

Luiss Guido Carli University

Department of Economics and Business

ABSTRACT

Doctoral Thesis

***Competing for Stakeholders: Three Essays on Business
Sustainability***

Doctor of Philosophy Candidate - Management Science: Caterina Tantalo

Supervisors

Co-chairs:

Matteo G. Caroli

Luiss Guido Carli University
Department of Economics & Business
via Romania 32,
Rome, Italy
E-mail: mcaroli@luiss.it

Richard L. Priem

Texas Christian University
Neeley School of Business
TCU Box 298530
Fort Worth, Texas 76129
Email: r.priem@tcu.edu

Members:

Jeff Vanevenhoven

College of Business and Economics
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
800 W. Main St.
Whitewater, WI 53190
Email: vanevenj@uww.edu

Table of contents

List of figures	5
List of tables	6
Chapter I	
Introduction to the dissertation	7
1.1 The definition of the phenomenon through the Business Sustainability.	11
1.2 Empirical and theoretical motivations.	14
1.3 The Research problem, questions and the research design	16
1.4 Research Relevance	21
1.5 Structure of the dissertation	25
Chapter II	
Literature Review	26
2.1 The sources of the sustainability issue: the “myopic” problem	29
2.2 The Business Sustainability and Corporate Responsibility: what’s the difference?	33
2.3 The strategic dimension of the sustainability	35
2.4 The stakeholder involvement for business sustainability	39
2.5 Discussion and research questions	46
Chapter III	
Competing for stakeholders toward a better understanding of Business Sustainability	49
3.1 Introduction	50
3.2 Overview: Competing for Stakeholder	52
3.2.1 Goals as Constraints	52
3.2.2 Synergistic Value Co-Creation for Stakeholders: the key assumptions	53
3.3 The model: the value co-creation process	55
3.4 The model in action: some real examples	68
3.5 Some practical considerations to apply the value co-creation paradigm	70
3.6 Discussion and Implications	71
3.6.1 The Role of Context for Stakeholder Relationships	72
3.6.2 How Good is “Good” Performance for Value Co-Creating Firms?	73
3.6.3 Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)	73
3.7 Conclusions	74
Chapter IV	
Identifying Stakeholders' Multiple utility source: a first step for value Co-creation	76
4.1 Introduction	77

4.2 The theoretical background	78
4.3 Methods	82
4.4 Data Analysis and Results	85
4.4.1 Investors Sample	85
4.4.2 Employees Sample	92
4.4.3 Customers Sample	94
4.4.4.General Public Sample	96
4.4.5 Suppliers Sample	98
4.5 Discussion and Implication	100
4.5.1 General Implications	102
4.5.2 Limitations and implications future research	103
Chapter V	
The model in action: a real example of value co-creation in an Italian SME	104
5.1 Theoretical background and propositions	107
5.2 The company and its values	112
5.2.1 The company profile	112
5.2.2 The industry	112
5.2.3 The core values of the company	113
5.3 The model in action	115
5.3.1 The role of the manager	115
5.3.2 The stakeholder sources of utility and the value co-creation process	116
5.4 Discussion and conclusion	119
Chapter VI	
Reflection and Discussion	122
6.1 Discussion	123
6.2 Contributions and future research paths	127
6.3 Limitations	129
References	131

List of figures

Figure 1 The Sustainable Development concept (UCN, 2006)	12
Figure 1 The research design	20
Figure 3 The firm in our model based on the Cyert and March (1963) approach	54
Figure 4 (a-b) – The “sequential attention to goals” (Cyert and March, 1963)	57
Figure 5 The prioritization model based on degree of salience (Mitchell et al., 1997)	59
Figure 6 The managerial tool the better understand the value driver to maximize the overall utility of all primary stakeholders	62
Figure 7 The synergic approach trough the value co-creation model	68
Figure 8 Investors’ sources of utility in three dimensions	88
Figure 9 Investors sources of utility in three dimensions	90
Figure 10 Employees’ sources of utility in three dimensions	93
Figure 11 Customers’ sources of utility in three dimensions	95
Figure 12 General Public sources of utility in three dimensions	97
Figure 13 Suppliers sources of utility in three dimensions	99
Figure 14 SMEs, Employment and Value Added in Europe	106

List of tables

Table 1 - 34 Sources of utility perceived by Investors	86
Table 2 Clusters of Sources of Utility (Investors)	90
Table 3 Clusters of Sources of Utility (Employees)	94
Table 4 Clusters of Sources of Utility (Customers)	96
Table 5 Clusters of Sources of Utility (General Public)	98
Table 6 Clusters of Sources of Utility (Suppliers)	100
Table 7 - Sources of utility for all five primary stakeholders	102

General Overview. The failure of the traditional managerial approaches and the recent crises of financial systems pushed many economics actors to change their business models: from a profit oriented approach to a sustainable model. This required a shift from “single-minded aspiration to maximize financial performance” of the corporations, to a “multiple stake oriented to create shared value”. The capability of the firm to manage different stakeholders expectations may represents a useful business tool to enhance the Competitive Advantage because of many benefits linked to an effectively stakeholder engagement of the corporation (see Freeman et al., 2010; Parmar et al., 2010). Simon (1964) argued that organizations must, by their nature, have multiple goals that actually should be viewed as constraints on top managers. That is, although top managers may label one or another of the constraints they face as “the” organizational goal, efforts to optimize on that goal can take place only within the operating space remaining after considering the minimum requirements of other key constraints. The implications of Simon’s (1964) argument for achieving business sustainability are clear: sustainability requires, at the very least, meeting the minimum needs of the firm’s essential stakeholder groups.

Yet over the past few decades the practitioner and scholarly focus has been much narrower, emphasizing nearly exclusively the single goal of maximizing for-profit firms’ financial performance (Harrison et al., 2010; Zollo et al., 2009). Such a single-minded aspiration – whether toward the profit goal or a different goal – is inconsistent with Simon’s (1964) argument and with firms’ long-term viability. The exclusive pursuit of financial performance (Steward et al., 2000; Dyllick et al., 2002; Bruce et al., 2005; Morris et al., 2005), for example, has contributed to many business failures, whether through incentive-induced top management frauds (e.g., Harris and Bromiley, 2007; O’Connor et al., 2006) or as an antecedent to the recent U.S. subprime mortgage crisis (Purnanandam, 2011). This over-emphasis on one goal, among many, is the antithesis of business management toward sustainable firms.

Achieving business sustainability requires instead that top managers: (1) return to the core assumption of the behavioral theory of the firm, that they must satisfy multiple goals that serve as constraints on their firms’ survival (Cyert and March, 1963; Simon, 1964); (2) strive to create increasing value for each primary stakeholder group, just as they must strive to create value for consumers (Priem, 2007); and (3) operate as stewards of, and entrepreneurs within, the organizational decision making system that is composed of the firm’s principal stakeholders (Augier and Sarasvathy, 2010).

The result is a view wherein top managers must address multiple stakeholder goals and, potentially even better for the firm, have the opportunity act as entrepreneurs in creating value above the minimum levels required for stakeholder participation. Managers’ super-ordinate goal is to attract and retain exceptional primary stakeholders, and even more to obtain their commitment and effort toward

system-wide value co-creation. This increases the system's resiliency and, in turn, the business firm's sustainability.

We develop these ideas by integrating aspects of stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984), stewardship theory (Jones et al., 1997), and resource dependence theory (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976) with the behavioral theory's explanation of organizations' multiple goals (Cyert & March, 1963; Simon, 1964) and with recent work identifying firm-level strategies that create value from a consumer perspective (Priem, 2007). The result is a model of the firm (Chapter III), its current stakeholders and its potential stakeholders as an organizational decision-making system, wherein top managers sequentially address multiple goals and create value above the minimum level required for stakeholder participation, in order to attract exceptional stakeholders and obtain their commitment and effort toward system-wide value creation. It fulfilled a consistent literature gap highlighted by Parmar et al. (2010) in terms of an integrated model which is able to explain the business sustainability of the corporations by multiple theoretical frameworks, starting from the stakeholder view of the corporation. Harrison et al. (2010, p. 61-63) advanced the stakeholder literature through their recent argument that those firms which better understand the utility functions of their stakeholders have an advantage, because of the resulting "better understanding of the minimum requirements of a stakeholder". We agree, and moreover think that an understanding of primary stakeholders' multi-attribute utility functions gives a firm the opportunity to entrepreneurially create value for multiple primary stakeholder groups simultaneously.

