

RICSI QUASI Seminar Series: 9/18/2020 Chat Transcription

Can shareholder-owned corporations maximize profits without harming their stakeholders?

Yes: Jill Brown; No: Jerry Davis; It depends: Rob Phillips; Moderator: Sandra Waddock

- 11:00:20 From Jonathan Bundy : He's slowly turning into Ed
- 11:12:24 From Ali Taleb : are you going to share a recorded video with attendees?
- 11:13:17 From Mike Barnett : We are recording it, but won't publicly post it. If you want access to the video, please email Deborah: dflemeng@business.rutgers.edu
- 11:13:22 From Sandra Waddock : Put your questions here!
- 11:14:16 From Robert Tomasko : Can debator's slides be available?
- 11:14:33 From Ali Taleb : 👍
- 11:15:14 From Mike Barnett : Sure, we'll find a way to post slides of all presenters who agree, on the Rutgers RICSi site.
- 11:15:36 From andy : Also almost all major benefits.
- 11:15:51 From Oded : Shareholders goal is to maximize firm value, not necessarily each year's profits. However, if taking care of stakeholders maximizes firm value, then isn't maximizing firm value an appropriate goal?
- 11:16:19 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : andy: +1
- 11:17:21 From Gastón de los Reyes : @Oded, how can you know that the "if" clause is true?
- 11:17:34 From andy : We apparently have no responsibility. Thank goodness. I have been feeling guilty.
- 11:17:39 From Irene M Henriques : Economist here - correct assessment
- 11:17:53 From Charles Cho : @Oded - problem is that only one stakeholder is "taken care of" (OK, 2 - shareholders and C-suite execs)
- 11:18:07 From Thomas Peyton Lyon : Many people are willing to sacrifice the snail darter for more Coke.
- 11:19:05 From Punit Arora : So, how about all the economic growth around the world- millions coming out of poverty? I think the problem is capitalism itself needs competition/threat from socialism to make it behave.
- 11:19:12 From Mike Barnett : Pretty sure Coke is made from snail darters
- 11:19:51 From Charles Cho : Share price... stock options... executive compensation... quarterly EPS, etc... (accountant here)
- 11:21:14 From Kathleen Rehbein : Isn't there also evidence that investors love CSR companies? (or the empirical evidence is split, decades of debate about this ?? they loved Unilever!
- 11:22:21 From Thomas Peyton Lyon : The Desjardins paper was focused on hedge funds, which buy up CSR firms, divest CSR activities, and leave the firm with reduced shareholder value 3 years later.
- 11:24:29 From Irene M Henriques : Canada's largest co-op , MEC, was just sold to an investment firm. Members are up in arms.
- 11:24:42 From Charles Cho : Koch is (tightly) private, for a reason
- 11:24:46 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : define "more humane"
- 11:24:55 From Thomas Peyton Lyon : The MEC story is sad. :-(
- 11:24:58 From rodolphe durand : Our DV is Tobin Q to be precise in the paper using activist Hedge Funds
- 11:25:52 From Thomas Peyton Lyon : Great paper, Rudy!
- 11:26:13 From Charles Cho : We almost all own shares (mutual funds, retirement plans...)?

11:26:20 From Caroline Flammer : I think we may need to be careful in assuming "shareholders" to be one homogenous group. There are vast differences among type of investors, and the tremendous growth of the # of signatories of the UN PRI (Principles of Responsible Investing) suggests that many shareholders indeed care about ESG and have a longer-term orientation (in contrast to, e.g., hedge funds)...

11:26:29 From rodolphe durand : Hope here? Danone voted at it last General Assembly (99% vote) to become a Public Benefit Corporation while being listed (Entreprise a Mission by the French Law voted in 2019 (Loi PACTE))...

11:26:57 From Jerry Davis : Rody can you post a link to your paper?

11:28:06 From rodolphe durand : <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/smj.3126>

11:28:08 From rodolphe durand : <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amj.2019.0238>

11:28:21 From rodolphe durand : here you go!

11:28:37 From Punit Arora : An ideological victory of capitalism over socialism has led to an environment of extreme capitalism. To soften its worst tendencies, we need a credible threat of socialism from somewhere! CSR can only put a band aid on a larger problem of absence of competition for capitalism

11:28:46 From Irene M Henriques : Mike will we get a copy of the chat? Some very interesting info here as well!!

