Vol III Issue VII August 2013
Impact Factor : 0.2105
ISSN No : 2230-7850

Monthly Multidisciplinary
Research Journal

Indian Streams Research Journal

IMPACT FACTOR : 0.2105

Welcome to ISRJ

RNI MAHMUL/2011/38595 **ISSN No.2230-7850**

Indian Streams Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial Board readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

Address:-Ashok Yakkaldevi 258/34, Raviwar Peth, Solapur - 413 005 Maharashtra, India
Cell : 9595 359 435, Ph No: 02172372010 Email: ayisrj@yahoo.in Website: www.isrj.net

Indian Streams Research Journal ISSN 2230-7850
Volume-3, Issue-7, August-2013

A Stakeholder's Approach To Managing A Business Environment

Abdolghader Ehsani Rad And Afsaneh Ehsani Rad

Department of Studies in Commerce, University of Mysore, Mysore, Karnataka
Shargh-e Golestan of Higher Education Institute, Gonbad-e Kavus, Iran

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to outline the development of the idea of "stakeholder management" as it has come to be applied in strategic management. We begin by the distinguishing characteristics of a stakeholder approach. We then suggest that traditionally the stakeholder approach to strategic management has several related characteristics that serve as distinguishing features. We review recent work on stakeholder theory and suggest how stakeholder management has affected the practice of management. We end by suggesting further research questions.

Keyword: Stakeholder's , Managing , Business Environment , strategic management.

INTRODUCTION

Recent economic crises urge managers to go beyond the shareholder view which focus only on economic values in order to maximize shareholder value. Managers need a broader perspective in their decision making processes in order to account for the more than the mere economic motivations for their enterprises to be successful. This perspective is well defined by Stakeholder Management Theory.

In management studies several theories have asked managers to look beyond the single enterprise to the relationships the enterprise have in the environment. For example in the resource based view (Wernerfelt, 1984; Barney, 1991) the source of the sustainable competitive advantage is deemed to be in the resources the enterprise can get access to, both through ownership and relationships. A tighter look at the role of relationships comes out from the Relational View (Gulati, 1999; Dyer & Singh, 1998) that held relationships are the best way to create a competitive advantage as they help in getting access to resources without having to pay their full price.

The same idea of relationships as the core of competitive advantage have been developed in the broader Market-Driven Management theory (Day, 1994; Lambin, Chumpitaz, & Shuiling, 2007; Sciarelli, 2008) where the source of a sustainable competitive advantage is the firm's management capability in creating, and keeping, relationships with the other value chain players.

Even more direct is the approach by Vital System Theory (Golinelli, 2002; Golinelli & Gatti, 2002) that, building on management cybernetic (Beer, 1959; Beer, 1972), focus the spotlight not in the relationships linking the enterprise to the external environment but in the interactions running through them, seen as the dynamic factor making them valuable; according to this theory, in fact, relationship are only a static element that can become "viable", and dynamic, only when the enterprise learns, adapts and evolve in order to become more effective in dealing with the external environment.

On the same side Stakeholder Management Theory (Freeman, 1984), asks managers to run their enterprises satisfying the requests of various other external environment's actors. In fact this theory sees enterprises as embedded in a network of bi-directional relationships with several external actors. These actors, called "Stakeholders" (Freeman, 1984), are those subjects that are significantly influenced by the firm, or that can significantly influence the firm itself in a positive or negative way. Stakeholder Management Theory asks managers to "create as much value as possible for stakeholders, without resorting to trade-offs (between them)" (Freeman et al., 2010).

WHO ARE STAKEHOLDERS?

A key question that has not been examined yet is a highly tricky one, and a major 'flaw' of the stakeholder approaches (L'Etang, 1995) who are stakeholders? If stakeholders are "those individuals or groups who depend on the organization to fulfill their own goals and on whom, in turn, the organization depends" (Johnson & Scholes, 2002), then one organization is concerned with a very large amount of people, if not everyone since many people depend, either directly or indirectly, on an organization's activity. And, if the organization is accountable to all its stakeholders (i.e., everyone) rather than to one constituency (i.e., the shareholders), then the notion of accountability becomes valueless because it is too broadly set and useless from a managerial point of view (Hummels, 1998; Vinten, 2000).

