

MARKETING ETHICS AND COMMUNICATION STRATEGY IN THE CASE OF ENRON ECONOMICAL FRAUD

Georgia Broni¹, John Velentzas², Harry Papapanagos³

© Springer International Publishing AG

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-48454-9_19

CHAPTER 19

ABSTRACT

Ethical discussion in marketing is still in its nascent stage. Marketing Ethics came of age only as late as 1990s. As it is the case with business ethics in general, marketing ethics too is approached from ethical perspectives of virtue, deontology, consequentialism, pragmatism and also from relativist positions. However, there are extremely few articles published from the perspective of 20th or 21st century philosophy of ethics. One impediment in defining marketing ethics is the difficulty of pointing out the agency responsible for the practice of ethics. Competition, rivalry among the firms, lack of autonomy of the persons at different levels of marketing hierarchy, nature of the products marketed, nature of the persons to whom products are marketed, the profit margin claimed, and everything relating the marketing field does make the agency of a marketing person just a cog in the wheel. Deprived of agency, the hierarchy of marketing hardly lets one with an opportunity to autonomously decide to be ethical. Without one having agency, one is deprived of the ethical choices.

1. Introduction

Business ethics is the behaviour that a business adheres to in its daily dealings with the world (Borgerson / Schroeder, 2008). The ethics of a particular business can be diverse. They apply not only to how the business interacts with the world at large, but also to their one-on-one dealings with a single customer (Solomon, 1991). Many businesses have gained a bad reputation just by being in business (Carr, 1968). To some people, businesses are interested in making money, and that is the bottom line (Solomon, 1983).

It could be called capitalism in its purest form. Making money is not wrong in itself. It is the manner in which some businesses conduct themselves that brings up the question of ethical behaviour (Solomon, 1983). Good business ethics should be a part of every business. There are many factors to consider. When a company does business with another that is considered unethical, does this make the first company unethical by association (Kahneman, Knetsch, Thaler, 1986; Velasquez, 1983). Some people would say yes, the first business has a responsibility and it is now a link in the chain of unethical businesses (Kanungo, Mendoca, 1996:81).

Many global businesses, including most of the major brands that the public use, can be seen not to think too highly of good business ethics. Many major brands have been fined millions for breaking ethical business laws. Money is the major deciding factor (Kanungo, Mendoca, 1996:81). If a company does not adhere to business ethics and breaks the laws, they usually end up being fined. Many companies have broken anti-trust, ethical and environmental laws and received fines worth millions (Velasquez, 1983). The problem is that the amount of money these companies are

¹ Georgia Broni, Technological Institute of Western Macedonia, g.mprwnh@kastoria.teikoz.gr

² John Velentzas, Technological Institute of Western Macedonia, drjohnvel@gmail.com

³ Harry Papapanagos, University of Macedonia, hp@uom.gr

making outweighs the fines (Solomon, 1983). The profits blind the companies to their lack of business ethics and the money sign wins.

2. Business ethics

A business may be a multi-million seller, but does it use good business ethics and do people care? There are popular soft drinks, fast food restaurants and petroleum agencies that have been fined time and time again for unethical behavior (Harwood, 1996). Business ethics should eliminate exploitation, from the sweat shop children who are making sneakers to the coffee serving staff who are being ripped off in wages. Business ethics can be applied to everything from the trees cut down to make the paper that a business sells to the ramifications of importing coffee from certain countries (Aiken, 1991).

In the end, it may be up to the public to make sure that a company adheres to correct business ethics. If the company is making large amounts of money, they may not wish to pay too close attention to their ethical behavior. There are many companies that pride themselves in their correct business ethics (Stark, 1993). But in this competitive world, they are becoming very few and far between. In the increasingly conscience-focused marketplaces of the 21st century, the demand for more ethical business processes and actions (known as ethicism) is increasing. Simultaneously, pressure is applied on industry to improve business ethics through new public initiatives and laws. Businesses can often attain short-term gains by acting in an unethical fashion; however, such behaviours tend to undermine the economy over time. Business ethics can be both a normative⁴ and

⁴ Normative ethics is the branch of philosophical ethics that investigates the set of questions that arise when we think about the question "how ought one act, morally speaking?" Normative ethics is distinct from meta-ethics because it examines standards for the rightness and wrongness of actions, while meta-ethics studies the meaning of moral language and the metaphysics of moral facts. Normative ethics is also distinct from descriptive ethics, as the latter is an empirical investigation of people's moral beliefs. To put it another way, descriptive ethics rate practice and a career specialization, the field is primarily normative. In academia descriptive approaches are also taken. The range and quantity of business ethical issues reflects the degree to which business is perceived to would be concerned with determining what proportion of people believe that killing is always wrong, while normative ethics is concerned with whether it is correct to hold such a belief. Hence, normative ethics is sometimes said to be prescriptive, rather than descriptive.

