INTRODUCTION
Background
Sustainability for the organisation has received asubstantial level of attention in the aftermath of the 2007-2009 global crisis. A Study by Brockett and Rezaee (2012), cited in Rezaee (2016) has confirmed that sustainability has gained attention to providing a mean of ensuring the long – term survival of the organisations and their accountability to the stakeholders (Rezaee, 2016). Further study of Rezaee (2016) has asserted that investors demand, regulatory requirements and public companies’ disclosure requirement has prompted organisations to publish their economic, governance, social, ethical and environmental (EGSEE) performance (Rezaee, 2016). Therefore, as identified by a study of Tonello and Singer (2015), cited in Kanda (2013), it can be asserted that business sustainability has become a relatively contemporary concept that focuses on the pursuits of corporate policy to achieve a sustainable performance on EGSEE dimensions (Kanda, 2013). However, a couple of studies (Brunnermeier, 2009) and (Taylor, 2009) have suggested that organisations’ corporate governance, that sets and directs the organisations have asignificant impact on its performance in the long – term (Erkens, et al., 2012). This issue has been significantly evident during the global crisis period that still plagues within the financial and business industry. That is why Kashyap et al (2008) as cited by Erkens, et al., (2012) have identified that the decisions of corporate boards have asubstantial impact on how the organisations perform during crisis and post – crisis period to ensure its sustainability (Erkens, et al., 2012). Therefore, it is
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The study recommends to adopt “Triple – Bottom – Line” (TBL) approach to measure and report the dimensions of sustainable operations for the governance of JLP. This is because they have already identified separate measurements for environmental sustainability. Thereby, an integration can be made by JLP where they can separately measure and report the dimensions of economic and social sustainability dimensions under TBL approach.
apparent that corporate governance has a lot to do with the sustainability of the organisation.

In this context, the study focuses on exploring the impact of corporate governance on organisational sustainability through studying the case of an organisation called John Lewis Partnership.

**Aim and Objectives**

**Aim**

The aim of this study is to critically evaluate the impact of corporate governance on the sustainability of organisation called John Lewis Partnership.

**Objectives**

The objectives of the study have been set as follows:

1. To critically evaluate the literature of the extents of sustainability and its implications on John Lewis Partnership
2. To critically discuss the issue of sustainability and its fundamental importance on the continuity of operations of John Lewis Partnership
3. To make judgement on how corporate governance is fundamental to the continuity of the operations of John Lewis partnership

**Rationale**

Corporate governance is the central base for an organisation (Aras & Crowther, 2008). Based on some prior research (Mason & Simmons, 2014; Klettner, et al., 2014), it can be addressed that many organisations have failed due to the lack of corporate governance or poor arrangements of corporate governance where they had been unable to identify any unforeseen circumstances that made negative impact on organisations (Eccles, et al., 2012). Since the demise of Lehman Brothers, there have been overhauls of the frameworks, concepts and guidelines regarding how an organisation should be governed to prevent any situation of failure(Aebi, et al., 2012). Moreover, the issue of sustainability has been undergone many changes, scrutiny and discussions to include wider stakeholders’ views instead of sticking to short-term shareholders’ profitability views (Aras & Crowther, 2008). In this context, this study concentrates on the examination of sound corporate governance and its impact on organisational sustainability. The study focuses on corporate governance arrangement of John Lewis Partnership and investigates its impact on sustainability of the organisation.

**Organisation Brief – John Lewis Partnership**

The operation of John Lewis began in 1864 as a family drapery store that later converted into a partnership business in 1929(Paranque & Wilmott, 2014). The architect of partnership model has been laid by John Spedan Lewis who pioneered the combination of the competitive business model through governance system and democratic partnership scheme (John Lewis Partnership, 2016). Since then, John Lewis is still lifting the spirits of partner ownership model and dedicated to serving the customers with flair and fairness in the British retail market.

John Lewis Partnership (JLP) operates under two business segments including John Lewis, a departmental store and Waitrose, a supermarket. At the time of writing, there are 88,900 permanent partners (staffs) who work at 48 John Lewis shops and 350 Waitrose supermarkets. Alongside, John Lewis Partnership also operates online and catalogue business(John Lewis Partnership, 2016).

The approximate turnover of JLP is over £11bn. The core value of JLP is to share the profits and benefits with the partners that have been embedded with JLP’s operations for many years (John Lewis Partnership, 2016). The study focuses on JLP’s unique partnership model through exploring its corporate governance arrangement and investigates its impact on sustainability.

**Contribution of Research**

Since the foundation of John Lewis Partnership, the organisation has been run by the constitutional governance system as set out by the founder(John Lewis Partnership, 2016). However, changes in business patterns and competitive environment have forced John Lewis to adopt new codes of corporate governance in terms of making the organisation more productive and efficient(Kocmanova, et al., 2011). This is also in line with prior academic studies including Coles et al (2001) and Patterson (2002) where they have argued that corporate governance is significantly important to organisational performance, market values and credibility (Aras & Crowther, 2008). Hence, the outcome of the study provides the contribution for JLP to enhance its existing corporate governance practice to ensure the sustainability of the operation. Furthermore, the outcome of the investigation will provide insight of good practice of corporate governance to ensure the sustainability of the organisation. Thus, it will set the guidance and direction for the retailers to apply the corporate governance practice to ensure the sustainability of the business operation.

**Research Issue and Findings**

The research issue has been focused on studying the impact of corporate governance on the organisational sustainability. This is based on the previous studies (Coles, et al., 2001; Patterson, 2002; Aras and Crowther, 2008) have presented that corporate governance has significant influence on the overall performance of the organisations. Besides that, some other studies (Brunnermeier, 2009; Taylor, 2009; Erkens, et. al., 2012) have demonstrated that the corporate governance has impact on the long – term performance of the organisation. To explore this issue further, the research has found out a positive relationship between the corporate governance and its impact on the organisational sustainability. The outcome of the research has agreed with the evidence of the prior studies where JLP has been nurturing their sustainability since their inception. Furthermore, another significant finding of this study indicates that JLP’s corporate governance sets the policy intended to secure a long – term strategic success that leads them to operate for the near future. Thus, the outcomes of this research carry the key findings from JLP that would be exemplary for the other organisations to practice corporate governance for securing a sustainable future of the organisation. The study has been conducted using secondary data where a mixed method has been used. The data has been collected using the published sources under secondary data collection methodology. The data has been collected from the
annual report and sustainability report of John Lewis. The data has been analysed through content analysis where reports of John Lewis have been evaluated against the literature review.