Indeed, if the stakeholder approach can help managers understand the relationships of the organization with the various constituencies involved in its activities at various levels, it does not itself provide them with means to apprehend the quality of these relationships, i.e., the forces of influence, the power and bargains of the stakeholders. Managers are actually unable to assess the potential threats stakeholders may represent to the organization's objectives (Argenti, 1993; Hummels, 1998; L'Etang, 1995).

Another inconvenience of too broad a definitional scope of stakeholders is that it becomes possible to call stakeholders groups that may harm rather than support the organization, for instance competitors (although this can be discussed – see Post et al., 2002) or terrorists (Scholl, 2001). Therefore, not only should the definition be sufficiently comprehensive and not too inclusive, but also should be clear enough to avoid misinterpretations. Stakeholder analysis tools, such as stakeholder mapping, power/interest matrix and stakeholder moral responsibilities' matrix have been developed to provide a practical framework for managers. They help identify the key stakeholders and develop adequate strategies and tactics to achieve as much as possible a win-win outcome (Frederick et al., 1992; Carroll, 1989; Vinten, 2000; Weiss, 2003).

Post, Preston and Sachs (2002) have recently conceptualized the New Stakeholder View. They propose a comprehensive, analytical, stakeholder-based framework that encompasses within three concentric circles: the resource-base, industry-structure and socio-political aspects of a corporation's environment. With supporting evidence from a thorough examination of three companies, Post, Preston and Sachs (2002) posit that the firm-stakeholders relationships 'are the essential assets that managers must manage and they are the ultimate sources of organizational wealth'. Therefore it is critical to institutionalize and maintain fruitful and open dialogue with key (if not all) stakeholders to secure long-term sustainable growth.

CATEGORIZATION OF STAKEHOLDERS

To avoid giving the term 'stakeholder' a too broadly inclusive scope, some authors have proposed sub-categories. The most widely used is the external/internal stakeholder framework (Johnson & Scholes, 2002). Others prefer the primary/secondary stakeholder framework (Weiss, 2003), whilst some separate voluntary from involuntary stakeholders (Post et al., 2002), and some favor the social/non-social stakeholders categorization (Wheeler & Sillanpaa, 1998). Another interesting approach is that of Phillips (2001; Jones et al., 2002), who identifies 'intrinsic' or 'definitional' stakeholders, and 'instrumental' stakeholders who affect the definitional stakeholders. In that view, organizations have moral obligations to all stakeholders, but also specific obligations to definitional stakeholders only.

Commonly identified stakeholder groups include shareholders (or owners), employees, customers, suppliers, local community, competitors, interest groups (or sometimes civil society representatives, though slightly more inclusive in definition), government, the media, and society-at-large (Carroll, 1991). Some of these terms by themselves raise significant problems in relation to the value of organizational accountability to stakeholders, especially 'society-at-large' and the notion of community. The environment is sometimes quoted as a stakeholder, but this engenders problems in identifying a spokesperson with which to discuss the stakeholders' concerns, interests and demands. In such cases, the constituents' representative is not affected by the corporation's activity, but they represent the constituents because they share their concerns (Wiedermann-Goiran et al., 2003).

RECENT WORK ON STAKEHOLDER MANAGE MENT

Since 1984 academic interest in a stakeholder approach has both grown and broadened.

Indeed the number of citations using the word stakeholder has increased enormously as suggested by Donaldson and Preston (1995). Most of the research on the stakeholder concept has taken place in four sub-fields:, normative theories of business; corporate governance and organizational theory; corporate social responsibility and performance; and, strategic management.

