

## REFERENCES

## **R.1 REFERENCES**

**Ackoff, R.L.** (1981) "On the Use of Models in Corporate Planning", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol 2: pp 353-359

**Akao, Y.** (1991) *Hoshin Kanri*. Cambridge, Mass.: Productivity Press

**Alexander, I.** (2003) "Stakeholders: Who is Your System For?", *Computing & Control Engineering*, April: pp 22-26

**Andersen, T.J.** (2004) "Integrating the Strategy Formation Process: An International Perspective", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 22, No.2: pp 263-272

**Ansoff, H.I.** (1987) *Corporate Strategy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd

**Argyris, C. and Schon, D.A.** (1985) "Organizational Learning" in *Organizational Theory. Selected Readings* ed. Pugh, D.S. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd

**Armstrong, P.A.** (1977) *Polymaths Preliminary Course in Mathematics. Book C Sets, Concepts and Relations*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes

**Asch, D. and Kaye, G.R.** (1996) *Financial Planning: profit improvement through modelling*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.

**Atkinson, A.A., Waterhouse, J.H. and Wells, R.B.** (1997) "A Stakeholder Approach to Strategic Performance Measurement", *Sloan Management Review*, Spring: pp 25-37

**Barsky, N.P. and Marchant, G.** (2000) "The Most Valuable Resource", *Strategic Finance*, Feb. 2000 Vol 81 Iss 8: p 58 et. seq.

**Bartkus, B.R., Glassman, M. and McAfee, R.B.** (2004) "A Comparison of the Quality of European, Japanese and U.S. Mission Statements: a content analysis", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 22 No. 4: pp 393-401

**Beer, M. and Eisenstat, R.A.** (2000) "The Silent Killers of Strategy Implementation and Learning", *Sloan Management Review*, Summer Vol 41 i4: p 29 et.seq.

**Bendell, A. and Marra, E.** (2002) "Six Sigma Analysed", *Quality World*, April 2002: pp 16-18

**Bennett, S., Skelton, J. and Lunn, K.** (2001) Shaum's Outline of UML. London: Macmillan & Co.

**Blenkinsop, S. and Burns, N.** (1992) "Performance Measurement Revisited", International Journal of Operations and Production Management, Vol.12 No.10: pp 16-25

**Blockley, D.** (1999) "Process Modelling From Reflective Practice For Engineering Quality", Civil Engineering and Environmental Systems, Vol 16: pp 287-313

**Boston Consulting Group** (2005) Innovation 2005. Boston, USA: Boston Consulting Group

**Bowie, N.E.** (2002) The Blackwell Guide to Business Ethics. Mass, USA: Blackwell

**BSi** (1992) "BS 6143:Part 1:1992. Guide to the Economics of Quality." : British Standards Institution

**Busby, J.S. and Williams, G.M.** (1993) "The Value and Limitations of Using Process Models to Describe the Manufacturing Organization", International Journal of Production Research, Vol. 31 No. 9: pp 2179-2194

**Busby, J.S. and Williamson, A.** (2000) "The Appropriate Use of Performance Measurement in Non-Production Activity. The Case of Engineering Design", International Journal of Operations and Production Management, Vol.20 No.3: pp 336-358

**Cannon, T.** (1994) Corporate Responsibility. London: Pitman

**Carson.T.L.** (2003) "Self-interest and Business Ethics: Some Lessons of the Recent Corporate Scandals.", Journal of Business Ethics, Vol.43 Iss.4: pp389-394

**Chase LC, Siemer WF and Decker DJ** (2002) "Designing Stakeholder Involvement Strategies to Resolve Wildlife Management Controversies", Wildlife Society Bulletin, Vol.30 Iss.3: pp-937-950

**Checkland, P.** (1995) "Model Validation in Soft Systems Practice", Systems Research, Vol. 12, Iss. 1: pp 47-54

**Christensen, C.M.** (1997) "Making Strategy: Learning by Doing", Harvard Business Review, Nov-Dec 1997: pp 141-156

- Clarkson, M.** (1995) "A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 20 Iss 1: pp 92-117
- Colquhoun, C.J., Baines, R.W. and Crossley, R.** (1996) "A Composite Behavioural Modelling Approach for Manufacturing Enterprises", *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, Vol.9 No.6: pp 463-475
- The Concise Oxford English Dictionary (2006)**, 11th edn., Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Conti, T.** (2002) "Stakeholder-Based Strategies to Enhance Corporate Performance", Presented at Annual Quality Congress Proceedings, , May 2002
- Cousins, P.** (1999) "The Snake and the Old Woman: Managing Inter-Firm Relationships", *Long Range Planning*, : pp 108-127
- Cox, S.** (2003) "Operational Excellence in Consumer Packaged Goods Manufacturing", *Computing & Control*, December 2003: pp 31-36
- Cullen, J., Joyce, J., Hassall, T. and Broadbent, M.** (2003) "Quality in Higher Education: From Monitoring to Management", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol 11 No. 1: pp 5-14
- Curtis, W, Kellner, M.I. and Over, J.** (1992) "Process Modelling", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 35, No. 9: pp 75-90
- Cyert, R.M. and March, J.G.** (1992) *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Second edition. Cambridge, Mass, USA: Blackwell
- Dahlgaard, J.J. and Dahlgaard, S.M.P.** (2002) "From defect reduction to reduction of waste and customer/stakeholder satisfaction", *Total Quality Management*, Vol.13 Iss.8: pp 1069-1085
- Daily, C.M., Dalton, D.R. and Cannella, A.A.** (2003) "Corporate Governance: Decades of Dialogue and Data", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 28(3): pp 371-382
- Davis, J.H., Schoorman, F.D. and Donaldson, L.** (1997) "Toward A Stewardship Theory of Management", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 22(1): pp 20-47

