Wood, D.J., Mitchell, R.K., et al. (1998). Essay Forum: Voices from the Scholarly Generations of Business and Society—Values in the service of equity and plenty. Business & Society, 37(1): 98-100, March, 1998.

BUSINESS & SOCIETY

BUSINESS & SOCIETY

Volume 37, Number 1, March 1998

CONTENTS

Sage Periodicals Press A Division of SAGE Publications, Inc.
Thousand Oaks • London • New Dei

reference page

modern work life affects my life and my family's; and how modern technology was proclaimed to enable leisure time—yet it has only enabled us to work longer hours, now from our homes, our cars, airplanes, hotel rooms, and distant lands.

And so for *Business & Society* readers, this is what a member of the youngsters generation, as Donna Wood has named us, devotes her time pondering, worrying about, losing sleep over, and exploring in the hopes that a solution exists wherein we can respect each other enough to enable us to live and love our families.

Values in the Service of Equity and Plenty

RONALD MITCHELL
University of Victoria

In the summer of 1997, James G. Speth, administrator of the UN Development Programme, reported that "much of the developing world is not making it," that "more than 100 countries are worse off today than they were 15 years ago," that "1,700 human beings an hour (mostly children) continue to die from hunger and poverty related causes," and that "by the year 2000 half the people in sub-Saharan Africa will be living on incomes equal to less that $1 a day" (Speth, 1997: 177). Furthermore, when scarcities are combined with threats to elites, the result is often violence on a massive scale (Percival & Homer-Dixon, 1996). As a business and society scholar working in an information age, in which the communications media subtext inexorably proclaims inequities, I wonder whether the business-society interface—although appearing to operate at the pace of plate tectonics when viewed in first-world terms—may in reality be volcanic when viewed globally.

The business-society interface is terrain on which the forces of pragmatism and idealism engage. Examples include (a) CSR_1 and CSR_2 (Frederick, [1978] 1994), (b) the SIM-sponsored 1996 Academy of Management keynote address in which Bill Frederick reemphasized the influence of the spiritual on the material (Frederick, 1996), and (c) the imperative that power and urgency as stakeholder attributes must be attended to if managers are to serve the legal and moral interests of legitimate stakeholders (Mitchell, Agle, and Wood, 1997). Materialistic/spiritualistic (Weber, [1930] 1985) tensions characterize the world of the business and society scholar. And presently, as presaged by Weber, capitalism resting on "mechanical foundations" appears to have "emerged victorious," no longer in need of its spiritual moorings (Weber, [1930] 1985: 181). Yet, in the face of this victory, hundreds of millions of people experience plenty as merely an elusive ideal.

In interpreting Weber and Frederick, I understand the term spirituality to be used in its broadest sense as defined in the Merriam-Webster Dictionary to mean "sensitive to values," which (at least) includes religious ethics (such as Puritan asceticism in the case of Weber's essay); social responsibility at the individual, organizational, and societal levels of analysis (Wood, 1991); and general ethical decision making at the level of the individual and the organization (Jones, 1993). I view the term plenty through both an economic/historical and an economic/scriptural lens: the former to mean "having provisions in store for an uncertain future" (Durant, 1935: 2) thereby meeting security needs (Maslow, 1954), and the latter meaning, having "enough and to spare" (Luke 15:17). In this context, I believe that our field's most pressing challenge in the next decade is to ensure that trends toward the marginalization of spirituality in economic, political, and scholarly discourse do not result in an unwitting demise of plenty.

Thus, key questions for the field in the next decade include the following: How does the de facto theory of the firm contribute to pent up inequality? Can a fully dimensionalized stakeholder theory of the firm focus the powerful to benefit the legitimate? Before an eruption? And specifically as a scholar working at the entrepreneurship interface between business and society, I wonder whether the right to create organizations—which appears to be an inalienable artifact of the corporate age—has been sufficiently balanced with requisite duties?

In our field, there is no shortage of value frameworks from which to choose. In my view, our next-decade challenge is to find ways to effectively apply values in the service of equity and plenty, in an information age.