However, few studies have examined primary stakeholders (Clarkson, 1995) as representing constraints for the firm (Reynolds, Schultz & Hekman, 2006, is an exception). Moreover, Freeman et al. (2010) and Parmar et al.'s (2010) review concluded that stakeholder theory provides a useful framework that helps explain how firms can create shared value. Yet they also concluded that key questions remain to be answered, including: "How can firms create different types of value for different stakeholders" (Parmar et al., 2010: 432)? We reply to this question following two different methodologies.

First of all, we take a step toward understanding the base multi-attribute utility functions of the five primary stakeholder groups – stockholders, customers, employees, suppliers and the general public (Clarkson, 1995). We develop five unprompted, inductive empirical taxonomies of stakeholder utility categories – one for each primary stakeholder group. We then compare these taxonomies as a first step in identifying potential for value co-creation opportunities that could increase utility for multiple stakeholder groups simultaneously (Chapter IV). Obtaining data about the sources of utility for all primary stakeholders is difficult because stakeholders may not be forthcoming about their preferences. For this reason, we gathered primary data and based our methodology on an established, inductive process using

multidimensional scaling and cluster analysis that did not “prompt” the respondents in any way and thereby minimized demand characteristics in their responses (e.g., Priem, et al., 2002; Voges, et al., 2004; Ketchen & Shook, 1996; Kruskal & Wish, 1978).

Finally, we develop a qualitative case study to better understand how the model we proposed effectively work into the reality and what are the linkages between the main variables. According to Yin (2008), in fact, a case study is necessary when it has need to understand a real-life phenomenon in depth, but such understanding encompassed important contextual conditions – because they were highly pertinent to the phenomenon of study (Yin and Davis, 2007). The specific role played by the managers into the small and medium sized firms – as steward entrepreneur - is aligned with the characteristics he has in the model we proposed. This evidence suggested investigating its effectiveness and the relations between its components into these environments. For these reasons, a medium firm has been chosen as unit of analysis and the specific study question is represented by “how do a medium firm build a sustainable business model based on the synergic value co-creation approach?” (Chapter V).

The definition of the phenomenon through the Business Sustainability. In the recent years, a new perspective has been assumed shifting the focus of the corporations: from the profit maximization approach (Friedman, 1970) to an organization designed to align private and public interests fulfilling the social requirement of everyone, directly or indirectly, involved in the organization (Donaldson and Preston, 1995; Freeman, 1984; Jensen, 2001).

This new orientation has been progressively influenced by a growing global awareness in respect of the main issues (e.g. poverty, environmental degradation, inequalities, etc.) caused by the adoption of growth models too focused on single-minded approaches which were unable to explicitly recognized the importance of shared public wealth rather than private value. The result was an increasing attention to that the World Commission on Environment and Development called the Sustainable Development (Brundtland report, WCED, 1987, p.43)¹. The sustainable growth model introduced encompasses the capability of the society and economic actors to generate value and wealth preserving the resources which will need to future generations to satisfy their needs. The sustainable path requires both to balance and often to reconcile the conflicts between these dimensions to successfully pursue a development which is able to generate shared value and wealth (ICLEI, 1996; Hardi and Zdan, 1997; Barton, 2000; Du Plessis, 2000; West Midlands Round Table, 2000; Giddins et al, 2002). This means rethinking the traditional

¹ The term was introduced for the first time by The World Conservation Strategy in 1980 (IUCN et al., 1980; Hopwood et al., 2005).

models of production/consumption and the social practices in a way which explicitly considers a development model both sustainable in the long run and shared by all parties involved (Sharma et al., 2003). The co-operation of different actors (corporations, institutions, shareholders, customers, suppliers, employees and public actors) is important to change some paradigms which are at the basis of the traditional growth models (Sharma, 2002) and to adopt an integrated view about economic, environmental and social concerns (Brundtland report, WCED, 1987; European Commission, 2001). Adopting sustainable development models mean pursue simultaneously economic improvement, environmental care and social objectives by growth paths which are able to achieve the sustainability as an instrument to permanently generate shared wealth for the present without compromising the satisfaction capability of the future generations to satisfy their needs. In a similar way can be defined the Business Sustainability we assumed in our work. It is “the adoption of business strategies and activities that meet the needs of the enterprise and its stakeholders today while protecting, sustaining and enhancing the human and natural resources that will be needed in the future” (IISD, 1992; see also Roome, 1998; Van Kleef & Roome, 2007). Thus, sustainability issues involve firm viability both now and in the future and focused on three specific components: the present needs of the corporations; the present needs of the stakeholders of the corporations; the needs of future generations. This new approach explicitly recognized the double nature of the corporations: as economic actors – according to the Friedman view of the business (Friedman, 1970) – and as social actors which directly affect the “environment” in which they operate (Campbell & Alexander, 1997). A mutual dependence relation between business and society is largely recognized (Porter & Cramer, 2006; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2009) and it represents the main source of the business responsibility (Doh and Guay, 2006; Porter and Kramer, 2006). However, according to Carroll and Buchholtz (2009:9), when we speak about business and society relationships, we cannot refer to the society in a broad sense because it may be not realistic but we need to consider either to specific segments/subgroups of the society or to some system in the society (eg. politics, law, custom, religion, economics). For these reasons, we refer to the Sustainable Business Management (SBM) as the “management of business that recognizes its embeddedness in social, environmental and economic systems, and focuses on management and relationships to meet the environmental, social, and economic requirements of many different stakeholders in its networks” (Roome, 1998; Van Kleef & Roome, 2007:44).

Empirical and theoretical motivations. For many years, the corporations assumed the firm’s performance maximization and the short term gains as the main organizational goal to enhance (Friedman, 1970; Steward et al., 2000; Dyllick et al., 2002; Bruce et al., 2005; Morris et al., 2005) and overemphasized the economic dimension of the firm’s business model (Linder et al., 2000; Stewart et al.,

2000; Mayo et al., 1999; Slywotsky, 1996). The result was the adoption of “single-minded” business models too focused on the maximization of the firm’s financial performance (those we call in the next the “myopic” business models). Some of these corporations are successful but most of them failed (Cap Gemini Ernst & Young Center for Business Innovation Analysis, September, 2002; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) Chair Sheila Bair on C-SPAN’s Newsmakers, October 2010). A progressively rush of scandals occurred in the last few years such as Enron (2001), WorldCom (2002), Tyco (2002), HealthSouth (2003), Parmalat (2003), Bernie Madoff (2008), Lehman Brothers (2010).

These are the situations in which long run public costs are bigger than short run private benefits, and the value is created just for few stakeholders – likely the shareholders - at the expenses of the others, due to the un-capability of the firm’s business models of align different interests and to recognized their involvement in the society, which affect and by which they are affected.

Many problems are directly linked to business models too focused on the maximization of the short run financial aspirations: the high risky degree of the corporations (Sanders, 2001; Sanders et al., 2007); managerial frauds (Bruner et al., 2005; Erickson, 2006; Johnson, 2006; Johnson et al., 2006, 2007; Robinson & Sartore, 2008); the adoption of the stakeholders prioritization model (Mitchell et al., 1997), value destroying (Jensen, 2000) and other issues directly related to the corporate governance of the corporations (Fama et al., 1983; Jensen, 1986; Jensen et al., 1990; Van den Berghe et al., 2002; Bruce et al., 2005; Carroll & Buchholtz, 2009). In contrast, a similar result is obtained by business model too focused to solve the social problems or other kinds of single objectives. Control Data Corporation may represents a real example.

These business examples underline that business models too focused on the enhancement of single objectives are unable to effectively exploit the double nature of the firm. They are not able to generate shared value for shareholders, stakeholders and the future generations (the long run perspective). They create value just for some of the stakeholders – in a broader sense - at the expenses of the others, ignoring the social requirement of everyone, directly or indirectly, involved in the corporations.

