

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. A GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

Term	Definition
Accountability	Liabile to be called to account, or to be responsible to
Agency theory	One party (the principal) engages another party (the agent) to perform services on the principal's behalf, by delegating decision-making authority to the agent (Godfrey et al., 1997, p. 262)
Analytical hierarchy process	A methodology, which allows both quantitative and qualitative criteria, which are expressed in either financial or non-financial terms, to be compared pairwise in order to facilitate a decision as to the most appropriate choice for a stated objective (Saaty, 1980)
Bounded moral rationality	Individual moral agents are constrained in their ability to discover and process morally relevant facts necessary to implement their preferred ethical theories (Donaldson & Dunfee, 1999, p. 29)
Descriptive stakeholder studies	Studies which describe and explain specific corporate characteristics and behaviour through concepts outlined in the theory (Donaldson & Preston, 1995)
Ethnography	The scientific description and classification of the various cultural and racial groups of humankind (The Macquarie Dictionary, 1997, p. 727)
Hypernorm	A principle based on a thin universal morality, that by its nature is so fundamental that it evaluates lower-order norms. They are discernible in a convergence of religious, political, and philosophical thought (Donaldson & Dunfee, 1999, p. 44)
Instrumental stakeholder studies	Studies which identify the relationship between stakeholder management and conventional corporate objectives (Donaldson & Preston, 1995)

APPENDIX A. (Continued)

Term	Definition
Legitimacy	In relation to stakeholder management, legitimacy reflects the degree to which the claims of the particular grouping are logically inferable and justified according to your beliefs (The Macquarie Dictionary, 1997, p. 1227)
Likert scaling	A unidimensional scaling method used to measure the strength of a particular concept or assertion. Scaling can be either dichotomous (agree vs. disagree) or interval response, i.e., 1 to 5 rating
Moral relativism	The view that moral standards are grounded only in social custom. The most famous statement of relativism in general is by the ancient Greek sophist Protagoras (480–411 BCE.): “Man is the measure of all things”
Moral universalism	The view that moral principles have universal validity. Unlike relativism, they are not relative to the particular interests or goals of individuals, societies, or cultures. They are norms, principles, policies, or goals that are not a function of time or place
Normative stakeholder studies	Prescriptive studies which interpret the function of the corporation in relation to basic moral or philosophical guidelines (Donaldson & Preston, 1995, p. 71)
Power	In relation to stakeholder management, power reflects the degree to which the particular grouping can effect or have the capability of instigating change, or be able to carry out its will
Social contract	An informal agreement between an organisation and one or more of its group constituents, whereby an organisation’s legitimate right to exist is dependent on the satisfaction of certain social welfare criteria, such as protection of its natural environmental surroundings and commitment to health and safety issues
Stakeholder	Groups or individuals who can affect and are affected by, the achievement of an organisation’s mission (Freeman, 1983, p. 38)
Stakeholder paradox	The notion that the multi-fiduciary duty to a range of organisational participants detracts from the strategic obligation that the firm has to the private property of

APPENDIX A. (Continued)

Term	Definition
	the stockholder. Underlying the paradox is the separation thesis, which states that an organisation can never be firm-strategic (business without ethics), while at the same time owing a multi-fiduciary duty to other stakeholders (ethics without business), underlies this stakeholder paradox (Goodpaster, 1991)
Stakeholder statutes	Legislation aimed at broadening the fiduciary “duty of care” that directors owe, to encompass the rights of organisational stakeholders other than shareholders
Stakeholder theory	Based on a democratic participatory concept, whereby an organisation, for both moral (normative) and economic (instrumental) reasons, embraces the viewpoints of constituents other than stockholders, who are effected by the achievement of the organisation’s mission (Freeman, 1983, p. 38) and explicitly systems-based view of the organisation (Gray et al., 1996, p. 45)
Stakeholder typology	A set of three attributes (legitimacy, power, and urgency) that constitute prominence, a measure of perceived influence a stakeholder has on an organisation (Mitchell et al., 1997)
Urgency	In relation to stakeholder management, urgency reflects the degree to which the claims of the particular grouping are of pressing or current importance as an issue. Mitchell et al. (1997, p. 867) state that urgency is based on the following two conditions: (1) time sensitivity and (2) criticality

APPENDIX B. SUMMARY USE OF STAKEHOLDER TERMINOLOGY

Article	Managers	Creditors	Environmental Groups	Shareholders	Employees	Customers	Government	Community	Suppliers	Other
Stanford Research Institute (1963)		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Ansoff (1965)	✓			✓	✓	✓			✓	
Rhenman (1968)		✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	
Freeman (1983, p. 35)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cornell and Shapiro (1987, p. 5)		✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
Evan and Freeman (1988, p. 101)	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Freeman and Evan (1990, p. 337)	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Carroll (1991, p. 44)			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Clarkson (1991, p. 336)				✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Clarkson, Deck and Shiner (1992, p. 1)				✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Hill and Jones (1992, p. 133)	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	

Hosseini and Brenner (1992, p. 100)				✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Roberts (1992, p. 597)		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Macey and Miller (1993, p. 403)		✓			✓	✓		✓	✓	
Dooley and Lerner (1994, p. 705)				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Freeman (1994, p. 415)		✓			✓	✓		✓	✓	
Donaldson and Preston (1995, p. 69)				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Donaldson and Dunfee (1995, p. 88)				✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Harrison and St.John (1996, p. 50)			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Atkinson, Waterhouse & Wells (1997, p. 27)				✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Agle, Mitchell and Sonnenfeld (1999, p. 508)				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Total	4	8	3	18	21	21	5	18	18	7

APPENDIX C. CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER LITERATURE

Study	Classification	Contribution
Freeman (1983)	Normative	A foundation article. The stakeholder concept is central to the strategic management paradigm, and can help to identify strategic direction, strategic formulation, where resource allocation should be made, evaluation of strategies, and the macro systems and structures necessary for implementation. Case studies used as demonstrations
Cornell and Shapiro (1987)	Instrumental	Corporate financial policy and strategy depends on the role of non-investor stakeholders because of the implicit claims made to them which affect the value of the firm
Evan and Freeman (1988)	Normative	The stakeholder concept is the core idea behind the contractual view of the firm. The firm is conceptualised as a series of multilateral contracts among stakeholders, which provide a mechanism by which safeguards can be implemented
Barton, Hill, and Sundaram (1989)	Descriptive/ empirical	Empirical testing of Cornell and Shapiro (1987). Found firms with closely related products, markets technologies tended to have lower debt ratios than firms with unrelated businesses
Roberts and King (1989)	Instrumental	Used a case study in a U.S. government agency to show how a stakeholder audit can be an effective management tool
Gomolka, Chittipeddi, and Schenk (1990)	Descriptive/ empirical	Provides an overall summary of the state of stakeholder literature to date. Concludes that existing theory generally involves normative propositions and lacks operationalisation. Greater focus needs to be on corporate behaviour and its effects rather than morality judgments