A Stakeholder Approach to Normative Theories of Business

A stakeholder approach emphasizes the importance of investing in the relationships with those who have a stake in the firm. The stability of these relationships depends on the sharing of, at least, a core of principles or values. Thus, stakeholder theory allows managers to incorporating personal values into the formulation and implementation of strategic plans. An example of this is the concept of an enterprise strategy. An enterprise strategy (Schendel & Hofer, 1979) describes the relationship between the firm and society by answering the question "What do we stand for?" In its original form a stakeholder approach emphasized the importance of developing an enterprise strategy, while leaving open the question of which type of values are the most appropriate. "It is very easy to misinterpret the foregoing analysis as yet another call for corporate social responsibility or business ethics. While these issues are important in their own right, enterprise level strategy is a differently concept. We need to worry about the enterprise level strategy for the simple fact that corporate survival depends in part on there being some "fit" between the values of the corporation and its managers, the expectations of stakeholders in the firm and the societal issues which will determine the ability of the firm to sell its products." (Freeman, 1984). However, the illustration that values are an essential ingredient to strategic management has, indeed, set in train an inquiry into the normative roots of stakeholder theory.

Donaldson and Preston (1995) argued that stakeholder theories could be categorized from descriptive, instrumental or normative points of view. A descriptive theory would simply illustrate that firms have stakeholders, an instrumental theory would show that firms who consider their stakeholders devise successful strategies; a normative theory would describe why firms should give consideration to their stakeholders. Thus, the search for a normative justification for stakeholder takes the theory beyond strategic issues and into the realm of philosophical foundations.

The question this research stream is trying to answer is "above and beyond the consequences of stakeholder management, is there a fundamental moral requirement to adopt this style of management?" Various attempts have been made to ground stakeholder management in a broad range of philosophical foundations. Evan and Freeman (1993) developed a justification of a stakeholder approach based on Kantian principles. In its simplest form this approach argued that we are required to treat people "as ends unto themselves." Thus, managers should make corporate decisions respecting stakeholders' well being rather than treating them as means to a corporate end. This framework has been further developed by Norman Bowie (1999) into a fully fledged ethical theory of business. From a different perspective Phillips (1997) has grounded a stakeholder approach in the principle of fairness. When groups of individuals enter voluntarily into cooperative agreements they create an obligation to act fairly. As such, normal business transactions create a moral obligation for firms to treat stakeholders fairly and thus to consider their interests when making strategic decisions. Others (Wicks, Freeman, & Gilbert, 1994; Burton & Dunn, 1996) have tried to justify a stakeholder approach through the ethics of care. Contrasting the traditional emphasis on an individual rights-based approach to business, an ethics of care emphasizes the primacy of the network of relationships that create the business enterprise. This approach advocates the use of a stakeholder approach because of the need to formulate strategy in the context of the relationships that surround it, rather than with the firm as a lone actor.

Finally, Donaldson and Dunfee (1999) have developed a justification for a stakeholder approach that is based on social contract theory. Recently, Kochan and Rubenstein (2000) have developed a normative stakeholder theory based on an extensive study of the Saturn automotive manufacturer. In this study they try and answer the question "Why stakeholder models should be given serious consideration at this moment in history." For Kochan and Rubenstein this is both a normative and positive inquiry "and one that requires research that both explicates the normative issues and poses the theoretical questions in ways that promote tractable empirical research". They conclude that stakeholder firms will emerge when the stakeholders hold critical assets, expose these assets to risk and have both influence and voice. However, stakeholder firms will only be sustainable when leaders' incentives encourage responsiveness to stakeholders and when stakeholder legitimacy can overcome society's skeptical ideological legacy towards stakeholder management.

A Stakeholder Approach to Corporate Governance and Organizational Theory

This stream of stakeholder research has grown out of the contrast between the traditional view that it is the fiduciary duty of management to protect the interests of the shareholder and the stakeholder view that management should make decisions for the benefit of all stakeholders. Williamson (1984) used a transaction cost framework to show that shareholders deserved special consideration over other stakeholders because of "asset specificity." He argued that a shareholder's stake was uniquely tied to the success of the firm and would have no residual value should the firm fail, unlike, for example, the labor of a worker. Freeman and Evan (1990) have argued, to the contrary, that Williamson's approach to corporate governance can indeed be used to explain all stakeholders' relationships. Many other stakeholders have stakes that are, to a degree, firm specific.