The Research problem and the research questions. According to Porter and Cramer (2006) successful corporations need a healthy society and in turn a healthy society needs successful companies. So, to transform this interconnection in opportunity, a company needs to explicitly recognize its social embeddedness building a business model which is able to effectively satisfy the needs of different stakeholders - including the shareholders - without compromising the satisfactions of some of them. To do so, a new approach to the value creation process of the corporations needs to be developed. In our

opinion, the business sustainability and the sustainable business management represent a viable approach to build that we call “sustainable business models” which are able to align public and private interests either fulfilling the social requirements of the stakeholders of the corporations and to generate wealth for their shareholders, in a long run perspective. Adding to this, many recent contributions converged around the idea that the business sustainability may represent the future viable path to create long-term shared value because many benefits linked to that (Funk, 2003; Porter and Kramer, 2006; Parmar et al., 2010). However, very little is known about the process by which the managers can effectively do this. This represents our research problem. It can be viewed as composed of three main sources of knowledge: a better understanding of how the corporations can effectively develop the sustainable business models presented above; what kind of activities need to be implemented to effectively create shared value, for the firms and for the stakeholders; what are the conditions under which it works. These represent our research questions in terms of:

- i. How do the corporations build sustainable business models?
- ii. What does “value” mean for a particular group of stakeholders and how do firms create these different types of “value for stakeholders”?
- iii. What are the activities that the firms need to develop to create shared value and under what conditions does the model effectively work?

The most recent literature (Parmar et al., 2010) confirmed a theoretical gap in order to explain how the corporation can enhance sustainable competitive advantage, co-create value with and for their stakeholders, directly contribute with their business models to the sustainability goal and sustainable development, as defined above. A more effort is required to fulfill these gaps. An integrated framework needs to be developed which is able to join different perspectives into a unique strategic paradigm (Parmar et al., 2010). This may be able to explain how managers can effectively manage different stakeholders’ group developing competitive resources for the corporations, maximizing the wealth of stakeholders’ system delivering value and allocating rents, contribute to sustainable development enhancing the goal of sustainability. According to Parmar et al. (2010), the stakeholders theory represents a reasonable way to do this reconciling the problem of value creation, sustainable competitive advantage (Harrison et al., 2010) and distributions of economic rents (Bosse et al., 2009) with the problem of ethics of capitalism and sustainability (Boutilier, 2007; Bansal, 2005; Sharma et al., 2005; Kolk et al., 2007). However, despite the recent contributions (Harrison et al., 2010; Bosse et al., 2009) very little is known regarding the process of managing for stakeholders when different stakeholders’ networks compete or when different stakeholders’ interests need to be included into the value creation process of the corporations (Parmar et al., 2010). This represents the main aim of our work.

The research design. Our research design is based on three different methodologies each one addresses a specific question.

A qualitative study was conducted developing the conceptual model that we called “the synergic approach to the value co-creation process”. It directly fulfills the main literature gap underlined by Parmar et al. (2010) in terms of a lack of an integrated theoretical approach which integrate the stakeholder theory with different frameworks such as: the resource dependent theory (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978); the resource based view in order to explain both the relationship between the resource management and the competitive advantage (Priem et al., 1991) and rents allocation into stakeholders’ groups (Barney et al., 2001); the decision making process model of the corporation (Cyert and March, 1963).

Basing our argumentation on the core assumption of the behavioral theory of the firm, that multiple stakeholders goals serve as constraints on their firms’ survival (Cyert and March, 1963) we develop our ideas by integrating aspects of stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984, Freeman et al., 2010), stewardship theory (Jones et al., 1997), and resource dependence theory (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976) with the behavioral theory’s explanation of organizations’ multiple goals (Simon, 1964) and with recent work identifying firm-level strategies that create value from a consumer perspective (Priem, 2007). The result is a model of the firm, its current stakeholders and its potential stakeholders as an organizational decision-making system, wherein top managers sequentially address multiple goals and create value above the minimum level required for stakeholder participation, in order to attract exceptional stakeholders and obtain their commitment and effort toward system-wide value creation.

Furthermore, Freeman et al. (2010) and Parmar et al.’s (2010) reviews concluded that stakeholder theory provides a useful framework that helps explain how firms can create shared value. Yet they also concluded that key questions remain to be answered, including: “How can firms create different types of value for different stakeholders” (Parmar et al., 2010: 432)? This represents our second research question which has been addressed by a quantitative approach. To create value for all stakeholders, managers need to better understand the value drivers of the different stakeholders’ groups and satisfy them by a resources allocation’ process characterized by two main factors: a synergistic approach and a value co-creation process. The first one underlines the capability of the corporation to allocate resources into different groups following a simultaneous approach rather than a sequential or prioritization one. This means generating value for multiple stakeholders and not just for one of them – that is, satisfying by a single managerial action a mix of different utility attributes that each primary stakeholders evaluate as important. The second process is called value co-creation because it is based on the managerial knowledge of the structure of the stakeholders’ utility functions, which permits managers to better

understand “what stakeholder really want.” This requires a new managerial role - *the manager as a steward and an innovation-seeking entrepreneur* – and an explicit recognition of the different, *multi-attribute* utility functions of primary stakeholder groups (following the approach of Harrison et al., 2010). To do this we gathered primary data and based our methodology on an established, inductive process using multidimensional scaling and cluster analysis (e.g., Priem, et al., 2002; Voges, et al., 2004; Ketchen & Shook, 1996; Kruskal & Wish, 1978). In particular, we gathered data from the five primary stakeholder groups – investors, customers, employees, suppliers and the general public – and developed inductive, empirical taxonomies of utility sources found in the multi-attribute utility functions of each group. Viewing top managers as stewards of, and entrepreneurs within, the organizational decision making system that is composed of the firm’s primary stakeholders, we take an initial step toward showing how managers’ actions can simultaneously increase utility for two or more primary stakeholder groups and, thereby, increase the long-term sustainability of the firm.

Finally, according to Yin (2008), a case study is necessary when it has need to understand a real-life phenomenon in depth, but such understanding encompassed important contextual conditions – because they were highly pertinent to the phenomenon of study (Yin and Davis, 2007). Despite the example presented above shown the model acting into big corporations, the specific characteristics of the managerial role as steward entrepreneur may suggest that a small and medium sized environment might represent the natural landscape in which the model effectively exploits its potential. For the specific characteristics of SMEs, a sustainable business model based on our synergic approach to value co-creation may represent the intrinsic orientation of their business strategy. The specific role played by the managers into the small and medium sized firms – as steward entrepreneur - is aligned with the characteristics of the managers’ role assumed in the model we proposed. This evidence suggested investigating its effectiveness and the relations between its components into these environments characterized by a lower complexity and a clear role of the manager as a steward entrepreneur. For these reasons, a medium firm has been chosen as unit of analysis for our case study and the specific study’s question is represented by “how does a medium firm apply the sustainable business model based on the synergic value co-creation approach?”.

Research Relevance. Many literature gaps are effectively fulfilled by our work (see Parmar et al., 2010) and the new sustainable approach to the value creation of the corporations represents an important improvement for the theoretical comprehension of the phenomenon. Our theoretical model directly contributes to shed light on the relations which link the variables involved in the business sustainability and integrate the stakeholder synergy approach through the strategic value co-creation

process of the corporation. This offers three main contributions for the development of an integrated theoretical framework which explains how firms can create value by a sustainable business model:

- ⇒ the recognition of the stakeholders framework as the first step of the organizational decision making process framework (Cyert and March, 1963), and its integration into other mainstream theories, following the suggestions of Parmar et al. (2010).
- ⇒ The new role of the managers explained by both the stewardship approach and the innovation seeking entrepreneurial orientation, to better explain the managers' behavior in pursuing a business sustainability approach.
- ⇒ The mechanisms for satisfying multiple sub-coalitions' multi-attribute utility functions simultaneously integrates the stakeholders approach into existing theories such as the resource dependence theory (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978), the decision making process model of the firm (Cyert and March, 1963), providing to solve many critical issues (see Freeman et al. 2010 and Parmar et al., 2010) in terms of resources management/allocation to achieve both competitive advantage (Priem and Butler, 2001) and "sustainable success" (Parmar et al., 2010, pp. 418).

Our model directly affects the general value creation paradigm of the corporation shifting the focus from a single minded financial approach to a long term shared value co-creation process, from the care of a single shareholder utility function to the balancing of different stakeholders' expectations. The success of the corporation is not just based on the profit maximization goal but on its capability to increase the overall utility of all the primary stakeholders of the corporation. This underlines to recognize an explicit inclusion of a sustainable approach into the business models of the corporation. To do this the managers need to act as stewards which care of different stakeholders' expectations, creating shared value by a co-creation activity and maximize the value of the corporation, by satisfying different stakeholders expectations.