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Freeman and Evan (1990)	Instrumental	Stakeholder interpretation is seen as a part of corporate governance, where the corporation is seen as a number of voluntary multilateral contracts with endogenous safeguards
Preston and Sapienza (1990)	Descriptive/empirical	Stakeholder performance indicators such as financial soundness, retention of quality employees, quality of products, and social responsibility were highly correlated between firms, and were also associated with corporate profitability and growth
Brenner and Cochran (1991)	Instrumental	Presents the stakeholder theory's four basic propositions: (1) fulfillment of stakeholder needs, (2) stakeholder value examination, (3) structuring and implementing choice processes, and (4) identification of stakeholders and their values; explores arguments supporting its usefulness, and outlines how the theory may influence business and society research
Carroll (1991)	Normative	Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is constituted by four elements: economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic. A framework is then developed whereby these elements are linked to stakeholder accountability under three different types of management: immoral, amoral, and moral
Clarkson (1991)	Instrumental	Stakeholder management model developed to provide a framework for case studies and analysis of the corporate social performance of corporations
Goodpaster (1991)	Normative	Stakeholder theory is a paradox because the relationship between managers and stockholders is ethically different, because of a fiduciary-duty obligation, from that between managers and other parties. Greater attention must be given to the nature of moral obligation and its limits on the principal-agent relationship

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Kreiner and Bhambri (1991)	Descriptive/ empirical	Organisations only gave priority to public policy issues generated by institutional stakeholders who were represented through specialised staff structures within a technical environment who are necessary for a firm's support and legitimacy
Savage, Nix, Whitehead, and Blair (1991)	Instrumental	Describes how each stakeholder's potential to threaten or co-operate can be classified as supportive, mixed-blessing, non-supportive, and marginal, which can then be used by the firm to manage and facilitate change
Vitell and Singhapakdi (1991)	Descriptive/ empirical	Strict enforcement of ethical codes within organisations, leads to marketers both valuing their company and client interests more highly. Therefore, elements of the organisational environment and personal experiences impact the perception of stakeholder (organisation, clients, peers) importance
Den Uyl (1992)	Normative	Replacing "stockholder" with "stakeholder" undermines the fiduciary relationship between managers and stockholders. Stakeholder theory subjects the organisation to views which are "politically savvy"
Hill and Jones (1992)	Normative	Recognises both the notions of power and efficiency in one framework to increase the predictive power of earlier theories of the firm such as agency and resource dependence theory. The resulting stakeholder-agency theory, therefore, accommodates the necessary adjustment mechanisms following short-term disequilibrium
Hosseini and Brenner (1992)	Instrumental	Proposes a multicriteria decision modelling approach, utilising the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) to estimate stakeholder value matrix weights

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Pinfield and Berner (1992)	Descriptive/ empirical	Used a Canadian case study to illustrate the growth in news articles of a large logging company over 15 years, specifically attributed to stakeholder concern over land use and pollution. Corporations need to respond to stakeholder challenges
Roberts (1992)	Descriptive/ empirical	Stakeholder theory explains social responsibility disclosure (SRD), as measures of stakeholder power (percentage owned by management, corporate political contributions, debt/equity ratios), strategic posture (corporate affairs staff, philanthropic contributions), and economic performance (return on equity) are related to SRD
Wang and Dewhurst (1992)	Descriptive/ empirical	Distinct stakeholder groups are perceived by U.S. directors. Directors have high stakeholder orientations, and directors view some stakeholders differently depending on director occupation (CEO vs. non-CEO and type (inside vs. outside)
Brenner (1993)	Normative	Greater understanding of organisational behaviour can be attained through a stakeholder theory of the firm's choice process model, which recognises the impact of the nature of stakeholder's values, stakeholder's relative levels of influence, organisational situational factors, the nature of the decision, and organisational structure
Steadman and Garrison (1993)	Instrumental	Despite the supplementation of U.S. firms for Japanese firms as economic leaders, traditional comparisons based on performance and value may not be appropriate because U.S. firms, unlike their Japanese counterparts, have moved from a "stockholder" to a "stakeholder" perspective, which may have implications for managerial success

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Altman and Petkus (1994)	Instrumental	Application of social marketing principles can help non-governmental stakeholders to articulate their policy desires and enhance successful environmental policy development and implementation
Dooley and Lerner (1994)	Descriptive/ empirical	Economic performance is found to moderate the relationship between CEO responsiveness to stakeholder concerns and pollution performance variables such as total and direct toxic releases, despite the fact that a CEO may have a strong community orientation
Freeman (1994)	Normative	Cannot divorce the ideas of a moral community with the value-creating activity of business, which has been advocated (Goodpaster, 1991) by the separation thesis (business and ethics can be separated). There is, therefore, no stakeholder paradox (which infers that it is illegitimate to base corporate decisions on ethical values that exceed fiduciary requirements)
Gregory and Keeney (1994)	Descriptive/ empirical	A stakeholder approach was used in a workshop in Malaysia to serve as a basis for improved discussion and dialogue to identify policy alternatives based on trade-offs between economic and environmental objectives
Lerner and Fryxell (1994)	Descriptive/ empirical	CEO preferences have only a modest influence on corporate social activity. Only corporate philanthropy was positively related to CEO community orientation. Preferences were constrained by external conditions and internal inertia
Steadman, Green, and Zimmerer (1994)	Instrumental	Japanese firms who have higher levels of economic efficiency than their U.S. counterparts, by their nature are able to mitigate the demands of stakeholder

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Tilt (1994)	Descriptive/ empirical	groups. Due to differences in societal expectations, there will never be a level global playing field Pressure groups (stakeholders), in particular, environmental groups, are the main users of corporate social disclosure (CSD). Pressure groups desire standards/legislation to enforce social responsibility, preferably through external social audits. There are high levels of dissatisfaction by pressure groups toward current levels of CSD
Wicks, Gilbert, and Freeman (1994)	Normative	Stakeholder theory can be understood in “feminist” terms as recognising value in a network of stakeholders, developing communication, decentralising power and authority, and generating consensus
Clarkson (1995)	Normative	Provides a framework for analysing stakeholder relationships under different ideological, political, cultural, and economic conditions. The extent of stakeholder management is a function of the normative core of an ideology
Donaldson and Dunfee (1995)	Normative	Proposes an Integrative Social Contracts Theory that allows humans to agree to hypothetical social contracts. Allows self-selected economic communities to set their own norms of ethical behaviour. Respects moral diversity present in economic communities
Donaldson and Preston (1995)	Normative	Major study, which provides a categorisation of stakeholder literature to date into studies which reflect its normative validity, instrumental power, and descriptive accuracy. Each category is mutually supportive, although the normative base is fundamental
Dunfee (1995)	Normative	Seeks to develop a generic normative stakeholder theory, based on widely

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Frost (1995)	Normative	accepted “hypernorms” to apply cross-culturally to all organisations, which is consistent with the economic nature of enterprise organisations and one which provides adequate normative guidance to decision-makers Stakeholder analysis provides a mechanism that defines moral and ethical frameworks within the mineral resources sector, which is characterised by a complex set of environments
Grimble and Chan (1995)	Instrumental	Stakeholder analysis can be a useful tool for consulting in natural resource management and other environmentally sensitive areas where occasionally no formal rules exist
Jones (1995)	Instrumental	Stakeholder management is advanced through a synthesis of the stakeholder concept, economic theory, behavioural science, and ethics. The concepts of trust and co-operation in the contracts between the firm and stakeholders help to solve opportunistic behaviour
Polonsky (1995a)	Instrumental	A stakeholder strategy matrix that positions stakeholders as either mixed-blessing, supportive, non-supportive, marginal, or bridging, can aid the environmental strategy development process
Polonsky (1995b)	Instrumental	Stakeholder management provides a process that allows an industrial marketer to develop an environmental marketing strategy that satisfies both the goals of the firm and stakeholders
Starik (1995)	Normative	Non-human natural environment can be integrated into the stakeholder management concept. Stakeholder concept is more than human political/economic. This would provide a more holistic, value-oriented, focused, and

