
Financial and non-financial reporting in Romanian entities operating in agriculture, forestry, and fishery

Mihaela MOCANU,
Bucharest University of Economic Studies,
E-mail: mihaela.mocanu@cig.ase.ro

Aureliana-Geta ROMAN,
Bucharest University of Economic Studies,
E-mail: romanaureliana@yahoo.de

Abstract

Due to the increased interest for sustainability issues, entities that operate in the areas agriculture, forestry and fishery are exposed to a variety of ecological challenges. Moreover, such fields are generally of strategic importance for a country's economy, which also increases their exposure to public debate. The present study aims to provide a detailed and accurate description of the financial and non-financial information made available by listed Romanian entities operating in agriculture, forestry and fishery. The research goes beyond the mere description of the content of shareholders' reports. Its purpose is to assess the financial performance and stability of selected companies and to investigate the relationships between the financial well-being of such companies and the extent to which they disclose non-financial information. The sample consists of companies which operate in the business of fields agriculture, forestry or fishery and are listed at the Bucharest Stock Exchange in Romania.

KEYWORDS: Agriculture; sustainability; reporting; performance; Bucharest Stock Exchange.

JEL Classification: M41; M42; Q15; Q22.

To cite this article:

Mocanu, M. and Roman, A.G. (2016), Financial and non-financial reporting in Romanian entities operating in agriculture, forestry, and fishery, *Audit Financiar*, vol. XIV, no. 6(138)/2016, pp. 659-669, DOI: 10.20869/AUDITF/2016/138/659

To link to this article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.20869/AUDITF/2016/138/659>

Introduction

Entities that operate in the areas agriculture, forestry and fishery face a variety of ecological challenges. Moreover, such fields are generally of strategic importance for a country's economy, so that this area has caught the researchers' attention over time. The academic literature includes several studies that deal with financial and non-financial reporting in these operational areas. For instance, Jack (2007) expects to clarify the difficulties with which farmers cope when using accounting and to explore the current agricultural environment, whereas this environment requests farmers more strongly than ever to engage in accounting activities. The evidence collected for this paper puts forward that in the face of corporate power or "post-productivist" activities, farmers are obliged to become engaged with accounting to a greater extent than they had in the past. In the same note, Bosch, Sabata Aliberch and García Blandón (2012) conduct an empirical research that compares and contrasts the accounting difficulties stemming from the use of two valuation methods for biological assets (fair value and historical cost accounting) in the agricultural sector.

The study of Whittaker, McManus and Smith (2013) compares 11 existing greenhouse gas (GHG) accounting tools produced in order to calculate emissions from arable crops, either for food or bioenergy production in the UK, whereas a multi-criteria-analysis is performed to test their relative strengths and weaknesses. Whittaker, McManus and Smith (2013) argue the significance of their study by emphasizing the fact that, of all economic sectors in the UK, agriculture contributes with around 9% of GHG emissions annually, and is a significant component of the lifecycle emissions of many everyday food and other products. In a similar fashion, O'Brien et al. (2014) compare the effect of applying two different methods when completing a marginal abatement cost curve analysis of national agricultural GHG emissions. This study adds to the body of research that proves the importance of sustainability in agriculture, by showing that the agricultural sector emitted 10% of European Union GHG emissions in 2011. On an international basis, this percentage varied from 2% in Malta to over 30% in Ireland.

Besides the task of decreasing GHG emissions, agriculture is also faced with the challenge of rising

production to feed a mounting world population, and providing feedstock for expanding biofuel production. Without any doubt, the agri-food industry is crucial.

However, there is little accounting academic research on agri-food industry, and little consideration of accounting issues in the agricultural literature (Argiles and Slof, 2001; Juchau and Hill, 2000). The present study tries to fill in this research gap by investigating the financial and non-financial reporting practices of companies operating in the agricultural sector, as well as of companies from related fields (namely forestry and fishery). First, the research design is described in detail. Then, the results of the research are presented and discussed and the final section of the paper includes the conclusions.