**Structure of Dissertation**

The dissertation is split into six chapters containing 1. introduction 2. Literature review 3. Methodology 4. Presentation and Findings 5. Analysis 6. Conclusion. Chapter 1, this chapter contains an introduction that has set out background, rationale, objectives of the study. Chapter 2 will critically review academic literature relevant to the dissertation topic. Chapter 3 will design methodology that will be deployed to explore this study. Chapter 4 will present findings of data collection. Chapter 5 will critically analyse the findings. The final chapter, chapter 6 will conclude study through summarising and providing recommendations.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Background of Literature Review**

According to Saunders et al (2012), it can be pointed out that a critical review of the relevant literature allows the provision of connecting the research objectives to the subsequent empirical materials through linking the different ideas from the arguments (Saunders, et al., 2012). Therefore, this chapter presents the literature review of two key contexts underpinning by corporate governance and sustainability.

**Corporate Governance**

Corporate governance is being considered as the environment embedded with trust, ethics, moral, values and confidence to run an organisation effectively and efficiently (Benn, et al., 2014). Durnev and Kim (2005) labelled corporate governance as a synergic effort within all the components of the society or precisely, the stakeholders, including government, the public, professional service providers, corporate sectors, different agencies and suppliers (Abras & Crowther, 2008). Hermelin (2005) had concluded from his study that corporate governance has been increasingly getting concerned due to the actions of the organisations and the result of those actions (Aebi, et al., 2012). This issue of gaining demands and concerns had also been echoed by Joyner and Payne (2002) where they had argued that due to the liberalisation and deregulation of the industry and business, there are urging corporate ethos of considering the arrangement of governance within the organisation (Mason & Simmons, 2014). Therefore, in line with the study made by Bushman and Smith (2001), it can be pointed out that there is a changing tune of paradigm where there is wider demand for corporate accountability under the provision of corporate governance (Abras & Crowther, 2008).

The above review of corporate governance definitions has revealed that there is no unified terminology of corporate governance. However, the report of Cadbury (1992) has provided fundamental definitions of corporate governance and that is perhaps simple and concise(Rezaee, 2016). This is because it simply puts corporate governance as a system through which the companies are managed and controlled. Furthermore, the report has outlined key responsibility and responsible bodies where it has been specified that responsible bodies of corporate governance shall set out company’s strategic goals, checking and monitoring on goal achievement, supervision of people and informing shareholders about the performance. However, Demb and Neubauer (1992) added that under the corporate governance arrangement the responsible parties owe stewardship duty to address the rights and request of stakeholders (Ercens, et al., 2012). By bringing the interests of stakeholders, they have extended the scope and study of corporate governance. That is why Kliriva (2001) concluded from his extensive research that corporate governance is the core element of reaching economic efficiency and growth to justify the increment of trust from shareholders, investors and stakeholders (Kocmanova, et al., 2011).

Therefore, corporate governance engrosses a broad range of issues relating to corporate management, administrative authorities, shareholders and stakeholders. That is why corporate governance is truly a system through which organisations are managed and controlled, this has also been agreed by OECD (1999)(Eccles, et al., 2012).

**Sustainability**

Studies including Aras and Crowther (2008) have labelled sustainability as a controversial topic due to its different meanings to different individuals and organisations(Aras & Crowther, 2008). Hence, as same as corporate governance, sustainability has also come across with different definitions and meaning. However, the initial agreement had been made to accept and practice the definition provided in “Brundtland Report” (1987) where the idea of sustainable development had been presaged out(Aebi, et al., 2012). The report (1987) published that sustainable development refers to the development that meets the present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs(Klettner, et al., 2014). Thus, it has brought up the wider issue of sustainable development and sustainability. However, the issuance of sustainable development and sustainability have created dilemma and confusion between these two terminologies. As argued by both Chambers (1994) and Pretty (1995), there is a confusion among them and so better to consider sustainability as to not harming the needs of future generation to meet present needs(Ercens, et al., 2012). Again, this matches with Brundtland report’s definition. But this concept has not been a new one as earlier studies had been focusing on sustainability through different terminologies and aspects. For example, McDonald and Puxty (1979) have questioned the traditional role of companies where they urged to change the attitude and put more focus on society as a whole (Rezaee, 2016). The same thing had been questioned by another study of Gray et al (1987) where they have pointed out that organisations and professionals have wider role and accountability to stakeholders(Cheng, et al., 2016). Later on, Rubenstein (1992) has recommended for anew social contract between business and stakeholders(Ercens, et al., 2012). Thereby, it is apparent that the issue and context of sustainability have truly broadened and in the contemporary period, it has traversed further to extend the issue of sustainability.

Although, there are confusion and controversy about defining sustainability, IFAC (2008) have come up with key elements of defining sustainability (Kocmanova, et al., 2011). They are as follows: -
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- Promotion of ethical responsibility and sound corporate governance practice
- Provision of safe working environment where health of employees is protected
- Promotion of cultural diversity and equity in workplace
- Reducing of adverse environment impact
- Providing opportunities for social and economic development within the environment of business operations

From the above core attributes as defined by IFAC (2008), it can be figured out that sustainability is the process of sustainable development. Perhaps, this somehow removes the anomalies between sustainability and sustainable development. Furthermore, prior studies [Hart, 1995; Shrivastava, 1996; Stead and Stead, 1995] have agreed on the matter that sustainability enables to form a strategy of sustainable development (Paranque & Wilmott, 2014). Also, based on their definitions of sustainability, it can be opined that corporate sustainability is a strategic approach that focuses on efficiency and effectiveness along with productivity to create values for the shareholders flowing from environmental, economic and social dimensions.

**Importance of Good Corporate Governance**

Cox et al (2004) have argued that a good governance at all levels should be associated with the improvement of public faith and confidence in the political and business environment (Aras & Crowther, 2008). This is, of course, supported by the fact that a good corporate governance has significant importance in all spheres of the society and environment due to the findings mentioned from the study of Hermalin (2005) where there was an indication of bi-lateral relationship between the organisations and the stakeholders (Eccles, et al., 2012). To demystify the issue of good corporate governance further, it can be pointed out from the study of Boele et al (2001), that a good corporate governance is associated with the minimum level of expectations from the stakeholders where the organisations are to make promotions of the welfare of the society with the available of limited resources (Aras & Crowther, 2008).