Adding to this, the managerial relevance needs to be underlined. To maximize for profit firms' sustainability adopting the conceptual model we proposed, managers need to focus equal attention to all stakeholders, irrespective of current salience. This not means ignoring the shareholders but explicitly recognize that stakeholders are different and to co-create value each of them need to be satisfied with the equal attention. This mechanism effectively works when managers are able to simultaneously satisfy two or more attributes of multi-attribute utility functions of the stakeholders of the corporation by a single synergic approach. The considerations above need that managers must resist shareholders pressure for ultra-high performance, because this is inconsistent with a sustainable business model developed in our model. Effectively replying to all primary stakeholders and increasing their utility represents a viable,

long-run way to overcome the limitations of the more common, short-run and single-minded business model focused solely on financial performance maximization. This may be made more possible by developing a better knowledge about primary stakeholders' multi-attribute utility functions (Harrison et al., 2010) and the value drivers on which their utility functions are based (Parmar et al., 2010). Improving the overall utility of all corporation stakeholder groups may increase the size of the pie for everyone (Gulati & Wang, 2002; Priem, 2007) because of better satisfaction, commitment and trust among the primary stakeholders (Pirson & Malhotra, 2010; Davis et al., 2000; Gundlach et al., 1995; Achrol et al., 1990; Anderson & Weitz, 1992; Morgan & Shelby, 1994; Dwyer et al., 1987) and because of the many benefits linked to a successful stakeholder care (Sisodia et al., 2007; Choi & Wang, 2009; Freeman et al., 2010; Harrison et al., 2010; Parmar et al., 2010). This, in turn, increases long-term business sustainability because value is actively created for and with different stakeholder groups. In this way managers can co-create value by satisfying aspects of stakeholders' heterogeneous utility functions. Therefore, the first step is to better understand the sources of utility which are able to increase the satisfaction of each primary stakeholder group. The model and the taxonomies we developed of the utility sources for all five primary stakeholder groups represent an important tool for managers interested in the building of the sustainable business models and the stakeholder value co-creation process.

Finally, our research represents the first model which effectively suggests how co-create value for different stakeholders in a sustainable way and the first empirical taxonomies developed to highlight the sources which each stakeholder group evaluates as important and which are able to increase their satisfaction and, in turn, their commitment.

The main results. The prescriptive model we propose has the aim to help the corporations to achieve higher levels of business sustainability. In doing so, we integrate aspects of established approaches, including stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984), stewardship theory (Jones et al., 2007) and resource dependence theory (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976), with the behavioral theory's explanation of organizations' multiple goals (Cyert and March, 1963; Simon, 1964) and with recent work identifying firm-level strategies that create value for consumers (Priem, 2007). The result is a model of the firm's primary stakeholders as an organizational decision-making system, wherein top managers simultaneously: 1) address multiple stakeholder goals and 2) act as entrepreneurs in creating value above the minimum levels required for stakeholder participation. The managers' super-ordinate goal in our model is to attract exceptional primary stakeholders and obtain their trust, commitment and effort toward system-wide value co-creation, thereby increasing the system's resiliency and, in turn, the business firm's sustainability. The process through which managers increase their firms' sustainability in our model, which involves firms "competing" for stakeholders and stakeholders simultaneously "competing" for firms, challenges several

commonly held assumptions about how top managers should deal with stakeholders. The adoption of this kind of business model directly affects the trust and commitment of multiple stakeholders, increasing the “size of the pie” (Gulati et al., 2003; Priem, 2007) and the sustainability of the corporation (IISD, 1992; see also Roome, 1998; van Kleef & Roome, 2007).

The first step to implement our model is represented by a better knowledge of the structure of the primary stakeholders’ multi-attribute utility functions (Harrison et al., 2010) and the value drivers on which their utility functions are based on (Parmar et al., 2010). Improving the overall utility of all corporation stakeholder groups may increase the size of the pie (Gulati & Wang, 2003; Priem, 2007) because of better satisfaction, commitment and trust among the primary stakeholders (Pirson & Malhotra, 2010; Davis et al., 2000; Gundlach et al., 1995; Achrol et al., 1990; Anderson & Weitz, 1992; Morgan & Shelby, 1994; Dwyer et al., 1987) and because of the many benefits linked to a successful stakeholder care (Sisodia et al., 2007; Choi & Wang, 2009; Freeman et al., 2010; Harrison et al., 2010; Parmar et al., 2010). This, in turn, increases the long-term business sustainability because value is actively created for and with different stakeholders groups. In this way managers can co-create value by satisfying aspects of stakeholders’ heterogeneous utility functions.

In doing so we developed the taxonomies of the utility sources for all five primary stakeholder groups. It represents an important first step toward a tool for managers interested in stakeholder value co-creation. In particular, our research represents the first empirical taxonomies developed to highlight the sources which each stakeholder group evaluates as important and which are able to increase their satisfaction and, in turn, their commitment. Looking at the results, each primary stakeholder group has shown different utility sources, but our results may provide managers with some initial insight regarding opportunities for value co-creation for multiple stakeholder groups. Product characteristics, quality and value delivered form an important utility category for employees, customers and the general public, and therefore represent an opportunity for initiatives that could increase the utility of these three stakeholder groups together. Similarly, management quality and accessibility form an important utility category for investors, suppliers, and the general public, which again offers opportunities for simultaneously increasing multiple stakeholders’ utility. Furthermore, the company reputation represents a valuable utility source for employees, customers and general publics. Adding to this, the financial stability of the corporation and its reliability may increase the utility for category of investors, general public and suppliers. These are just some of the combinations of utility sources which may be used to increase the overall utility of two or more primary stakeholders simultaneously.

The qualitative case study shows the way in which the steward entrepreneur may explicitly recognize the primary stakeholders' sources of utility as an opportunity to exploit, generating and delivering value in an innovative way by a unique value proposition. It represents a real example of synergic value co-creation in which the utility sources of the primary stakeholders are effectively satisfied in a simultaneous way rather than a traditional approach. Finally, the case study confirms our propositions in terms of the real effectiveness of the model and the new role of the manager into the small and medium sized corporations.

Contributions and future research paths. We have developed a model which changes many business logics: from a single financial objective maximization to a shared value co-creation; from the care of a single shareholder utility function to the balancing of different stakeholders expectations. The involvement of the primary stakeholders and the knowledge of their utility sources increase the sustainable profile of the corporations according to the business sustainability concept and improve the capability of the corporations to create shared value maximizing the overall utility of all the primary stakeholders. This causes the rethinking of the managerial role that needs to moderate the shareholders' pressure to the financial performance maximization and take care of the stakeholders' satisfaction to increase their commitment and the long term survival of the corporation, increasing the size of the pie.

Our model explicitly refers to an alternative model to manage the stakeholders' utility functions based on both: the recognition of different stakeholders' groups and sub-segments and the comprehension of the nature/weight of the different attributes/value drivers which determine the individual goals of each of them. Each stakeholders group, in fact, can be viewed as composed of multiple segments which show differences into their utility functions (e.g. different kind of employees may have different expectations in order to the satisfaction of the same main objective). For this reason, the activities developed by the firms need to consider all these aspects building a sustainable business model which is able to create and deliver value in a simultaneously way for all primary stakeholders, implicitly including the shareholders' interests. In other words, each stakeholder group can be identified by a specific utility function (Hill and Jones, 1992; Harrison et al., 2010) or by separate utility functions where segments are present within the group. For this reason, identifying and classifying the components of those utility functions would be an important step for researchers and for practitioners managing stakeholders, because the firm is required to "take into account its relationship with specific stakeholder groups as it sets corporate direction and formulates its strategies" (Roberts and King, 1989). This suggests that the first step in managing stakeholder relationships is to identify the stakeholders' categories and the relative sub-segments' utility functions within each stakeholder group (i.e. homogeneity/heterogeneity), the nature of the desired relationships and details of the utility functions for each stakeholder type in terms of value

drivers/attributes for each stakeholder group. Although Harrison et al. (2010) have argued that trust is an essential ingredient for the sharing of utility function information between the corporation and its stakeholders (Harrison et al., 2010), together with reciprocity (Bosse et al., 2009) and the degree of salience of each stakeholders group (Mitchell et al., 1997), we advocated a different approach. Instead, the characteristics of the exchange must be considered before investing in trust, and it is the value offered to each stakeholder group that is most important in obtaining their commitment irrespective of exchange characteristics.