1. Research design

In terms of **research philosophy**, the present research reflects the philosophy of **positivism** (in accordance with the current trends in accounting research identified by Mocanu, 2015b), which is traditionally spread in natural sciences. As emphasized by Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009), the research philosophy contains assumptions about the researchers' view of the world that have great impact on the choice of the research strategy and methods. First of all, within the philosophy of positivism, the researcher focuses not on impressions, but on facts that build the observable social reality typically investigated by natural scientists (Remenyi et al., 1998). In the financial field, as mentioned by Jensen (1976) cited by Ionaşcu (1997), the philosophy of positivism translates in a theory able to explain why is accounting what it is, why do accountants do what they do and which are the effects of these phenomena on society and economy. Second of all, positivist research is undertaken in a value-free way. As far as possible, the researcher is external to the process of data collection, in other words – does not affect, nor is affected by the subject of research (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2009).

In terms of **research purpose**, the present study is designed both as a descriptive, and as an explanatory study. As defined by Robson (2002), the object of **descriptive** research is to offer an accurate profile of persons, events or situations. Accordingly, the present study aims to provide a detailed and accurate description of the financial and non-financial information made available by listed Romanian entities operating in

agriculture, forestry, and fishery. However, it goes beyond the mere description of the content of shareholders' reports and engage in an **exploratory** research, too. The purpose is to assess the financial performance and stability of selected companies and to explain the relationships between the financial well-being of such companies and the extent to which they publish non-financial information.

In order to gain answers to the paper's research questions, the authors chose to carry out an analysis of **secondary data**. By definition, secondary data is data that has already been collected for some other purpose. Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2007) identifies the following types of secondary data:

- **Documentary secondary data**, consisting in *written materials* (such as organisation's databases, communications, or websites; reports and minutes of committees; journals; newspapers; diaries and interview transcripts) and *non-written materials* (e.g. media accounts; voice recordings; video recordings);
- **Multiple source secondary data**, which may be *area-based* (such as country reports; government publications; books; journals) or *time-series-based* (industry statistics and reports; government publications; European Union publications; books; journals)

- **Survey secondary data**, including censuses, continuous and regular surveys, as well as ad hoc surveys undertaken by entities such as governmental and non-governmental bodies or large organisations.

For the purposes of the present research, authors employed the first type of data, namely documentary secondary data comprising the shareholders' reporting packages made available online on the website of the Bucharest Stock Exchange in Romania for the companies in the sample. The reasons for this choice of data sourcing are the advantages of using secondary data, such as: they have fewer resource requirements; they provide an unobtrusive measure, which is beneficial especially in sensitive organizational situations such as going concern issues; and they may be checked relatively easy, being both permanent and publicly available. Moreover, researchers are independent of secondary data, thus this choice is consistent with the philosophy of positivism.

The sample comprises all companies that operate in agriculture, forestry and fishery and are listed at the Bucharest Stock Exchange in Romania. Consequently, the sample consists of 23 organisations with the following NACE codes as displayed in **Table 1** (Nomenclature statistique des activités économiques dans la Communauté européenne, *En*. Statistical classification of economic activities in the European Community).

Table 1. Structure of the sample by activity

Type of activity	No.	%
111 Growing of cereals (except rice), leguminous crops and oil seeds	5	22%
161 Support activities for crop production	6	26%
147 Raising of poultry	5	22%
Others (146 Raising of swine/pigs, 130 Plant propagation, 220 Logging, 210 Silviculture and other forestry activities, 164 Seed processing for propagation, and 322 Freshwater aquaculture)	7	30%
TOTAL	23	100%

Source: Authors' processing.

Additionally, **Table 2** presents the geographical dispersion of the selected companies, in order to provide a more comprehensive overview on the sample. From an administrative point of view, Romania is divided into 41 districts and 8 regions, as follows: Region I North-East comprising the districts Bacău, Botoșani, Iași, Neamț, Suceava, and Vaslui; Region II South-East: Brăila, Buzău, Constanța, Galați, Vrancea, and Tulcea; Region III South: Argeș, Călărași, Dâmbovița, Giurgiu,

Ialomița, Prahova, and Teleorman; Region IV South West: Dolj, Gorj, Mehedinți, Olt, and Vâlcea; Region V West: Arad, Caraș-Severin, Hunedoara și Timiș; Region VI North-West: Bihor, Bistrița-Năsăud, Cluj, Maramureș, Satu-Mare și Sălaj; Region VII Center: Alba, Brașov, Covasna, Harghita, Mureș, Sibiu; and Region VIII Bucharest-Ilfov. Almost a third of the companies in the sample are located in the southern region (35%), 17% operate in North-West, whereas 13% have their

headquarters in North-East and the same percentage in Center. The remaining fifth of the total companies are located in South-East, South-West, West, and in Bucharest-Ilfov.