**Dawkins, J. and Lewis, S.** (2003) "CSR in Stakeholder Expectations: and Their Implication for Company Strategy.", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.44 Iss 2 (May): pp 185-193

**de Bono, E.** (1986) *Tactics: The Art and Science of Success*. Great Britain: Fontana Paperbacks

**de Geus, A.** (1988) "Planning as Learning", *Harvard Business Review*, Mar-Apr 1988: pp 70-74

**deFeo, J.A. and Janssen, A.** (2001) "Implementing a Strategy Successfully", *Measuring Business Excellence*, Vol.5 No.4: pp 4-6

**Department of Trade and Industry (UK)** (2004) "What is CSR?", <http://www.csr.gov.uk>

**DeTienne, K.B. and Lewis, L.W.** (2005) "The Pragmatic and Ethical Barriers to Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure: The Nilke Case", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 60: pp 359-376

**Drucker, P.F.** (1955) *The Practice of Management*. London: Heron Books

**Eisenhardt, K.M.** (1989) "Agency Theory: An Assessment and Review", *Academy of Management Review*, vol 14(1): pp 57-74

**Elms H, Berman S and Wicks A.C.** (2002) "Ethics and incentives: An evaluation and Development of Stakeholder Theory in the Health Care Industry", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol.12 Iss.4: pp 413-432

**Encyclopaedia Britannica Online (2007)**, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Chicago.

**Eriksson, H.** (2004) *UML2 toolkit*. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.

**European Economic Union** (1996) "Document 96/280/EEC (1996)", *Official Journal* 107 of 30/04/1996

**European Foundation for Quality Management** (1992) *The EFQM Excellence Model*. : British Quality Foundation

**Evans, S.** (2003) *Telecommunications network modelling, planning and design*. London: Institution of Electrical Engineers

**Fama, E.F.** (1980) "Agency Problems and the Theory of the Firm", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol 88: pp 288-307

**Foster, T.R.V.** (ed.) (1993) 101 Great Mission Statements. London: Kogan Page Ltd.

**Frazer, L. and Lawley, M.** (2000) Questionnaire Design and Administration: a practical guide. Australia: John Wiley & Sons

**Freeman, R. E.** (1984) Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Boston: Pitman

**Friedman, A.L. and Miles, S.** (2002) "Developing Stakeholder Theory", Journal of Management Studies, Vol 39: pp 1-21

**Frigo, M.L.** (2003) "Strategy or Execution? (Strategic Management)", Strategic Finance, March: pp 9-10

**Garvare, R. and Isaksson, R.** (2001) "Sustainable Development: Extending the Scope of Business Excellence Models", Measuring Business Excellence, Vol. 4, Iss. 3: pp 11-15

**Garvin, D.A.** (1993) "Building a Learning Organization", Harvard Business Review, July-Aug 1993: pp 79-91

**Gerst, R.M.** (2004) "QFD in large-scale social system redesign. (quality function deployment)", International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management, Sept: pp 959-972

**Gill, J. and Johnson, P.** (1991) Research Methods for Managers. London: Paul Chapman Publishing

**Gillan, R.** (1999) An Introduction to Systems Thinking and Models. London: Ethree

**Graafland, J.J., Eijffinger, S.C.W. and SmidJohan,H.** (2004) "Benchmarking of Corporate Social Responsibility: Methodological Problems and Robustness", Journal of Business Ethics, vol 53 iss1/2: pp 137

**Hair, J.F., Babin, B, Money, A.H. and Samuel, P.** (2003) Essentials of Business Research Methods. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons