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Fineman and Clarke (1996)	Descriptive/empirical	<p>strategic approach to stakeholder management, potentially benefiting both nature and organisations</p> <p>Pro-environmental responses by managers in the U.K. supermarket, automotive, power, and chemical industries are dependent on the nature of a stakeholder's power. Campaigners and regulators are perceived as legitimate because of their ability to adversely affect an industry</p>
Harrington (1996)	Normative	Goals of regulatory policy will be fully understood and evaluated by embracing a stakeholder approach that requires public conversation, encourages explicit instead of implicit approaches, and results in moral scrutiny of our economic and social systems
Harrison and St. John (1996)	Instrumental	Successful stakeholder partnerships result in product success, manufacturing efficiency, reduced litigation and negative publicity, and favourable regulatory policies
Polonsky (1996a)	Instrumental	Steadman et al. (1994) did not consider the complexities and importance of internal stakeholders, and underestimated the growing importance of external stakeholders in Japan
Polonsky (1996b)	Instrumental	Stakeholder management can be used by marketers for more effective and comprehensive strategy formulation, by identifying each stakeholder's relationship with the firm
Polonsky and Ryan (1996)	Instrumental	U.S. stakeholder statutes provide socially responsible managers with protection against creditors who assert that their interests are impaired by managerial choices, although the degree to which this applies remains limited when an

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Atkinson, Waterhouse, and Wells (1997)	Instrumental	organisation faces hostile takeovers because of their non-mandatory status Performance measurement systems that incorporate secondary objectives such as supporting contractual relationships between stakeholders, rather than relying solely on the primary corporate objective of profit, provide the necessary robustness needed for successful internal management and control
Sternberg (1997)	Normative	Stakeholder theory is fundamentally misguided and intrinsically incompatible with organisational objectives. It undermines both private property and accountability
Greenley and Foxall (1997)	Descriptive/ empirical	Although stakeholder orientation is positively associated with company performance, an optimal allocation of resources to address stakeholder claims is influenced by external factors such as competitive rivalry and appears to mitigate strategic efforts to address the diverse interests of multiple stakeholders
Mitchell, Agle, and Wood (1997)	Instrumental/ normative	Stakeholder theory can be enhanced by identifying stakeholders based on the attributes of power and urgency, in addition to that of the common legitimacy argument. This can be used to generate a typology of stakeholders, and propositions concerning their salience to managers of the firm
Morris (1997)	Descriptive/ empirical	Stakeholder management devices affect perceived moral climates within a firm and managerial expectations about the consequences of good social performance, but not about organisational member attitudes toward corporate social responsibility

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Rowley (1997)	Instrumental/ normative	Accommodates multiple and interdependent stakeholder demands so that an organisation's conformation to stakeholder expectations is a function of the network density (the number) of stakeholders, and the centrality (the degree to which it acts as an intermediary) of the organisation
Cordano and Rands (1998)	Descriptive/ empirical	Suggest that attitudes more specifically related to behaviours should be the focus of examination. The study found that attitudinal differences on policy agendas played a significant role in stakeholder conflict irrespective of group affiliation
Reed (1999)	Normative	Prescribes a critical theory perspective toward stakeholder management, that provides (1) a firm basis for establishing the validity and scope for management's normative responsibilities and (2) the conceptual clarity for determining stakeholder validity through the three different normative realms (legitimacy, morality, and ethics) that constitute a critical approach
Jones and Wicks (1999)	Normative/ instrumental	Proposes a convergence between normative and instrumental aspects of stakeholder theory by stating that both moral and practical organisational responses can be achieved without compromising one over the other
Agle, Mitchell, and Sonnenfeld (1999)	Descriptive/ empirical	Empirically tested the salience model by Mitchell et al. (1997). CEO perception of legitimacy, power, and urgency are related to stakeholder salience
Gibson (2000)	Normative	Argues a normative stakeholder approach, and the moral basis for claims of particular stakeholders as a basis for distinguishing between competing stakeholder claims

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Phillips and Reichart (2000)	Normative	Criticises Starik's (1995) attempt at ascribing stakeholder status to the non-human environment. Argues that the environment should be accounted for on a fairness-based approach through legitimate organisational stakeholders
Wijnberg (2000)	Normative	Suggests that given that problems exist with respect to the ethical foundation and norms between corporate and individual responsibilities, that managers should adopt an Aristotelian approach whereby managers live a complete and good life and undertake decisions for the interests of different stakeholders
Jawahar and McLaughlin (2001)	Normative	Argues for a descriptive stakeholder theory whereby a stakeholder's importance is dependent on the stage of the organisation's life cycle, and the organisation's response strategy will differ with each stakeholder
Hendry (2001)	Normative	Criticizes the predominant economic theory focus of existing stakeholder work, which sees the moral basis of stakeholder relationships being grounded in a "nexus of contracts". Argues that you cannot reduce the moral purely to the economic. Ethics is also about the social relationships between moral actors
Kaler (2002)	Normative	Argues that stakeholders in a business have to be defined as those with either a strong or weak morally legitimate claim to have their interests served
Kaler (2003)	Normative (implicitly prescriptive)	Rejects the Donaldson and Preston (1995) normative, instrumental, and descriptive stakeholder classification typology in favour of a stakeholder theory whereby duties to shareholders and stakeholders range from qualified to unqualified

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Drisco and Starik (2004)	Normative	<p>depending on the obligations and duties owed to each</p> <p>This article integrates into managerial decision-making the relationship between business organisations and the natural environment. The authors review the literature on who or what should count as a stakeholder, and critique and expand the stakeholder identification and salience model developed by Mitchell et al. (1997). The stakeholder attributes of power, legitimacy, and urgency is reconceptualised and a fourth stakeholder attribute is developed “proximity”, to argue for the salience of the natural environment as the primary and primordial stakeholder</p>
Buchholz and Rosenthal (2005)	Normative	<p>Rejects both the inherent individualist aspect of stakeholder theory and the alternate feminist viewpoint in favour of a pragmatic approach involving pluralism as a basis for understanding the relationship between the firm and stakeholders</p>
Kaler (2006)	Normative	<p>Argues that there is a need to limit the number and degree of stakeholders and responsibilities to them, and consequently obligations to shareholders/ stakeholder are not enmeshed in claims about property rights and economic superiority</p>
Neville and Menguc (2006)	Normative/ instrumental	<p>Develops a framework, called “stakeholder multiplicity”, drawing on Mitchell et al. (1997), to understand and measure the effects on the organisation of competing, complementary, and co-operative stakeholder interactions. The framework is based upon the direction, strength, and synergies of the interacting claims</p>

APPENDIX C. (Continued)

Study	Classification	Contribution
Reynolds et al. (2006)	Descriptive	Indivisible resources and unequal levels of stakeholder salience impede managerial efforts to weigh stakeholder interests. Resource divisibility also influenced whether managers used a within-decision or an across-decision approach to balance stakeholder interests
Shropshire and Hillman (2007)	Descriptive	Using a longitudinal sample (1992–1999) of stakeholder management data, the authors find that firm age and size, along with industry shifts in stakeholder management, and to a lesser degree organisational risk and performance, managerial discretion, ownership and succession, increase the likelihood of changes in stakeholder management over time

APPENDIX D. STAKEHOLDER QUESTIONNAIRE

November 8, 1999

Dear Sir/Madam,

Name of Project: *Attitudes toward Stakeholder Prominence within an Asia-Pacific Context*

You are invited to participate in an international study on the attitudes toward organisational constituents (“stakeholders”) within the Asia-Pacific region. The purpose of the study is to elicit the attitudes of managers and managerial students toward stakeholder groups across the Asia-Pacific region.