Based on the evidence of studies, a good corporate governance has an important influence on society as a whole. In addition, the study of Durнев and Kim (2005) has revealed that a good corporate governance has at least a prevalent impact on the corporate world through embedding trust and confidence (Mason & Simmons, 2014). This matches with the definition of corporate governance as provided by Aras and Crowther (2008) where they have also corporate governance to the environment of trust (Aras & Crowther, 2008). Therefore, it can be argued that good corporate governance has not only importance on the corporate world but also in every sphere of the society. A good governance system is critical to improving public confidence and trust, when there are limited resources to meet the expectations of stakeholders.

**Fundamental Principles of Corporate Governance**

In practice, there are four fundamental principles of good corporate governance that are (Aras & Crowther, 2008):

1. Transparency
2. Accountability
3. Responsibility
4. Fairness

All the above four principles are associated an organisational corporate responsibility towards stakeholders. However, there are dubious aspects of the extents of corporate governance and its dimensions. Whereas, different prior studies including Beder (1997); Mayhew (1997); Gray and Bebbington (2001) had argued that there can be many misinterpretations among the corporate bodies to define and frame corporate governance (Atras & Crowther, 2008). For instance, management could interpret managing a firm for the sole purpose of creating and maintaining value for the shareholders. However, different other studies including Cowen et al (1987); Gray et al (2001); Burke and Longsdon (1996) had argued that corporate governance arrangement is related to every aspect of the management where the management should attempt to create values for the shareholders and satisfy all the stakeholders to keep the procedures in a balanced mode (Erkens, et al., 2012). Notably, the study of Sethi (2002) provided good issue of corporate governance to define its principles where he pointed towards the creation of balance between the economic and social goals of the company (Kocmanova, et al., 2011; Klettner, et al., 2014). Thereby, it can be asserted that corporate governance is overall related to the efficient use of resources, accountability and behaviour of the organisation within the social environment.

Despite, Aras and Crowther (2008) have suggested the above outlined four principles of corporate governance, they have also argued that the definition and measurement criteria of good corporate governance are still subject to be agreed (Aras & Crowther, 2008). However, a later study of Erkens et al (2012) has confirmed that good corporate governance addresses key points like the creation of sustainable value, achievement of objectives and keeping a balance between economic and social benefits (Atras & Crowther, 2008). Furthermore, Cox et al (2004) and Hermalin (2005) have also suggested for the creation of sustainable values through good corporate governance (Rezaee, 2016). Therefore, it can be asserted that corporate governance is definitively related to the offering of long – term benefits for the organisations that provide the architecture of creating good corporate governance arrangement within the organisation.

**Key Features of Corporate Sustainability**

The Study of Marrewijk and Werre (2003) has specified that there is no certain definition or attributes of corporate sustainability (Aebi, et al., 2012). Therefore, they have proposed that each organisation needs to design and develop its own framework of sustainability. However, the study of Spangenberg (2004) disagreed with Marrewijk and Werre (2003) where prior one has proposed for environmental and social concern as part of the sustainable strategy (Erkens, et al., 2012). Again, this was scrutinised by Dythlick and Hockerts (2002) on the plea that sustainability needs to be wider than merely focused on aspects. However, none of them hasnot recognised any aspect of financial dimension as part of sustainability. This was identified by Crowther (2002) where he came up with the conflation of financial and social performance under sustainability. Perhaps, based on this study,
Aras and Crowther (2008) have proposed four aspects of corporate sustainability as shown in figure 1:

![Figure 1](image1)

**Figure 1 Key Aspects of Corporate Sustainability**


In line with Aras and Crowther (2008) proposal,

1. Societal influence – it is the measurement of the impact to the society under the social provision.
2. Environmental impact – it is the effect of any action by the organisation within its capacity of thegeophysical environment.
3. Organisational culture – it is the relationship between the organisation and its internal stakeholders including employees to define their bi-lateral relationship.
4. Finance – it is related to the return against the undertaken risks for the shareholders.

Thereby, these four aspects can be considered as the basis of studying corporate sustainability due to its broader scope. Furthermore, the framework has considered four aspects on two-dimensional matrixes under polarities of internal versus external focus and short – term versus long – term focus as in figure 1. The amalgamation of them provides a complete view of organisational performance. Furthermore, and perhaps most importantly, the above four aspects provide attention to the future without compromising present times. Thereby, it clearly demonstrates the core attributes of sustainability that was put up by Hart and Milstein (2003) where sustainability focuses on long – term position with maximising the utilisation of present resources(Klettner, et al., 2014).

**Integrating Good Governance and Sustainability**

Previous studies [Cowen et al, 1987; Gray et al, 2001] have investigated the relationship between the characteristics of a firm and its disclosure (Kanda, 2013). They have demonstrated a direct relationship between sustainability and organisational success. Also, the study of Burke and Longsdon (1996) demonstrated the benefits of corporate social responsibility and firm performance (Rezaee, 2016). These have been matched with the study of Mason and Simmons (2014) where they have integrated different dimensions of sustainability with the corporate social responsibility of good governance(Mason & Simmons, 2014). However, CSR or environmental policy are merely just a single part of good corporate governance. Whereas, as identified before good governance extends further to control and manage the organisation. In addition, Salo (2008) has demonstrated from an empirical study that there is an individual contribution from environmental performance and good corporate governance on the overall performance of business (Kanda, 2013). That is why it is clear that there is a direct relationship between corporate governance and sustainability of organisation that provides the basis for this study.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework of this study has been drawn in figure 2 as below:

![Figure 2 Conceptual Framework](image2)

Adapted from: (Aras & Crowther, 2008).

Figure 2 provides the conceptual framework of this study. Implying this framework, the study will seek to find out the corporate governance arrangement of John Lewis Partnership and its influence on their sustainability. However, there need to be certain key performance indicators or attributes of evaluating JLP’s good corporate governance and sustainable approaches. To do so, the study presents the following key performance indicators or good attributes under figure 3:

The above criteria are not exhaustive; it can be flexible as per findings from JLP. Furthermore, this type of assessment evidence has been carried out by prior studies including Gompers et al (2003) and Bebchuk et al (2003) where they used the above same criteria to assess the relationship between sustainable performance and good corporate governance (Rezaee, 2016). Therefore, this study will adopt the same approach in investigating the relationship between good corporate governance and organisational sustainability.