However, on certain versions of the meta-ethical view called moral realism, moral facts are both descriptive and prescriptive at the same time. Broadly speaking, normative ethics can be divided into the sub-disciplines of moral theory and applied ethics. In recent years the boundaries between these sub-disciplines have increasingly been dissolving as moral theorists become more interested in applied problems and applied ethics is becoming more profoundly philosophically informed. Traditional moral theories were concerned with finding moral principles which allow one to determine whether an action is right or wrong. Classical theories in this vein include utilitarianism, Kantianism, and some forms of contractarianism. These theories offered an overarching moral principle to which one could appeal in resolving difficult moral decisions.

In the 20th century, moral theories became more complex and were no longer concerned solely with rightness and wrongness, but were interested in many different kinds of moral status. This trend may have begun in 1930 with W. D. Ross in his book, "The Right and the Good". Here Ross argues that moral theories cannot say in general whether an action is right or wrong but only whether it tends to be right or wrong according to a certain kind of moral duty such as beneficence, fidelity, or justice (he called this concept of partial rightness *prima facie* duty). Subsequently, philosophers have questioned whether even *prima facie* duties can be articulated at a theoretical level, and some philosophers have urged a turn away from general theorizing altogether, while others have defended theory on the grounds that it need not be perfect in order to capture important moral insight. In the middle of the century there was a long hiatus in the development of normative ethics during which philosophers largely turned away from normative questions towards meta-ethics.

Even those philosophers during this period who maintained an interest in prescriptive morality, such as R. M. Hare, attempted to arrive at normative conclusions via meta-ethical reflection. This focus on meta-ethics was in part caused by the intense linguistic turn in analytic philosophy and in part by the pervasiveness of logical positivism. In 1971, John Rawls bucked the trend against normative theory in publishing *A Theory of Justice*. This work was revolutionary, in part because it paid almost no attention to meta-ethics and instead pursued moral arguments directly. In the wake of A

a descriptive discipline. To some extent society regards this as acceptable, but where is the ethical line to be drawn?

3. Marketing Ethics

Marketing ethics overlaps strongly with media ethics, because marketing makes heavy use of media. However, media ethics is a much larger topic and extends outside business ethics. Marketing Ethics is a subset of business ethics. Ethics in marketing deals with the principles, values and / or ideals by which marketers (and marketing institutions) ought to act. Marketing ethics too, like its parent discipline, is a contested terrain. Discussions of marketing ethics are focused around two major concerns: one is the concern from political philosophy and the other is from the transaction-focused business practice. On the one side, following ideologists like Milton Friedman and Ayn Rand, it is argued that the only ethics in marketing is maximizing profit for the shareholder.

On the other side it is argued that market is responsible to the consumers and other proximate as well as remote stakeholders as much as, if not less, it is responsible to its shareholders (Jones, Parker, Bos, 2005:3; (Murphy, 2002:168-169). The ethical prudence of targeting vulnerable sections for consumption of redundant or dangerous products / services, being transparent about the source of labour (child labour, sweatshop labour, fair labour remuneration), declaration regarding fair treatment and fair pay to the employees, being fair and transparent about the environmental risks, the ethical issues of product or service transparency (being transparent about the ingredients used in the product / service (Murphey, Laczniak, et al., 2007), use of genetically modified organisms, content, "source code" in the case of software), appropriate labelling, the ethics of declaration of the risks in using the product / service (health risks, financial risks, security risks etc.), product / service safety and liability, respect for stakeholder privacy and autonomy, the issues of outsmarting rival business through unethical business tactics etc. advertising truthfulness and honesty, fairness in pricing & distribution, and forthrightness in selling etc., are few among the issues debated among people concerned about ethics of marketing practice. Marketing ethics is not restricted to the field of marketing alone, rather its influence spread across all fields of life and most importantly construction of "socially salient identities for people" and "affect some people's morally significant perceptions of and interactions with other people, and if they can contribute to those perceptions or interactions going seriously wrong, these activities have bearing on fundamental ethical questions". Marketing, especially its visual communication, it is observed, serve as an instrument of epistemic closure (Borgerson, Schroeder, 2008:89).