Table 2. Structure of the sample by geographical area

Region	No.	%
I North-East	3	13%
II South-East	1	4%
III South	8	35%
IV South West	1	4%
V West	2	9%
VI North-West	4	17%
VII Center	3	13%
VIII Bucharest-Ilfov	1	4%
TOTAL	23	100%

Source: Authors' processing.

For each and every company in the sample, the authors analysed the most recent annual financial report published on the official website of the Bucharest Stock Exchange (www.bvb.ro), respectively the package prepared for the year ended 31th of December 2013. Generally, in accordance with the Romanian regulations, the financial report published by listed companies includes the following elements: the financial statements, the administrator's report, the report of the censor, the external auditor's report, the decisions of the general assembly of shareholders, as well as the report prepared in accordance with the Regulation of the Romanian National Securities Commission no. 1/2006.

2. Results and discussion

2.1. Analysis of audit reports issued upon financial statements of selected companies

One of the focuses of the present study is the audit opinion issued upon the most recent financial statements of the companies in the sample. The approach used in *analysing* the audit reports follows a similar path and is consistent with the previous research of Mocanu (2015a), Păunescu (2015), Mocanu (2011) and Țurlea, Ștefănescu and Mocanu (2010). In the particular case of the selected companies, five different situations have been identified, as presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Types of audit opinions in the sample

Case	Number
Unmodified opinion (ISA)	7
Modified opinion (ISA)	7
Limited review (ISRS 4400)	1
Annual reporting not submitted	2
Audit report not available	6
TOTAL	23

Source: Authors' processing.

The majority of the audits have been performed in accordance with the International Standards on Auditing (ISA), adopted in their entirety by The Chamber of Financial Auditors in Romania (Camera Auditorilor Financiari din România - CAFR). In such a case, the auditors offer a high level of reasonable assurance on the audited financial statements, thus observing the applicable legislative provisions regarding the auditing of public interest entities in Romania. Surprisingly, in one case, the assurance offered by the auditor's report is limited, as the audit was performed in accordance with the International Standard on Related Services ISRS 4400 "Engagements to Perform Agreed-Upon Procedures". Another particular case is that of two companies that did not submit neither the annual reporting, nor the audit report, whereas for six companies, the independent auditor's report was not included in the yearly reporting package, thus being unavailable.

Interesting was also the type of auditors that performed the audit of listed companies operating in the field agriculture, forestry and fishery, as presented in Table 4. None of the auditors that were mandated by companies from the three areas of activities belong to the Big Four group. The majority of auditors (73%) are smaller companies, whereas the remaining 27% are individuals.

Table 4. Types of auditors

Auditor type	Number
Non Big Four	11
Big Four	0
Individual	4
TOTAL	15

Source: Authors' processing.

Also in connection to the audit report, authors analysed the areas that triggered a modified opinion. Few such triggers are general, e.g. the lack of operations in the reporting year or going concern issues (for a detailed analysis of auditor's accountability in relation to such issues, relevant are the comments of Țurlea and Mocanu, 2010). Related to fixed assets, the audit opinion was modified based on the following reasons: the company did not revalue its fixed assets; no depreciation has been computed; the recoverability of financial investments is doubtful; there are significant financial investments in a bankrupt related party for which no adjustments have been booked; auditors identified other significant aspects related to: the revaluation of buildings related to an abrogated contract; to buildings, revaluation reserves, depreciation; to land and property.

With respect to inventories, aspects mentioned as basis for a modified audit opinion were: net realizable value of spare parts older than a year; inventory held in custody for third parties; assessment of the production cost of inventory; and net realizable value of consumables. Related to third parties, significant for the auditors were, for instance, the following issues: recoverability of trade receivables and receivables from related parties; invoices to be received; bad debt for which no appropriate adjustment has been booked; and lack of balance confirmations from suppliers. Just in two cases, the problems in cash and cash equivalents triggered a modified opinion.