Furthermore, shareholders have a more liquid market (the stock market) for exit than most other stakeholders. Thus, asset specificity alone does not grant a prime responsibility towards stockholders at the expense of all others.

Goodpaster (1991) outlined an apparent paradox that accompanies the stakeholder approach. Management appears to have a contractual duty to manage the firm in the interests of the stockholders and at the same time management seems to have a moral duty to take other stakeholders into account. This stakeholder paradox has been attacked by Boatright (1994) and Marens and Wicks (1999) and defended by Goodpaster and Holloran (1994). Others have explored the legal standing of the fiduciary duty of management towards stockholders, Orts (1997), Blair (1995). Many of these debates are on-going, with some advocating fundamental changes to corporate governance and with others rejecting the relevance of the whole debate to a stakeholder approach.

There have also been a number of attempts to expand stakeholder theory into what Jones (1995) has referred to as a 'central paradigm' that links together theories such as agency theory, transactions costs and contracts theory into a coherent whole (Jones, 1995; Clarkson, 1995). From this perspective stakeholder theory can be used as a counterpoint to traditional shareholder-based theory. While it is generally accepted that stakeholder theory could constitute good management practice, its main value for these theorists is to expose the traditional model as being morally untenable or at least too accommodating to immoral behavior. This literature has historically consisted of fractured collection of viewpoints that share an opposition to the dominant neoclassical positive approach to business. Because of its accommodating framework the stakeholder concept provided an opportunity to develop an overarching theory that could link together such concepts as agency theory, transactions costs, human relationships, ethics and even the environment. More recently Jones and Wicks (1999) have explicitly tried to pull together diverging research streams in their paper "Convergent Stakeholder Theory."

A Stakeholder Approach to Social Responsibility and Social Performance

A significant area of interests for theorists of social responsibility has been the definition of legitimate stakeholders. It has been stated that "one glaring shortcoming is the problem of stakeholder identity. That is, that the theory is often unable to distinguish those individuals and groups that are stakeholders form those that are not" (Phillips & Reichart, 1998). Mitchell, Agle and Wood addressed this issue by developing a framework for stakeholder identification. Using qualitative criteria of power, legitimacy and urgency, they develop what they refer to as "the principle of who and what really counts." This line of research is particularly relevant in areas such as the environment and grassroots political activism. The critical question is whether there is such a thing as an illegitimate stakeholder, and if so how legitimacy should be defined.

Agle, Mitchell and Sonnenfield (2000) have taken an opposite approach. Rather than try and theoretically define stakeholder legitimacy, they have conducted an empirical study to identify which stakeholders managers actually consider to be legitimate.

A large body of research has been carried out in order to test the 'instrumental' claim that managing for stakeholders is just good management practice. This claim infers that firms that practice stakeholder management would out perform firms that do not practice stakeholder management. Wood (1995) pointed out that causality is complex, the relationship between corporate social performance (CSP) and financial performance is ambiguous, there is no comprehensive measure of CSP and that the most that can be demonstrated with current data is that "bad social performance hurts a company financially."

It has often been hypothesized that firms who invest in stakeholder management and improve their social performance will be penalized by investor who is only interested in financial returns. This has been referred to as 'the myopic institutions theory. 'Waddock and Graves (1990) have demonstrated the growth in importance of institutional stakeholders over the last twenty years. On further investigation they found that firms that demonstrated a high level of corporate social performance (CSP) tend to lead to an increase in the number of institutions that invest in the stock (Graves & Waddock, 1994).

This result is "consistent with a steadily accumulating body of evidence that provides little support for the myopic institutions theory (Graves & Waddock, 1994)."

A range of recent studies have been carried out using new data and techniques to try and shed light on the links between stakeholder management and social and financial performance (Berman et al., 2000; Harrison & Fiet, 1999; Luoma & Goodstein, 1999). At a more practitioner level Ogden and Watson (1999) have carried out a detailed case study into corporate and stakeholder management in the UK water industry. At present most conclusions in this area are somewhat tentative as the precision of techniques and data sources continue to be developed.