The study is being undertaken by Mr Lorne Cummings, Department of Accounting and Finance, Macquarie University, NSW, Australia, Tel 61-2-9850-8531. This study is being conducted to meet the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy under the supervision of Professor James Guthrie 61-2-9850-9030 of the Macquarie Graduate School of Management (MGSM).

You are asked to complete a questionnaire based on pairwise comparisons of the importance of selected organisational “stakeholders”.

The study consists of three (3) matrices regarding the legitimacy, power and urgency of claims of certain “stakeholders”.

This questionnaire is the first of its kind, and is important in gaining an understanding of current and potentially future managerial attitudes toward certain stakeholder groups across nation states within the Asia-Pacific region.

Any information or personal details gathered in the course of the study are confidential. No individual will be identified in any publication of the results, and the data will be held solely by the researcher.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could complete the attached questionnaire, and return it in the enclosed addressed envelope as soon as possible. Your time and co-operation toward this study is greatly appreciated.

Yours Sincerely

Mr Lorne Cummings
Associate Lecturer in Accounting and Finance
Macquarie University, Australia

ASIA-PACIFIC STAKEHOLDER QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete the questionnaire in pen rather than pencil. Please place a tick in the appropriate box.

1. Sex

- Male Female

2. In What Age Group Are You?

- Under 25 45-54 years
 25-34 years 55+ years
 35-44 years

3. Country of Birth

- Australia
 China
 Indonesia
 Other (please specify)

4. Cultural Background

- Anglo/European
 Chinese
 Native Indonesian
 Other (please specify)

5. What formal level of education have you obtained?

- High school
 Technical Certificate
 PhD
 Master's degree
 Bachelor's degree
 Other (please specify) _____

6. What is your Occupation?

- Business Owner
 Full-Time Manager
 Full-Time Manager/Part-Time Student
 Full Time Student
 Other (please specify) _____

7. Is your organisation owned by a foreign multi-national organisation? (for managers only)

- Yes No

For each of the two (2) questionnaire matrices, please indicate the relative concern of the goal or group on the left of the matrix, compared to the goal or group on the right by placing a circle around the most appropriate level of influence/legitimacy.

Example

	← More Important				Equal	More Important →				
	Extreme	Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Equal	Moderate	Strong	Very Strong	Extreme	
Apples	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Oranges
Apples	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Pears
Oranges	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Pears

With respect to their overall role as an organisational stakeholder, from an individual perspective, for each pair please select the relative LEGITIMACY that you place on the claims of the group on the left, compared to the group on the right (i.e., circle one number for each line).

(Legitimacy reflects the degree to which the claims of the particular grouping are logically inferable and justified according to your beliefs).

	← More Legitimate					Equal	More Legitimate →				
	Extreme	Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Equal	Moderate	Strong	Very Strong	Extreme		
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Employees	
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Environment Groups	
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Government	
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors	
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers	
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Environment Group	
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Government	
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors	
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers	
Environment Groups	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Government	
Environment Groups	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors	
Environment Group	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers	
Government	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors	
Government	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers	
Investors	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers	

Customers = The legitimacy of customers as an organisational stakeholder group. Employees = The legitimacy of employees as an organisational stakeholder group. Environmental Groups = The legitimacy of environmental groups (e.g., Greenpeace) as an organisational stakeholder group. Government = The legitimacy of government as an organisational stakeholder group. Investors = The legitimacy of investors as an organisational stakeholder group. Suppliers = The legitimacy of suppliers as an organisational stakeholder group.

With respect to their overall role as an organisational stakeholder, from an individual perspective, for each pair please select the relative POWER that you place on the claims of the group on the left, compared to the group on the right (i.e. circle one number for each line).

(Power reflects the degree to which the particular grouping can effect or have the capability of instigating change).

	← More Powerful				Equal	More Powerful →				
	Extreme	Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Equal	Moderate	Strong	Very Strong	Extreme	
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Employees
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Environment Groups
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Government
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Environment Group
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Government
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers
Environment Groups	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Government
Environment Groups	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors
Environment Group	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers
Government	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors
Government	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers
Investors	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers

Customers = The power of customers as an organisational stakeholder group. Employees = The power of employees as an organisational stakeholder group. Environmental Groups = The power of environmental groups (e.g., Greenpeace) as an organisational stakeholder group. Government = The power of government as an organisational stakeholder group. Investors = The power of investors as an organisational stakeholder group. Suppliers = The power of suppliers as an organisational stakeholder group.

With respect to their overall role as an organisational stakeholder, from an individual perspective, for each pair please select the relative URGENCY that you place on the claims of the group on the left, compared to the group on the right (i.e., circle one number for each line).

(Urgency reflects the degree to which the claims of the particular grouping are of pressing or current importance as an issue).

	← More Urgent				Equal	More Urgent →				
	Extreme	Very Strong	Strong	Moderate	Equal	Moderate	Strong	Very Strong	Extreme	
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Employees
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Environment Groups
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Government
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors
Customers	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Environment Group
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Government
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors
Employees	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers
Environment Groups	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Government
Environment Groups	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors
Environment Group	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers
Government	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Investors
Government	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers
Investors	9	7	5	3	1	3	5	7	9	Suppliers

Customers = The urgency of customers as an organisational stakeholder group. Employees = The urgency of employees as an organisational stakeholder group. Environmental Groups = The urgency of environmental groups (e.g., Greenpeace) as an organisational stakeholder group. Government = The urgency of government as an organisational stakeholder group. Investors = The urgency of investors as an organisational stakeholder group. Suppliers = The urgency of suppliers as an organisational stakeholder group.

Thank you very much for completing the survey.