11:29:37 From Lisa Kaplowitz : According to RBC, approx. 40% of companies commented on DEI initiatives and addressing racial inequities on their 2Q conference calls. Do you think (a) these words will convert into action and (b) do you think that this focus on other stakeholders will lead to increase in shareholder value?

11:29:43 From Mike Barnett : Hi Irene. I'll look into that -- not sure if we can record the chat.

11:29:54 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : to Punit's points, I highly recommend Halliday & Thrasher's book on "The Ethics of Capitalism"

11:29:55 From Sophie Bacq : I think Caroline makes a really important point: there is stakeholder heterogeneity but also shareholder heterogeneity — great insight from the UN PRI

11:30:02 From Jerry Davis : Mike: ctrl-A, and ctrl-C

11:30:11 From dorozco : First limited liability entity in the world was the East India Tea Co. The Queen granted limited liability to allow this risky venture.

11:30:24 From Cecile Betit : yes to save chat, click file and save

11:30:25 From Mike Barnett : Jerry - that saves the whole chat, or just screen capture?

11:30:33 From Charles Cho : THEY allowed the select all/copy function so should be easy to do/save

11:30:44 From Caroline Flammer : I encourage you to join me at the PRI Academic Week: <https://www.unpri.org/events/pri-academic-week/6208.article>

11:30:55 From Cecile Betit : saves whole chat usually

11:31:20 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : Caroline: thanks for the link!

11:31:25 From LEKHA WARRIER : I strongly believe that making a business case for creating social impact is futile. If firms were in it to just make profits, they'd be out of it the moment it challenges the economics of doing business! But sustainable investing (by some genuinely committed investors) comes as that last piece in this jig saw puzzle of making a 'responsible' business case. Influential investors who can direct and discipline companies in conducting business responsibly become crucial then to urge firms to create an auto-check on how they make those profits. Underline the fact that it is not just what the companies do with their profits, but also HOW they create it which matters.

11:31:28 From Jonathan Bundy : Jerry, can you post a reference to the book you mentioned?

11:32:20 From Jerry Davis : <https://www.bkconnection.com/books/title/the-vanishing-american-corporation>

11:32:29 From Ximena Vidal De Col : What was the book he just mentioned?

11:32:45 From Joris Gjata : Moral Tribes

11:32:55 From Irene M Henriques : @Sophie and @Caroline - is this heterogeneity large enough to force change?

11:33:15 From Sophie Bacq : <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/299057/moral-tribes-by-joshua-greene/>

11:33:18 From Ximena Vidal De Col : Thank you, Joris

11:33:55 From Ximena Vidal De Col : Thank you Sophie

11:34:14 From Joris Gjata : But reciprocity comes with expectations of possible comparison and equal starting points and also similar standards of evaluating and judging action - all of which are implied by competition and are not a great basis for embracing diversity and differences and acknowledging complexity with compassion

11:34:31 From Onna van den Broek : The goes back to the idea of bounded rationality which comes from the fact we do not know others' preferences, nor do we have all the information to form our selves (why rational choice doe snot work)

11:34:54 From Sophie Bacq : @Irene, I guess I would go with « it depends » but I am encouraged by the insight shared by Caroline; hopefully heterogeneity is growing or we can help it grow...

11:34:54 From Punit Arora : @Enrique- interesting book reference. Thx

11:35:11 From Charles Cho : @Onna - agree

11:35:24 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : @Punit: <https://www.amazon.com/Ethics-Capitalism-Introduction-Daniel-Halliday/dp/0190096217>

11:35:58 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : by the way, an entire chapter is devoted to socialism

11:36:05 From Punit Arora : Yes, I found it already

11:36:54 From Thomas Peyton Lyon : Sadly, it seems to be quite easy for those in power to shred ethical norms if they have powerful media propaganda behind them.

11:37:20 From Caroline Flammer : @Irene: the heterogeneity is indeed large. whether it is large enough to force change? Good question. What is clear however is that there is tremendous growth in responsible investing. Just to give you a sense, the United Nations' Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI)—the largest network of responsible investors—was launched in 2006 and nowadays counts over 3,000 signatories representing more than \$100 trillion in assets under management. Overall, responsible investing corresponds to over 25% of all professionally managed assets globally.