**Summary of Literature Review**

The critical review of the literature has revealed that both corporate governance and sustainability have numerous definitions and different points of views from academics and professionals. However, there are wide agreements on the fact that corporate governance provides a system for controlling and managing an organisation and sustainability provides the roadmap of functioning business for long – term future. The chapter has developed atheoretical framework that will be utilised later in this study to analyse data.
Adapted from:
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Figure 3 Key Performance Indicators of Good Corporate Governance and
Corporate Sustainability.
Adapted from: (Rezaee, 2016).
The key identifications of corporate governance’s
classifications include transparency, accountability,
responsibility and fairness that will design how the organisation
is run. Also, the review has provided four key aspects of
sustainability including societal, environmental, cultural and
financial dimensions. The whole chapter has provided core
knowledge of undertaking to investigate the relationship
between corporate governance and organisational sustainability
of John Lewis Partnership on the basis of following three
hypotheses: -

Hypothesis 1: The practice of sound corporate governance
promotes ethical responsibility of John Lewis Partnership.

Hypothesis 2: The good corporate governance of John Lewis
Partnership addresses societal, cultural, environmental and
financial aspects of sustainability.

Hypothesis 3: The good corporate governance of John Lewis
Partnership influences the sustainability of the organisation.

METHODOLOGY

Overview
The methodology chapter discusses the research methods and
the methodology of this study. The chapter will discuss the
available options of research methods and methodology along
with the selection of the most appropriate one. The chapter will
be crucial for the further study of this dissertation as it will
provide the basis for data collection and analysis.

Research Philosophy
Research philosophy underpins research strategy and methods
to conduct research (Saunders, et al., 2012). The study follows
the commitment of positivism philosophical stance to study
through observing social reality. Thereby, the study attempts to
explore social reality as underpinned by the impact of corporate
governance on the sustainability of the organisation. This is
because the prior studies (Aras & Crowther, 2008; Aebi, et al.,
2012; Erkens, et al., 2012) where the issue of corporate
governance has been labelled as a contemporary phenomenon
to have an impact on organisational long-term performance.

Research Approach
The study follows adeductive approach where research objectives
have been formulated first that has provided the core
aspects of conducting a literature review. In addition, there are
also development of hypotheses based on the literature review.
Then, it follows to collect data and analyse them based on the
literature review. Finally, it provides the conclusion to make
comments and recommendations on the objectives as set
initially based on the collected data. The deductive approach
as adopted in this study enabled to undertake a critical review of
the literature. This has provided atheoretical framework to
assess and analyse the impact of corporate governance on the
sustainability of the selected organisation. In addition, previous
studies on corporate governance and sustainability (Aras &
Crowther, 2008; Kochmanova, et al., 2011; Klettner, et al.,
2014) have undertaken the same approach that has provided the
basis of undertaking a literature review first then analyse the
collected data.

Research Strategy
The study follows a case study approach where an investigation
has been done on a specific issue within the real world context.
This is because the study attempts to obtain an in-depth
understanding of the impact of corporate governance on the
sustainability of the organisation. Thereby, the case study
strategy enables to explore and analyse the issue of corporate
governance and sustainability in-depth by studying the case
study of John Lewis Partnership. Furthermore, acase study of
John Lewis provides the findings of this study that has been
studied in association with the literature of the corporate
governance and sustainability.

Research Method
The study takes mixed method combining both quantitative and
qualitative data. This is based on the conceptual framework
where both numerical and non-numerical measuring criteria
have been established for the literature review. So, adopting a
mixed method, the study collects both quantitative and
qualitative data to measure those criteria. Furthermore, the
mixed method enables to make a generalisation of the collected data by putting the numbers from the findings under quantitative method and analysed them by the qualitative method. This provides a generalised finding for the conceptual framework (figure 2) to assess the impact of corporate governance on the sustainability of the organisation. In addition, the study also follows mixed method based on prior evidence where different studies (Aras & Crowther, 2008; Eccles, et al., 2012; Erkens et al., 2012; Mason & John, 2014) have used the mixed method to collect data and analyse them. Thereby, the study takes the same approach to investigate the issue of this research.

**Research Data**

This study is based on secondary data where existing and published data is being used to achieve research objectives. This is predominantsince secondary data can support researchers to achieve research objectives as they contain published information that can be used to analyse and study on the specific issue. Furthermore, the context of this study and its scope have similar precedence to prior studies where there is evidence of using secondary data. Rezaee (2016), one of the recent publications has used secondary data to study business sustainability (Rezaee, 2016). In addition, Erkens et al (2012) studied corporate governance on companies at specific time using secondary data (Erkens, et al., 2012). Furthermore, Aras and Crowther (2008) studied governance and sustainability that has more relevance to the topic of this study, they had used secondary data where they had also studied on the different organization (Aras & Crowther, 2008). Thereby, based on the above reasoning, it is justifiable and reasonable to use secondary data in this study. This will allow being coherent with other approaches and methodologies. For example, secondary data can be used in both explanatory and descriptive studies. Whereas, this study is related to explanatory research and secondary data selection has definite logic and coherence for this study.

**Data Sources**

Saunders et al (2006) have developed multiple sources of secondary data shown in figure 4:

**Types of secondary data**

Table: Types of secondary data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary data</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>Organisations' databases, books, newspapers, journals, television programs, radio programs, government publications, newspapers, books, journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple source</td>
<td>Media articles, government reports, organization reports, Official statistics, government survey data, organization's reports, organisational websites, reports and minutes of committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Media articles, government reports, organization reports, organisation reports, organisational websites, reports and minutes of committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc surveys</td>
<td>Media articles, government reports, organization reports, organisation reports, organisational websites, reports and minutes of committees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from: (Saunders, et al., 2012).

Based on the findings from the above sources, the study uses documentary secondary data. This is because documentary secondary data can provide access to published materials. Also, the documentary secondary data can be used to collect mixed data type including quantitative and qualitative. Therefore, this is coherent with overall methods and methodology of this study. As specified in figure 4, the key sources of secondary data of this study include written materials like journals, books, newspapers, organisation’s reports and databases. The study collects secondary data from the reports (annual and sustainability reports) published by John Lewis to obtain data about their practice of corporate governance including hierarchy of board structure, the performance of the boards, remuneration etc. along with the published data about their approaches towards sustainability. In terms of alteritreview that is also part of secondary data of this study uses the published journals, books, articles published in online newspapers and books to obtain akey concept of the literature of corporate governance and sustainability.

**Sampling**

This study represents a low sample size of 10 – 15 journals within the scope of timing and funding. This is because the study needs to be completed within the specific time and funding is a key issue in obtaining access to published materials. Some access cannot be made due to lack of funding to purchase alicense.

