1 = Explicit stakeholder engagement described; 1 = Explicit stakeholder engagement described; 2 = 3-4 aspects and performance) described 8 Sub – Score 10 1 Key risks and opportunities described; 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described 2 2 Assessment of the likelihood and lifer each; explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the likelihood.			1 , 1		
6 Governance practices exceeds legal requirements 1 1 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		5	enabling innovation by governance		1
requirements provided. 7 Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation 8 Sub – Score 1 Diagrammatic presentation 0 = No diagram; 1 = Diagram provided 2 Key elements of the business model 1 each for input, business activities, output and outcome. 4 Narrative flow based on the business model Good flow of explanation provided; 1 = Condition of the flow of the plusiness model described; 1 = Explicit stakeholder engagement described; 1 = Explicit stakeholder engagement described 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) described 5 Sub – Score 10 Sub – Score 11 Risks described; 1 = Copportunities described 2 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact 1 for each; explanation of the risk likelihood, explanation of the risk likelihood, explanation of the reach; explanation of the risk likelihood, explanation of the risk likelihood.			U		
7 Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation Sub – Score 1 Diagrammatic presentation 2 Key elements of the business model 2 Key elements of the business model 3 Narrative flow based on the business model 4 Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Compensation policies and plans are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation 1 = No diagram; 1 = Diagram provided; 1 = Diagram provided provided; 1 = Diagram provided provided; 1 = Diagram provided; 1		6	Governance practices exceeds legal	0 = No disclosure; 1 = Explanations	1
are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation Sub - Score			requirements	provided.	
are determinable; 2 = Compensation policies and plans are linked to the value creation Sub - Score		7	Compensation policies and plans	1 = Compensation policies and plans	
Sub - Score 12				are determinable; 2 = Compensation	
Sub - Score 12				policies and plans are linked to the	2
1 Diagrammatic presentation 0 = No diagram; 1 = Diagram 1 provided 2 Key elements of the business model 1 each for input, business activities, output and outcome. 4 3 Narrative flow based on the business model 4 Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) 5 Sub – Score 10 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described 2 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact 1 for each; explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the				value creation	
Business model The provided 1 each for input, business activities, output and outcome. 4 3 Narrative flow based on the business model 0 = No explanation provided; 1 = Good flow of explanation provided. 1 1 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3			Sub – Score		12
Business model 2 Key elements of the business model 3 Narrative flow based on the business model 4 Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) 5 Key risks and opportunities and performance) 1 Explicit stakeholder engagement described; 1 = 12 aspects described; 2 = 3-4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = 0 Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact 1 for each; explanation of the risk likelihood, explanation of the		1	Diagrammatic presentation	0 = No diagram; 1 = Diagram	1
Business model Business model Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score 1				provided	
Business model Business model Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score 1		2	Key elements of the business model	1 each for input, business activities,	
business model Good flow of explanation provided. Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies Explicit stakeholder engagement described; 1 = 1 Explicit stakeholder engagement described Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score Rey risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = 0 Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and likelihood, explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the				_	4
business model Good flow of explanation provided. Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies Explicit stakeholder engagement described; 1 = 1 Explicit stakeholder engagement described Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score Rey risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = 0 Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and likelihood, explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the		3	Narrative flow based on the	0 = No explanation provided; 1 =	
Business model 4 Critical stakeholders' identification and other dependencies 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) 5 Sub – Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 Explicit stakeholder engagement described 1 = 1-2 aspects described; 2 = 3-4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described 1 Explicit stakeholder engagement described; 1 = 1-2 aspects described; 2 = 3-4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and and impact 1 = Risks described; 1 = 10 Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and likelihood, explanation of the risk likelihood, explanation of the				= =	1
Business model and other dependencies described; 1 = 1 Explicit stakeholder engagement described 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = 0 Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and likelihood, explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the		4			-
Explicit stakeholder engagement described 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact likelihood, explanation of the	Business model	-			1
described 5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact likelihood, explanation of the	D districts into det		and other dependencies		1
5 Connection to information covered in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) 5 Sub – Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact 1 Connection provided; 1 = 1-2 aspects described; 2 = 3-4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described 1 Exists described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and likelihood, explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the likelihood.					