11:37:24 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : @Thomas but see Trump

11:38:07 From Charles Cho : Yes, the "ethical" norms are usually shaped, decided and implemented by the elite and powerful

11:38:13 From Thomas Peyton Lyon : That's what I meant.

11:38:59 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : if stakeholders really mattered, we would see more of them on boards

11:39:34 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : no one mentioned senator warren's proposed "accountable capitalism act"

11:39:49 From Ben Strauss : do you think governments and business have a different role in your schema of the world? How does shareholder theory say they should interact?

11:39:50 From Kathleen Rehbein : there have been an increase in diversity, racial and gender, not quickly enough, but there are CSR committees, and stakeholders have been put on boards...

11:40:03 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : her bill would would require employee representation on boards

11:40:13 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : now it's all cheap talk

11:40:27 From Rosalie Luo : we also have bounded ethicality, as Chugh and Kern (2016) point out: http://people.stern.nyu.edu/kscarbro/dolly/2016_ROB.pdf

11:40:28 From Mike Barnett : Everyone please mute

11:40:40 From Charles Cho : CSR committees = more symbolic than anything...

11:40:53 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : @charles +1

11:40:54 From Charles Cho : @Enrique - agree

11:41:20 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : the day I see employees on boards is the day I will take car seriously

11:41:24 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : csr

11:41:31 From Umar Boodoo : @Enrique - Theresa May tried to get stakeholder rep. on boards post-Brexit to create a new, fairer Britain. That didn't go anywhere

11:41:49 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : @umar same with warren's bill

11:42:04 From Kathleen Rehbein : Employee equity---Chobani? might be a better model

11:42:04 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : that's why I say it's all cheap talk

11:42:22 From Charles Cho : Talk is cheap and easy

11:42:30 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : hear hear

11:42:45 From Onna van den Broek : stakeholders on boards means other powerful players off the boards, so if the powerful decide, it might not be in "their" interests?

11:43:26 From Vijaya Narapareddy : thank you for arranging such an interesting and timely debate. will you be able to send a link to access this recording? thank you!

11:43:34 From Mike Barnett : Perhaps I could ask each presenter to offer at least one new specific research question that you think that researchers should be focused on

11:43:37 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : yes, what a great discussion

11:43:41 From Charles Cho : @Onna - need to empower the employees

11:43:47 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : @Mike +1

11:44:21 From Ronei Leonel : @Mike +2

11:45:00 From Charles Cho : @ Enrique - wait, you are at UCF????? My triple alma mater!! Private chat now ;-)

11:45:00 From LEKHA WARRIER : @Mike +3!

11:45:00 From Lisa Kaplowitz : 40% of companies said they are going to address racial inequities on their 2Q conference calls. they have now said it so investors and other stakeholders can hold them accountable because many gave targets of what that means (representation, philanthropy, pay, etc)

11:45:19 From Vijaya Narapareddy : i hope this discussion is being recorded

11:46:02 From Punit Arora : Zoom records all chat automatically by default

11:46:10 From Mike Barnett : Yes, we're recording it.

11:46:26 From Mike Barnett : Also, have a court reporter and sketch artist

11:46:33 From Punit Arora : lol

11:46:50 From Vijaya Narapareddy : thank you! look forward to receiving the link to this recording

11:46:55 From Joris Gjata : Thank you Sandra for mentioning nature alongside society! We need to put the more than human world as part of the relationships we need to tend and develop similarly to the social relations we other humans.

11:47:02 From John Maxwell : Not sure how we can have a discussion about business and society/stakeholder, norms etc. without talking about regulation - good, bad or indifferent.

11:47:14 From Ben Strauss : agreed

11:47:23 From Joris Gjata : Ditto John!

11:47:59 From Irene M Henriques : @John - government is not just another stakeholder here. We need to bring this actor in as the critical referee

11:48:21 From John Maxwell : @Irene agree!

11:48:40 From Tricia Olsen : @John and @Irene — I have a paper that looks at the state as a unique stakeholder in BEQ. Might be of interest... :)

11:49:00 From John Maxwell : Thanks

11:49:01 From Irene M Henriques : @Tricia please post link

11:49:18 From Sandra Waddock : How does value creation change the lens?