4. Corporate Social Responsibility

4.1. General remarks on Corporate Social Responsibility

One of an organization's primary goals is its obligation to operate in a socially responsible manner (Velentzas, Broni, 2010). Therefore, the recognition that the vast power of the modern corporation carry with it an equally large responsibility to use that power responsibly is an important message for managers. Here, we examine corporate social responsibility and the related area of managerial ethics. Corporate social responsibility has been a topic of academic study for several decades. Numerous studies have tried to arrive at consensus definition of social responsibility but have failed to do so. Although it difficult to present definition of social responsibility, much of the research attempts to identify various kinds of socially responsive activities, present the list of these activities

to the business manager, and then measure and frequency of response to which the activities are practiced by those agencies or people being questioned. Moreover, the concept of social responsibility is a continually evolving concept and means different things to different people (Stange, 1994:461).

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) can be defined as the economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations at a given point in time. The concept of corporate social responsibility means that organizations have moral, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities in addition to their responsibilities to earn a fair return for investors and comply with the law. A traditional view of the corporation suggests that its primary, if not sole, responsibility is to its owners, or stockholders. However, CSR requires organizations to adopt a broader view of its responsibilities that includes not only stockholders, but many other constituencies as well, including employees, suppliers, customers, the local community (local self-government), state government, environmental groups, and other special interest groups (Viswesveran, Deshpande, Milman, 1998). Collectively, the various groups affected by the actions of an organization are called "stakeholders."

The stakeholder concept is discussed more fully in a later section. Corporate social responsibility is related to, but not identical with, business ethics. The economic responsibilities refer to society's expectation that organizations will produce goods and services that are needed and desired by customers and sell those goods and services at a reasonable price (McWilliams, Siegel, 2001). Organizations are expected to be efficient, profitable, and to keep shareholder interests in mind. The legal responsibilities relate to the expectation that organizations will comply with the laws set down by society to govern competition in the marketplace. Organizations have thousands of legal responsibilities governing almost every aspect of their operations, including consumer and product laws, environmental laws, and employment laws.

The ethical responsibilities concern societal expectations that go beyond the law, such as the expectation that organizations will conduct their affairs. This means that organizations are expected to do more than just comply with the law, but also make proactive efforts to anticipate and meet the norms of society even if those norms are not formally enacted in law. Finally, the discretionary responsibilities of corporations refer to society's expectation that organizations be good citizens. This may involve such things as philanthropic support of programs benefiting a community or the nation. It may also involve donating employee expertise and time to worthy causes. Corporate policy should state clearly, Illegal actions in any form will not be condoned or tolerated by the company. Much of the battle that goes between government, business, and society is a result of the conflict between their different views on economic and social responsibility goals. Today, business cannot operate without contact and interaction with the government and its myriad of rules and regulations. The managers of the corporation who must take responsibility to fulfil their duties to their stockholders and to the public (Broni, 2010) at large by extending themselves further by making more personal contact among employees, business management, the academic community, and political groups.

This in turn will permit corporate leaders to become influential in political affairs to an extent never before realized (Velentzas / Broni, 2010). The most convenient way to explore this approach is to consider the supra-legal moral principles that philosophers commonly offer. Five fairly broad moral principles suggested by philosophers are as follows:

5. The case of Enron Fraud

The case of Enron is an important example of using communication strategies to create a virtual profile. The Enron Company was founded in July 1985 by Kenneth Lay and was a result of the

merger Houston Gas and Internorth based in Houston, Texas. It started as a local energy company (natural gas). In 1995, executives were determined to make the top Enron energy company worldwide. It expanded in the European energy market, the electricity sector and the field of communication by providing high quality broadband services and applications. The Kenneth Lay adopted its aggressive growth strategy in order to become a world-renowned company and scope and the ball.