Another area that was considered to be misstated by the financial auditor was that of incomes and expenses, whereas significant triggers for a modified opinion were:

sales and related disposal costs of inventory; turnover and related costs; overstatement of result through the subventions of previous periods; and overstatement of both operational expenses and operational income, without affecting the result.

There have also been cases in which the audit opinion was not modified, and the auditor has just emphasized matters in a separate paragraph, such as: the existence of an ongoing litigation with unknown and unforeseeable resolution; potential difficulties in payment of short term bank loans; accounting treatment of subsidies; and loss from writing-off of bad debt (bankrupt client). Four such situations of emphasis of matter have been identified when analysing the 15 audit reports.

2.2. Assessment of financial performance and stability of selected companies

A second focus of the present research was the analysis of the financial performance and stability of the companies in the sample. The information source is the most recent financial data posted on the Bucharest Stock Exchange site. The key figures of the financial statements of 2013 (for 17 companies) and 2012 (in case of 3 companies) have been included in the analysis, as no other more recent information was available. For 3 out of 23 companies no data was available, therefore this part of the study was performed using a sample of 20 companies. Four key indicators have been computed for each of the 20 companies, as presented in Table 5. Each of these indicators has been interpreted according to the following assessment scale (as presented in Table 6).

Table 5. Description of performance indicators used in the study

Field of analysis		Indicator	Symbol	Formula
Financial stability	Financing	Equity ratio	I1	Equity/Total capital * 100
	Liquidity	Duration of debt repayment, in years	I2	(Borrowed capital - Cash and cash equivalents) / Cash flow before taxes
Earnings situation	Return	Return on investment	I3	(Current result + Borrowed capital interest)/Total capital * 100
	Result	Cash flow in percentage of turnover	I4	Cash flow before taxes / Turnover * 100

Source: Authors' processing in accordance with Probst J.W. (2008).

Researchers (i.e. Probst (2008) and other authors from the German-speaking literature) have chosen just four main indicators based on their relevance and informational power, having the purpose of providing clarity and simplicity to the research conclusions. First of all, in order to diagnose the financial stability of the companies in the sample, two figures were selected as relevant: the equity ratio and the duration of debt repayment in years. The higher the equity ratio, the better is the financial stability of the company. A negative equity ratio (usually stemming from negative equity) is a sign of exposure to bankruptcy. A very good duration of debt repayment is considered one of less

than three years, while durations of more than 12 years is an indicator of poor financial stability.

Second, the earnings situation is described by return on investment and by cash flow in percentage of turnover. A return on investment higher than 12% suggests a good and very good situation, whereas a value of less than 8% or even a negative value signals a serious problem in earnings. A similar interpretation is given to cash flow in percentage of turnover. If the percentage is more than 10%, the analysed company has a very good situation. In case the value is of less than 5%, the result is interpreted as bad. Negative values are generally suggesting a high exposure to bankruptcy.

Table 6. Interpretation key of the four indicators

Symbol	Assessment scale				
	very good (1)	good (2)	middle (3)	bad (4)	exposed to bankruptcy (5)
I1	> 30%	> 20%	>10%	<10%	negative
I2	< 3 years	< 5 years	<12 years	<30 years	>30 years
I3	> 15%	> 12%	> 8%	<8%	negative
I4	>10%	>8%	>5%	<5%	negative

Source: Authors' processing in accordance with Probst J.W. (2008).

Table 7 depicts the results of the performed analysis on the financial performance of the companies in the sample. Based on the data from the financial statements, all four key figures have been computed for each of the companies in the sample. To enable the interpretation, the resulting values for each company and each indicator have been graded with a figure from 1 (very good) to 5 (bankruptcy risk). **Table 7** contains the average for each indicator and each activity area, in

order to provide an appropriate overview on the entire sample. The highest financial stability is that of companies that carry out support activities for crop production (NACE 161), whereas least stable are the entities that raise poultry (NACE 147). The earnings situation is middle tending to be bad throughout the entire sample of companies. In this respect, companies that carry out support activities for crop production (NACE 161) have the highest performance of all.