A Stakeholder Approach and Management Practice

The impact of a stakeholder approach on management practice is difficult to establish. Much of contemporary debate and commentary is trapped in the rhetoric of a 'stakeholder versus shareholder' debate. Once strategic management is divided into this false dichotomy, stakeholder theory can be mischaracterized as anti-capitalist, anti-profit and anti-business efficiency. For this reason the words 'stakeholder management' have mostly been relegated to descriptions of a small number of radical businesses that are run very differently from mainstream corporations, for example Body Shop and Ben and Jerry's. However, the premise of the stakeholder approach that it is necessary for all firms would suggest that we should find many firms, rather than a radical few, using a stakeholder approach. Indeed that is what we find when we examine three recent books on the practice of management In Built to Last (Collins & Porras, 1994) Jim Collins and Jerry Porras put the "shareholder versus stockholder' debate in a new light. Collins and Porras attempted to explain the sustained success of firms across many industries by contrasting them with less successful peers. They proposed that a necessary condition of long-term financial success is a strong set of core values that permeates the organization. "Core values are like an ether that permeates an organization… you can think of it as analogous to the philosophy of life that an individual might have. Core values are analogous to a biological organism's genetic code."(pp. 29) The authors confirmed this hypothesis with a rigorous financial analysis of successful and unsuccessful firms over the last century.

Not only does "Built to Last" provide strong support for the importance of an enterprise strategy as proposed in a stakeholder approach, many of the core values identified in the research confirm the importance of basing strategy on collaborative stakeholder relationships. For example 3M's core values include " a respect for individual initiative and personal growth"; Merck's core values include "profits, but profit from work that benefits humanity"; Hewlett-Packard's core values include " respect and opportunity for HP people" and "affordable quality for HP customers" and "profit and growth as a means to make all else possible"; Marriott's core values include "people are #1- treat them well, expect a lot, and the rest will follow'; and Walt Disney's core values include "to bring happiness to millions, and to celebrate, nurture and promulgate wholesome American values."

"Built to Last" tells a story of the widespread use of a stakeholder approach by dozens of successful firms that include many elite multinationals. More importantly they found that the stakeholder approach in practice predates the formal articulation of stakeholder theory in academia. Thus, Collins and Porrit provide both empirical support for the success of a stakeholder approach and they confirm that the academic theory grew out of management practice rather than vice versa. In The Stakeholder Strategy (Svendsen, 1998) Svendsen investigates firms who are building collaborative stakeholder relationship as part of their business strategy.

From Wal-Mart, Marks and Spencer, Saturn, BankBoston and British Telecom to BC Hydro, Motoman Inc., Stillwater Technologies, and Van City Credit Union she demonstrates how managements across the world are continuing to develop and implement their strategies by developing collaborative relationships with the stakeholders in their firms. Svendsen concludes that in an increasingly volatile world "the ability to balance the interests of all stakeholders will be a defining characteristic of successful companies in the next decade. This is not to say that companies will be able to satisfy everyone's interests all the time. However, companies that have a strong set of values and that can communicate their business goals clearly will maintain stakeholders support when the results are not in their favor."(Pg. 188).

Wheeler and Sillanpaa (The Stakeholder Corporation, 1997) trace the use of a stakeholder approach from Robert Owen, William Morris, and Thomas Watson of IBM to The Body Shop. Their research illustrates the history, the rationale and the practical implementation of stakeholder ideas. They develop, and illustrate the use of, positively reinforcing cycles of inclusion that help build stronger and more cooperative stakeholder relationships. They also emphasize the need to red scribe the world of business in ways beyond, but not necessarily in contradiction to, the profit maximization view. As Anita Roddick points out in the Foreword to the book "Some of our best companies still retreat into "shareholder value" justification for excellent community outreach programs when they should simply celebrate and say "this is what business should be about.""(Pp. Vii).