APPENDIX E. LIST OF CORPORATIONS SURVEYED

Australian Companies

Ameron Coatings Pty Ltd	KMCC Western Australia Pty Ltd
Ampol Lubricating Oil Refinery Ltd	Lanes Biscuits Pty Ltd
Arthur Yates & Co Ltd	Lemington Coal Mines Ltd
Austral Plywoods Pty Ltd	Ludowici Limited
Australian Dried Fruit Sales Pty Ltd	Mackay Sugar Co-Op Association Ltd
Australian Quality Egg Farms Ltd	Macquarie Textiles Group Ltd
Australian Window Furnishings (Qld) P/L	Matilda Bay Brewing Co Limited
B.P Australia Ltd	MEC-Kambrook Pty Ltd
Baiada Poultry Pty Ltd	Melocco Pty Ltd
Baxter Healthcare Pty Ltd	Merck Sharp & Dohme (Australia) P/L
Benckiser Australia Pty Ltd	Metroll Pty Ltd
BHP Minerals Pty Ltd	Milne Feeds Pty Ltd
Blackmores Ltd	Miranda Wines Pty Ltd
Bonds Industries Ltd	Monopak Pty Ltd
Brownes Dairy Pty Ltd	Mossman Central Mill Company Ltd
Canning Vale Weaving Mills Ltd	Namoi Mining Pty Ltd
Capilano Honey Ltd	National Can (NSW) Pty Ltd
Caterpillar Elphinstone Pty Ltd	Nonferral (NSW) Pty Ltd
Commercial Minerals Ltd	North Flinders Mines Ltd
Delta Gold NL	North Gold (WA) Ltd
Dow Chemical Australia Ltd	North Mining Limited
Eagle Mining Corporation NL	Novacoal Australia Pty Ltd
Ebenezer Mining Company Pty Ltd	Novartis Crop Protection Australasia
Energy Resources of Australia	NSW Sugar Milling Co-Operative Ltd
Ericsson Australia Pty Ltd	NT Gas Pty Ltd
Fasson Pty Ltd	Nufarm Limited
Gibson Chemicals Limited	Oakey Abattoir Pty Ltd
Golden Circle Limited	Oil Company of Australia Ltd
Goldfan Ltd	Oil Drilling & Exploration Ltd
Goodman Fielder Ltd	Olin Australia Limited
Gove Aluminium Ltd	Olivegrove
Gunns Ltd	Olympic Fine Foods Pty Ltd
H B Fuller Company Australia Pty Ltd	Palmer Tube Mills (Aust) Pty Ltd
Harris-Daishowa Australia Pty Ltd	Parke Davis Pty Ltd
Hydro-Chem Pty Ltd	Pasminco Australia Ltd
Industrial Galvanizers Corp Pty Ltd	PAX Australia Pty Ltd
James Hardie Windows Pty Ltd	Peerless Holdings Pty Ltd
Joyce Corporation	Peter Metchev Pty Ltd
KAAL Australia Pty Ltd	Perilya Mines NL
	Pfizer Pty Ltd

APPENDIX E. (Continued)

Australian Companies

Pharma Pacific Pty Ltd	St George Appliances Pty Ltd
Philip Morris Limited	St Regis Bates Pty Ltd
Phosphate Resources Limited	Spring Valley Fruit Juices
Pioneer International Limited	Stanbroke Pastoral Company P/L
Pivot Limited	Starch Australasia Ltd
PNC Exploration (Australia) Pty Ltd	Steggles Limited
Powercoal Pty Ltd	Stramit Corporation Limited
QCT Resources Limited	Sunburst Regency Foods Pty Ltd
Queensland Alumina Limited	Suncoast Milk Pty Ltd
Queensland Breweries Pty Ltd	Sunstate Cement Ltd
Queensland Cement Limited	Swane Bros Pty Ltd
Queensland Sugar Corporation	Tasmanian Pulp and Forest Holdings Ltd
Renown & Pearlite Pty Ltd	Tassal Limited
Rexam Australia Pty Ltd	Tatiara Meat Company Pty Ltd
Rhone-Poulenc Rural Australia P/L	Tatura Milk Industries Limited
Ridley Corporation Limited	Tea Estates of Australia Ltd
Riverina Stock Feeds Pty Ltd	Textron Corporation Pty Ltd
Riverina Wool Combing Pty Ltd	Thames Water Asia/Pacific Pty Ltd
Robe River Iron Associates	The Argus and Australasian Pty Ltd
Roche Products Pty Ltd	The Austral Brick Co Pty Ltd
Rohm and Haas Australia Pty Ltd	The Queensland Times Pty Ltd
Rosedale Leather Pty Ltd	The Stanley Works Pty Ltd
Sancella Pty Ltd	The Swan Brewing Company Pty Ltd
Sandhurst Farms Ltd	The Wrigley Company Pty Ltd
Sarlou Industries Pty Ltd	Thompsons Kelly and Lewis Pty Ltd
Saxonvale Coal Pty Ltd	Thor Plastics Pty Ltd
Scholle Industries (Manufacturing) P/L	Thorn Lighting Pty Ltd
Selleys Pty Ltd	Tiger Engineering Pty Ltd
Shorko Australia Pty Ltd	Timcast Pty Ltd
Sigma Pharmaceuticals Pty Ltd	Tixana Pty Ltd
Simplot Australia Pty Ltd	Tooheys Pty Ltd
Slimax Laboratories Pty Ltd	Toowoomba Foundry Pty Ltd
Snow Brand Tatura Dairies Pty Ltd	Topmix Pty Ltd
Softwood Holdings Ltd	Total Australia Limited
Sonoco Australia Pty Ltd	Toyo Tyre and Rubber Australia Ltd
South Blackwater Coal Ltd	Transcom Communications Systems Ltd
South Johnstone Mill Ltd	Transform Composites Holdings P/L
Southcorp Wines Pty Ltd	Transparent Sheet Aust Pty Ltd
Southern Country Foods Aust Pty Ltd	Trollope Silverwood and Beck P/L
SPC Limited	

APPENDIX E. (Continued)

Australian Companies

Tube Fitting Sales Pty Ltd	Welded Tube Mills of Australia Pty Ltd
Tycan Australia Pty Ltd	Wesfarmers Bunnings Limited
Tyco Australia Pty Ltd	Wesfi Manufacturing Pty Ltd
Tyco Building Products Pty Ltd	Wespine Industries Pty Ltd
UDR Group Ltd	Western Australian Mint
Unidrive Pty Ltd	Western Metals Ltd
United Milk Tasmania Ltd	Westralian Sands Limited
UVS Ultra Violet Pty Ltd	White Industries Australia Limited
Valley View Poultry Pty Ltd	Pioneer- White Rock Quarries Pty Ltd
Valpak Pty Ltd	Wiluna Gold Pty Ltd
Valvoline (Australia) Pty Ltd	Windridge Pig Farm
Varian Australia Pty Ltd	WMC Fertilizers Ltd
Vinidex Tubemakers Pty Ltd	Woodbridge Henderson's Aust Group
Vita Pacific Ltd	Woodside Offshore Petroleum Pty Ltd
Walker Australia Pty Ltd	WR Grace Australia Limited
Warkworth Mining Ltd	Wyeth Australia Pty Ltd
Warrnambool Milk Products Pty Ltd	Wyndham Estate Wines (Aust) Ltd
Wattyl Limited	Yakka (Aust) Pty Ltd
WD & HO Wills (Australia) Limited	Yakult Australia Pty Ltd
Webforge Australia Pty Ltd	Yokogawa Australia Pty Ltd
Weir Engineering Pty Ltd	Yolarno Pty Ltd