11:49:24 From Tricia Olsen : @Irene Here you go!
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/business-ethics-quarterly/article/political-stakeholder-theory-the-state-legitimacy-and-the-ethics-of-microfinance-in-emerging-economies/4FCB51D35527EA8CF549C11D6A646FCC>

11:49:43 From Ximena Vidal De Col : Value as profits can be measured--something tangible, feeds into our capitalist and consumerist culture. How else can you measure "value" that is immediate, tangible, and affects shareholders directly?

11:49:56 From John Maxwell : @Tricia - thanks!

11:50:02 From Tricia Olsen : Not sure that worked. Here you go:
<https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2016.59>

11:51:35 From Gerard : who are stakeholders? most models do not mention future generations

11:51:44 From Joris Gjata : Just by keeping our conversations in terms of 'individuals' keeps us within the neoliberal discourse and will not lead to finding solutions!

11:52:16 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : @Gerard see Derek Parfit

11:52:37 From Jill Brown : Substituting value creation for profit max lends itself more readily to shared utility arguments...a la Bosse et al....Harrison and Wicks (2013) identify other indicators of value creation....fairness of exchange, happiness in the relationship....

11:52:40 From Marcelo de la Cruz : I think it more the managing of tensions than trade-offs

11:53:09 From Frank de Bakker : @Gerard many individuals are employees, neighbours, shareholders all in one indeed

11:53:46 From Ximena Vidal De Col : Individualism is so engrained in our culture. Goes back the protestant ethic--how can we change our individualistic mentality to a collective one?

11:53:47 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : wait, what's wrong with capitalism again?

11:54:16 From Danyang Chen : @ Marcelo de la Cruz I am on you. Like some decoupling strategy to solve the kind of tension

11:54:36 From John Maxwell : Platform companies are exempt from responsibility for things users post. This impacts Facebook's reluctant behavior regarding posts. Once they dabble in controlling content they impact this exemption. Facebook lives in a legal regulatory system it isn't fully free to do what it wants.

11:54:45 From Mike Barnett : Paul is featured next month!

11:55:14 From Charles Cho : No, we drive on the "right" :-)... and we use metric system like the rest of the world :-)

11:55:43 From Paul Adler : Adler - The 99 Percent Economy: How Democratic Socialism Can Overcome the Crises of Capitalism. (Oxford UP)

11:55:56 From Joris Gjata : @Jerry but why do we care about those? Whom in power makes them irresistible to ignore?

11:56:17 From Joris Gjata : And how can regulation really play a role in here?

11:56:32 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : I call your Adler and raise you: Tyler Cowen, Big Business: Love Letter to an American Anti-Hero

11:57:20 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : have to go; have another zoom at noon; thanks to all

11:57:37 From Alberto Aragon-Correa : Any research great papers on the effects of alternative approaches (systems, regulations, or companies)?

11:57:38 From Ximena Vidal De Col : Just a reminder--when buying books, let's try to buy from black-owned businesses :)

11:57:55 From Ximena Vidal De Col : Or used books stores, too!

11:58:27 From Charles Cho : Make money but to whose expense?

11:58:32 From Gerard : yes, frequency trading

11:58:44 From Onna van den Broek : Reminds of the book of paul mason on Postcapitalism!

11:59:50 From Lisa Meyer : Amazon continues to drive share value with no (or low) profits. They can do it because the shareholders allow it.

11:59:54 From Oded : By definition, profit is the residual after all stakeholders other than the shareholders are paid.

12:00:10 From Charles Cho : Profit increase/stability is linked to share price so shareholders automatically get rich

12:01:06 From Cecile Betit : How does this week's Rand report on wages, affect this discussion?

12:01:28 From Sophie Bacq : @Rob: does that mean we need new governance mechanisms to rule what leaders do with the profit that has been maximized? Who (what institutions) would enforce these potentially new rules?

12:02:03 From Charles Cho : But "profit" can also be all "on paper" by the "magic" of accrual accounting :-)... Profitable, no cash, share price increase

12:02:24 From Irene M Henriques : Perspective of economic development from an Indigenous perspective...

12:02:33 From Deborah Flamengo : Hi all. For access to today's recording or any other information, please email me at dflameng@business.rutgers.edu. Thanks!