Introducing the concept of an organizational decision-making system into the framework of stakeholder theory provides a new perspective for examining “real world” management decisions regarding stakeholder constraints using well-known constructs such as bounded rationality, sequential attention to goals, quasi-resolution of conflict, uncertainty avoidance, problemistic search and organizational learning, among others (Augier and Sarasvathy, 2010). Moreover, ethics and moral obligations – long recognized but infrequently discussed in strategy scholarship (Bernard, 1938; Hosmer, 1987, 1994) – can be reintroduced to the prioritization models by which managers satisfy stakeholders’ demands (Mitchell et al., 1997). It may be that, given the different values held by different stakeholders, a competing for stakeholders approach is most likely to result in sustainability for the individual firm and, when aggregated across many firms, in sustainability for society.

Finally, our model clearly shown that sustainable business is not in contrast with value creation process of the corporation neither with their profit (Friedman, 1970) but it generates a better allocation of resources and the simultaneously satisfaction of shareholder and shareholder. Moreover, many literature gaps have been fulfilled highlighted by Parmar et al. (2010) in terms of: an integrated theoretical model which explains how the corporations can create value for different stakeholders increasing its long term sustainability and what the value mean for different stakeholders’ groups.

Despite the important contributions highlighted above, further researches need to be addressed in order to better understand the linkages between the variables of our model.

A better comprehension of the nature of the activities/policies that the managers need to develop to implement the model we proposed has to be developed. Each single stakeholders group/segment is characterized by different utility sources which can be satisfied by different managerial policies. These sources may be viewed in terms of entrepreneurial opportunities for value co-creation among multiple groups and how the value created for different stakeholders can be effectively measured by the

corporation represents interesting areas for future researches (following the approach proposed by McWilliams et al., 2010).

Furthermore, Pirson et al. (2010) found that the trustworthiness varied across different stakeholder types and it has directly affected by the nature of the relations they have with the corporation. In the same way, we may suppose that the effectiveness of the model may be affected by the nature of the relationship with the different stakeholders. Following this approach, it represents a viable path for future researches.

Finally, more contributions need to be focused on better determine whether firm size, age, country and industry affect the relationships in the model.

Limitations. Our study has a number of limitations that must be kept in mind when interpreting our results, and these limitations represent opportunities for future research. In particular, it is likely that each primary stakeholder group's multi-attribute utility function may exhibit some within-group heterogeneity, similar to customer segments common in the customer stakeholder group. Additional research with larger samples may be able to identify the degree of this heterogeneity – and which segments are large enough to warrant attention – within each primary stakeholder group. Moreover, primary stakeholder groups' multi-attribute utility functions may differ somewhat across industries. While our multiple industry samples helps generalizability, industry-specific studies are needed to identify industry differences. Similarly, stakeholder groups' multi-attribute utility functions may differ across countries, so country-specific studies are also called for to see which utility sources are common across countries and which are specific to particular countries. Finally, ours is an inductive classification study. An important next step will be to determine weightings given by stakeholders to specific utility categories in different contexts.

Our work represents a first step in examining the value co-creation approach: recognizing what factors contribute to the multi-attribute utility functions of each primary stakeholder group. Yet even this first step has identified important implications for managerial behavior and for future practices that are likely to increase long-run business sustainability.

References

- Achrol, R. S., Scheer, L.K. & Stern L. 1990. Designing Successful Transorganizational Marketing Alliances. Marketing Science Institute. Cambridge, Working Paper. Report.
- Adler, Paul S. and Seok-Woo Kwon (2002), "Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept," *Academy of Management Review* 27 (1), 17-40.
- Adner, R. (2002). 'When are technologies disruptive? A demand-based view of the emergence of competition'. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, 667-688.
- Adner, R. and Levinthal, D. (2001). 'Demand heterogeneity and technology evolution: Implications for product and process innovation'. *Management Science*, 47, 611-628.
- Adner, R., and Snow, D. (2010). 'Responses to technological threats: Demand heterogeneity and graceful technology retreats'. *Strategic Management Journal*, in press.
- Adner, R., and Zemsky, P. (2006). 'A demand-based perspective on sustainable competitive advantage'. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 215-239.
- Alchian, A. A. & Demsetz, H. 1972. Production, information costs and economic organization. *American Economic Review*, 62, 777-795.
- Alchian, A. A. and Demsetz, H. (1972). 'Production, information costs and economic organization'. *American Economic Review*, 62, 777-795.
- Aldenderfer, M. S. & Blashfield, R. K. 1984. *Cluster Analysis*. San Francisco: Sage Publ.
- Aldrich, H. E. & Fiol, C. M. 1994. Fools rush in - the institutional context of industry Creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 645-670.
- Aldrich, H.E & Pfeffer, J. 1976. Environments of Organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 79-105.
- Anderson, E. and Weitz, B. (1992). "The use of pledges to build and sustain commitment in distribution channels". *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29 (February), 18-34.
- Andrews, K. R. (1971). *The concept of corporate strategy*. New York: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Aoki, R. (1988). Cournot and Bertrand competition with vertical quality differentiation. Mimeo, Department of Economics, The Ohio State University.
- Augier, M. & Sarasvathy S. D. 2004. Integrating evolution, cognition and design: Extending Simonian perspectives to strategic organization. *Strategic Organization*, 2, 169-204.
- Baker, T. & Nelson, R. 2005. Creating something from nothing: resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50, 329-366.
- Baker, T. & Nelson, R. (2005). 'Creating something from nothing: resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50, 329-366.
- Barber, B. (1983). *The logic and limits of trust*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Barney, J. B. & Hansen, M. H. 1994. Trustworthiness as a source of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 175-190.
- Barrow, C. & R. Brown, 1997. *Principles of Small Business*. International Thomson Business Press, London.
- Bruce Barringer, D. Ireland, 2008, "What's Stopping You? Shatter the Nine Most Common Myths Keeping You from Starting Your Own Business," *Financial Times*.
- Beekun, R. & Badawi, J. (2005). 'Balancing Ethical Responsibility among Multiple Organizational Stakeholders: The Islamic Perspective'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 60, 131-145.
- Berman S.L., Wicks A.C., Kotha S., Jones T. M. (1999). 'Does stakeholder orientation matter? The relationship between stakeholder management models and firm financial performance', *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 488-506;
- Bernard, C. I. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bitektine, A. (2010). 'Entrepreneurs under attack: Collective defense strategies in emergent industries', *Academy of Management 2010 Annual Meeting*, Montreal, QC, Canada, August.

- Bodin, Ö., Crona, B. and Ernstson H. (2006). 'Social networks in natural resource management: What is there to learn from a structural perspective?'. *Ecology and Society*, 11, [online] [URL:http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss2/resp2/](http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss2/resp2/).
- Bolton, J. E.: 1971, *Small Firms: Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Small Firms* (HMSO, London).
- Bosse, D. A., Phillips, R. A., & Harrison, J. S. 2009. Stakeholders, reciprocity, and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30, 447–456.
- Brammer, S. M., Millington, A. (2003). 'The effect of stakeholder preferences, organizational structure and industry type on corporate community involvement'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45, 213-226.
- Brass, D.J. (1992). 'Power in organizations: a social network perspective', in G. M. a. J. A. W. (Eds.), ed. *Research in politics and society*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Brenner, S. N. and Cochran, P. (1991). The stakeholder theory of the firm: Implications for business and society theory and research. Annual Meeting of the International Association for Business and Society, Sundance, UT.
- Buckko, A. A. 1994. Conceptualization and Measurement of Environmental Uncertainty: An Assessment of the Miles and Snow Perceived Environmental Uncertainty Scale. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 410-425.
- Burke, I., and Jarratt, D. (2004). The influence of information and advice on competitive strategy definition in small-and medium-sized enterprises. *Qualitative Market Research*, 7(2) 126-138.
- Campbell, J. L. (2003). 'States, politics, and globalization: Why institutions still matter'. In Paul, T.V., Ikenberry, G. J. and Hall A. J. (Eds.), *The nation-state in question*, 234–259, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carpenter, G., White, P. (2004). 'Sustainable development: Finding the real business case', *Corporate Environmental Strategy*, 11, 17-22.
- Carroll, A. B. and Buchholtz, A. K. (2009). *Business & Society: Ethics & Stakeholder Management*. South-Western/Cengage Learning, 7th Edition, pp. 970.
- Cattell, R. B. 1966. The scree test for the number of factors 1. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1(2), 245-276.
- Chen, I. J., Paulraj A. and Lado A. A. (2004). 'Strategic Purchasing, Supply Management, and
- Choi, J. & Wang, H. 2009. Stakeholder relations and the persistence of corporate financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30, 895-907.
- Clarkson, M. 1995. A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 92-117.
- Coff, R. W. (1999). 'When competitive advantage doesn't lead to performance: the resource-based view and stakeholder bargaining power'. *Organization Science*, 10, 119–133.
- Commission of the European Communities (1996). 'Commission recommendation of April, 3 1996 concerning the definition of small and medium-sized enterprises'. Brussels, C(96) 261 final.
- Curran, J., Rutherford, R. & S. Lloyd Smith (2000). "Is There a Local Business Community? Explaining the non-participation of small business in local economic development", *Local Economy* 15(2), 128-143.
- Cyert, R. M. & March, J. G. 1963 [1992]. *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs.
- Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., and Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 20–47.
- Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F.D., Mayer, R.C. & Tan, H. H. 2000. The trusted general manager and business unit performance: Empirical evidence of a competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 563–576.
- Decideware White Paper (2008). *The Benefits of an Optimized Strategic Supplier Relationship: A framework for developing a "people-oriented" value chain*. Available on the web site <http://www.whitepapercompany.com/pdfs/Decideware2.pdf>.