in other content elements (e.g., strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact in other content elements (e.g., aspects described; 2 = 3–4 aspects described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described		-	Compostion to information and	***************************************	
strategy, risk, and opportunities and performance) Sub – Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact strategy, risk, and opportunities described; 3 = more than 4 aspects described 10 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described 2 2 2 2 3 4 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6		3		-	
and performance) Sub – Score 10 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and likelihood, explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the				-	2
Sub – Score 1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and likelihood, explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the			= -	=	3
1 Key risks and opportunities 1 = Risks described; 1 = Opportunities described 2 Assessment of the likelihood and likelihood, explanation of the likelihood, explanation of the				described	
Opportunities described 2 2 Assessment of the likelihood and impact likelihood, explanation of the risk likelihood, explanation of the		-			10
2 Assessment of the likelihood and likelihood, explanation of the risk likelihood, explanation of the		1	Key risks and opportunities	,	
impact likelihood, explanation of the				Opportunities described	2
		2	Assessment of the likelihood and	1 for each; explanation of the risk	
			impact	likelihood, explanation of the	
				opportunity likelihood,	4

Risk and			magnitude of impact of risk and	
opportunities			magnitude of impact of opportunity	
11	3	Steps to mitigate/manage risk or	1 = Steps to mitigate/manage risk	
		create value from opportunity	provided; 1 = Steps to create value	2
			from opportunity provided	
		Sub – Score		8
	1	Short, medium, long term strategic	0 = No description provided; 1 =	
		objectives	Strategic objectives stated without	
			relevant time frame; 2 =Strategic	2
			objectives and their time frames are	
			listed	
	2	Strategies in place or plan to	0 = No specific description provided;	
		implement to achieve the	1 = Specific actions taken/planned	1
		objectives	are described	
	3	Resource allocation plan to	0 = No plan explained; 1 = Plan	1
Strategy and		implement strategies	explained	
resource	4	Measurement of achievements and	0 = Not disclosed; 1 = Measurement	
allocation		target outcomes	of achievement of strategic	
			objectives stated without relevant	
			time frame disclosed; 2 =	2
			Measurement of achievement of	
			strategic objectives with their time	
			frames are listed.	
		Sub – Score	0 17 1 1707	6
	1	KPIs that draws relationship	0 = No mixed KPIs or equivalent	
		between financial performance and	disclosed; 1 = A mix of financial and	
		performance regarding other	other KPIs or equivalent	2
		capitals	disclosed; 2 = KPIs linking financial and other capitals disclosed.	2
	2	KRIs	0 = No key risk indicators described;	
	_	KKUS	1 = KRIs or equivalent described.	1
	3	Explanation of KPIs and KRIs of	1 = Explanation of significance of	
		significance, implications and	KPIs and KRIs; 1 = Implications of	
		methods and assumptions used in	KPIs/KRIs; 1 = Methods and	3
		compiling them	assumptions used in compiling	
		1 0	them explained	
	4	The organization's effect on the	0 = No consideration to the six	
		capitals	capitals; 1 = Consideration of	
		•	financial and manufactured	2
Performance			capitals; 2 = All material capitals	
			considered.	
	5	State of key stakeholder	1 = Key stakeholder relationships	
		relationships and how the	stated; 1 =	
		organization has responded to key	Identification of key stakeholder	
		stakeholder needs and interests.	needs and interests provided; 1 =	3
			Organizational response to 3 key	

			stakeholder needs and interests provided.	
	6	Comparison of past and present performance and current performance and target performance	0 = No comparison provided; 1 = Comparison of	2
		Sub – Score		13
	1	Management's expectations about external environment	0 = No statement provided; 1 = Expectations described without timeframe; 2 = Expectations 2 described with time frame	2
Outlook	2	Potential implications of these external expectations on the organization	0 = Not explained; 1 = Implications explained	1
	3	Organizational readiness in responding to the challenges and uncertainties	0 = Not explained; 1 = Readiness explained	1
		Sub – Score		4
Basis of	1	Summary of materiality determination process—Material issues/determination, impact on creating/preserving value	0 = No discussion of material matters; 1 = Description of processes used to identify the material matters; 1 = Identification of the role of 2 key personnel in the identification and prioritization of material matters identification and prioritization of material issue	2
preparation and presentation	2	Reporting boundary and its determination	0 = No boundary disclosed; 1 = Boundary is determinable; 2 = Boundary determinable and the process explained	2
	3	Summary of significant frameworks and methods used to quantify or evaluate material matters	0 = No frameworks or method used 1 = Frameworks and methods used	2
		Sub – Score		5
Total scores				74