**Handy, C.** (2002) "What's a Business For?", Harvard Business Review, December: pp 49-55

**Hammer, M.** (1990) "Reengineering Work: Don't Automate, Obliterate", Harvard Business Review, July-August: pp 104-112

- Hammer, M.** (2001) *The Agenda*. Sydney: Random House
- Hammer, M. and Champey, J.** (2001) *Reengineering the Corporation - a Manifesto for Business Revolution*. London: Nicholas Brealey
- Harman, P. and Watson, M.** (1998) *Understanding UML - the Developer's Guide*. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Hatten, K.J. and Rosenthal, S.R.** (1999) "Managing the Process-Centred Enterprise", *Long Range Planning*, Vol 32 No 3: pp 293-310
- Hauser, J.R. and Clausing, D.** (1988) "The House of Quality", *Harvard Business Review*, May-June: pp 63-73
- Heugens, P.P.M.A.R. and van Oosterhout, Hans** (2002) "The Confines of Stakeholder Management: Evidence From the Dutch Manufacturing Sector", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.40 Iss.4: pp 387-403
- Heskett, J.L., Jones, T.O., Loveman, G.W., Sasser Jr., W.E. and Schlesinger, L.A.** (1994) "Putting the Service-Profit Chain to Work", *Harvard Business Review*, March-April 1994: pp 164-174
- Hines, P., Lamming, R., Jones, D.T., Cousins, P. and Rich, N.** (2000) *Value Stream Management*. Edinburgh: Prentice Hall
- Hines, P. and Rich, N.** (1998) "Competing Against Ignorance: Advantage Through Knowledge", *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, Vol.28 No.1: pp 18-43
- Holt, B., Quelch, J.A. and Taylor, E.L.** (2004) "How Global Brands Compete", *Harvard Business Review*, September 2004: pp 68-75
- Howard, M., Vidgen, R. and Powell, P.** (2003) "Overcoming Stakeholder Barriers in the Automotive Industry: Building to Order With Extra-Organizational Systems", *Journal of Information Technology*, Vol. 18: pp 27-43
- Hoyle, D.** (2004) "The Great Transition Debate", *Quality World*, Feb 2004: pp 36-39
- Humber, J.M.** (2002) "Beyond Stockholders and Stakeholders: A Plea for Corporate Moral Autonomy", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.36 Iss.3: pp 207-221
- Hussey, J. and Hussey, R.** (1997) *Business Research - a Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students*. Basingstoke: Palgrave

**Hysom, R.** (2001) "Adding Value to Enterprise Modelling", *Production Planning & Control*, Vol.12 No.2: pp 119-127

**Imai, M.** (1986) *Kaizen: The Key to Japan's Competitive Success*. New York: McGraw-Hill

**Imai, M.** (1997) *Gemba Kaizen: A Commonsense, Low-cost Approach to Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill

**ISO 14001** (2004) *BS EN ISO 14001:2004 Environmental Management Systems – Requirements With Guidance for Use*. : International Standards Organisation (ISO)

**ISO 27001** (2005) *BS EN ISO 27001:2005 Information Technology – Security Techniques – Information Security Management Systems - Requirement*. : International Standards Organisation (ISO)

**ISO 9001** (2000) *BS EN ISO 9001:2000 Quality Management Systems - Requirements*. : International Standards Organisation (ISO)

**ISO 9004** (2000) *BS EN ISO 9004:2000 Quality Management Systems - Guidelines for Performance Improvements*. : International Standards Organisation (ISO)

**Jenkins, H.** (2004) "A critique of conventional CSR theory: an SME perspective", *Journal of General Management*, Vol 29 iss 4: pp 37-57

**Jones, K.** (2004) "The Moral Test", *Quality World*, Jan 4: pp34-36

**Kaler, J.** (2002) "Morality and Strategy in Stakeholder Identification.", *Journal of Business Ethics*, August: pp 91-99

**Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P.** (1992) "The Balanced Scorecard - Measures That Drive Performance", *Harvard Business Review*, January-February: pp 71-79

**Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P.** (1996a) "Using the Balanced Scorecard as a Strategic Management System", *Harvard Business Review*, January-February: pp 75-85

**Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P.** (1996b) *The Balanced Scorecard*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press

**Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P.** (2004) *Strategy Maps. Converting Intangible Assets into Tangible Outcomes*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press

**Knopfel, A., Grone, B. and Tabeling, P.** (2005) *Fundamental Modeling Concepts: effective communication of IT systems*. London: John Wiley & Sons

**Knox, S. and Maklan, S.** (2004) "Corporate Social Responsibility: Moving Beyond Investment Towards Measuring Outcomes", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 22 No. 5: pp 508-516

**Knox, S., Maklan, S. and French P.** (2005) "Corporate Social Responsibility: Exploring Stakeholder Relationships and Programme Reporting across Leading FTSE Companies", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 61: pp 7-28

**Koubarakis, M and Plexousakis, D.** (1999) "Business Process Modelling - a Formal Model and Methodology", *BT Technology Journal*, Vol.17 No.4 October: pp 23-35

**Lewis, L.K., Richardson, B.K. and Hamel, S.A.** (2003) "When the "Stakes" are Communicative: The Lamb's and the Lion's Share", *Human Communication Research*, Vol.29 Iss.3: pp 400-430

**Lynch R.** (2006) *Corporate Strategy*. Fourth Ed.. Harlow: Prentice Hall

**Majchrzak, A. and Wang, Q.** (1996) "Breaking the Functional Mind-Set in Process Organizations", *Harvard Business Review*, Sep-Oct 1996: pp 93-99

**Malvey D., Fottler M.D. and Slovensky D.J.** (2002) "Evaluating Stakeholder Management Performance Using a Stakeholder Report Card: The Next Step in Theory and Practice", *Health Care Management Review*, Vol.27 Iss.2: pp 66-79

**Marrewijk, M. van** (2004) "A Value Based Approach to Organization Types: Towards a Coherent Set of Stakeholder-oriented Management Tools", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 55: pp 147-158