- Denrell, J. 2005. Should We Be Impressed With High Performance?. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14, 292-298.
- Dirks, K. T., Ferrin D. L., (2001). "The role of trust in organizational settings". *Organization Science*, 12(4), 450–467.
- Doh, J. P., Guay, T. R. (2006). 'Corporate social responsibility, public policy, and NGO activism in Europe and the United States: An institutional-stakeholder perspective'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43, 47-73.
- Donaldson, L. and Davis, J. H. (1991). 'Stewardship Theory or Agency Theory: CEO Governance and Shareholder Returns'. *Australian Journal of Management*, 16, 49–64.
- Donaldson, T. & Dunfee, T.W. 1994. Toward a unified conception of business ethics: integrative social contracts theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 252–284.
- Donaldson, T. & Preston, L. 1995. The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 65-91.
- Donnet, L., Weatherspoon, D., and Hoehn, J.P. (2007). "Price determinants in top quality
- Dougill, A. J., Reed, M. S., Fraser, E. D. G., Hubacek, K., Prell, C., Stagl, S. T., Stringer, L. C. and Holden, J. (2006). 'Learning from doing participatory rural research: Lessons from the Peak District National Park'. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 57, 259–275.
- Dwyer F. R., Schurr P. H. & S. Oh 1987. Developing Buyer - Seller Relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 51, 11–27.
- Enderle, G. (2004) 'Global competition and corporate responsibilities of small and medium-sized enterprises', *Business Ethics*, Vol. 13, pp.51–63.
- Everett, B.S., & Der, G. 1996. A handbook of statistical analyses using Sas. Eondon: Chapman and Hall.
- Faulkner, P. and Runde, J. (2009). 'On the identity of technological objects and user innovations in function'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 442 - 462.
- Frentz, A., Nouws, J. and Zwaard, A. (1993). Milieu-beleid en MKB. Zoetermeer. Economic Institute for the Small and Medium Sized Firm.
- Freeman, E. 1984. *Strategic Management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman: Boston, MA.
- Freeman, L. C. (1979). 'Centrality in social networks: Conceptual clarification'. *Social Networks*, 1, 215-239.
- Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S. and Wicks A. C. (2007). *Managing for Stakeholders: Survival, Reputation and Success*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Freeman, R.E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Parmar, B., & De Colle, S. 2010. *Stakeholder theory: The state of the art*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedman, A. L. and Miles, S. (2004). 'Stakeholder Theory and Communication Practice'. *Journal of Communication Management*, 9, 89–97.
- Friedman, A. L. and Miles, S. (2006). *Stakeholders: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ganesan, S. (1994). "Determinants of long-term orientation in buyer-seller relationships". *Journal of Marketing*, 58(2), 1–19.
- Gans, J., MacDonald, G. and Ryall, M. (2008). The two sides of competition and their implications for strategy. Working paper August 18, Melbourne Business School, Melbourne.
- Goffee, R. and R. Scase, (1995), *Corporate Realities: The Dynamics of Large and Small Organisations* (International Thomson Business Press, London).
- Goodpaster, K. E. (1994). 'Work, Spirituality and the Moral Point of View'. *International Journal of Valuebased Management*, 7, 49–62.
- Granovetter, M.: 1973, 'The Strength of Weak Ties', *American Journal of Sociology* 78, 1360–1380.
- Grant, R.M. (2005). *Contemporary strategy analysis: concepts, techniques, applications*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Graves, S. B., Waddock S.A. 1994. Institutional owners and corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1034–1046.

- Gray, C., & Lawless, N. (2000). Innovations in the distance development of SME management skills. *European Journal of Distance Learning*, retrieved July 25, 2005, from <http://www.euodl.org/materials/contrib/2000/gray.html>.
- Greve, J. 2008. Healthcare in developing countries and the role of business: A global governance framework to enhance the accountability of pharmaceutical companies. *Corporate Governance*, 8, 490-505.
- Gruber, M., MacMillan, I., and Thompson, J. (2008). 'Look before you leap: market opportunity identification in emerging technology firms'. *Management Science*, 54, 1652-1665.
- Gulati, R. & Wang, L. O. 2003. Size of the pie and share of the pie: Implications of network embeddedness and business relatedness for value creation and value appropriation in joint ventures. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 20, 209-242.
- Gulati, R. and Westphal, J. D. (1999). "Cooperative or controlling? The effects of CEO-board relations and the content of interlocks on the formation of joint ventures". *Administration Science Quarterly*, 44(3), 473-506.
- Gundlach, G.T., Ravi, S.A. & Mentzer, J.T. 1995. The structure of commitment in exchange. *Journal of Marketing*, 59, 78-92.
- Habisch, A., Meister, H. P., & Schmidpeter, R. (Eds.). 2001. *Corporate citizenship as investing in social capital*. Berlin: Logos.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Anderson, E. R., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. 1987. *Multiple discriminant analysis. Multivariate data analysis with readings*. Macmillan, New York, 73-144.
- Hannan, M. & Freeman, J. 1977. The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 929-64.
- Hardin, G. (1968). 'The Tragedy of the Commons'. *Science*, 162, 1243-48.
- Harris, J. and Bromiley, P. (2007). 'Incentives to Cheat: The Influence of Executive Compensation and Firm Performance on Financial Misrepresentation'. *Organization Science*, 18, 350-67.
- Harrison, J. S., Bosse, D. A. & Phillips, R. A. 2010. Managing for stakeholders, stakeholder utility functions, and competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31, 58-74.
- Harrison, J.S. & John, C.H. 1996. Managing & partnering with external stakeholders. *Academy of Management Executive*, 10, 46-60.
- Hart, S., Milstein, M. (2003). 'Creating sustainable value'. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17, 56-69.
- Haugh, H. M. & McKee, L. (2003): "It's just like a family – shares values in the family firm", *Community, Work & Family*, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 141-158.
- Hemingway, C. A., & MacLagan, P. W. (2004). Managers' personal values as drivers of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50(1), 33.
- Hendry, J. (2004). *Between Enterprise and Ethics: Business and Management in a Bimoral Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, C. W. L. & Jones, T. M. 1992. Stakeholder-agency theory. *Journal of Management, Studies*, 29: 131-154.
- Hill, C. W. L. (1995). 'National institutional structure, transaction cost economizing and competitive advantage: The Case of Japan', *Organization Science*, 5, 594-607.
- Hillmann A.J. & Keim G.D. 2001. Shareholder value, Stakeholder Management, and Social Issue: What's the bottom line?. *Strategic of Management Journal*, 22, 125-139.
- Holliday, R. (1995). *Investigating Small Firms*, Routledge, London.
- Hosmer, L. (1987). *The Ethics of Management* (1st ed). Homewood: Richard D. Irwin.
- Hosmer, L. (1994), 'Strategic planning as if ethics mattered'. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 17-34.
- Hutchinson, A. & Chaston, I. (1994). 'Environmental management in Devon and Cornwall's small and medium sized enterprise sector'. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 3:1, 15±22.
- IISD, Deloitte and Touche/ISSD 1992. *Business strategy for sustainable development: leadership and accountability for the 90s*.