12:03:05 From Nancy DiTomaso : Companies cannot do things only with regard to their own companies. Business leaders have a moral responsibility to the society as well as to their own firms. And we have to keep the systemic versus individual distinction. Government is supposedly the collective means to protect individuals and groups from tyranny, but tyranny can be built into the government and to large and wealthy organizations that can escape any efforts to regulate or constrain them. Note that Federalist 10 is about restraining the ability of the majority to vote for redistribution from the minority of property owners.

12:03:28 From Marc Ventresca to Deborah Flamengo(Privately) : Thank you for all the infrastructure work. Great session.

12:03:46 From Lisa Meyer : shareholder activists and C-Suite incentives drive short-termism - It IS part of the system.

12:04:18 From Enrique Guerra-Pujol : @nancy federalist 10 is about factions (including lobby groups financed by wealth corps)

12:04:20 From Irene M Henriques : @Charles - that is what Nortel did and it finally caught up to them and went bankrupt - so many people lost their pensions

12:04:24 From Ximena Vidal De Col to Deborah Flamengo(Privately) : Yes, just saw it. Thank you

12:05:19 From Charles Cho : @Irene- yep, my good friend Michel Magnan wrote a paper on that... the rise and fall of Nortel (JBE I think). Sad.

12:05:20 From Mike Barnett : If others want to suggest very specific research questions that they think need to be asked -- things they'd love to see in papers they read and review -- please post them.

12:05:42 From Brian Kelleher Richter - UT Austin : To Caroline's comment Nobel Prize winning economist Oliver Hart has a paper on this

12:05:45 From Kathleen Rehbein :
1. Sikavica K, Perrault E, Rehbein K. Who Do They Think They Are? Identity as an Antecedent of Social Activism by Institutional Shareholders. Business & Society. 2020;59(6):1228-1268. doi:10.1177/0007650318762752

12:06:09 From Charles Cho : <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-008-9680-9>

12:07:00 From Alberto Aragon-Correa : Yes, thank you Mike! Specific questions for future research would be great

12:07:15 From Jill Brown : @Caroline F-Yes! Institutional shareholders could/should play a role in shifting the focus of business...they have the power

12:07:49 From Thomas Peyton Lyon : Wow, Jerry, you are abandoning objective research! Very exciting.

12:08:19 From Ante Glavas : I fully agree on needing research that does not just analyze the past, but if we were to analyze the past, one question is what works well and what can be build on?

12:08:36 From Jonathan Bundy : Hi Everyone. Shameless plug. AMR will be announcing a Special Topic Forum next week (papers due Oct 1, 2021). Lots of good ideas here could fit the call!

12:08:41 From Marc Ventresca : with @Jerry on this point even while appreciating @Mike's efforts. The question of institutional design as a practice is a 'new' agenda for management school faculty. Not welcome by many.

12:08:43 From Charles Cho : Shareholders (whatever type) usually think about 3 things: share price, stock price and shareholders (and self-interest maximization of all 3) :-)

12:08:48 From Caroline Flammer : @Jil: And they are ... here is a list of top academic articles on shareholder engagement on ESG issues: <https://www.unpri.org/academic-research/top-academic-resources-on-responsible-investment/4417.article>

12:08:49 From Sandra Waddock : See my new paper: Reframing and Transforming Economics around Life. Sustainability-Management, September 2020, 12, 7553; DOI: 10.3390/su12187553, <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/18/7553/pdf>.

12:10:35 From Gastón de los Reyes :
<https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/08/companies-stand-solidarity-are-licensing-themselves-discriminate/614947/>

12:11:05 From Gastón de los Reyes : Signatories to Business Roundtable Statement did more layoffs and stock buybacks

12:11:28 From Caroline Flammer : @ Jill: institutional investors are increasingly pushing their portfolio companies to adopt i) a longer-term orientation, and ii) social and environmental issues.

12:12:29 From Michael Pirson : i argue the question of " human nature" going beyond people are complex or home economicus is critical as basis for org design..multilevel selection theory could be helpful in explaining human and org survival

12:12:56 From dorozco : wow

12:13:04 From rodolphe durand : A potentially promising question could be: how to maximise operational/Financial and non-Financial performance (for decision markers), and what conséquences for share value and wealth redistribution?