The company Enron was the seventh largest company in America. In 2000 it was elected for the 6th consecutive year by Fortune magazine as the most innovative company in America as it was considered a model new economy. The profits of the company in 2000 reached US \$ 101 billion while the business is spread across 40 countries. The staff was 21 000 employees of whom 9 thousands in Europe.

5.1 Founding members and top executives

It is very important to refer to the personalities of top executives of the company to grasp that led to the bankruptcy of such a great company.

The company's founder Kenneth Lay maintained a strong friendship with the Bush family and was the main contributor to the first campaign of Bush. He claimed "The Enron treats everyone with absolute integrity, we want to do business with us to believe that we are absolutely reliable".

The General Manager of the company Jeffrey Skilling described in the documentary as an intelligent, adventurous man in his life and in his business. He stated "We like the risk. Because it makes money". Something that characterizes us is to ask why.

CEO of the company Andy Fastow who created fictitious companies and sell them to banks putting as guarantor of these companies to Enron.

From the above it is understood that the company was controlled by smart people but they put as a priority in their immediate personal gain.

According to Grant (1991), the core business strategy features are three:

- a) The setting of objectives, which are long-term, simple and acceptable,
- b) The deep understanding of the competitive environment and
- c) The objective evaluation of the company's resources.

From the above, the Enron characteristics are in the second as the objectives of executives and the resource assessment was hypothetical.

5.2 Communication strategy before the Enron scandal

The communication strategy of the company was such that it did not give room for doubt by journalists or analysts. The company had a holistic approach of its operational requirements that created the image of a perfect company with an excellent reputation for high returns and profits. The top executives, in press releases and interviews with traditional concepts, were leading the company to be considered novel and innovative and strains of highly intelligent and infallible. In addition to the company prevailing theory of Social Darwinism they were working only the best like scientists and communicators. In an interview Skilling said that employees had been graded between them on a scale from 1 to 5 and whoever took the worst score would be dismissed. Their energy was considered quite harsh by social media but of course no one responded and it was considered a right step in maintaining good image and reputation in such a competitive environment. Even if there were some doubt by a journalist whether the Enron overrated, o Kenneth Lay reassured investors saying: "It is hard to show the world of capital movement especially in terms of sales. The article was published because there is competition between journals. The criticism is ridiculous". Finally the representatives of the company and its managers proudly

declared that the primary objective of the company is the desire to achieve a profit and that there are no unattainable goals for them.

5.3 The reality

But what happened in reality was far from the image promoted by the company. The Enron was using several front companies in which it gave deficits and debts, to show inflated results. The aim of this falsification of balance sheets was to increase the share and to grow the market value of the company. In most cases, the business strategy is not the result of a planned and rational process but emerges as a compromise (Leander, 2008:41).

The company took high risk to be managed to survive, which risks were leading to unethical acts by employees at all levels. The company was involved in fraud associations with unexplained blackouts in California to put pressure on the government to release electricity. Then they could manipulate the prices and increase the price of electricity for the benefit of Enron. When someone asked Skilling for the involvement in the California case he said “we are angels”. Overcharging of profits and shares, speculation and the big lies of executives led to distorted information and disorientation and confusion efforts. Under these conditions, people experiencing cognitive limits on their ability to achieve their purposes had no perfect knowledge "(Leander, 2008:41). Additionally, the company was prevailing opportunism “individuals tend to pursue their individual interests by fraud, ie deliberate attempts to mislead” (Leander, 2008:42). It is obvious that greed and profiteering that took place in the company at some point led to disaster.

5.4 The descent

In August 2001 Skilling declares resignation for personal reasons and later claimed that “On the day I left I believed that the company had good economic situation”.

The Audit-Accounting Andersen company which was responsible for the financial control of Enron, a few days before the Enron announced its bankruptcy, sought the destruction of tons of documents related to the audit of the company.

Simultaneously Lay reassured investors: “The business has very strong bases. The investigation will take a long time compared with our accountants and lawyers but ultimately these issues will expire. Despite the rumors, despite speculation the company is doing well, financially and operationally”. They convinced the lenders about the creditworthiness of the company to report impressive financial statements and to conceal debts of \$ 3.9 billion for the period 1992-2001.

On December 2 of 2001 the company filed for bankruptcy and laid off all employees with employee compensation \$ 4,500 while the big executives got bonus.