**McAdam, R. and O'Neill, E.** (1999) "Taking a Critical Perspective to the European Business Excellence Model using a Balanced Scorecard Approach: a Case Study in the Service Sector", *Managing Service Quality*, Vol 9, No. 3: pp 191-197

**McGovern, G.J., Court, D., Quelch, J.A. and Crawford, B.** (2004) "Bringing Customers into the Boardroom", *Harvard Business Review*, Nov. 2004: pp 70-80

**Meyer, C.** (1994) "How the Right Measures Help Teams Excel", *Harvard Business Review*, May-June: pp 95-103

**Meyer, C. and Schwager, A.** (2007) "Understanding Customer Experience", Harvard Business Review, Feb 2007: pp 117-126

**Mintzberg, H.** (1978) "Patterns in Strategy Formulation", Management Science, Vol 24: pp 934-948

**Mintzberg, H.** (1990a) "The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact", Harvard Business Review, Mar-Apr: pp 163 et. seq.

**Mintzberg, H.** (1990b) "The Design School: Reconsidering the Basic Premises of Strategic Management", Strategic Management Journal, Vol 11. Iss.3: pp 171-196

**Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B. and Lampel, J.** (ed.) (2005) Strategy Bites Back. Harlow, England: Prentice Hall

**Mitchell D.W., Bruckner, C. and Coles, C.B.** (2004) "Establishing a Continuing Business Model Innovation Process", Journal of Business Strategy, Vol. 25 Iss. 3: pp 39-49

**Morris, W.T.** (1966) "On the Art of Modeling", Management Science, Vol.13 No.12, August: pp B707-717

**Nadler, D.A. and Tushman, M.L.** (1999) "The Organization of the Future: Strategic Imperatives and Core Competencies or the 21st Century", Organizational Dynamics, Vol 28 No 1: pp 45-60

**Nevis, E.C., diBella, A.J. and Gould, J.M.** (1995) "Understanding Organizations as Learning Systems", Sloan Management Review, Winter 1995 Vol 36 n 2: pp 73-85

**New, C.** (1974) "Production Funnels - A New Tool for Operations Analysis", Management Decision, Vol.12 No.3: pp 167-178

**NIST** (1993) "Integration Definition for Function Modeling (IDEF0)", <http://www.idef.com>

**Nohria, N., Joyce, W. and Roberson, B.** (2003) "What Really Works", Harvard Business Review, July: pp 43-53

**Norreklit, H.** (2000) "The Balance on the Balanced Scorecard - a Critical Analysis of Some of its Assumptions", Management Accounting Research, Vol. 11, No. 1: pp 65-88

**Oakland, J.S.** (1993) Total Quality Management. The Route to Improving Performance. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd.

**Oakland, J.S.** (2001) Total Organizational Excellence. Revised paperback. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd.

**Oakshott, Les** (1997) Business Modelling and Simulation. London: Pitman

**Ohno, T.** (1988) The Toyota Production System: Beyond Large Scale Production. Portland, Oregon, USA: Productivity Press

**Oppenheim, A.N.** (2001) Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement. London: Continuum

**Orlitsky, M.** (2001) "Does Firm Size Confound the Relationship Between Corporate Social Performance and Firm Financial Performance?", Journal of Business Ethics, Vol 33 iss 2: pp 167 et. seq.

**Orts E.W. and Strudler A.** (2002) "The Ethical and Environmental Limits of Stakeholder Theory", Business Ethics Quarterly, Vol.12 Iss.2: pp 215-233

**Pahl-Wostl, C.** (2002) "Participative and Stakeholder-Based Policy Design, Evaluation and Modeling Processes", Integrated Assessment, Vol.3 Iss 1: pp3-14

**Pearson, A.E.** (2002) "Tough-Minded Ways to Get Innovative", Harvard Business Review, Aug: pp 117-124

**Phillips R.A.** (2003) "Stakeholder Legitimacy", Business Ethics Quarterly, Vol.13 Iss.1: pp 25-31

**Phillips, E.M. and Pugh, D.S.** (1994) How to get a Ph.D.. Second edition. Buckingham: Open University Press

**Phillips R.A., Freeman, R. E. and Wicks A.C.** (2003) "What Stakeholder Theory is not", Business Ethics Quarterly, Vol.13 Iss.4: pp 479-502

**Pidd, M.** (1999) "Just Modeling Throgh: a Rough Guide to Modeling", Interfaces, Vol.29 No.2 March-April: pp 118-132

**Polonsky, M.J., Schuppisser, D.S.W. and Beldona, S.** (2002) "A Stakeholder Perspective for Analyzing Marketing Relationships", Journal of Market Focused Management, Vol.5 Iss 2: pp 109-126

**Porter, L.** (2002) "Six Sigma Excellence", Quality World, April 2002: pp 12-15

**Porter M.E.** (1985) Competitive Advantage. Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance. New York: The Free Press

**Porter M.E. and Kramer, M.R.** (2006) "Strategy and Society: the Link Between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility", *Harvard Business Review*, Dec 2006: pp 78-92