Saunders et al (2012) have developed framework of selecting sampling technique as shown in figure 5:

![Figure 5 Sampling Techniques](image)

Adopted from: (Saunders, et al., 2012).

Based on the identifications made on the above figure, it is likely to use simple random sampling method under probability sampling. This is because it enables to select a sample at random from the sampling frame. Hereby, the study selects samples of journals where topics are known and within the sample frame of the time period between 2008-2016. This is to provide the inputs of recent information and data on this study. Furthermore, the other sources like organisation’s reports are known and hence, the samples are specific. Therefore, a simple random sampling method under probability sampling is appropriate to use in this study.

**Evaluation and Validity of Secondary Data**

Saunders et al (2012) have strongly recommended validating the secondary data at the same level as primary data. Thereby, they have developed a three - stage validation process for secondary data as shown in figure 6:
Adapted from: (Saunders, et al., 2012).

In evaluating and validating the process, the study follows the above systematic process in selecting secondary sources. Specifically, in doing the sampling of journals, the study validates those journals that have direct relevance to this study. This has been done by reading the abstract of journals to seek whether they have relevance and importance for this study. Furthermore, some journals are needed to be excluded due to costs and access right issue. Thus, the secondary resources have been validated in this study.

Data Analysis

The study analyses the data using content analysis procedure where a systematic analysis has been done following the qualitative text analysis from the findings. The content analysis provides the scope to have inputs from the quantitative data and convert them into the qualitative analysis (Lapan, et al., 2012). Specifically, the data collected from the organisation’s secondary resources (reports) have been converted into the qualitative analytical procedure. Whereby, the study analyse the data using the conceptual framework (figure 3) following the qualitative procedure. Also, the content analysis has been done in most of the prior studies (Aras & Crowther, 2008; Aebi, et al., 2012; Cheng, et al., 2016; Erkens, et al., 2012) as used in the literature review where they have converted the quantitative data into qualitative analysis under the content analysis. This study does the same to analyse data.

Summary

The study uses secondary research method to collect data. The data contains mixed method of data collected from the secondary sources. The sources of data of the study contain the sustainability report, annual report and constitution document of John Lewis Partnership. The data analyses follow content analysis procedure where the inputs of the quantitative data have been converted into qualitative data.

Presentation and Findings

Overview

The chapter presents the findings of this study using amixed method of secondary data. The key sources of secondary data of this chapter are the annual reports and sustainability reports of John Lewis Partnership. The data collection follows the criteria as set out in the conceptual framework (figure 3). The chapter presents the findings in two separate sections by delineating corporate governance first and then the sustainability of the organisation. The findings have been presented in the format in line with content analysis procedure where quantitative inputs have been converted into qualitative procedures.

Findings

Corporate Governance

The governance of John Lewis Partnership (JLP) follows “comply or explain” approach where they have constituted alternative approach as suggested by Financial Reporting Council (FRC)(John Lewis Partnership, 2015). However, the partnership constitution of JLP takes precedence over FRC’s codes that have to revise each year within their governance structure. Following provides the governance structure of JLP: -

![Governance Structure of John Lewis Partnership](Image)

The governance structure in figure 7 reveals that JLP appoints independent committees and three directors of the operations including director for John Lewis, director for Waitrose and Group Finance Director. The structure and number of independent committees are shown below: -

![Structure of Independent Committee of JLP](Image)
As identified in figure 9, it can be revealed that the chairman is accountable to both partnership board and partnership council. Thus, JLP separates the power, control and roles of the chairman within their governance structure. However, this brings the structure of partnership board and partnership council.

From the figure 10, it reveals that there are total 15 directors on the partnership board. In addition, from the figure 10, it can be identified that there are total 12 insider directors within the board that makes a total 80%. The chairman as identified before is accountable to the partnership board. The responsibility of the partnership board has provided below (John Lewis Partnership, 2015):

- approval of major policy and strategic decisions
- allocation of the financial and other resources of the business
- review of the effectiveness of the partnership’s internal controls
- review and assess the risk management systems
- ultimate responsible for the overall management and performance of the partnership

The partnership board as identified is the ultimate responsible of the overall management of JLP is diversified in terms of gender diversity.

Among the 15 members of the board, figure 11 reveals that the board is split into 40% female members and 60% male members. As per findings, it can be revealed that the board is independent and diversified to bring the expertise to the table. JLP states that their board is diversified and enriched with industry expertise to perform the ultimate responsibility of sustaining the partnership’s operations.

The final structural component of JLP is the partnership council who are the body that delegates the responsibility to the chairman and partnership board as provided in figure 9. The board structure is made up as follows:

- ultimate responsible for the overall management and performance of the partnership

The final finding is about the audit committee at JLP who provides an assessment of partnership’s performance and conducts are view of the effectiveness of the risk management process. The board is composed as follows:
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Figure 13 Composition of Audit Committee at JLP

As per figure 13, the audit committee of JLP is made up of 3 non-executive directors, 3 elected directors and 1 partner’s counsellor. As suggested by JLP, the committee operates independently to assess and review the integrity of the performance reports and risk management of the partnership’s operations.

Societal Influence

JLP contributes towards the development of the community in three aspects i. volunteering ii. Charity schemes iii. Initiatives in schools. As of 2015 report, JLP’s total investment to community accounts for 4.3%. Following provides the breakdowns of contributions towards the community: -

Figure 14 Community Contributions made by JLP

Figure 14 reveals that JLP has not only contributed by only giving cash to the community rather they have also counted for their time and managerial inputs. Specifically, the total value of time invested in the community cause equates to £2.4m and the management cost equates to £1.3m. Some of the key highlights are provided in the following table about the core activities of JLP’s social contributions: -

From the above table 1, it can be identified that JLP has dedicated activities to support the good causes of the local community. In addition, they also work with their farmers (suppliers) to ensure that they do business in sustainable. Furthermore, John Lewis has also dedicated their partners’ contributions towards the social good causes that have seen a continuous investment to make the community as a better place.

Table I Highlights of JLP’s Social and Community Influences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Golden Jubilee Trust”</td>
<td>Six months volunteering by the partners at the registered UK charity A total of 260,000 hours has been dedicated to data by the partners 657 partners are currently performing as part of temporary assignments 45 charities have been supported so far in the year 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Bringing Skills to Life Programme”</td>
<td>Delegates Community – Liaison coordinators to recruit partners in volunteering Take part in school workshops to improve the life skills of the people An increment of 60% of volunteering hours in the year 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sustainable Cotton Programme”</td>
<td>Working with the farmers to source the fibre through economically viable, environmentally sustainable and socially acceptable ways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Influence

The constitution of partnership states that: -

“To take all reasonable steps to minimise any detrimental effect of operations on the environment and to promote good environmental practice.”

