

Czy przedsiębiorstwa praktykują dialog z interesariuszami, tak jak to deklarują?

Do companies practice dialog as they claim?

prof. dr hab. Jolanta Mazur

Szkoła Główna Handlowa w Warszawie, Kolegium Gospodarki Światowej

jolanta.mazur@sgh.waw.pl

Liczne teorie nauk o zarządzaniu wskazują na dialog z interesariuszami jako na warunek skuteczności organizacji, wpływający na jej wyniki. O dialogu wspomina się zwłaszcza w kontekście społecznej odpowiedzialności przedsiębiorstw. Celem artykułu jest ocena, czy przedsiębiorstwa faktycznie angażują się w dialog z interesariuszami. Dialog rozumiany jest jako interaktywny proces wspólnego uczenia się i kreowania nowej wiedzy, zorientowany na osiągnięcie wzajemnego zrozumienia. Stwarza on okazje do pozyskiwania pomysłów nowych produktów, nowych kampanii marketingowych, nowych przedsięwzięć i aliansów. Możliwości prowadzenia dialogu rosną wraz z postępem technicznym w zakresie komunikowania się. Czy zmiany w tym zakresie skłoniły przedsiębiorstwa do angażowania się w konwersację dialogową? Udzieleniu odpowiedzi na podstawowe pytanie służy przegląd literatury. Tekstów traktujących o dialogu poszukiwano w czasopismach naukowych z zakresu zarządzania i biznesu. Publikacje zostały podzielone na kategorie z punktu widzenia podejścia do tematu. Analiza ich treści sugeruje, że większość przedsiębiorstw nie podejmuje dialogu z interesariuszami, stwarzając jedynie pozory konwersacji dialogowej, która nie skutkuje trwałymi relacjami. Na ogół przedsiębiorstwa nie interesują się oczekiwaniemi informacyjnymi interesariuszy, traktując komunikaty adresowane do nich jako narzędzie public relations. Ponieważ przytaczane artykuły dotyczą na ogół dużych przedsiębiorstw, wniosków nie należy odnosić do mniejszych podmiotów, pomijanych w literaturze. Wyjątkowość postawionego pytania, jak i rezultaty analizy powinny skłonić do podejmowania dalszych badań naukowych, a praktyków gospodarczych do refleksji nad ułomnościami praktyki komunikowania się z interesariuszami.

Keywords

dialog, komunikowanie się, interesariusze, CSR, public relations

Numerous management theories point to the dialogue with stakeholders as to the factor impacting organizational effectiveness and performance. Being engaged in a dialogue with stakeholders is considered a major requirement when a company claims its social responsibility. The objective of the article is to find out whether companies practice what they preach. The dialog is defined as an interactive process of learning together, focused on reaching mutual understanding. It results in opportunities for generating ideas of new products, new campaigns, new businesses and partnerships. Progress in communication made the dialog with many distant stakeholders possible from technical point of view. Was it a sufficient incentive to encourage companies to practice dialogic conversations? A literature review is conducted in order to answer the major research question. The focus is on academic business and management journals addressing dialog practice. The analyzed articles are segmented into groups, which demonstrate various authors' approaches to the topic. The literature review shows the deficiencies of communication with stakeholders, which is claimed to be the dialogue, though it does not lead to parties sustainable relationships. Generally, the companies are not interested in information needs of their stakeholders, and treat one-way communication as public relations tool. As the articles revised are mainly focused on communication practices of the large corporations, therefore the findings do not refer automatically to smaller organizations, which are of minor interest to academics. The question asked in the article is novel in the Polish literature and may encourage further research. The findings should motivate practitioners to challenge communication deficiencies.