5.5 Communication strategy after the Enron scandal

Enron Communication strategy was very different after the scandal for financial fraud company. According to Constantine Anna Economou Silver (thesis, 2005, p. 32) in times of crises, operators must assume their responsibilities, to avoid making excuses and face problems with realism, responsibility and honesty.

Lay said “The Enron collapse is a huge tragedy. In such a company existed many executives who had great power and enjoyed extreme confidence. We grieve for the loss of the company”.

Skilling argues: “The Enron destroyed by massive withdrawals in banks”. Communication strategy which followed before and after the scandal is far different from the proper business communication strategy. Unfortunately, in our time, the occasional profit prevails so as the fictional

image of the individual to society. A company that aims to increase the profit is not very different from an immoral man who exploits others to promote and enrich. To avoid future similar financial scams we must change the orientation and philosophy of the individual and then the ethics of business.

References

- Abrams, F. (1954). Management responsibilities in a complex world, in: Carroll, T.H. (Ed.), *Business Education for Competence and Responsibility*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Adams, A. (1992). *Bullying at Work*. London: Virago Press.
- Aiken, L.R. (1991). *Psychological testing and assessment* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Albertson, Todd (2007). *The Gods of Business: The Intersection of Faith and the Marketplace*. Los Angeles, CA: Trinity Alumni Press.
- Aquinas, Thomas St., *Summa Theologiae*.
- Ariss, S., Nykodym, N., Cole-Laramore, A.A. (2002). *Trust and Technology in the Virtual*
- Aristotle. (1948). *Politics*, trans. E. Barker Oxford: Clarendon.
- Aristotle. (2000). *Politics; Nicomachean Ethics*, ed. Roger Crisp, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Armstrong, M.B. (2002). *Ethical Issues in Accounting*. In: N.E. Bowie (Ed.), *The Blackwell guide to business ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell (145-157).
- Badiou, A. (2001). *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil*. London, Verso.
- Badre, A.N. (2002). *Shaping Web Usability: Interaction Design in Context*. Addison-Wesley, UK.
- Balabanis, G., Philips, H.C., Lyall, J. (1998). Corporate social responsibility and economic performance in the top British companies: are they linked?, *European Business Review*, Vol. 98, No. 1, 25-44.
- Barnett, S., Buchanan, D., Patrickson, M., Maddern, J. (1996). Negotiating the Evolution of the HR Function: Practical Advice From the Health Care Sector, *Human Resource Management Journal* 6 (4), 18-38.
- Bernard, W. (1972). *Morality*, Harper & Row.
- Biller-Andorno, N., Karageorgiou, A. (2001). Evidence Based Medicine in Germany. Paper Presented at the European Union EVI-BASE project state of the art meeting.
- Biessi, A., Nunn, H. (2005). *Realism and Revelation*. London: Wallflower Press.
- Bowie (Ed.), *Ethical Theory and Business*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Boldrin, M., Levine, D.K. (2008). *Against Intellectual Monopoly*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bowie, N.E. (Ed.) (2002). *The Blackwell guide to business ethics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bowie, N.E. (1999). *Business Ethics: A Kantian Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Boyd R., Richerson P.J. (1985). *Culture and the evolutionary process*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Boylan, M. (1995). *Ethical Issues in Business*. Florida: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Brady, F.N. / Dunn, C.P. (1995). Business meta-ethics: An Analysis of two theories, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 5, 385-398.
- Bratton, J., Gold, J. (1999). *Human Resource Management. Theory and Practices*. Hampshire: Macmillan Business.
- Broni, G. (2010). *Ethics in Business*, [in greek], IuS.
- Campbell, J. K. (1964). *Honour, Family and Patronage. A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Capaldi, N. (2005). Corporate social responsibility and the bottom line, *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 32, No. 5, 408-423.
- Capaldi, N. (2006). What Philosophy Can and Cannot Contribute to Business Ethics, *Journal of Private Enterprise* 22 (2): 68-86.
- Carr, A. (1968). Is Business Bluffing Ethical?, *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Febr.