Chinese Companies

ARCO Chemical Great China Ltd	Changsha Asbestos Prod Factory
ABB Xiamen Switchgear Co Ltd	Changsha Cigarette Factory
Anhui Cotton and Hemp Co	Changsha Tongda Group
Anhui Glass Bottle Fty	Changsha Timber Co
Anhui Petroleum General Co	Changsha Cement Factory
Anyang Dyestuffs Plant	Changxin Textile Co Ltd
Baling Petrochemical Corp	Chanzhou Forging General Factory
Baoding Tianwei Group Co Ltd	Changzhou Kangdali Pharmaceutical
Baoji Petroleum Machinery	Co
Manufacturing	Chaozhou Glazed Tile Factory
Baoji Petroleum Steel Pipe & Tube	Chenadu Chemical Co Ltd
Works	Chenadu Enamel General Factory
Boc-Tisco Gases Co Ltd	China Bekaert Steel Cord Co Ltd
CPC Foods Co Ltd	China Lucky Film Corporation
Cangzhou Ji-Hua Plastics Co Ltd	China National Timber Corp

APPENDIX E. (Continued)

Chinese Companies

China National Tree Seed Corp	Guangzhou Steel Pipe Mill
China National Salt Industry Corp	Guizhou Xianfeng Industrial Corp
China Silk Garments I/E Corp	Guizhou Xizhong Plastics Co Ltd
China Tobacco Import and Export Yunnan Corp	H.R Medical Ltd
Chingqing Rubber Industry Corp	Haier Condenser Factory
Dalian Dyestuff Plant	Hainan Pharmaceuticals Co
Dalian Heng Cheng Industrial Corp	Hainan SEG Industrial Co Ltd
Dalian Longquan Winery Co Ltd	Hangzhou Oil Refinery
Dalian Metals and Minerals I/E Corp	Hangzhou People's Glass Factory
Dalian Pharmaceutical Factory	Hangzhou Resin General Factory
Dandong Yinhe Industrial Co Ltd	Hangzhou Toothpaste Plant
Dandong Nail and Needle Factory	Hangzhou Wahaha Nourishing Food Plant
Dongfang Electrical Machinery Co Ltd	Harbin Bearing Co Ltd
Dongfeng Adhesives Factory	Harbin Medicine Co Ltd.
Dongguan Advanced Coatings Co Ltd	Harbin Pharmaceutical Factory
Dongguan Henghui Electric Co Ltd	Hebei Textiles I/E Group Corp
Dongguan Shilong Industrial Gen Corp	Hefei Bearing Factory
Dongguan Yuelin Furniture Co Ltd	Heifei Castings and Forgings Plant
Dow Chemical (China) Ltd	Hefei Iron and Steel Co Ltd
Enping Guanghua Ceramics Co Ltd	Heilongjiang Feedstuff Co
First Brands Guangzhou Ltd	Henan Cotton Yarns and Fabrics I/E Corp
Foshan Pacific Metal Packaging Co Ltd	Henan Jiaozuo Steel Plant
Fujian Dongmen Enterprises Group Co	Henan Metals and Minerals I/E Corp
Fujian Petroleum Yiamen Co	Henan Pingyuan Pharmaceutical Factory
Fujian Sanming Chemical Industrial Complex	Henan Tianhe Industrial Corp
Fushun Industrial Fabric Fty	Hengyang Feilong Co Ltd
Fushun Petroleum Machine Works	Hua Dong United Can Co Ltd
Fuzhou Fuxing Medicine Co Ltd	Huafeng Electrical Appliance Co Ltd
Fuzhou Medical-Chemical Corp	Huaibei Garments Group Co
Gansu Cereals, Oils and Foodstuffs I/E Corp	Huamao (Xiamen) Weaving Dyeing & Finishing Co Ltd
Golden World Pharmaceutical Co Ltd	Huaxin Cement Co Ltd
Guangdong Chemical Material Corp	Hunan Zhenghong Forge Co Ltd
Guangdong Color Picture Tube Co Ltd	Hugingyutang Pharmaceutical Factory
Guangdong Panyu Silk I/E Co	Husi Food Co Ltd
Guangdong Power Development Co Ltd	Jiangmen Battery Factory

APPENDIX E. (Continued)

Chinese Companies

Jiangmen Chemical and Rubber Machine Factory	Liuzhou Chemical Group Co
Jiangmen Danone Biscuits Co Ltd	Liuzhou Minicar Factory
Jiangmen Leather Manufacturing Corp	Maoming Industrial Development General Co
Jiangmen Textiles Co	Mei Li Ya Animal Health Co Ltd
Jiangmen Water Co	Nanhai Tannery and Leather Prod Co Ltd
Jiangsu Aquatic Prod Corp	Nanjing Ferrous Alloy Factory
Jiangsu Baoling Chemical Co Ltd	Nantong Hymo Co Ltd
Jiangsu Huaian Lantian Towel Factory	Ningbo Chinese Medical Materials Co Ltd
Jiangsu Industrial Chemicals Corp	Ningbo Zhonghua Paper Co Ltd
Jiangsu Salt Industry Corp	Ningxia Coal I/E Corp
Jiangsu Soto Chemical Co Ltd	North China Pharmaceutical Group
Jiangsu Textiles I/E Group Corp	Nosawa and Co Ltd
Jiangxi Animal By-Product I/E Corp	Panyu Chemicals I/E Co
Jiangxi Cereals, Oils and Foodstuffs	Qilu Petro Chemical Corp of China
Jiangxi Garments I/E Corp	Qingdao Dayang Foof Group Corp
Jiangxi Medicines and Health Products I/E Corp	Qingdao Ciba Pigments Co Ltd
Jiangxi Metals and Minerals I/E Corp	Qingdao Laoshan Brewery
Jiangxi Native Produce I/E Corp	Qingdao Brewery Group
Jiangxi Pharmaceutical Ltd Liability Co	Qianwei Paper Mill
Jiangyin Mould Plastic Group Co	Quanzhou Haixia Medicine Co Ltd
Jiaxing Spun Silk Factory	Sanming Iron and Steel Works
Jiaozou Xinda Chemical Industry Co Ltd	Shandong Ocean Chemicals Group Co Ltd
Jihua Pesticide Factory	Shandong Silk Corp
Jilin Carbon Plant	Shantou Pesticide Factory
Jilin Chemical Industrial Company Limited	Shanxi Machinery I/E Corp
Jilin Knitting Wool Mill	Shaoxing Intel, Printing and Dyeing Co Ltd
Jilin Paper Group Co Ltd	Shenyang Garments I/E Corp
Jilin Pharmaceutical Stock Co Ltd	Shenyang Pharon Health Prod Co Ltd
Jung Yoon Toys Corp	Shenzhen Futian Medical Co Ltd
Kaiping Rubber Products Factory	Shenzhen Guangqiao Foodstuff Co Ltd
Kang Bei Garment Industrial Co	Shenzhen Nanshan Cereals Co
Kunming Chemical Industry Corp	Shenzhen SINOR Pharmaceutical Co Ltd
Kunming Machine Tool Co Ltd	Showa Shoi Co Ltd
Kunya Plastic Co Ltd	
Liaoning Pelagic Fisheries Co Ltd	

APPENDIX E. (Continued)