- Jensen, M. (2002). 'Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function'. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 12, 235–256.
- Jensen, M. (2003). "The role of network resources in market entry: Commercial banks' entry into investment banking, 1991–1997". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(3), 466–497.
- Jensen, M. C. and Meckling, W. H., (1976), 'Theory of the firm: managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure'. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3, 305-360.
- Jenkins, H. (2004), "A critique of conventional CSR theory: an SME perspective", *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 37-57.
- Jenkins H., 2006, "Small Business Champions for Corporate Social Responsibility", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67.
- Johnson. G & Scholes. K. (1997). "Exploring Corporate Strategy" Prentice Hall: Europe.
- Jones, T. M. (1995). 'Instrumental stakeholder theory: a synthesis of ethics and economics'. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 404–437.
- Jones, T., Felps, W. and Bigley, G. (2007). 'Ethical Theory and Stakeholder Related Decisions: The Role of Stakeholder Culture'. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 137–155.
- Ketchen Jr, D. J., & Shook, C. L. 1996. The Application of Cluster Analysis in Strategic Management Research: An Analysis and Critique. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(6), 441-458.
- King, S. F. and Burgess, T. F. (2008). 'Understanding success and failure in customer relationship management'. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37, 421–431.
- Kirzner, I. (1997). 'Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian approach'. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35, 60-85.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1993). 'The Pure Time Preference Theory of Interest: An Attempt at Clarification.' in *The Meaning of Ludwig von Mises: Contributions in Economics, Sociology, Epistemology, and Political Philosophy*. Ed. J. M. Herbener. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Koley, B. and Meredith, G.G., 1997. Relationship among owner-Manager Personal Values, Business Strategies, and Enterprise Performance. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 2, pp.37-64.
- Kruskal, J. B. 1964. Multidimensional scaling by optimizing goodness of fit to a nonmetric hypothesis. *Psychometrika*, 29(1), 1-27.
- Kruskal, J. B., & Wish, M. 1978. *Multidimensional Scaling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lahdesmaki, M.: 2005, "When ethics matters – interpreting the ethical discourse of small nature-based entrepreneurs", *Journal of Business Ethics* 61(1), 55-68.
- Laplume, A. O., Sonpar, K. & Litz, R. A. 2008. Stakeholder Theory: reviewing a theory that moves US. *Journal of management*, 34, 1152 – 1189.
- Lepoutre, J. & Heene, A. (2006), "Investigating the impact of firm size on small business social responsibility: a critical review", *Journal of Business Ethics* 67(3), 257-273.
- Lloyd-Reason, L. & Mughan, T. (2002) 'Strategies for internationalisation within SMEs: the key role of the owner-manager', *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp120-129.
- Locke, E. A. (1997). 'The motivation to work: What we know'. In Maehr, M. L. and Pintrich, P.R. (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Locke, E. A., and Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Locke, E. A., and Latham, G. P. (2002). 'Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey'. *American Psychologist*, 57, 705–717.
- Maki, K., Pukkinen, T. (2000), "Barriers to growth and employment in Finnish small enterprises", paper presented at the ICSB World Conference 2000, Brisbane.
- March, J.G. & Simon H.A. 1958. *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Margolis J.D., Walsh J.W. (2001). *People and Profits? The search for a link between a firm's social and financial performance*. Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers. Mahawah, NJ.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

- McWilliams, A. D. and Siegel, S. (2010). 'Creating and Capturing Value: Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility, Resource-Based Theory, and Sustainable Competitive Advantage'. *Journal of Management*, Special Issue, in press.
- McWilliams, A. D., Siegel, S. & Wright, P.M. 2006. Corporate social responsibility: strategic implications. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43, 2–17.
- McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. 2000. 'Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: Correlation or misspecification?'. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 603- 610.
- Meyer, A.D. (1991). 'What is strategy's distinctive competence?'. *Journal of Management*, 17, 821-833.
- Meyer, J. P., and Allen, N. J. (1991). 'A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment'. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61–89.
- Meyer, J. P., and Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., and Vandenberghe, C. (2004). 'Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 991–1007.
- Milligan, G. W. & Sokol, L. M. 1980. A Two-Stage Clustering Algorithm with Robust Recovery Characteristics. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 40(3), 755.
- Mitchell R. K., Agle B. R. and Wood D.J. (1997), 'Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts'. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 853-886.
- Mithas, S., Krishnan, M.S. and Claes Fornell (2005). 'Why Do Customer Relationship Management Applications Affect Customer Satisfaction?'. *Journal of Marketing*, 69, 201–209.
- Moore, G. & Spence, L. (2006): Editorial: Responsibility and Small Business. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Volume 67, No. 3, 219-226.
- Moorman, C., G. Zaltman, and R. Deshpande (1992), "Relationships between Providers and Users of market research: The dynamics of trust within and between organisations." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29 (August), 314-28.
- Morgan, R. M. & Shelby D. H. 1994. The Commitment–Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 20–38.
- Murillo, D. & Lozano, J. (2006), "SMEs and CSR: an approach in their own words", *Journal of Business Ethics* 67(3), 227-240.
- Nahapiet, J. and Ghoshal S. (1998). "Social Capital, Intellectual Capital, and the Organizational Advantage." *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242-266.
- O'Connor, J., Priem, R., Coombs, J. & Gilley, K. M. 2006. Do CEO stock options prevent or promote fraudulent financial reporting?. *Academy of Management J.*, 49, 483–500.
- Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F.L. & Rynes, S.L. 2003. Corporate Social Performance: A meta-Analysis, *Organization Studies*, 24, 403-441.
- Parmar, B. L. , Freeman, R. E. , Harrison, J. S. , Wicks, A. C. , Purnell, L. and de Colle, S. (2010). 'Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art', *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4, 403-445.
- Parmar, B., Freeman, R. , Harrison, J., Wicks, A., Purnell, L. & De Colle, S. 2010. Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4, 403-445.
- Perrini, F., 2006, SMEs and CSR Theory: Evidence and Implications from an Italian Perspective, *Journal of Business Ethics* 67(3);
- Perrini, F., A. Russo and A. Tencati, 2007, "CSR Strategies of SMEs and Large Firms. Evidence from Italy, *Journal of Business Ethics* 74(3);
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in Organizations*. Pitman: Marshfield, MA.
- Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Phillips, R. A. & Johnson-Cramer, M. E. 2006. Ties that unwind: dynamism in integrative social contracts theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 68, 283–302.
- Pinder, C. C. (1998). *Motivation in work organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Pirson, M. and Malhotra D. (2010). "Foundations of Organizational Trust: What Matters to Different Stakeholders?". *Organization Science*, October, 22, 1-18, in press.

- Polonsky, M. J. (1995). 'A Stakeholder Theory Approach to Designing Environmental Marketing Strategy'. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 10, 29–46.
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. Free Press: New York.
- Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. 2006. The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84, 78-92.
- Post, J.E., Preston, L.E., & Sachs, S. 2002. *Redefining the Corporation, Stakeholder Management and Organizational Wealth*. Stanford, CT: Stanford University Press.
- Prell, C. (2003). 'Community networking and social capital: early investigations'. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, 8, <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol8/issue3/prell.html>.
- Prell, C., Hubacek, K. and Reed M. (2007). 'Stakeholder Analysis and Social Network Analysis in Natural Resource Management'. *SRI Papers*, 6, August.
- Priem, R. 2007. A consumer perspective on value creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 219-235.
- Priem, R. L., Love, L. G., & Shaffer, M. A. 2002. Executives' Perceptions of Uncertainty Sources: A Numerical Taxonomy and Underlying Dimensions. *Journal of Management*, 28(6), 725.
- Puncheva, P. 2008. The Role of Corporate Reputation in the Stakeholder Decision-Making Process. *Business & Society*, 47, 272-290.
- Punj, G. & Stewart, D. W. 1983. Cluster Analysis in Marketing Research: Review and Suggestions for Application. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20, 134-148.
- Purnanandam, A. 2011. Originate-to-Distribute Model and the Subprime Mortgage Crisis. *Review of Financial Studies*, in press.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Quinn, J. (1997), "Personal ethics and business ethics: the ethical attitudes of owner/managers of small business", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 119-27.
- Reichheld, F., and Sasser, W.E. (1990) , 'Zero defections: quality comes to services'. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 105-11.
- Reichheld, F.F. (1996). *The Loyalty Effect*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Reynolds, S., Schultz, F. & Hekman D. 2006. Stakeholder Theory and Managerial Decision-Making: Constraints and implications of Balancing stakeholder Interests. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64, 285-301.
- Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M. and Yip, G. S. (2009). 'Measuring organizational performance: towards methodological best practice', *Journal of Management*, 35, 718-840.
- Roberts, N.C. and King, P.J. (1989), "The stakeholder audit goes public". *Organizational*
- Roman, R. M., Hayibor, S. and Agle, B. R. (1999). 'The relationship between social and financial performance: repainting a portrait'. *Business & Society*, 38, 109–125.
- Roome, N.J. (1998). *Sustainability Strategies for Industry: the Future of Corporate Practice*. Island: Washington, DC.
- Russo, A., & Tencati, A. (2008). Formal vs. Informal CSR Strategies: Evidence from Italian Micro, Small, Medium-sized, and Large Firms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(S2), 339-353.
- Russo, A., & Tencati, A. 2009. Formal vs. informal CSR strategies: Evidence from Italian micro, small, medium-sized, and large firms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(Supplement 2): 339-353.
- Sanders, W. and Hambrick, D. (2007). 'Swinging for the Fences: The Effects of CEO Stock Options on Company Risk Taking and Performance'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1055–78.
- Sarle, W.S. 1983. *Cubic Clustering Criterion*. SAS Technical report A-108. Cary, NC: SAS Inc.
- Sathe, V. (1983). Implications of corporate culture: A manager's guide to action. *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn, 5-23.