12:13:08 From Irene M Henriques : Share prices are now disconnected from the economy. How can share prices be rising under COVID?

12:13:19 From Charles Cho : Markets are efficient... ? (JK :-))))))

12:13:32 From Kathleen Rehbein : Good point Irene!!

12:13:40 From Alberto Aragon-Correa : @Mark is not just about analyzing the past (from a quantitative point of view), but about offering "specific" guidance to the world. Otherwise, our perspectives could be "a too much" academic discussion.

12:13:48 From Charles Cho : Markets = social construction

12:14:08 From Sophie Bacq : Rudy, interesting question... what difference did you mean between value and wealth in posing your question?

12:14:34 From Robert Bwana : @Irene could it be capital rush to the few companies that shareholders are sure will survive the pandemic in good standing?

12:14:43 From Marc Ventresca : To @Alberto: There are varied, rich literatures on design, system, regulations, companies. Would be a good project to assemble some focused sets of readings that speak to these per @Jerry encouragement and others - where to put intellectual and policy energy.

12:14:56 From Marc Ventresca : Who has already a reading list per @Alberto's question?

12:15:13 From Thomas Peyton Lyon : @Irene Most of the gains seem to be in the handful of Big Tech companies, as we move our whole lives online.

12:15:22 From Nancy DiTomaso : Federalist 10 may be about factions, but it is primarily about propertied factions versus the majority without property. From Wikipedia (sorry tried to find something short): "Specifically, Madison feared that the unpropertied classes would use their majority power to implement a variety of measures that redistributed wealth. There could be "a rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property, or for any other improper or wicked project," Madison warns (Dawson 1863, p. 64). In short, Madison feared that a majority faction of the unpropertied classes might emerge to redistribute wealth and property in a way that benefited the majority of the population at the expense of the country's richest and wealthiest people."

12:15:38 From Irene M Henriques : @Robert some has said that the sport gamblers have entered the market and have seen great

12:15:39 From Alberto Aragon-Correa : Thank you @Marc!

12:16:33 From Mike Barnett : A flip side, too: what research questions can we stop asking ASAP???

12:17:18 From Charles Cho : Yes, agree with Irene... these are systemic problems

12:17:19 From Michael Pirson : another research frame can be informed by Fiske anthropological model of grammars of social relations..how to organize in addition to market pricing..

12:17:20 From Robert Bwana : True. You manage what you measure

12:18:30 From dorozco : Are customers also complicit stakeholders?. I am not on facebook. Never liked it and thought it was creepy.

12:18:34 From Umar Boodoo : Easier said than done that we should stop using stock price as our DV. Write a paper as a junior scholar with a very different DV and submit it to a good enough journal and what you get is: "explain the DV"

12:18:56 From Lisa Meyer : we are not addressing C-Suite incentives based upon share price

12:19:00 From Charles Cho : The only way???