Chinese Companies

Shunde Debao Adhesive Co Ltd	Xinjiang Kunlun Plastics Factory
Sinopec Maoming Petrochemical Co	Yantai Huada Foodstuff Industry Co Ltd
Songjiang Cannery Factory	Yangzhou Tongyun Container Co Ltd
Southseas Oils & Fats Industrial (Chiwan) Ltd	Yibin Paper Co Ltd
Suzhou Classical Forestry Construction Corp	Yingkou Copy Machine Co Ltd
Suzhou Chemical Fiber Factory	Yizheng Chemical Fibre Co Ltd
Suzhou Zhenya Group Co	Yunnan Phosphate Fertilizer Factory
Taizhou Yuntong Electrical Plastics Co Ltd	Zhangjiagang Olay Clothing Co Ltd
The Jiangmen Sugarcane Chemical Factory Ltd	Zhanjiang Animal Products I/E Corp
Tianjin Steel Tube Corp	Zhejiang Huadong Optical Instrument Factory
Tong Fa Garment Manufacturing Co Ltd	Zhejiang Haimen Glassware Factory
Wenzhou Marine Fishery Corp	Zhejiang Jiande Perfume Plant
Wuhan Iron and Steel Co	Zhejiang Medicines and Crude Drugs Co Ltd
Wuxi Electric Household Appliances Co Ltd	Zhejiang Zheyuan Co Ltd
Wuxi Metal Materials Corp	Zhejiang Pacific Chemical Corp [JV]
Wuzhou Wuyi Plastic Factory	Zhenhai Refining & Chemical Company Limited
Xiamen Doly Chemical Co Ltd	Zhingshan Morning Star Glass Co Ltd
	Zhongshan Rubber Machinery and Moulding Factory

Indonesian Companies

Abadi Genteng Keramik	Aneka Tambang PT
Abadi Sakti Timber PT	Argha Karya Prima Industry PT
ABC Central Food PT	Argo Pantes PT
Ades Alfindo Putrasetia PT	Artha Nugraha Mandiri PT
AICA Indonesia PT	Arun Natural Gas Liquefaction Co PT
AKTIF Indonesia Indah PT	ASEAN Aceh Fertilizer PT
Alfred C Toepper Pelletizing Factory Indonesia PT	Atlantic Ocean Paint PT
Altron Niagatama Nusa PT	Atrisco Asbestos Cement Industry PT
Ancol Terang Metal Printing Industry PT	Badan Tekstil Nasional PT
Aneka Bina Cipta Central Food Industry PT	Bakrie Sumatra Plantation PT
	Bali Raya PT
	Bangun Delima Indah PT
	Barito Pacific Timber PT

APPENDIX E. (Continued)

Indonesian Companies

Bima Mandrasakti PT	Indocement Tunggul Prakarsa PT
Bina Kimia Nufarm PT	Indonesia Kasai Perkasa PT
Bintang Toedjoe PT	Indonesia Pelleting Co PT
Bowater Bulk Packaging PT	Indonesian Acids Industry Ltd PT
Bukit Baiburi Enterprise PT	Indorayonesia Lestari PT
Bumi Waras CV	Indotama Megah Indah Rubber PT
Cahaya Kalbar PT	Industri Soda Indonesia PT
Central Rama Informatik PT	Inkoasku Ltd PT
Champion Kurnia Djaja Chemicals	Insfoil Pradanasakti PT
Cisadane Raya Chemicals PT	Intan Suar Kartika PT
Continental Oil Company of Indonesia Inc.	Interworld Steel Mills Indonesia PT
Coronet Crown PT	Inti Celluloseutama Indonesia PT
Dactex Indonesia PT	Intraco PT
Dasa Windu Agung PT	Invetco Nusantara PT
Deho Canning Company PT	IVO MAS Tunggul PT
Dinar Makmur Industri PT	Japfa Comfeed Indonesia PT
Dong Sung Indonesia PT	Jaya Kertas PT
Duta Pertiwi Nusantara PT	Jayabaya Raya PT
Eastara Melawi Mineral PT	Joesnoes Tunggul PT
Erka Primasta Incorporated PT	Justus Sakti Raya Corporation PT
Extrupack PT	Kahatex PT
Family Raya PT	Kalbe Farma PT
Findeco Jaya PT	Kanindo Prima Perkasa PT
Friesche Vlag Indonesia PT	Kartika Tirta Hema PT
Gana Mas Prima PT	Karya Bahana Unigam PT
Gema Polytama Kimia PT	Karyasega Sejati PT
Giri Asihjaya PT	Kawan Niaga Sahabat Textile Industry PT
Graha Geotama Perdana PT	Kayu Mas Timber PT
Great Giant Pineapple Co	Kedaung Industrial Ltd PT
Gunatex Jaya PT	Kemajuan-Pabrik Mesin
Gunung Madu Plantation PT	Kenrose Indonesia PT
Hanjaya Mandala Sampoerna PT	Kerta Rajasa Raya PT
Hasfarm Products PT	Kiami Kentas PT
Henkel Indonesia PT	Kimia Farma PT
IGA Abadi PT	Kintama Agungerasi PT
Ikaindo Industry Karbonik PT	Kodeco Batu Licin Plywood PT
Indawan Ekaperkasa PT	Konimex PT
Indo Milk PT	Krakatau Steel PT

APPENDIX E. (Continued)

Indonesian Companies	
Kurnia Kapuas Utama TBK PT	National Industry and Textile Co Ltd
Kusuma Raya Utama PT	PT
Lamipak Primula Indonesia PT	New Simo Mulyo PT
Langgeng Makmur Plastic Industry Ltd PT	Nonferindo Utama Aluminium Alloy PT
Laris Chandra PT	Nusantara Damasplastik PT
Lea Sanent PT	Nutrifood Indonesia PT
Leewon Industrial Co PT	NV Hadji Kalla Trading Company
Liang Chi Indonesia PT	NV Sumatra Tobacco Trading Company
Lionindo Jaya PT	Omedata Electronics PT
Lippo Industries PT	Opal Indah Glass Industrial PT
Lispap Rayasentosa	Oyama Ltd PT
Lontar Papyrus Pulp and Paper Industry PT	Pabrik Gula Candi Sidoarjo PT
Mabarfeed Indonesia PT	Pabrik Pipa Indonesia PT
Mahera CV	Pacific Indomas Plastic Indonesia PT
Mangole Timber Producers PT	Padma Pacific Sejahtera PT
Martin Lestari CV	Pan Gas Nusantara Industri PT
Maspion PT	Panca Usahatama Paramita PT
Matahari Sakti PT	Pancayasa Prima Tangguh PT
Mawar Sejati PT	Panverta Cakrakencana PT
Maxus Southeast Sumatra Inc	Papertech Indonesia PT
Medion Parma Jaya PT	Parama Binatani PT
Megah Megalon Industries PT	Pardic Jaya Chemicals PT
Merck Indonesia PT	Pelangi Indah Canindo PT
Metrocorp Indonusa PT	Pelita Cengkareng Paper Co Ltd.
Milatronika Karya Nipah PT	Perkebunan III PT
Mitra Kumkang Shoe PT	Perusahaan Dagang Dan Industri Keris PT
Mitra Saruta Indonesia PT	Perusahaan Dagang Rodamas Co Ltd PT
Monagro Kimia PT	Perusahaan Obat Nyamuk Menara Laut
Moom Lion Industries PT	Perusahaan Pertambangan Minyak Dan Gas Bumi Nasional
Moya Zamzami Utama PT	Polkrik Chemicals Company PT
Mulia Glass PT	Polypet Karyapersada PT
Mulia Plastindo PT	President Feed Indonesia PT
Multi Harapan Utama PT	Pulosynthetics PT
Multi Inti Chemicals Abadi	
Naarden Indonesia PT	
Nasiodelta Electric PT	