An Agenda for Future Research

So what are the critical issues facing a stakeholder approach to strategic management today? There are two main theoretical issues that stand out from the rest:

First of all theorists must deal with what Freeman (1994) and Wicks and Marens have called "The Separation Thesis". The Separation Thesis states that we cannot usefully analyze the world of business as if it is separate from the world of ethics or politics. Our personal values are embedded in all our actions, therefore unless our theories take this into account, they will do a poor job of explaining our world. The separation thesis was formulated because of the widespread adoption of a stakeholder approach within business ethics and because of the continued neglect of a stakeholder approach in the area of strategic management. This distortion has resulted in stakeholder theory being seen as an ethical rather than a business theory. This categorization serves to isolate ethical issues from the mainstream business theories and to isolate a stakeholder approach from mainstream business strategy.

Second, Wicks and Freeman have recently called for a pragmatist perspective to the study of management. A stakeholder approach grew out of a practical study of management problems. A pragmatic approach to strategic management would focus academic research on the detailed study of concrete business situations. Over time general theories might emerge, but not through abstract theory development.

Those who have called for a pragmatic approach to stakeholder theory have been seeking to combine a post-modern anti-foundation list approach to theorizing with a Rortian desire to reform and red scribe the human enterprise (Wicks & Freeman, 1994). The post-modernist seeks to abandon the quest for Truth that began in the Enlightenment.

These theorists argue that there is no truth about the world of business to be found. There are no irrefutable foundations for business theory or economics. The frameworks and laws that we use to describe business are simply ideas that have achieved a broad level of agreement among informed practitioners. To search for higher levels of abstraction, that would provide a foundation for these laws as Truth, is a distraction to the progress of business strategy. To the contrary, the priority for business theorist should be to study the world of business and develop new ways to describe value creation and trade. New descriptions of bad or harmful business practices will inspire us to challenge existing practices, norms and attitudes. New ways of describing excellent ways of creating value will provide hope and stimulate change and innovation.

This approach to business research would challenge the idea that there is a separate world where "business is business" and where the fundamental principles, self interest, unfettered competition and the maximizing of shareholder wealth, have already been discovered. This approach would encourage researchers to challenge the language and metaphors of existing theories of business and economics. It would challenge the accepted laws and truths about business and to abandon the search for an overarching 'true' paradigm of business. Rather, researchers should expect a multitude of theories and frameworks that describe different approaches and different aspects of business. There will still be good and bad theories of business strategy, but the value of the theory will depend on its ability to help mangers make sense of their world, rather on the basis of theoretical elegance.

What would pragmatism mean for a stakeholder approach? First, it would mean the end of separate streams of business ethics and business strategy research. Second, it would mean an end to the search for normative or foundational roots for stakeholder theory. Third, it would mean abandoning the search for absolute object definitions of such things such as stakeholder legitimacy. These issues would depend on the question at hand and on the circumstances under consideration. A stakeholder approach might consist of a collection of interacting, reinforcing and contradicting theories of business strategy. Each theory would be based on concrete studies of real business case studies.

This is not to say that we need to abandon the idea of general principles for the sake of contingent theories. At any point in time there will always be theories, based on specific examples, who's message holds true for a great many businesses and mangers. These will still be general principles of business; indeed the idea that businesses should be managed in the interests of stakeholders is one of those ideas. However these principles will, over time, be continuously under review and will eventually be replaced by a description that are more useful. The work of Kochan and Rubenstein (2000) is, in many ways, at the vanguard of this approach. As outlined above there are theoretical, epistemological and research challenges for a stakeholder approach to strategic management. The authors believe that these challenges should be met by turning our faces towards practitioners and the development of a set of narratives that illustrate the myriad ways of creating value for stakeholders.

REFERENCE

Agle, B., Mitchell, R., & Sonnenfeld, J. (1999). Who matters to CEOs? An investigation of stakeholder attributes and salience, corporate performance, and CEO values. Academy of Management Journal, 42, 507-525.

Argenti, J. (1993) .Your Organization: What is it for? London: McGraw Hill.

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of management, 17(1), 99-120.

Beer, S. (1959). Cybernetics and management. USA: Wiley.