REFERENCES

Durant, Will. 1935. *The Story of Civilization*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Frederick, William C. [1978] 1994. "Classic Paper: From CSR_1 to CSR_2: The Maturing of Business-and-Society Thought." *Business & Society* 33:150-64.

———. 1996. "Moving to CSR_4: What to Pack for the Trip." SIM Keynote Address, Academy of Management meeting, Cincinnati, OH, August.

Jones, Thomas M. 1993. "Ethical Decision-Making by Individuals in Organizations: An Issue-Contingent Model." *Academy of Management Review* 16 (2): 366-95.

Maslow, Abraham H. 1954. *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper.
Mitchell, Ronald K., Agle, Bradley R., and Wood, Donna J. 1997. "Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts." *Academy of Management Review* 22 (4): 816-49.
Percival, V., and Homer-Dixon, T. 1996. "Environmental Scarcity and Violent Conflict: The Case of Rwanda." *Journal of Environment & Development* 5 (3): 270-84.
Speth, J. G. 1997. "Marshall's Living Legacy." *Foreign Affairs* 76 (4): 172-8.
Weber, Max. [1930] 1985. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Boston: Irwin.
Wood, Donna J. 1991. "Corporate Social Performance Revisited." *Academy of Management Review* 16 (4): 691-718.

Expanding Beyond Our Invisible College

GARY R. WEAVER
University of Delaware

I believe it was the well-known American logician W.V.O. Quine who observed that "the divisions in the university ought not be confused with divisions in the universe." Organization studies generally, and business and society studies specifically, appeal to me in part because they are structured (or perhaps I should say unstructured?) so as to incorporate an interdisciplinary outlook with relative ease. This makes business and society a somewhat unusual venue within which to study. This should not be surprising. If we think of the community of business and society scholars as analogous to an organization, we should expect the structure of our organization to mirror the complexity and dynamism of the business organizations and social institutions and practices we study. Call this a "contingency theory" of business and society research, if you wish. True, this organization of scholars is not always neatly arranged. Unclear or debatable goals (e.g., help business or revolutionize business or get tenure?) and different or disputed technologies (e.g., qualitative and/or quantitative, normative and/or empirical) and other circumstances of business and society research sometimes help it to resemble one of Cohen, March, and Olsen's organizational anarchies (1972), rather than a carefully structured organization.

The interdisciplinary character of business and society scholarship poses tensions. Business and society research may risk appearing merely derivative, applying insights of various other fields to a particular set of issues, in the way that engineering sometimes is alleged to be derivative

on the natural sciences. Efforts to practice engineering as if it were entirely derivative on pure sciences have prompted occasional disasters (e.g., the Tacoma Narrows bridge collapse [Billington, 1983]). Business and society researchers also can argue that the relationships among business organizations and societal institutions will not yield happily to the procrustean beds of more pedigreed fields of inquiry. But efforts to avoid appearances of being derivative (and thus marginalizable), however, might tempt efforts to create a sui generis theory of business and society—a business and society paradigm in the sense advocated for organization studies by Pfeffer (1993). Organization theories themselves suggest that this would be a mistake; complex environments require complex, multifaceted treatment.

A challenge for business and society research is to maintain its multifaceted, sometimes anarchic character in the face perceived institutional pressures to the contrary. Business and society research has profited from attention to other theories and disciplines—for example, decision making (psychology), agency theory (economics), institutional theory (sociology), normative ethics (philosophy). Though we have borrowed much, there remains much more to be borrowed and adapted in well-informed and creative fashion. That ability to adapt multiple theories and insights for understanding the complexities of business and society relationships is one of the value-adding contributions of business and society research. A key task for the future, then, is to see that our conversations continue to expand beyond the confines of the formally and informally constituted community of business and society researchers (i.e., our "invisible college"), so that the resources needed to better understand our complex subject will be available to us, and so that business and society will avoid becoming merely one more division in an academic world whose divisions often poorly fit the social universe it claims to study.

REFERENCES

Billington, David P. 1983. *The Tower and the Bridge: The New Art of Structural Engineering*. New York: Basic Books.
Cohen, Michael D., James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. 1972. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17:1-25.
Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1993. "Barriers to the Advance of Organizational Science: Paradigm Development as a Dependent Variable." *Academy of Management Review* 18:599-620.