- Carroll, Archie (1979). A Three Dimensional Conceptual Model of Corporate Performance, *Academy Of Management Review*, Vol. 4, No 4, 497-505.
- Carroll, Archie B. (1996). *Business and Society: Ethics and Stakeholder Management*. (3rded.) Cincinnati: South-Western College Publishing.
- Carroll, Archie (2000). A Commentary And Overview of Key Questions On Corporate Social Performance Measurement, *Business And Society*, Vol. 39, Issue 4.
- Conger, J., Kanungo, R. (1998). *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*, www.ncsl.org.uk.
- Connock, S., Johns, T. (1995). *Ethical Leadership*. London: Chartered Institute for Personnel and Development.
- Conry, E., Nelson, D. (1991). Business Law and Moral Growth, In: P. Hodapp (Ed.) *Business Ethics and the Law*, University Press of America 105.
- Darby R. (1995). Developing the euro manager: managing in a multicultural environment, *European Business Review*, 95 (1), 13-15.
- D'Arcimoles, C.H. (1997). Human Resource Policies and Company Performance: A Quantitative Approach Using Longitudinal Data. *Organization Studies* 18, 857-874.
- Darcy, K. (1999). Ethics and Corporate Leadership. In: R. E. Frederick (Ed.), *A Companion to Business Ethics*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- David Preston (1997). Can Business Ethics Really Exist?, *Computers and society*, March 1997.
- Davidson, D.K. (2002). *The moral dimension of marketing: Essays on business ethics*. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Davies, P.W.F. (Ed.) (1997). *Current issues in business ethics*. New York: Routledge.
- Dealy, M.D. (2006). *Managing by accountability: What every leader needs to know about responsibility, integrity and results*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Decker, O.S. (2004). Corporate social responsibility and structural change in financial services, *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 6, 712-28.
- DeFrances, C.J., Smith, S.K., Langan, P.A., Ostrum, B.J., Rottman, D.B., Goerdt, J.A. (1995). *Civil Jury Cases and Verdicts in Large Counties*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, NCJ-154346, 1-14.
- Dobson, J. (1997). *Finance Ethics: The Rationality of Virtue*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Donaldson, Thomas (1989). *The Ethics of Business Ethics* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Donaldson, Tom (1982). *Corporations and Morality*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Elston, M.A. (1995). The Politics of Professional Power: Medicine in a Changing Health Service. In: J. Gabe, D. Kelleher, G. Williams (Ed.) *Challenging Medicine*. London: Routledge.
- Enderle, Georges (1999). *International Business Ethics*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Epstein, M.J., Hanson, K.O. (2006). *The accountable corporation*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Ferrell, O., Fraedrich, J. (1997). *Business ethics: ethical decision making and cases*, Houghton Mifflin.
- Fletcher, C., Williams, R. (1985). *Performance Appraisal and Career*
- Floffman, D.E. (1993). Evaluating Ethics Committees: A View From Outside. *The Milbank Quarterly* 71, 677-701.
- Flynn R. (1999). Managerialism, Professionalism and Quasi-Markets. In: M. Exworthy, S. Halford (Ed.). *Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Frederick, William C. (1994a). From CSR1 to CSR2. The Maturing of Business-and-Society Thought, *Business & Society*, 33 No. 2, August 150-164 [Working Paper 279, Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, 1978].
- Frederick, William C. (1994b). Moving to CSR4, What to Pack for the Trip, *Business and Society*, vol. 37, no. 1, March, 40-59.