Slowa kluczowe

dialog, communication, stakeholders, CSR, public relations

Bibliografia

- Albinsson, P. A., Perera, B. i Sautter, E. (2011). Assessing value co-creation: DART scale development and validation (s. 458–459). W: S. M. Noble i C. H. Noble (red.), *AMA Summer Educators Conference 2011: Delivering Value in Turbulent Times*, 22.
- Andriof, J. (2001). Patterns of stakeholder partnership building. W: J. Andriof i M. McIntosh (red.), *Perspectives on Corporate Citizenship* (s. 215–238). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing. https://doi.org/10.9774/GLEAF.978-1-909493-19-3_15
- Argyris, C. i Schon, D. A. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Ballantyne, D. (2004). Dialogue and its role in the development of relationship specific knowledge. *Journal of Business i Industrial Marketing*, 19(2), 114–123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08858620410523990>
- Bartkus, B. R. i Glassman, M. (2008). Do firms practice what they preach? The relationship between mission statements and stakeholder management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83(2), 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9612-0>
- Berman, S. L., Wicks, A. C., Kotha, S. i Jones, T. M. (1999). Does stakeholder orientation matter? The relationship between stakeholder management models and firm financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(5), 475–490. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256972>
- Blanchard, O. (2011). *Social Media ROI: Managing and Measuring Social Media Efforts in Your Organization*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Bohm, D. (1996). *On Dialogue*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203180372>
- Bolchini, D. i Paolini, P. (2006). Interactive dialogue model: A design technique for multi-channel applications. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 8(3), 529–542. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMM.2006.870733>
- Bonsón, E. i Flores, F. (2011). Social media and corporate dialogue: The response of global financial institutions. *Online Information Review*, 35(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14684521111113579>
- Burchell, J. i Cook, J. (2006). Assessing the impact of stakeholder dialogue: Changing relationships between NGO and companies. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 6(3/4), 210–227. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.229>
- Burchell, J. i Cook, J. (2008). Stakeholder dialogue and organizational learning: Changing relationships between companies and NGOs. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 17(1), 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8608.2008.00518.x>
- Carey, A. i Sancto, J. (red.). (1998). *Performance Measurement in the Digital Age — Adding Value to Corporate Reporting*. London: ICAEW.
- Cheney, G. i Christensen, L. T. (2001). Organizational identity: Linkages between internal and external communication. W: F. M. Jablin i L.L. Putnam (red.), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory, Research, and Methods* (s. 231–269). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). The logic of open innovation: Managing intellectual property. *California Management Review*, 45, 33–58. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166175>
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2006). *Open Innovation. The New Imperative of Creating and Profiting from Technology*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Cozier, Z. R. i Witmer, D. F. (2001). The development of a structuration analysis of new publics in an electronic environment. W: R. L. Heath i G. Vasquez (red.), *Handbook of Public Relations* (s. 615–623). Thousand Oaks: Sage. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452220727>
- Crane, A. i Livesey, S. (2003). Are you talking to me? Stakeholder communication and the risks and rewards of dialogue. W: J. Andriof, S. Waddock, B. Husted i S. Rahman Shutherland (red.), *Unfolding Stakeholder Thinking 2. Relationships, Communication, Reporting and Performance* (s. 39–52). Sheffield: Greenleaf Books.
- Czaplejewicz, E. (1978). Wprowadzenie do pragmatycznej teorii dialogu. W: E. Czaplejewicz i E. Kasperski (red.), *Dialog w literaturze* (s. 11–48). Warszawa: PWN.
- Di Pietro, L. i Pantano, E. (2012). An empirical investigation of social network on consumer purchasing decision: The case of Facebook. *Journal of Direct Data and Digital Marketing Practice*, 14, 18–29. <https://doi.org/10.1057/dddmp.2012.10>
- Digital Transformation Scoreboard. (2017). *Digital Transformation Scoreboard 2018. EU businesses go digital: Opportunities, outcomes and uptake*. Pozyskano z https://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/dem/monitor/sites/default/files/Digital%20Transformation%20Scoreboard%202018_0.pdf
- Elving, W. J. i May Postma, R. (2017). Social media: The dialogue myth? How organizations use social media for stakeholder dialogue. W: B. Van Ruler, I. Smit, O. Ihlen i S. Romenti (red.), *How Strategic Communication Shapes Value and Innovation in Society* (s. 123–141). Emerald Publishing.
- Eurostat. (2017). *Social media. Statistics on the use by enterprises*. Pozyskano z https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Social_media_-_statistics_on_the_use_by_enterprises