This highlights that JLP takes the positive influence of operations to the environment seriously and integrate as part of their core operations. Following highlights some of their performance and activities towards achieving sustainable operations: -

Figure 15 CO2e Emission per £m sales at JLP.

Figure 15 reveals that JLP has reduced the CO2 emissions in 2014 by 5% of their total annual revenues. Also, this is an increment of almost 2% from the prior year. However, the target of 15% is yet far to be achieved.
Figure 16 Water Consumption Per Square ft. of Trading Floor.

Figure 16 reveals that water consumption per square ft. has not been reduced since 2012 and maintains at a steady level. Whereas, the target is 20% by 2020 seems to be halted since 2012 in which year it reduced by 14%.

Organisational Culture

The culture of partnership operation has been nurturing the founding principle since 1929. This resembles their constitution’s principle that states:

“The Partnership’s ultimate purpose is the happiness of all its members, through their worthwhile and satisfying employment in a successful business. Because the partnership is owned in the trust for its members, they share responsibilities of ownership as well as its rewards – profit, knowledge and power”

Based on the above-stated principles, JLP has established its culture as a distinctive model of co-ownership of the operations of the UK business. The culture is centralised into three aspects of operations as shown below:

As per figure 17, it can be pointed out that JLP has achieved their recycling target of 95% in 2014 by exceeding to 96.1%. This has made them onset for a new target of 98% by 2017. At the same time, the diversion from the landfill target of 85% has not achieved in 2014. This is perhaps because they have seen a fall in 2013 where the diversion has fallen in 2013.

In terms of food packaging, they reduced the food packaging by 40% until 2014. But the target is to achieve 50% by 2016. Despite, there are areas where JLP is yet to achieve their target, all of the activities under environmental influence indicate their commitment to making positive impact as per their principal code of business and make the operations sustainable.
As per figure 16, the business strategy of partnership operation is built on three aims including a. Increase advantages of partners – making the partners personally satisfied, JLP attempts to achieve competitive advantage by providing them with a worthwhile and secured employment; b. Realise market potentials-The adaptation to changing market needs and flexibility to adopt the strategy provides an enhanced support towards sustainable operation by deepening the relationship with the customers; c. Grow efficiently-To ensure that a balanced approach is sustained between the profits and costs, the efficiency is at top agenda for the sustainable operations.

As highlighted in figure 16, the strategy intends to make efficient growth of the operations, JLP creates value by articulating the following process:

1. Efficient Selection and Sourcing
2. Connecting Products to Markets
3. Excellent Customer Experience

Figure 20 Value Creation by JLP operations.

Thereby, JLP selects and source the best products for their customers to meet their needs. Furthermore, the values sustain within their supply chain where they procure local, ethical and sustainably sourced products. Finally, JLP is committed to providing excellent customer experience by operating a smart distribution network with the impetus of technology.

Finance

The financial aspects of JLP’s operation split into two trading divisions of Waitrose and John Lewis. Following providing the highlights of the key performance under financial aspects:

Figure 21 reveals Waitrose contributing 60% of sales for JLP but the sales of John Lewis has been increased more than Waitrose in 2013 in which John Lewis has seen a rise of 7.5% and Waitrose has seen 6.0%. However, all of them accumulate to a group increment of 6.6%.

Figure 22 Operating Profit for JLP.

There has been increment of overall group’s operating profit by 3.9% in 2013 while Waitrose leads the group profit by making an increment of 6.1%.

Figure 23 Partnership Bonus.

The partnership bonus has been reduced by 2% in 2014. However, the compensation has been caused due to JLP’s investment on the sustainability like making an investment on new projects and expansion. Again, this is part of one of their three core strategies (figure 19) of business operations.

In addition to the key performance areas, JLP assesses and reviews their risk factors of business operation. They do this in association with their risk and audit committee where they identify the issue and provide responses for mitigating them. Thereby, JLP has configured a risk management framework as below: -
Under this framework in Figure 24, JLP identifies strategic risks which defend them from taking wrong investment decision; operational risks to protect from doing things in the wrong ways; financial risks to make their operation efficient by not to incur any unnecessary costs or liabilities; compliance risks to provide the guidance on complying with the framework (John Lewis Partnership, 2016). However, JLP’s risk framework does not intend to make fully elimination of risk rather managing the risk for the sustainable operations.

**Analysis**

**Corporate Governance**

The corporate governance practice of JLP conforms to the concise definition of corporate governance. This is because JLP’s corporate governance is structured to oversee the policy making, setting directions and managing operations of the business. This approach matches with the simple and precise definition of corporate governance as formulated by the Cadbury report (1992) where it states that the corporate governance is the system of managing and controlling the organisation (Rezaee, 2016). From the findings, it has been identified that the partnership council is the ultimate body to have the responsibility of overseeing the management of the operations. Whereby, they delegate the responsibility to the chairman and the partnership board. By making these arrangements, the governance of JLP assures the protection of partners’ assets and resources for the foreseeable future. This brings out the issue of their stewardship duties towards stakeholders. This is in line with the identifications made by Demb and Neubauer (1992) where they argued that responsible parties have stewardship duties towards the stakeholders (Erkens, et al., 2012). The boards and chairman both have demonstrated their responsibilities not only towards the partners but also for the external stakeholders. This is based on the findings where the boards approve the strategic decisions and policies while the chairman provides accounts of strategic planning to the council of JLP. Thus, they have provided the evidence of conforming their stewardship duties towards stakeholders of JLP.

Furthermore, the core strategic values as embedded with the organisational culture of JLP is focused on making efficient growth while also remitting values for the stakeholders. This is because of the findings that have revealed that JLP’s business strategy is based on three core objectives including a. Increase advantages of partners – making the partners personally satisfied, JLP attempts to achieve competitive advantage by providing them with a worthwhile and secured employment; b. Realise market potentials – The adaptation to changing market needs and flexibility to adopt the strategy provides an enhanced support towards sustainable operation by deepening the relationship with the customers; c. Grow efficiently – To ensure that a balanced approach is sustained between the profits and costs, the efficiency is at top agenda for the sustainable operations. This is in line with the conclusion of the research of Klirova (2001) where she provided that economic growth and efficiency resemble the trust of the stakeholders, investors and stakeholders (Kocmanova, et al., 2011). Thereby, it can be argued that by adopting three core strategy of operations JLP’s boards have been delivering their duties to the stakeholders and attaining the trust of them.