- Hoffman, M.W., Frederick, R., Schwartz, M. (Ed.) (2000). *Business Ethics. Readings and Cases in Corporate Morality*. (4th ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Frederick, W.C., Preston, L.E. (1990). *Business Ethics: Research Issues and Empirical Studies*, Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.
- Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Boston: Pitman.
- Freeman, R.E (2000). *A Stakeholder Theory of The Modern Corporation*, John W. Dienhart (Ed), Oxford University Press, New York.
- Freeman, R.E., William M.E. (1990). Corporate Governance: A Stakeholder Interpretation, *Journal of Behavioral Economics* 19 (4): 337-359.
- French, P.A. (1979). The Corporation as a Moral Person, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 16, 207-215.
- Friedman, Milton (1970-09-13). The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Its Profits, (September 13), 122-125. *The New York Times Magazine*.
- Fritzsche, D. J. (2005). *Business ethics: A global & managerial perspective*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Fuller, T., Tilley F. (2005). Corporate ethical futures: responsibility for the shadow on the future of today's ethical corporations. *Futures* 37 (2005), 183-197.
- Fulford, K.W.M., Howse, K. (1993). Ethics of research with psychiatric patients: principles, problems, and the primary responsibilities of researchers. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 19, 85-91.
- Garten, J.E. (2002). *The politics of fortune: A new agenda for business leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gattiker, U.E. (1995). Firm and Taxpayer Returns From Training of Semiskilled Employees. *Academy of Management Journal* 38, 1152-1173.
- Gilbert, D.R.Jr. (1996). *Ethics through corporate strategy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gillinson, S., Miller, P., Parker, S. (2004). *Disabilism: How to Tackle the Last Prejudice*, London: Demos.
- Gillon, R. (1997). Clinical Ethics Committees - Pros and Cons. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 23, 203-204.
- Green, Ronald (1991). When is "Everyone's Doing It" a Moral Justification?, *Business Ethics Quarterly* 1 (1), 75-93.
- Greening, D.W., Turban, D.B. (2000). Corporate social performance as a competitive advantage in attracting a quality workforce, *Business & Society*, Vol. 39, 254-280.
- Grief A., (1994). Cultural beliefs and the organization of society: a historical and theoretical reflection on collectivist and individualist societies, *Journal of Political Economy*, 102, 912-950.
- Hart, H.L.A. (1961). *The Concept of Law*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hartman, E. (1996). *Organizational ethics and the good life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hartman, L.P. (2005). *Perspectives in Business Ethics*. (3rd ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Hawkins, G. (2001). The Ethics of Television. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, Vol.4 (4), 412-426.
- Hazlitt, H. (1964). *The Foundations of Morality*, Princeton Van Nostrand.
- Hill, A. (2005). *Reality TV - Audiences and Popular Factual Television*. New York: Routledge.
- Hodapp, P. (Ed.), (1991). *Business Ethics and the Law*, University Press of America.
- Hoel, H., Cooper, C.L. (2001). Origins of bullying: theoretical frameworks for explaining bullying. In: N. Therani (Ed.) *Building a culture of respect: managing bullying at work*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Holevas G.K. (1995). *Principles of Organization and Business Administration* [in greek]. Interbooks.
- Hooker, B. (1998). Self-interest, Ethics and the Profit Motive. In: C. Cowton, / R. Crisp (Ed.) *Business Ethics. Perspectives on the Practice of Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopkins, W.E. (1997). *Ethical dimensions of diversity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hoque, K. (1999). Human Resource Management and Performance in the UK Hotel Industry, *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 37, 419-443.