APPENDIX E. (Continued)

 Indonesian Companies

Pupuk Sriwijaya PT	Swadaya Plastikatama PT
Puspa Kumala Jaya PT	Tambang Timah PT
Quarry Masutama PT	Taruna Mekar Sakti PT
Rapigra PT	Tens Indonesia PT
Rita Sinar Indah PT	Tlogomas Abadijaya Engineering Plastic Industry PT
Salim Rengo Containers PT	Topwell Indoceil PT
Salitrosa Ausasia PT	Tri Jasa Sarana Pratama Textile PT
Sandang Rakyat Textile PT	Tulung Agung Indah PT
Santos Jaya Abadi PT	Unggul Indah Corporation PT
Sasa Inti PT	Uni Tumbuh Utama
Shinta Indahjaya PT	Union Chemicals Industries PT
Sinar Jatimulya Gemilang PT	Usaha Mina (Persero) PT
Sinar Olechemical International PT	Vastex Prima Industries PT
Smart Corporation PT	Wirifa Sakti PT
Sugizindo PT	Yunix Foods
Sulfindo Adiusaha PT	Zeta Agro Corporation PT
Sumi Asih PT	

APPENDIX F. STAKEHOLDER PROMINENCE RESULTS

Category	Stakeholder	Australia (Respondents = 236)			China (Respondents = 204)			Indonesia (Respondents = 238)			All Respondents (Respondents = 678)			
		Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	
		Country of origin	Customer	.271	.267	.334	.148	.143	.173	.271	.248	.307	.274	.244
	Employee	.221	.154	.186	.126	.087	.132	.170	.109	.140	.174	.109	.141	
	Environmental group	.072	.066	.070	.218	.123	.173	.079	.070	.089	.081	.069	.089	
	Government	.094	.179	.110	.211	.329	.196	.119	.226	.152	.120	.236	.155	
	Investor	.252	.249	.212	.202	.218	.214	.269	.264	.227	.259	.259	.217	
	Supplier	.091	.086	.089	.096	.099	.112	.093	.083	.085	.092	.083	.084	
	Total = 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	Overall inconsistency		.00860			.00489			0.00648			0.00494		

Category	Stakeholder	Australia (Respondents = 13)			China (Respondents = 3)			Indonesia (Respondents = 13)			All Owners (Respondents = 29)			
		Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	
		Owner	Customer	.305	.279	.352	.090	.068	.146	.320	.342	.369	.287	.277
	Employee	.197	.170	.157	.222	.126	.135	.134	.126	.092	.177	.151	.124	
	Environmental group	.069	.077	.058	.110	.112	.143	.050	.045	.053	.066	.066	.063	
	Government	.054	.104	.082	.345	.442	.207	.076	.107	.100	.079	.128	.101	
	Investor	.297	.275	.263	.143	.174	.222	.292	.292	.272	.287	.284	.271	
	Supplier	.079	.095	.088	.090	.078	.148	.128	.088	.115	.104	.094	.109	
	Total = 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	Overall inconsistency		.02145			.04573			.01555			.01230		

Stakeholder		Australia (Respondents = 101)			China (Respondents = 20)			Indonesia (Respondents = 53)			All FT Managers (Respondents = 174)		
		Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg
Full-time manager	Customer	.259	.275	.341	.156	.118	.146	.283	.256	.303	.256	.248	.303
	Employee	.235	.162	.201	.136	.106	.142	.172	.109	.145	.204	.138	.178
	Environmental group	.067	.065	.069	.216	.199	.222	.073	.080	.085	.080	.081	.087
	Government	.096	.173	.109	.216	.285	.191	.113	.218	.151	.113	.201	.132
	Investor	.250	.242	.193	.190	.207	.201	.267	.252	.236	.253	.246	.212
	Supplier	.092	.083	.086	.087	.084	.099	.093	.085	.079	.094	.086	.088
	Total = 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Overall inconsistency		.01036			.01661			.00665			0.00602	

Stakeholder		Australia (Respondents = 83)			China (Respondents = 101)			Indonesia (Respondents = 61)			All Full-Time Managers/Part-Time Students (Respondents = 245)		
		Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg
Full-time manager/ part-time student	Customer	.298	.269	.353	.141	.161	.174	.316	.273	.362	.233	.222	.274
	Employee	.207	.151	.174	.122	.089	.129	.178	.107	.130	.169	.113	.148
	Environmental group	.071	.061	.065	.231	.119	.182	.073	.064	.069	.123	.083	.105
	Government	.095	.192	.115	.202	.313	.186	.110	.220	.161	.142	.248	.159
	Investor	.242	.240	.209	.208	.220	.225	.249	.261	.205	.242	.242	.222
	Supplier	.086	.088	.084	.097	.099	.104	.075	.075	.073	.091	.092	.092
	Total = 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Overall inconsistency		.00813			.00502			.01043			.00494	

APPENDIX F. (Continued)

Stakeholder		Australia (Respondents = 26)			China (Respondents = 39)			Indonesia (Respondents = 94)			All FT Students (Respondents = 159)		
		Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg
Full-time student	Customer	.225	.237	.286	.172	.158	.176	.234	.210	.263	.217	.201	.244
	Employee	.235	.140	.179	.142	.084	.134	.163	.103	.144	.169	.104	.148
	Environmental group	.087	.076	.086	.178	.109	.157	.092	.076	.113	.108	.084	.119
	Government	.103	.187	.104	.141	.308	.171	.137	.269	.164	.133	.265	.156
	Investor	.260	.274	.252	.263	.247	.240	.270	.258	.224	.270	.260	.235
	Supplier	.089	.086	.092	.104	.093	.122	.104	.084	.092	.103	.087	.100
	Total = 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Overall inconsistency		.01726			.00688			.00729			.00394	
Stakeholder		Australia (Respondents = 13)			China (Respondents = 41)			Indonesia (Respondents = 16)			All Other (Respondents = 70)		
		Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg	Leg	Pow	Urg
Other	Customer	.248	.235	.244	.135	.109	.180	.240	.281	.310	.185	.163	.223
	Employee	.194	.121	.179	.104	.071	.128	.187	.124	.173	.145	.092	.150
	Environmental group	.096	.072	.084	.222	.115	.144	.083	.059	.099	.163	.095	.124
	Government	.097	.220	.107	.314	.400	.248	.109	.163	.100	.213	.308	.178
	Investor	.236	.266	.250	.144	.190	.173	.299	.283	.228	.198	.233	.203
	Supplier	.127	.087	.136	.084	.115	.127	.082	.090	.090	.097	.108	.122
	Total = 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Overall inconsistency		.01546			.00980			.01947			.00518	