- 12:19:11 From Nancy DiTomaso : What Jerry's sister should do depends on what kind of social support is otherwise available to have a decent life. If it is only individual wealth, then she needs to be more focused on stock price, but if there is more support from the government (from collective taxes) for all citizens, then she can be less concerned about what her retirement life might look like.
- 12:19:38 From Disen Huang : Thaler's book "Nudge" actually advises people not to look at their portfolios on any kind of regular basis
- 12:19:39 From Gastón de los Reyes : How about talking to shareholders as a way to find out what they care about?
- 12:19:51 From Charles Cho : Shareholders might be different but they trade on the same market, hence the same shares, etc
- 12:20:40 From Lisa Meyer : CEOs don't care about Jerry's sister.
- 12:20:49 From Caroline Flammer : In terms of research questions: based on this conversation, we may want to move beyond the CSR-CFP question and rather look at whether/how responsible corporate behavior has REAL impact (in the real economy) ... so pick outcome variables that are not related to operating performance and/or stock market reaction.
- 12:21:09 From Michael Pirson : the ethical systems approach by Jonathan Haidt et al could help and aligns evolutionary and anthropological insights about human nature
- 12:21:26 From Irene M Henriques : @Caroline - yes impact is what we need to think about
- 12:21:32 From rodolphe durand : yes, like employment growth in disadvantaged vs. advantaged areas
- 12:21:55 From Robert Bwana : Isn't tax 'avoidance' also a contributing factor? Some issues tackled by CSR used to be the governments domain but if tax receipts do not grow alongside corporate growth, wouldn't it lead to such a situation?
- 12:22:43 From Irene M Henriques : We may want to include the sense of place as an important variable.
- 12:22:47 From Timothy Devinney : It is interesting that no one talks about the issue of who has property rights claims on the corporation's assets. Shareholders have one set of rights but so do debt holders (which no one is talking about). This is seen most notably in family and privately equity owned firms. Most firms are NOT public and their owners are not who we think they are.
- 12:23:18 From Alberto Aragon-Correa : Good point @Caroline, @Irene, @Rodolphe! "(Social) Impact" as DV.
- 12:23:56 From Onna van den Broek : And perhaps look more at the boundary conditions: what type of shareholder-owned firms (e.g. size, industry, context) can maximise value (instead of just profit) that does no harm (or even provide good) for their stakeholders (which are these? What types of responsibilities are they "require"?)
- 12:24:01 From Mike Barnett : The JOM paper I linked to above argues for social impact as DV, and notes that it has been missing from the more than 6200 published articles on CSR outcomes
- 12:24:11 From Sophie Bacq : Right Rudy, a focus on different outcomes—seems like what the AMR CFP is calling for too. What are the « DVs » that matter in practice and that we have a responsibility to research
- 12:24:15 From Timothy Devinney : Also, there has been no discussion of 'performance' .. as we point out in a number of papers there are dimensions of performance and while these are correlated they are distinct.

12:25:50 From Jonathan Bundy : Yes Sophie, that's exactly the idea. What outcomes should we be focused on, and why?

12:25:56 From Jill Brown : I teach at 12:30...gotta run!!!

12:26:18 From Cecile Betit : Thank you one and all!!

12:26:48 From Kathleen Rehbein : Thank you a great panel and discussion!!

12:27:13 From Ben Strauss : Thank you! So many good points! I want to watch again!

12:27:18 From Charles Cho : B-corps is a good option (maybe)

12:27:32 From Caroline Flammer : Echo this

12:28:18 From rodolphe durand : bravo, really great conversation!

12:28:47 From Jerry Davis : <https://democratizingwork.org/>

12:28:57 From Sophie Bacq : Yes!

12:29:28 From rp : Robert Dahl?

12:29:37 From Frank de Bakker : Thanks all - great debate!

12:29:39 From Tricia Olsen : Thanks, all, for an interesting conversation! Stay well.

12:29:45 From nc7329 : What a great panel, really enjoyed this debate!

12:30:00 From Charles Cho : This was a really great conversation, thanks!

12:30:01 From Rosalie Luo : thanks everyone!

12:30:02 From Marcelo de la Cruz : Thank you very much!

12:30:02 From Sezen Aksin Sivrikaya : thanks all! stay well.

12:30:04 From dorozco : applause!!!

12:30:11 From Svetlana Flankova : Very insightful discussion - thank you!

12:30:13 From Antigoni Papadimitriou : Thank you

12:30:18 From Yoseph Mamo : Thank you very much!!

12:30:20 From Ante Glavas : Applause - great session, thank you!

12:30:26 From Paul Adler : thank you everyone - terrific discussion!

12:30:34 From Sebastian Hafenbrädl : Thanks all, great session!

12:30:36 From Patia McGrath : This was great, thank you!

12:30:44 From Charles Cho : NO it is not :-)

12:30:53 From Sophie Bacq : Fascinating, thank you ALL!!

12:31:06 From Irene M Henriques : Thank you

12:31:08 From Joris Gjata : Thank you everyone!

12:31:08 From Paola Garrone : thank you all

12:31:09 From Sarah Woodside : Thank you!

12:31:11 From Charles Cho : Thanks Mike, thanks everyone!

12:31:11 From Ximena Vidal De Col : Thank you for this session! Thought-provoking and inspiring.

12:31:13 From Umair Shah : Thank you

12:31:14 From Jonathan Bundy : Thanks!

12:31:27 From Ali Taleb : thank you

12:31:33 From Alberto Aragon-Correa : Thank you all of you! Great discussion