**Porter M.E., Lorsch, J.W. and Nohria, N.** (2004) "Seven Surprises for new CEOs", *Harvard Business Review*, October 2004: pp62-72

**Post J.E., Preston, L.E. and Sachs S.** (2002) "Managing the Extended Enterprise: The New Stakeholder View", *California Management Review*, Vol.45 Iss.1: pp 6-28

**Prahalad, C.K. and Hamel, G.** (1990) "The Core Competencies of the Corporation", *Harvard Business Review*, May-June: pp 79-91

**Riley, K.F., Hobson, M.P. and Bence, S.J.** (2000) *Mathematical Methods for Physics and Engineering*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

**Robson, C.** (2002) *Real World Research*. Second ed. Mass.: Blackwell

**Salzmann, O., Ionescu-Somers, A., Steger, U., Steger, U., Steger, U. and Steger, U.** (2005) "The Business Case for Corporate Sustainability: Literature Review and Research Options", *European Management Journal*, Vol 23, No.1: pp 27-36

**Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A.** (2007) *Research Methods for Business Students*. fourth edition. Harlow: Prentice Hall

**Schneiderman, A.M.** (1988) "Setting Quality Goals", *Quality Progress*, April: pp 51-57

**Senge, P.M.** (1990) "The Leader`s New Work: Building Learning Organizations", *Sloan Management Review*, Fall 1990: pp 7-23

**Senge, P.M.** (1993) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Paperback. London: Century Business

**Sidhu, J.** (2003) "Mission Statements: is it Time to Shelve Them?", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 4: pp 439-446

**Simons, L.** (1986) *The Basic Arts of Financial Management*. Third edition. London: Business Books Ltd

**Simpson, W.G. and Kohers, T.** (2002) "The Link Between Corporate Social and Financial Performance: Evidence from the Banking Industry", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 35 Iss 2: pp 97 et. seq.

**Sirgy, M.J.** (2002) "Measuring Corporate Performance by Building on the Stakeholder Model of Business Ethics", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 35: pp 143-162

**Smith, H.J.** (2003) "The Shareholders vs. Stakeholders Debate", *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol.44 Iss.4: pp 85-91

**Snider J., Hill, R.P. and Martin, D.** (2003) "Corporate Social Responsibility in the 21st Century: A View From the World's Most Successful Firms", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 48, Iss 2: pp 175-187

**Stata, R.** (1989) "Organizational Learning - The Key to Management Innovation", *Sloan Management Review*, Spring 1989: pp 63-74

**Stone H.L.** (2002) "Graphically Modeling Stakeholder Values", *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, Vol.38 Iss.4: pp 1019-1026

**Sussland, W.A.** (2004) "Business Value and Corporate Governance: a New Approach", *Journal of Business Strategy*, Jan-Feb: pp 49-56

**Tushman, M.L. and Nadler, D.A.** (1986) "Organizing For Innovation", *California Management Review*, Vol 28 No 3 Spring: pp 74-92

**Tvorik, S.J. and McGivern, M.H.** (1997) "Determinants of Organisational Performance", *Management Decision*, Vol.35 No.6: pp 417-435

**van der Woerd, F. and van den Brink, T.** (2004) "Feasibility of a Responsive Business Scorecard - a pilot study.", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Dec 2004 v55 i2: pp 173-176

**Wheeler, David, Colbert, B. and Freeman, R. E.** (2003) "Focusing on Value: Reconciling Corporate Social Responsibility, Sustainability and a Stakeholder Approach in a Network World.", *Journal of General Management*, Vol.28 Iss.3: p1-28

**Willemain, T.R.** (1994) "Insights on Modeling From a Dozen Experts", *Operations Research*, Vol.42 No.2 Mar-Apr: pp 213 222

**Williams, P.** (2004) "Novell Sets its Sights on the Open-Source Desktop", *Computing*, 23/09/2004: p 28

**Wilson, B.** (2001) *Soft Systems Methodology*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons

**Wolfe R.A. and Putler D.S.** (2002) "How Tight are the Ties That Bind Stakeholder Groups?", *Organization Science*, Vol.13 Iss.1: pp 64-80

**Womack, J.P. and Jones, D.T.** (1994) "From Lean Production to the Lean Enterprise", Harvard Business Review, March-April: pp 93-103

**Womack, J.P. and Jones, D.T.** (1996) Lean Thinking. New York: Simon and Shuster

**Wortmann, J.C., Hegge, H.M.H. and Goossenaerts, J.B.M.** (2001) "Understanding Enterprise Modelling From Product Modelling", Production Planning & Control, Vol.12 No.3: pp 234-244

**Zack, M.H.** (1999) "Managing Codified Knowledge", Sloan Management Review, Summer Vol 40 iss 4: p 45

**Zairi, M. and Youssef, M.A.** (1995) "Quality Function Deployment: a Main Pillar for Successful Total Quality Management and Product Development", International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management, Vol 12 No.6: pp 9-23

## **APPENDIX A**

### **ORGANISATION SIZE DEFINITIONS**

The following summary of definitions is taken from the official publication of the European Economic union (European Economic Union, 1996). The definitions are used by other organisations, such as grant-awarding bodies, to classify organisations for the purposes of determining the type and level of support for which they qualify. In the following an SME is any organisation qualifying as a Micro, Small or Medium Enterprise.