Beer, S. (1972). Brain of the firm: A development in

management cybernetics. New York (USA): Herder and Herder.
Berman,S., Wicks,A., Kotha, S., & Jones, T. (1999). Does stakeholder orientation matter: The relationship between stakeholder management models and firm financial performance? Academy of Management Journal, 42, 488-506.
Blair, T. (1995). The rights we enjoy reflect the duties we owe, the lecture. London: labour party.
Boatright, J. (1994). Fiduciary duties and the shareholder-management relation: Or, what's so special about shareholders? Business Ethics Quarterly, 393-407.
Bowie, N. (1999). Business ethics: A Kantian perspective. Oxford: Blackwell's.
Burton, B., & Dunn, C. (1996). Collaborative control and the commons: Safeguarding employee rights. Business Ethics Quarterly, 6, 277-288.
Carroll, A.B. (1989). Business and Society: Ethics and Stakeholder Management. Cincinnati. OH: South-Western.
Carroll, A.B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. Business Horizons, 34(4), 39–48.
Clarkson, M. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. Academy of Management Review, 20, 92-117.
Collins, J., & Porras, J. (1994). Built to last. New York: Harper.
Day, G. S. (1994). The capabilities of market-driven organizations. Journal of Marketing, 58(4), 37-52.
Donaldson, T., & Dunfee, T. (1999). Ties that bind: A social contracts approach to business ethics. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. Academy of Management Review, 20, 65-91.
Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of inter organizational competitive advantage. Academy of management review, 23(4), 660-679.
Evan, W., & Freeman, E. (1993). A stakeholder theory of the modern corporation: Kantian capitalism. In Beauchamp, T. & Bowie, N. 1993. Ethical theory and business, 5th edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
Frederick, W.C., Davis, K., & Post, J.E. (1992). Business and Society, (6th edition), New York: McGraw Hill.
Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach, Boston (USA): Pitman.
Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Parmar, B. L., & De Colle, S. (2010). Stakeholder theory: The state of the art. UK: Cambridge University Press.
Goodpaster, K. (1991). Business ethics and stakeholder analysis. Business Ethics Quarterly, 1, 53-73.
Goodpaster, K., & Holloran, T. (1994). In defense of a paradox. Business Ethics Quarterly, 4, 423-430.
Graves, S., & Waddock, S. (1994) . Institutional investors and corporate social performance. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 1035–1046.
Gulati, R. (1999). Network location and learning: The influence of network resources and firm capabilities on alliance formation. Strategic Management Journal, 20(5), 397-420.
Harrison, J., & Fiet, J. (1999). New CEOs pursue their own self-interests by sacrificing stakeholder values. Journal of Business Ethics, 19, 301-308.
Harrison, J., & John, S. (1994). Strategic Management of Organizations and Stakeholders, West Publishing Company, College & School Division.
Hummels, H. (1998). Organizing ethics: a stakeholder debate. Journal of Business Ethics, 17(13), 1403-1419.
Johnson, G. , & Scholes, K. (2002) Exploring Corporate Strategy: Text and Cases, 6th edition, Harlow: FT/Prentice Hall.
Jones, T. (1995). Instrumental stakeholder theory: A synthesis of ethics and economics. Academy of Management Review, 20, 92-117.
Jones, T.M., Wicks, A.C., & Freeman, R.E. (2002). Stakeholder theory: the state of the art, in N.E. Bowie (Ed.) the Blackwell Guide to Business Ethics, Oxford: Blackwell.
Kochan, T., & Rubenstein,(2000). Toward a stakeholder theory of the firm: The Saturn partnership. Organizational Science, 11(4), 4367-386.
Robert, L. (1984). Competitive strategic management, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
L'Etang, J. (1995). Ethical corporate social responsibility: A framework for managers. Journal of Business Ethics, 14(2), 125-132.
Lambin, J. J., Chumpitaz, R., & Shuiling, I. (2007). Market-driven Management: strategic and operational marketing. USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
Luoma, P., & Goodstein, J. (1999). Stakeholders and corporate boards: Institutional influences on board composition and structure. Academy of Management Journal, 42, 553-563.
Richard, M., & Andrew, W. (1999). Corporate-stakeholders; Corporation-law; Stockholders; Investor-relations; Directors-of-corporations. Business Ethics Quarterly (BEQ), 9(2), 273 – 93.