Table 7. Financial stability and performance of selected companies

Field of activity	I 1	I 2	I 3	I 4	Financial stability	Earnings situation	Overall result
111	1.50	4.00	4.25	3.00	2.75	3.63	3.19
161	1.00	3.00	3.67	3.00	2.00	3.33	2.67
147	2.75	3.25	4.00	3.25	3.00	3.63	3.31
Other	1.00	4.00	4.50	3.83	2.50	4.17	3.33

Source: Authors' processing.

2.3. Non-financial reporting of selected companies

Important for the current research was also the extent in which selected companies report on non-financial aspects, namely what details on sustainability issues they include in the report prepared in accordance with the Regulation of the Romanian National Securities Commission no. 1/2006. The comments usually have a general and positive character, as depicted in the following excerpts from the reports:

Excerpt 1. "Company's operations have an average impact on the environment, especially due to the use of chemical products (fertilizers, herbicides, insecticides), but these effects can be precluded especially through their rational use and strict oversight of these materials. The company holds all necessary authorizations for legally carrying out their activity."

Excerpt 2. "Company's main activities do not have a significant impact on the environment. The use pesticides for the treatment of farming cultures and the packaging are submitted to the authorized collecting centres. In the wood processing area, they have a system to exhaust the sawdust, which was modernized in the year 2010".

Excerpt 3. "The environmental impact becomes effective especially when processing the seeds (which results into husks and substance losses in the treatment process) or when depositing the treatment substances and the end product. Although the husk is a biodegradable waste, some of the processing equipment of the company has special filters for it. Moreover, the treatment substances are deposited in special rooms, according to the norms in force. Treatment is made with treatment machines deposited in closed rooms, which have aerosol blowers and manipulated by specialized personnel. Depositing the end product is made in warehouses especially arranged for this purpose, which do not leave room for polluting the environment."

Excerpt 4. "The Company has the environmental authorization no. X. There are no uncertainty factors that could affect the environment. The company delineates the management of waste which they periodically submit to specialized units, according to contracts concluded for this purpose. The actions of environmental protection are in compliance with the norms in force, thus insuring a balance between economic development and

environmental protection. The personnel is trained and encouraged in having an ecological behaviour in all aspects of life. Monitoring and observing the conditions imposed through the environmental authorizations, as well as implementing the measures imposed by the compliance programs represent ways to act in the spirit of the principles of the internal norms of the company and in accordance with the legislation in force. The company was and is not involved in any litigation regarding the environmental protection and no such litigation is foreseen."

Excerpt 5. "All locations have valid environmental authorizations and the company complies with the legislation in force. The farm from Y has become a model unit at European level which is no longer under special oversight, thus becoming a farm with self-control. The environmental policy is oriented towards observing the norms on environmental issues and work health, towards improving the employees' environmental awareness, which must become a minimal behavioural requirement in the company's culture".

The five excerpts presented above are an exception, offering the highest number of information from all reports investigated. Most often, companies state that they have all necessary authorizations and that they do not have any environmental impact generated by their operations.

2.4. Investigation of the relationships between the financial well-being and the audit opinion, namely extent of non-financial reporting

The following hypotheses have been tested by means of regression analysis, in order to identify the potential relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

H1 There is a significant relationship between the company's financial stability and the type of audit opinion.

H1.1. There is a significant relationship between the company's equity ratio and the type of audit opinion.

H1.2. There is a significant relationship between the company's duration of debt repayment in years and the type of audit opinion.

H2 There is a significant relationship between the company's financial performance and the type of audit opinion.

H2.1. There is a significant relationship between the company's return on investment and the type of audit opinion.

H2.2. There is a significant relationship between the company's cash flow in percentage of turnover and the type of audit opinion.

H3 There is a significant relationship between the company's financial performance and stability and the type of audit opinion.

Table 8. Descriptive statistics for the data analysed in relation to H1, H2 and H3

	Financial stability	Earnings situation	Final result	No. of reserves in the audit report
Average	2.35	3.69	3.02	1.69
Maximum	3.50	5.00	4.00	8.00
Minimum	1.00	2.00	1.50	0.00
Range	2.50	3.00	2.50	8.00
Median	2.50	3.50	3.00	0.00
1st Quartile	2.00	3.00	2.50	0.00
3rd Quartile	3.00	5.00	4.00	2.00
Inter-Quartile Range	1.00	2.00	1.50	2.00
Standard deviation	0.83	1.03	0.84	2.72
Count	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00
Standard error	0.23	0.29	0.23	0.75
Skewness	-0.47	0.13	-0.16	1.79
Kurtosis	-1.03	-1.17	-1.13	2.21

Source: Authors' processing.