**A.1 MICRO ENTERPRISE:**

Less than 10 employees

No more than 25% owned by one or more companies that are not classed as SMEs

**A.2 SMALL ENTERPRISE:**

Between 10 and 49 full-time employees and either

Annual turnover of no more than Euro 7 million (~£4.41m)

or Balance sheet of no more than Euro 5 million (~£3.1m)

No more than 25% owned by one or more companies that are not classed as SMEs

**A.3 MEDIUM ENTERPRISE:**

Between 50 and 249 full-time employees and either

Annual turnover of no more than Euro 40 million (~£25m)

or Balance sheet of no more than Euro 27 million (~£17m)

No more than 25% owned by one or more companies that are not classed as SMEs

**A.4 LARGE ENTERPRISE:**

By default, any organisation not included in any of the above.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **THE SURVEY SAMPLE**

The following table summarises the organisations used in the survey described in chapters 3 and 4 of the thesis. For reasons of confidentiality the organisations are numbered, and these numbers are consistent with the identification used in the analysis and presentation of data. The organisations are identified in correspondence and in the original data which has been retained by the author.

## B.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

ID	Sector	Size	Description	Scope	Mission
1	Private	Small	Accountants	Local	
2	Public	Large	University college	Regional	Yes
3	NFP	Medium	Chamber of commerce	Regional	
4	Private	Micro	Retail shop	Local	
5	NFP	Micro	Chamber of commerce	Local	
6	Private	Micro	Children's nursery	Local	
7	Public	Small	Local authority	Local	Yes
8	Private	Small	Travel agent	National	
9	Private	Micro	Insurance agent	Local	
10	NFP	Large	Paramedic charity	National	Yes
11	Public	Large	Heritage agency	Regional	Yes
12	Public	Medium	Environmental agency	Regional	Yes
13	NFP	Large	Professional association	Multi-national	Yes
14	NFP	Small	Disabled charity	Regional	Yes

Table C.1: Description of the Sample

## B.2 CLASSIFICATIONS

The sector of each organisation is either Private, Public or Not-For-Profit (NFP). The sectors are as stated by the organisations themselves, and not assumed according to their activities. The sectors are used in the analysis of data.

The size of each organisation is banded according to the definitions given in Appendix B. Sizes are not used in the analysis, but the information was collected in case future opportunities arise where the sample can be extended to the point where analysis by size may become meaningful.

The scope of each organisation is as described by the organisations themselves, according to the principal influences of their operations (e.g. the dispersion of their customer base), and is either: Local (confined mainly within about 20 miles), Regional (confined mainly within about 100 miles). National (mainly confined within the UK) or Multi-national (dispersed within the UK, with significant overseas interests). Scope is not used in the analysis because the distribution is uneven, but the information was collected in case future opportunities arise where the sample can be extended to the point where analysis by scope may become meaningful.

Half of the organisations publish a mission statement, in most cases on their web site but in some cases in their annual report or accounts. The publication of a mission statement may be taken as an indication that the organisation publicly espouses certain values, but it cannot be taken that it is reflected in the operational priorities (Foster, 1993). With such an incomplete sample, it was not considered worthwhile analysing the alignment between the mission statements and the numerical profiles of stakeholder importance.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **SURVEY RESPONDENT DETAILS FORM**

The form on the following page was sent to each respondent to confirm their contact details and record classification data that was required for analysis.

## Respondent Details

The following is required in order to confirm contact details, and provide the basis for analysis.

**Contact details**

	Amended details:
--	------------------

Please note: All the following apply to that part of the organisation which is well known to the respondent. It need not be the entire organisation, although it does need to be a distinct and autonomous operation in respect of management objectives.

**Brief description of the organisation**

**Mission statement (if published, or indicate if it is published on a web site)**

**Size (Equivalent full-time employees). Please tick one**

1-9	<input type="checkbox"/>	10-49	<input type="checkbox"/>	50-249	<input type="checkbox"/>	250-499	<input type="checkbox"/>	500+	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	--------	--------------------------	---------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Predominant scope of operations Please tick one**

Local		Regional		National		Multi-national	
-------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------------	--

**Sector. Please tick one**

Private / commercial		Public service		Not for profit	
----------------------	--	----------------	--	----------------	--

## **APPENDIX D**

# **THE MAIN SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

The forms on the following pages were sent to each respondent in advance of conducting interviews by telephone, and comprise the main data collection instrument used in the field research.

## **QUESTIONNAIRE 1 – IDENTIFYING STAKEHOLDERS**

The following questions are intended to identify what relationships your organisation considers desirable. It considers all those people or organisations which may be affected by you. This includes at least the following:

### **Input of materials or services.**

- Output of materials or services.
- Processing and disposal of waste.
- The manner in which you conduct your operations or processes.
- Those who share information with you.

This survey is concerned only with the expectations these groups may have of your organisation, and is **not** concerned with what your organisation may expect or require from them.