- Foster, D. i Jonker, J. (2005). Stakeholder relationships: The dialogue of engagement. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 5(5), 51–57. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700510630059>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Perspective*. Boston: Pitman.
- Gallaugh, J. i Ransbotham, S. (2010). Social media and customer dialog management at Starbucks. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 9(4), 197–212.
- Gillin, P. (2007). *The New Influencers: A Marketer's Guide to New Social Media*. Sanger: Quill Driver Books.
- Gowthorpe, C. (2004). Asymmetrical dialogue? Corporate financial reporting via the Internet. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 9(4), 283–293. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563280410564020>
- Greenwood, M. (2007). Stakeholder engagement: Beyond the myth of corporate responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74, 315–327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9509-y>
- Grönroos, Ch. (1994). Quo vadis, marketing? Toward a relationship marketing paradigm. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10(5), 347–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.1994.9964283>
- Grönroos, Ch. (2004). The relationship marketing process: Communication, interaction dialogue, value. *Journal of Business Industrial Marketing*, 19(2), 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08858620410523981>
- Grönroos, Ch. (2006). On defining marketing: Finding a new roadmap for marketing. *Marketing Theory*, (4), 395–417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593106069930>
- Grunig, J. E. i Grunig, L. A. (1992). Models of public relations and communication. W: J. E. Grunig, D. M. Dozier, W. P. Ehling, L. A. Gruning, F. C. Pepper i J. White (red.), *Excellence in Communication and Communication Management* (s. 285–325). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Grzenia, J. (2003). Internet jako miejsce dialogu. W: M. Kita i J. Grzenia (red.), *Porozmawiajmy o rozmowie. Lingwistyczne aspekty dialogu* (s. 81–90). Katowice: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Guibert, L. i Roloff, J. (2017). Stakeholder Dialogue: Strategic Tool or Wasted Words? *Journal of Business Strategy*, 38(5), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-07-2016-0071>
- Gummesson, E. (1994). Making Relationship Marketing Operational. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 5(5), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09564239410074349>
- Gummesson, E. (2011). *Total Relationship Marketing*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080880112>
- Hąbek, P. (2009). Społeczna odpowiedzialność przedsiębiorstw jako koncepcja firmy zorientowanej na interesariuszy. *Organizacja i Zarządzanie*, 2(6), 69–86.
- Habisch, A., Patelli, L., Pedrini, M. i Schwartz, Ch. (2010). Different talks with different folks: A comparative survey of stakeholder dialog in Germany, Italy, and the US. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100, 381–404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0686-8>
- Hamel, G. i Prahalad, C. K. (1996). *Competing for the Future*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hoffman, D. L. i Fodor, M. (2010). Can you measure the ROI of your social media marketing? *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 52(1).
- Idowu, S. O. i Papasolomou, I. (2007). Are the corporate social responsibility matters based on good intentions or false pretences? An empirical study of the motivations behind the issuing of CSR reports by UK companies. *Corporate Governance*, 7(2), 136–147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700710739787>
- Illa, L., Romenti, S., Rodríguez-Cánovas, B., Murtarelli, G. i Carroll, C. E. (2015). Exploring corporations' dialogue about CSR in the digital era. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 146(1), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2924-6>
- Johansen, T. S. i Nielsen, A. E. (2011). Strategic stakeholder dialogues a discursive perspective on relationship building. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 16(3), 2004–2017. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563281111156871>
- Kantanen, H. (2012). Identity, image and stakeholder dialogue. *Corporate Communication: An International Journal*, 17(1), 56–72. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563281211196353>
- Kaptein, M. i van Tulder, V. R. (2003). Toward effective stakeholder dialogue. *Business and Society Review*, 108(2), 203–224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8594.00161>
- Kent, M. L. i Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the World Wide Web. *Public Relations Review*, 24(3), 321–334. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111\(99\)80143-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(99)80143-X)
- Kent, M. L. i Taylor, M. (2002). Towards a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 28(1), 21–37. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111\(02\)00108-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(02)00108-X)
- Kent, M. L., Taylor, M. i White, W. J. (2003). The relationship between web site design and organizational responsiveness to stakeholders. *Public Relations Review*, 29(1), 63–77. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111\(02\)00194-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(02)00194-7)
- Lubaś, W. (2003). Nazywanie osób w dialogu. W: M. Kita i J. Grzenia (red.), *Porozmawiajmy o rozmowie. Lingwistyczne aspekty dialogu* (s. 71–80). Katowice: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Magnold, W. G. i Faulds, D. J. (2009). Social media: The new hybrid element of the promotion mix. *Business Horizons*, 52(4), 357–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.03.002>