H4 There is a significant relationship between the company's financial stability and the extent of mandatory non-financial reporting.

H3.1. There is a significant relationship between the company's equity ratio and the extent of mandatory non-financial reporting.

H3.2. There is a significant relationship between the company's duration of debt repayment in years and the extent of mandatory non-financial reporting.

H5 There is a significant relationship between the company's financial performance and

the extent of mandatory non-financial reporting.

H4.1. There is a significant relationship between the company's return on investment and the extent of mandatory non-financial reporting.

H4.2. There is a significant relationship between the company's cash flow in percentage of turnover and the extent of mandatory non-financial reporting.

H6 There is a significant relationship between the company's financial performance and stability and extent of mandatory non-financial reporting.

Table 9. Descriptive statistics for the data analysed in relation to H4, H5 and H6

	Financial stability	Earnings situation	Final result	No. of words on non-financial issues
Average	2.39	3.69	3.04	54.11
Maximum	3.50	5.00	4.00	145.00
Minimum	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Range	2.50	4.00	3.00	145.00
Median	3.00	3.50	3.25	38.50
1st Quartile	1.63	3.00	2.50	23.00
3rd Quartile	3.00	5.00	4.00	74.75
Inter-Quartile Range	1.38	2.00	1.50	51.75
Standard deviation	0.92	1.20	0.97	46.15
Count	18.00	18.00	18.00	18.00
Standard error	0.22	0.28	0.23	10.88
Skewness	-0.60	-0.52	-0.69	0.96
Kurtosis	-1.27	-0.33	-0.61	-0.34

Source: Authors' processing.

The results of the regression analysis show that in case of all hypotheses, the model has no predictive value, as

emphasized by the values of the key indicators disclosed in Table 10.

Table 10. Results of the regression analysis

	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Adjusted R Square	Significance F	P-value intercept
H 1.1	I1 Equity ratio	No. of words on non-financial reporting issues	0.05412728	0.17926442	0.20545918
H 1.2	I2 Duration of debt repayment in years		-0.06154015	0.90575879	0.04959165
H 2.1	I3 Return on investment		-0.00533237	0.35434902	0.04797894
H 2.2	I4 Cash flow in percentage of turnover		-0.02649970	0.46467471	0.01200184
H 3	Overall financial status		-0.05363722	0.71853062	0.09298544
H 4.1	I1 Equity ratio	No. of reserves in the audit report	-0.09083446	0.97860556	0.28689792
H 4.2	I2 Duration of debt repayment in years		-0.06995818	0.65162353	0.70111137
H 4.3	I3 Return on investment		-0.08145581	0.76229062	0.94166309
H 4.4	I4 Cash flow in percentage of turnover		0.05957507	0.21148411	0.05381028
H 5	Overall financial status		0.13794382	0.77356949	0.41840477

Source: Authors' processing.

4. Conclusions

The agri-food industry nowadays faces numerous challenges, among which reducing greenhouse gas

emissions; the increasing production to feed a growing world population, and providing feedstock for expanding biofuel production. On this background, the research

focused on companies listed at the Bucharest Stock Exchange which operate in the fields agriculture, forestry and fishery.

The analysis revealed that in terms of financial stability, the situation can be assessed as being “average”, whereas in terms of earning, the status of such companies tends to be unfavourable. Some are also exposed to bankruptcy.

Regarding the auditors’ opinion on the financial statements of the selected companies, the situation is different: some received a modified opinion, while others benefit from an unmodified opinion.

With reference to the reporting of sustainability issues in the report prepared in accordance with the Regulation of the Romanian National Securities Commission no. 1/2006, such reporting is scarce

and not at all detailed. Most companies simply state that they have the operating, sanitary, veterinary and environmental authorizations which are stipulated by law for the activities they carry out; that related to the legal provisions, their operations do not have a significant environmental impact; that no litigations regarding the violation of environmental regulations exist or are foreseen.