- Sawhney, M., Verona, G., and Prandelli, E. (2005). 'Collaborating to create: the Internet as a platform for customer engagement in product innovation'. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 19, 4-17.
- Schneper, W. D., and M. F. Guillén. (2004). "Stakeholder rights and corporate governance: A cross-national study of hostile takeovers." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49, 263-295.
- Scozzi, B., Garavelli C. and Growston K., (2005). 'Methods for modeling and supporting innovation processes in SMEs'. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 8(1), 120-137.
- Shah, S. K. and Tripsas, M. (2007). 'The accidental entrepreneur: the emergent and collective process of user entrepreneurship'. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1, 123-140.
- Shane, S., and Venkataraman, S. (2000). 'The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research'. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 217-226.
- Sharma, P. and J.J. Chrisman, 1999. Towards a reconciliation of the definitional issues in the field of corporate entrepreneurship. *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, 23(3): 11-27.
- Simon, H. A. (1964). 'On the concept of organizational goal'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9, 1-22.
- Sisodia, R., Wolfe, D. & Sheth, J. (2007). *Firms of endearment: How world-class companies profit from passion and purpose*. Philadelphia: Wharton School Publishing.
- Sokal, R. R., and Michener, C. D. 1958. *A Statistical Method for Evaluating Systematic Relationships*. University of Kansas Science Bulletin, 38, 1409-1438.
- Southiseng, N., & Walsh, J., 2010a. "Competition and management issues of SME entrepreneurs in Laos: Evidence from empirical studies in Vientiane municipality, Savannakhet and Luang Prabang," *Asian Journal of Business Management*, Vol.2, No3, pp.57-72, available at: <http://maxwellsci.com/print/ajbm/v2-57-72.pdf>.
- Spence L. (1999). "Does size matter? The state of the art in small business ethics", *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol. 8 No. 3.
- Spence, L. J. & Schmidpeter, R.: 2003. "SMEs, social capital and the common good", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45: 93-108.
- Spence, L. J., Lozano, J. F., 2000, *Communicating about ethics with small firms: Experiences from the UK and Spain*. *Journal of Business Ethics* 27(1);
- Spence, L. J., Rutherford, R., 2001, *Social Responsibility, Profit Maximisation and the Small Firm Owner-Manager Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Summer 8(2);
- Spence, L.J., 2000, *Practices, Priorities and Ethics in Small Firms*. Institute of Business Ethics, London.
- Spence, L.J., 2004, *Small firm accountability and integrity*. In George Brenkert, ed., *Corporate Integrity and Accountability*, London: Sage;
- Spence, L.J., 2007, *CSR and Small Business in a European Policy Context: The Five 'C's of CSR and Small Business Research Agenda 2007*, *Business and Society Review*, 112 (4);
- Spence, L.J., R. Jeurissen, R. Rutherford, 2000, *Small Business and the Environment in the UK and the Netherlands: Toward Stakeholder Cooperation*, *Business Ethics Quarterly* 10(4);
- Spence, L.J., R. Rutherford, 2003, *Small Business and Empirical Perspectives in Business Ethics: Editorial*, *Journal of Business Ethics* 47(1);
- Spence, Laura J. and Robert Rutherford. 2004. "Social Responsibility, Profit Maximisation and the Small Firm Owner-Manager." Pp. 35-58 in *Responsibility and Social Capital: The World of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises*, edited by Laura J. Spence, Andre Habisch, and Rene Schmidpeter. Basingstoke, Hamps, U.K.: Macmillan.
- Surroca J., Tribò A. J. and Waddock S. (2010). 'Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial performance: The role of Intangible Resources'. *Strategic management Journal*, 31, 463-490.
- Tanabe, K. and Watanabe, C. (2005). 'Sources of small and medium enterprises excellent business performance in a service oriented economy'. *J. Serv. Res-US*, 5(1).
- Tencati, A., Perrini, F. & Pogutz, S. 2004. *New Tools to Foster Corporate Socially Responsible Behaviour*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(1-2): 173-190.
- Tilley, F. (2000), "Small firm environmental ethics: how deep do they go?", *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Vol. 9 No. 1.

- Tripsas, M. (2008). 'Customer preference discontinuities: a trigger for radical technological change'. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 29, 79-97.
- Tsai, W., Ghoshal, S. (1998). "Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks". *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(4), 464-477.
- UCN. 2006. *The Future of Sustainability: Re-thinking Environment and Development in the Twenty-first Century*. Report of the IUCN Renowned Thinkers Meeting, 29-31 January 2006 http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_future_of_sustainability.pdf
- Users of Marketing Research: The Dynamics of Trust Within and Between Organizations". *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29, 314-329.
- Uzzi, B. (1997). "Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(1), 35-67.
- Van Kleef, J. A. G. & Roome, N.J. 2007. Developing capabilities and competence for sustainable business management as innovation: a research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 15, 38-51.
- Voges, K. E., Priem, R. L., Shook, C. & Shaffer, M. 2004. A Taxonomy of the Uncertainty Sources Perceived by Public Sector Managers in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 7(1), 1-21.
- Ward Jr., J. H. 1963. Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301), 236-244.
- Wasserman, S. and Faust, K. (1994). *Social network analysis: Methods and application*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Werner, S., Brouthers, L. E., & Brouthers, K. D. 1996. International Risk and Perceived Environmental Uncertainty: The Dimensionality and Internal Consistency of Miller's Measure. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27, 571-589.
- Wicks, A. C., Berman, S. L., Jones, T. M. (1999). 'The structure of optimal trust: Moral and strategic implications'. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 99-116.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). 'Commitment in organizations: A normative view'. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.
- Wilkinson, A. (1999), "Employment relations in SMEs", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 20-1.
- Williams, M. (2001). "In whom we trust: Group membership as an affective context for trust development". *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(3), 377-396.
- Williamson, O. E. (1981). 'The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach'. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 87, 548-577.
- Williamson, O. E. (1993). "Calculativeness, trust, and economic organization". *Journal of Law and Economics*, 36(1, Part 2) 453-486.
- Zander, I., Zander, U., 2005. The inside track: On the important (but neglected) role of customers in the resource-based view of strategy and firm growth. *Journal of Management Studies* 42 (8), 1519-1548.
- Zimmerer, T .W. and N.M. Scarborough, 2005. *Essentials of entrepreneurship and small business management: the foundations of entrepreneurship*. Pearson Education, The United States of America.
- Zollo, M., and Coda, V. (2009). *Toward an Integrated Theory of Strategy*. Working paper 09/016, CROMA (Center for Research in Organization and Management), Milan.
- Zollo, M., Minoja, M., Casanova, L., Hockerts, K., Neergaard, P., Schneider, S. and Tencati A. (2009), 'Towards an internal change management perspective of CSR: evidence from project response on the sources of cognitive alignment between managers and their stakeholders, and their implications for social performance'. *Corporate Governance*, 9, 355 - 372.