- Mainetti, L., Paiano, R., Bolchini, D. i Pandurino, A. (2012). Dialogue-based modeling of rich internet applications: The Rich-IDM approach. *International Journal of Web Information Systems*, 8(2), 157–180. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17440081211241941>
- Mazur, J. i Zaborek, P. (2014a). Logika usługowa, a lojalność klientów. W: A. Czubała, P. Hadrian i J.W. Wiktor (red.), *Marketing w 25-leciu gospodarki rynkowej w Polsce* (s. 544–553). Warszawa: PWE.
- Mazur, J. i Zaborek, P. (2014b). Validating DART model. *International Journal of Management and Economics*, 44, 106–125. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijme-2015-0012>
- Michaelidou, N., Siamagka, N. T. i Christodoulides, G. (2011). Usage, barriers and measurement of social media marketing. An exploratory investigation of small and medium B2B brands. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(7), 1153–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2011.09.009>
- Mollen, A. i Wilson, H. (2010). Engagement, telepresence and interactivity in online consumer experience: Reconciling scholastic and managerial perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(9–10), 919–925. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.05.014>
- Payne, C. M. i Ballantyne, D. (2002). *Relationship Marketing: Creating Stakeholder Value*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Peters, K., Chen, Y., Kaplan, A. M., Ognibeni, B. i Pauwels, K. (2013). Social media metrics — A framework and guidelines for managing social media. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 27(4), 281–298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2013.09.007>
- Prahalad, C. K. i Ramaswamy, V. (2003). The new frontier of experience innovation. *Sloan Management Review*, 44(4), 12–18.
- Prahalad, C. K. i Ramaswamy, V. (2004a). *The Future of Competition: Co-creating Unique Value with Customers*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Prahalad, C. K. i Ramaswamy, V. (2004b). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18(3), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.20015>
- Ranjan, K. R. i Read, S. (2016). Value co-creation: Concept and measurement. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44(3), 290–315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0397-2>
- Romenti, S., Valentini, Ch., Murtarelli, G. i Meggiorin, K. (2016). Measuring online dialogic conversations' quality: A scale development. *Journal of Communication Management*, 20(4). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-11-2015-0090>
- Schein, E. H. (1994). The process of dialogue: Creating effective communication. *The System Thinker*, 5(5), 1–4.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline*. New York: Doubleday.
- Spaul, B. (1997). *Corporate Dialogue in Digital Age*. London: ICAEW.
- Stanek-Kowalczyk, A. (2018). *Factors Affecting the Scope of Data Disclosed in Corporate Non-financial Data Reports* (niepublikowana dysertacja doktorska). SGH w Warszawie.
- Szul-Skjoeldkrona, E. (2011). Dialog z interesariuszami. Polski punkt widzenia. W: *Standardy AA1000. Narzędzie społecznej odpowiedzialności biznesu. Przewodnik dla biznesu*. Warszawa: CSRinfo.
- Taghizadeh, S. K., Jayaraman, K., Ismail, I. i Rahman, S. A. (2016). Scale development and validation for DART model of value co-creation process on innovation strategy. *Journal of Business i Industrial Marketing*, 31(1), 24–35. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-02-2014-0033>
- Taylor, M., Kent, M. L. i White, W. J. (2001). How activist organizations are using the Internet to build relationship. *Public Relations Review*, 27(3), 263–284. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111\(01\)00086-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(01)00086-8)
- Vargo, S. L. i Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036>
- Varney, J. (1996). The power of dialogue. *Management Development Review*, 9(2), 30–32. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09622519610772111>
- Wachowiak, P. (2011). Społeczna odpowiedzialność biznesu — wyzwania stojące przed polskimi przedsiębiorstwami. *E-mentor*, 4(41).
- Wachowiak, P. (2012). Jak prowadzić dialog z interesariuszami? *E-mentor*, 1(43), 20–24.
- Wigley, S. i Lewis, B. K. (2012). Rules of engagement: Practice what you tweet. *Public Relations Review*, 38(1), 165–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.08.020>
- Wilkoń, A. (2003). Gatunki mówione. W: M. Kita i J. Grzenia (red.), *Porozmawiajmy o rozmowie. Lingwistyczne aspekty dialogu* (s. 46–58). Katowice: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Wilson, M., Bokma, A., Hall, R., Smith, P. i Wales, J. (1999). Tomorrow's company reporting — Stakeholder dialogue in the digital age. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, 5(1), 67–97. <https://doi.org/10.1108/96754269980000784>
- Witek-Hajduk, M. K., Zaborek, P., Mazur, J., Sznajder, A. i Targański, B. (2017). Związki między cechami domen internetowych polskich marek a ich międzynarodową aktywnością w Internecie. *Handel Wewnętrzny*, 3(268), 423–438.

Yi, Y. i Gong, T. (2013). Customer value co-creation behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1279–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.026>

Zaborek, P. i Mazur, J. (2017). Exploring links between engaging customers in value co-creation and product innovativeness. *International Journal of Management and Economics*, 53(3), 82–106. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijme-2017-0020>

nie. Warszawa: PWE.