There is no time limit on the following questions. All the questions are to be considered from the point of view of the organisation rather than your personal opinions or activities, if they should differ. You may consult any documents you wish, or confer with colleagues if it helps you to provide accurate answers.

### **Question 1.1**

In order to focus your thoughts, the attached list (Stakeholder Groups) has been prepared from other sources which shows a number of distinct groups of people or organisations which may be affected by your organisation.

Individuals and organisations often perform multiple roles, and it is important that these are kept separate. The following examples illustrate.

- A patient in a healthcare situation can be regarded as a customer (who makes the purchasing decision) and a user (who has to live with the consequences).
- A company director is also an employee and possibly an investor or lender as well. Each of these roles has to be addressed as a separate issue because they affect different people in different ways.
- A company making vacuum cleaners should consider separately the purchaser (e.g. price) the user (e.g. weight) and the maintainer (service spares).
- A manufacturer needs to consider separately their relationship with their customer, which may be a dealer or distributor, and the end user who realises the value of the product in use. This shows how some stakeholders can be important even though there is no direct contact with them.
- A person making a purchase may not be the user – they may be making a family, group or company purchase for others to use.

Please examine this list carefully and consider the following:

1.1.1 Can you think of anybody who relates to your organisation, and is not covered by these groups? If so, please describe such a person or organisation in the box at the end of the list.

### Question 1.2

For each of the groups, consider the importance to your organisation of satisfying its members. You should consider the potential benefits or penalties that the groups can bestow and the amount of management attention that they merit. Please assign a score from 0 to 10 to each group. You may assign the same score to several groups if you wish, but to provide a reference for analysis **at least one must be assigned a score of 10**. You may find it easier to first consider the group or groups which obviously have the greatest importance and assign them a score of 10; then consider any that you

consider to be entirely irrelevant or insignificant for your organisation, and assign them a score of zero; then assign intermediate scores to the remainder.

1.2.1 Please enter a score alongside each group in the list.

### **Question 1.3**

Each group represents an opportunity for the organisation to adopt a high or low degree of involvement. Thus, the organisation may at one extreme only aim to do the minimum necessary to keep out of trouble, and at the other extreme may work with members of the group to streamline processes for mutual advantage. The desired level of involvement is scored as follows:

- 0 Either the other party controls the relationship, or it is unimportant.
- 1 Minimum compliance with specification, enforceable standards or visibly acceptable behaviour.
- 2 Active efforts to encourage and improve relationships. This may involve providing, for example, free technical advice or support, or access to privileged information.
- 3 Active efforts to integrate processes for mutual advantage. This may involve, for example, changing working practices or management practices in partnership with members of a group.

The desired level of involvement may vary between members of a group. To avoid unnecessary complications, the predominant or average value should be taken.

1.3.1 Please enter a score alongside each group in the list.

### **Question 1.4**

Finally, each group may be considered as either a benefit to be nurtured, or a source of problems to be kept at bay. This is scored very simply, either positive or negative (+ or -), or zero if there is no clear overall indication. Please do not assume that there is an obvious relationship with the answers to earlier questions.

1.4.1 Please enter a value (+, - or 0) alongside each group in the list.

**Question 1.5**

A further list (Stakeholder Requirements) is attached which shows the requirements for each group. Please examine this list carefully, and answer the following:

2.1.1 For each group, are there any significant requirements which have been left out or which need clarification? If so, please make comments in the list or in the box at the end of the list. You are not requested at this point to score them.

**STAKEHOLDER GROUPS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Synonyms</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Score 0-10</b>	<b>Involve ment 0-3</b>	<b>Benefit +/-/0</b>
Community	Members of the public, sponsorship	People who are affected by the organisation in ways over which they have no direct control. Includes visitors to premises and passers-by, who may be affected by noise, mess, obstructions etc.; also sponsorship and voluntary benevolent actions.			
Competitors		Other organisations which, either directly or through substitution, offer alternative products or services. There may be a need to support collective interests or trade reputation. Your relationship may also be defensive.			
Customers	Buyers,	Those responsible for			

	purchasers, clients	negotiating and ratifying contracts for the supply of goods or services. They receive goods or services, including those which may be passed on or resold to users or consumers within their own or other organisations.			
Directors	Organisation owners, trustees.	Those with final legal liability (fiducial responsibility) for the conduct of the organisation's affairs. Distinct from their roles as employees.			
Employees	Staff, people	Those who depend on the organisation for reward in return for labour. They may be represented indirectly by trades unions, staff associations or other bodies. They may be unpaid volunteers.			
Environment	Animal welfare, countryside, renewable	The natural environment, where it can be affected by levels of resource			

	energy.	extraction, resource denial or waste disposal especially where it cannot be compensated by natural processes.			
Government and regulators	Government offices, local authorities	Taxation, law enforcement agencies and other non-trading bodies which can invoke legally enforceable penalties for failure to comply with their standards or demands. Includes trade or profession specific regulators. Also includes politicians or lobbyists used to influence regulators.			
Infrastructure	Public resources	Publicly funded resources and infrastructure shared by the organisation with others, for which the availability may be affected for good or bad by the operations of the organisation.			
Investors	Shareholder	Providers of capital at			