The findings have also revealed that there are independent committees, separation of the role of the chairman and director, accountability and responsibility towards stakeholders. This provides core aspects of the characteristics of a good corporate governance practice. This is in line with the proposal of the study of Aras and Crowther (2008) where they identified four attributes of good practice of corporate governance (Aras & Crowther, 2008). Based on these attributes, it can be argued that JLP’s corporate governance practice is transparent and fair as they have made separation of role between the chairman and the board. Also, they have independent committees who oversee the responsibility and accountability of the boards. Specifically, the committees are independent to that of the whole corporate structure. This has strengthened the transparency and accountability of the board of JLP. Furthermore, the governance system of JLP has demonstrated their responsibilities towards keeping a balanced between the power and control of the boards. This is where they have segregated the roles of boards and chairman. Perhaps that is why the governance of JLP is focused on creating values for the stakeholders. Whereby, it matches with the study of Erkens, et al., (2012) where they have recommended that a good corporate governance shall attempt to create values for the shareholders and satisfy the needs of the stakeholders. Overall, the findings have provided similarity with the core findings from the literature where a good corporate governance arrangement entails to make long – term benefits for the whole organisation. This is what has been figured out from the practice of corporate governance at JLP where they intend to make long – term contributions for the benefits of all the stakeholders of the organisation.

**Sustainability**

The sustainability practice of JLP has been identified under four key aspects of the conceptual framework of this study including a. societal influence b. environmental influence c. organisational cultured. finance. From the findings of the societal influence, it can be argued that JLP has widened its corporate practice of sustainability rather than merely focused on the economic aspects of the operations. This is in line with
the study of Dyllick and Hockerts (2002) where they argued that the sustainability should be wider than merely focusing on the particular aspects (Aebi, et al., 2012). Further to this argument, the study has figured out that JLP provides a certain proportion of contribution towards the community development as part of their social commitment. In addition, they do not just consider the contributions in the form of giving cash rather they take part in the social activities intended to developing the community. This demonstrates their commitment to making the community developed so as they progress. This practice has been coined by one of the studies undertaken by Spangenberg (2004) where he debated that social concerns carry the symbol of a sustainable strategy. Hence, it is also clear that JLP carries that sustainable strategy throughout their practices of sustainable development.

Furthermore, JLP also provides commitment to make a positive impact on the environment. This is in line with the findings where JLP has set target to reduce the impact of CO2 on the environment. Although the study reveals that the target is yet to be achieved but in some extents, they have made tremendous progress. For instance, in 2014 they have achieved the target of recycling the wastes. This has demonstrated their concerns for the environment and steps towards making their operations sustainable.

As sustainability is a broad issue within the context of the contemporary period so the sustainability of JLP can be assessed based on the core elements suggested by IFAC (2008) (Kocmanova, et al., 2011). As per summarised findings made by the study of Kocmanova, et al., (2011), following contain the assessment of JLP’s sustainable practice:

Promotion of ethical responsibility and sound corporate governance practice. JLP demonstrates a sound practice of corporate governance as discussed earlier where they have separated the duties of the chairman and the directors. Also, JLP’s corporate governance resembles the characteristics of ethical responsibility by extending their responsibilities and accountabilities to the wider stakeholders including the local community.

Promotion of cultural diversity and equity in the workplace. The equity at the workplace and cultural diversity is part of JLP’s partnership values as per their written principles in the partnership constitution. Furthermore, the findings suggest that their boards are also diverse in terms of expertise and gender to support their partners for the sustainable development of the organisation. In addition, JLP demonstrates a unique concept of partnership business where they distribute a certain proportion of profits to the partners (employees) as part of their core cultural values.

Reduction of adverse environment impact. The findings suggest that JLP is fully committed to making reduction of the adverse impact on the environment. This has been underpinned by their initiatives and achievements towards sustainable operations. In particular, JLP has set targets to achieve the objective of reducing the impact on the environment.

Providing opportunities for social and economic development within the environment of business operations. The findings have figured out that JLP is putting their investment in the form of both cash and managerial inputs to make social development. This has been determined their contributions to the good causes of the society and initiatives at the school. In addition, JLP is focused on the social and economic development of their suppliers. In particular, they train and educate the farmers for their economic and social viable development.

All of the above provide clear demonstrations that JLP is not putting their profitable interest ahead of the aspects of social and environmental concerns. Therefore, this matches with the definition of sustainable practice as put up by the “Brundtland Report” (1987) where it indicated that the sustainability is all about practising the policies that meet the present needs without making any comprise of the future generations’ needs (Klettner, et al., 2014). In the context of JLP, they are also doing the same where they are utilising their existing resources to meet their existing needs and at the same time creating scope for further development for the future generations.

Corporate Governance and Sustainability

The corporate governance of JLP is underpinned by their constitutional principle of sustainable operations. This is because the principle states that the governance of JLP shall focus on the long–term strategic benefits and success of the organisations. Hence, it is apparent that the governance practice of JLP focuses on creating long – term benefits for their stakeholders where they have focused on creating strategy that entails to make efficient growth utilising the resources and creating opportunities for the development of the stakeholders. Hence, this can be incorporated into the study of Burke and Longsdon (1996) where they have demonstrated a long – term benefits on the performance of the organisation due to their commitment towards sustainable operations (Rezaee, 2016). Furthermore, the good governance of JLP as discussed earlier embodies the core characteristics of sustainability. This is because, with that good governance of JLP, they have been managing and controlling the operations of JLP without making any compromise for the future. Although, they might have provided less bonus for the employees in 2014 but it has been done with the intention for the long – term benefits for the partners and stakeholders. Furthermore, the governance of JLP conforms to the study of Salo (2008) where they have provided an empirical finding that organisational contribution towards environmental concerns can make their performance efficient and effective(Kanda, 2013). This has been evident in the practice of JLP where they focus on reducing CO2 emissions, control of water consumption and waste management, all of them are interrelated with their good practice of corporate governance and sustainable operations. Another key issue is the financial aspect of sustainable practice that also demonstrates a link between the corporate governance and sustainability. This is because governance practice of JLP develops the framework of risk management where they identify the risks related to the business. Also, the boards of JLP work with the audit and risk committee who identifies the issues and JLP take actions as per their identifications. Therefore, the findings of JLP are in line with the literature where it has been clear that there is a direct relationship between the corporate governance and sustainability of the organisation.