The regression analysis did not indicate a significant relationship between firm’s financial performance and stability (on one hand) and type of audit opinion/extent of non-financial reporting (on the other hand). Future research shall expand upon other reporting outlets, such as the websites of the selected companies or other reports issued for the shareholders.

REFERENCES

1. Argiles, J.M. and Slof, E.J. (2001), New opportunities for farm accounting, *The European Accounting Review*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 361–83.
2. Bosch, J.M.A., Sabata Aliberch, A. and García Blandón, J.A. (2012), Comparative Study of Difficulties in Accounting Preparation and Judgement in Agriculture Using Fair Value and Historical Cost for Biological Assets Valuation, *Revista de Contabilidad*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 109-142, doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1138-4891\(12\)70040-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1138-4891(12)70040-7).
3. CNVM (2006), “Regulation no. 1/2006 regarding the issuers and the transactions with securities” [Regulamentul nr. 1/2006 privind emitenții și operațiunile cu valori mobiliare], [pdf] Available at: <http://www.asfromania.ro/files/capital/regulamente/2006/Regulamentul-01-2006.pdf>, [Accessed on March 25, 2016]
4. Ionașcu, I. (1997), *Epistemologia contabilității*, București: Editura Economică.
5. Jack, L.(2007), Accounting, post-productivism and corporate power in UK food and agriculture, *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 905-931, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2006.04.004>.
6. Jensen, M. (1976), Reflections on the State of Accounting Research and the Regulation of Accounting, in *Conflicts and Compromises in Financial Reporting*, edited by Burton, J. C., Stanford Lectures in Accounting. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Graduate School of Business, pp. 11-19, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.321522>.
7. Juchau, R. and Hill, P. (2000), *Agricultural accounting: perspectives and issues*, University of London: Wye College.
8. Mocanu, M. (2015a), Reporting in Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery. The Case of Romania, 1st International Conference on Business Management „New Challenges in Business Research”, Valencia, Spain, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4995/ICBM.2015.1418>.
9. Mocanu, M. (2015b), Research Methods in the Field of Accounting. The Case of Romania, in Bezzina, F. and Cassar, V. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 14th European Conference on Research Methodology for Business and Management Studies*, Reading: Academic Conferences and Publishing International Limited.
10. Mocanu, M. (2011), Sociological Perspectives on Financial Auditing, *Actual Problems of Economics*, vol. 126, no. 12, pp. 391-399.
11. O’Brien, D., Shalloo, L., Crosson, P., Donnellan, T., Farrelly, N., Finnan, J., Hanrahan, K., Lalor, S., Lanigan, G., Thorne, F. and Schulte, R. (2014), An

- evaluation of the effect of greenhouse gas accounting methods on a marginal abatement cost curve for Irish agricultural greenhouse gas emissions, *Environmental Science & Policy*, vol. 39, May 2015, pp. 107-118, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2013.09.001>.
12. Păunescu, M. (2015), The Quality of Independent Auditors Reports – Is it Room for Improvement?, *Audit Financiar*, vol. 13, no. 130(10), pp. 61-68.
 13. Probst, J.H. (2008), Bilanzen lesen leicht gemacht. Zahlen richtig analysieren und interpretieren, München: Redline Wirtschaft, FinanzBuch Verlag GmbH.
 14. Remenyi, D., Williams B., Money, A. and Swartz, E. (1998), *Doing Research in Business and Management: An Introduction to Process and Method*, London: Sage.
 15. Robson, C. (2002), *Real World Research*, 2nd Edition, Oxford: Blackwell.
 16. Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2007), *Research methods for business students*, 4th Edition, Harlow: Pearson Hall.
 17. Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2009), *Research methods for business students*, 5th Edition, Harlow: Pearson Hall.
 18. Țurlea, E. and Mocanu, M. (2010), Reflections upon the accountability of management and auditors in evaluating going concern, *Audit financiar*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 24-31.
 19. Țurlea, E., Ștefănescu, A. and Mocanu, M. (2010), Financial audit in an arena context. An analysis at the meso-level, *Annales Universitatis Apulensis, Series Oeconomica*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 325-331.
 20. Whittaker, C., McManus, M. and Smith, P. (2013), A comparison of carbon accounting tools for arable crops in the United Kingdom, *Environmental Modelling & Software*, vol. 46, August 2013, pp. 228-239, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.03.015>.