	<p>s and stockholders</p>	<p>a rate of return determined by a competitive share market, and who have no direct influence over management.</p>			
Lenders	<p>Banks, credit agencies.</p>	<p>Providers of capital at a negotiated rate of return, and who may have some level of control over management and/or charge on assets.</p>			
Maintainers	<p>Servicers, technical support</p>	<p>Those responsible for the continuing capability of supplied goods or services to produce value for users. Includes replenishment of consumables as well as repairs. Can also apply to third party suppliers of products services procured by customers to support or accessorise products or services.</p>			
Parent		<p>Financially linked</p>			

organisations		organisations which have some level of control over the management.			
Partners	Alliances	Other organisations which have compatible aims, and for which there is an agreed, mutually advantageous relationship other than as a supplier or customer.			
Public media	News and editorial journalists	Those who provide a public information interface between the organisation and the community, other than as a paid supplier of advertising.			
Security	Natural phenomena, loss of amenity and criminal activity.	Mediation of the likelihood or effects of events outside the organisation and its normal activities. Includes fire, flood, earthquake, power cuts, and criminal activity related to physical or information resources.			

Subsidiaries	Franchisees	Financially linked organisations over which there is a formal level of control over the management.			
Suppliers		Providers of specific goods or services on a contract basis, but not necessarily a commercial basis for those goods or services which are free at the point of delivery.			
Trade associations	Professional bodies	Non-profit bodies accepting subscriptions in return for specialist information services and possibly development of relevant “state of the art”.			
Users	Consumers	Those who realise or share the end value of the product or service without passing it on, whether or not it is physically consumed in the process.			

**Additional group(s) and comments**

--

**STAKEHOLDER REQUIREMENTS**

<b>STAKEHOLDER GROUPS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR SATISFACTION</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
<b>Community</b>	
Safety on premises	
Safety off premises	
Convenience and accessibility on premises	
Convenience and accessibility off premises	
Voluntary contributions/sponsorship	
Promotion of cultural values	
<b>Competitors</b>	
Protection of industry reputation	
Development of industry standards	
Protection of information or relationships	
Fair play, honouring accepted standards	
<b>Customers</b>	
Information and advice on specification and suitability	
Transparency of price and life cost	
Product or service quality	
Value for money	
Low price	
Transparency of price and life cost	
Availability of product or service	
Suitability for purpose	

Reliability of supply	
Convenience of supply	
Process integration / support	
Opportunity for profit	
Quality of post-sales support (advice, complaints)	
Anticipating requirements	
Trustworthiness or reliability of relationship	
<b>Directors</b>	
Protection against litigation	
Reputation for social responsibility	
<b>Employees</b>	
Safe working conditions	
Comfortable working conditions	
Pay and benefits	
Personal status at work	
Creative opportunities	
Work-life balance and welfare	
Personal development opportunities	
Job satisfaction / fulfilment	
Employer's public image	
Employer's social responsibility	
Clear responsibilities and targets	
<b>Environment</b>	
Animal welfare and cruelty	
Safeguarding natural resources	
Conservation of energy	
<b>Government</b>	
Supply of statutory information	

Payment of taxes	
Compliance with trading law	
<b>Infrastructure</b>	
Protection from damage	
Support local economy	
Encourage use of public services	
Promotion of recreational amenity	
<b>Investors</b>	
Dividends	
Share value	
Transparency of activities	
General social responsibility	
Assurance of future prospects	
<b>Lenders</b>	
Timely payment of debts	
Accurate status information	
Trustworthiness	
<b>Maintainers</b>	
Technical information or training	
Technical backup on demand	
Availability of parts and consumables	
Tools and/or software	
<b>Parents</b>	
Return on investment	
Support for group image and reputation	
Compliance with group strategy	
<b>Partners</b>	
Protection of joint interests	
Clearly defined relationship	
Compliance with agreed relationship	

Trustworthiness	
<b>Public media</b>	
Positive public image	
Avoidance of scandal	
Frequent exposure	
<b>Purchasers</b>	
Information on specification and suitability	
Transparency of price and life cost	
Value for money	
Low price	
Availability of product/service	
Reliability of supply	
Convenience of supply	
Process integration / support	
Opportunity for profit	
Quality of service	
Anticipating requirements	
Trustworthiness	
<b>Security</b>	
Physical security, criminal	
Information security, criminal	
Natural disaster	
Loss of amenity	
<b>Subsidiaries</b>	
Strong corporate image	
Protection from competitors	
Finance	
Technical/process support	
Management support	

Trustworthiness	
<b>Suppliers</b>	
Clear specification of requirement	
Compliance with payment terms	
Process integration / support	
Creative opportunities for profit	
<b>Trade associations</b>	
Payment of fees	
Supply of statistical information	
Participation in working groups	
Contribution to state-of-the-art	
<b>Users</b>	
Product appearance	
Longevity	
Cost of use	
Ease of use	
Safety in use	
Suitability for purpose	
Handling of problems	
Innovative design or concept	
Product/service range or variety	

**Additional requirements and comments**

--