Summary of the Analysis

The summary of the analysis based on the findings has been linked to the objectives of this study as follows:
Objective i. To critically evaluate the literature of the extents of sustainability and its implications on John Lewis Partnership.

The literature of sustainability has provided the framework of sustainable practices that have been underpinned by the four aspects including a. societal influence b. environmental influence c. organisational culture d. finance. The literature provides that sustainable practice is related to the extents of those aspects. Whereby, the findings and analysis of JLP has revealed that its corporate governance is arranged to oversee the sustainable operations of the business. They have extended their practices to the wider issues of the society and environment where they have created a sound practice of operation. Thereby, the implications of those aspects of sustainability have made the operations of JLP sound and sustainable.

Objective ii. To critically discuss the issue of sustainability and its fundamental importance on the continuity of operations of John Lewis Partnership.

Although the literature has provided conflicting views of sustainable practices but there have been agreements that sustainability ensures a foreseeable operation for the organisation. This is because sustainable practices are intended to create long – term values for the operations. Hence, from the findings and analysis of JLP, it can be identified that they have also considered the importance of sustainable practices where they have taken initiatives to make their operation sustainable. Furthermore, the sustainable practices have been central to the operations of JLP as they have focused on the long – term impact of their actions and strategies to the stakeholders including partners. Thus, it demonstrates a wider impact of sustainable practice to the continuity of JLP’s operations.

Objective iii. To make judgement on how corporate governance is fundamental to the continuity of the operations of John Lewis partnership.

JLP has put their governance at the central of the operation. This is because they have made the unique format of corporate governance in the UK where they have created the structure intended to make their operation sustainable. This has been demonstrated and figured out by this study that JLP’s council, boards and the chairman are committed, accountable and responsible for ensuring that their actions and strategies are intended to make long – term benefits for the stakeholders of the organisation. However, this practice has been embodied by the founder’s principle and has been written in the constitution of partnership practice. Although it has been written and adopted by JLP but it requires an effective implementation which has been prevalent within the practice of JLP. Perhaps, the biggest evidence of this prevalence practice of sustainable operation has been inherent within the fact that JLP has been operating successfully since 1929. In addition, based on the findings and analysis, it has been clear that JLP is envisioned to operate another for the near future by nurturing their core principle of partnership practice where the governance will be providing the oxygen of running the operations for the sustainable future.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that JLP practices good corporate governance by exhibiting the four characteristics of a good corporate governance practice. They have separated the boards and the chairman role along with the formation of independent committees and council. All of them have similarity to the literature of good corporate governance practices. JLP demonstrates those practices by embedding transparency, accountability, fairness and responsibility within their corporate governance structure and practice. The study also identifies that JLP has placed sustainability at the centre of its business operation. From the findings and analysis, it has become clear that JLP puts the interest of society, environment, employees and other stakeholders before profit seeking interest. In fact, JLP has been nurturing this culture since their inception and placed them at the centre of its business model. Thus, this resembles the literature of corporate sustainability and its practices that JLP demonstrates. Furthermore, the study figures out that the sustainable practices of JLP ensure the continuity of their operations for the near future. Based on the findings and analysis, the governance of JLP is based on creating long – term values for the stakeholders. Thereby, the directors and boards of JLP designs and implements strategies to create long – term values instead of merely focusing on short – term value creation. This aspect of JLP’s operations conforms to the sustainable practices of the organisation.

Finally, the study has concluded based on the findings and analysis that the sustainability of JLP is dependent on the good practice of corporate governance. This is based on the fact that the governance system of JLP is structured to develop strategies and oversee the operations with a view to creating values for the stakeholders in the long – term. Thereby, the study concludes that a good corporate governance structure and practice is fundamental for the sustainability of an organisation. Although JLP demonstrates a sustainable practice by reporting and measuring performance on the four key aspects of corporate sustainability however, it could go beyond the traditional measures of sustainable performance to measure the value additions elements for the stakeholders. To do so, the study recommends to take “Triple – Bottom – Line” (TBL) approach to measure and report sustainable practices. This is because under TBL approach as proposed by John Elkington (1990) cited in Slaper and Hall (2011) JLP could identify and measure the activities under three separate dimensions of performance (Slaper & Hall, 2011). They are: -

Economic Sustainability. The TBL approach suggests that a separate measurement of the economic sustainability would avoid being biased in favour of taking short – term decision(Sherman, 2012). Thereby, it is significant for JLP as they put long – term value creation as top priority. So, under economic sustainability measurement, JLP could identify the area of business that is not performing well. At present, this cannot be detected while producing sustainability report.

Social Sustainability. The TBL approach indicates that social sustainability would enable to identify the contributions and monitor the progress of development to add values to the society (Sherman, 2012). Thereby, JLP could identify extended areas of their social contributions and how they are adding values to the society. Although they have reported their managerial and financial contributions however they lack substance of value addition elements for the society. Hence, social sustainability measurement as a separate dimension would eliminate that gap.
Environmental Sustainability. It represents the measures of the natural resources and addresses the potential impact to its viability (Slaper & Hall, 2011). Based on the study, JLP produces separate reports with the measurement of elements of environmental sustainability. Thereby, it will be feasible for JLP to integrate environmental sustainability measurement with the other two components of the TBL approach.

The purpose of this study is to identify the impact of corporate governance on the organisational sustainability. Hereby, study attempts to understand the relationship between these two variables. Thereby, it is linked to a causal relationship between the two variables. Hence, the purpose of this study is explanatory where the context of corporate governance and sustainability has been studied. Furthermore, the study provides the analysis based on the findings to explain that relationship. In addition, the explanatory purpose of this study is also in line with some other studies (Aras & Crowther, 2008; Erkens, et al., 2012) where they explained the impact of corporate governance on the organisational sustainability. Thereby, in accordance with those studies, the study also follows an explanatory purpose of the research. Thus, the findings and analysis have been justified in the context of the available evidence. Nevertheless, the study is limited to cover the issue of corporate governance and sustainability. Both of these topics are vast and so as their applications. Hence, studying those issues on a single organisation has provided limited findings. Furthermore, not all organisations have away to demonstrate the sustainable practices that JLP does. This is because JLP has a unique structure of corporate governance to that of other organisations. Thereby, it has extended the scope of the future study.

The experience and skills achieved from this study will be utilised to conduct research on industry-specific context. The extent of the literature covered in this study will be capitalised to study on a wider industry specific. Specifically, the contributions received from this study will be transferred to make research on wider context and contribute further to the practice of corporate governance and organisational sustainability.
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