- Hume, D. (1739-1740). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Republ. David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature: Two-volume set* (The Clarendon Edition of the Works of David Hume) (2007) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jennings, M. M. (1999). *Business Ethics: Case Studies and Selected Readings*. Boston: South-Western College / West.
- Kant, I. (1963). What is enlightenment (1784), In: L. White Beck (ed. and trans.) *On History*. Trans. Indianapolis: The Bobbs Merrill Company.
- Kant, I. (1990). *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785). Trans. By Lewis White Beck. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Kant, I. (1994). The metaphysics of moral: The metaphysical principles of virtue (1797). In: I. Kant, *Ethical Philosophy* (2nd ed), Trans by James W. Ellington. Indianapolis / Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Kotsiris, L. (1998). Contents of Greek Codes of Ethics [in greek].
- Kotsiris, L. (2002). Corporate Social Responsibility [in greek].
- Kotsiris, L. (2003). On business ethics [in greek].
- Kotter, J.P. (2001). *Leading changing*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, J.P., Heskett J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*, The free press.
- Kraman, S.S., Hamm, G. (1999). Risk Management: Extreme Honesty May Be the Best Policy. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 131 (12), 963-967.
- Leather, P., Lawrence, C., Beale, D., Cox, T., Dixon, R. (1998). Exposure to occupational violence and the buffering effects of intra-organizational support. *Work and Stress*, 12, 161-178.
- Lee, M. (2005). Critiquing code of ethics. In: C. Elliott & S. Turnbull (Ed.), *Critical Thinking in Human Resource Development*. London: Routledge. Legal Aspects of Clinical Ethics Committees. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 27 suppl. I: i50-i53.
- Leandros N. (2008). *Communication and Society: business strategies and the media industry*, Kastaniotis, Athens.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The Content and Development of Mobbing at Work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 5 (2), 165-184.
- Lippke, R. (1995). *Radical Business Ethics*, Lanham, Rowman and Littlefields Publ.
- Litvin, D. (2003). *Empires of profit: Commerce, conquest and corporate responsibility*. New York: Texere.
- Morreim, E. (1988). Cost Containment: Challenging Fidelity and Justice. *Hastings Cent Rep* 18, 20-25.
- Morrow, C.C., Jarrett, M.Q., Rupinski, M.T. (1997). An Investigation of the Effect and Economic Utility of Corporate-Wide Training. *Personnel Psychology* 50, 91-119.
- Mpourantas, D. (2005). *Leadership. The Road To permanent success*. [in greek] Athens: Kritiki.
- Mpourantas, D., Papalexandri N. (2002). *Human Resources Management*. [in greek] Athens: Kritiki.
- Murray, P., Murray, L. (1963). *The Art of the Renaissance*. London: Thames& Hudson (reprinted in 2000).
- Neal, A., Griffin, M.A. (1999). Developing a Theory of Performance for Human Resource Management. *Asia Pacific, Journal of Human Resources* 37, 44-59.
- Nelson, D.L., Quick, J.C. (2006). *Organizational Behavior. Foundations, Realities and Challenges*. Ohio: Thomson South-Western.
- Paciello, M. (2000). *Web Accessibility for People with Disabilities*. New York: CMP Books.
- Pagano, B., Pagano, E. (2004). *The transparency edge: How credibility can make or break you in business*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Paine, L. S. (2003). *Value shift: Why companies must merge social and financial imperatives to achieve superior performance*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Passas, N., Goodwin, N. (Ed.). *It's legal but it ain't right: Harmful social consequences of legal industries*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Patriotta, G. (2003). *Organizational Knowledge in the Making: How Firms Create, Use and Institutionalize Knowledge*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Patterson, M., West, M.A., Lawthom, R., Nickell, S. (1997). *Impact of People Management Practices on Business Performance*, London Institute of Personnel and Development. *Issues in People Management*, 22.
- Pearce, J.A.II, Doh, J.P. (2005). The high impact of collaborative social initiatives, *MITSloan Management Review*, Vol. 46, No. 3, 30-38.
- Pelegrinis, Th. (1997). *Ethical Philosophy*. [in greek]. *Ellinika Grammata* [Greek Letters].
- Preston, D. (1997). Can Business Ethics Really Exist?, *Computers and society*, March, 6-11.
- Preuss, L. (1997). A moral handrail for business: the need for a contextual model of business ethics, In: G. Moore (Ed.), *Business Ethics*, 41.
- Rawls, John (1971). *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, Mass., Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Ross, W.D. (Ed.). (1924). *Aristotle's Metaphysics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Roth, W.F. (2005). *Ethics in the workplace: A systems perspective*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Russell, B. (1967-1969). *A Liberal Decalogue. The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*. London: Routledge.
- Schelling, T.C. (1960). *Strategy and Conflict* (Harvard Univ. Press).
- Scott, Mary (2004). *Companies With A Conscience*. Denver, CO: Myers Templeton.
- Seglin, J.L. (2003). *The right thing: conscience, profit and personal responsibility in today's business*. Rollinsford, NH: Spiro Press.
- Shaw, W.H. (2005). *Business ethics* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Smith, Adam (1967). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations; The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Modern Library, New York, NY.
- Smith, A. (1982). *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Press.
- Sollars, G.G. (2002). The Corporation As Actual Agreement. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 12,351-369.
- Silver A. (2005). Thesis Communication Public Relations strategies in times of crisis and their relations with the media. Case study of accidents at the company S & B Industrial Minerals SA and suspected outbreak of the SARS virus in Emirates Airlines, Technological Educational Institution of Western Macedonia, Annex Kastoria: Department of Public Relations and Communication, Kastoria.
- Solomon, Robert C. (1983). *Above the Bottom Line: An Introduction to Business Ethics*. Harcourt Trade Publishers.982
- Solomon, Robert (1991), *Business Ethics*, In: Peter Singer (Ed.), *A Companion to Ethics*, Malden, MA: Blackwell, 354-365.
- Solomon, R. C. (1996). *Ethical Leadership, Emotions and Trust: Beyond "Charisma"*, www.academy.umd.edu.
- Terpstra, D.E., Rozell, E.J. (1993). The Relationship of Staffing Practices to Organizational Level Measures of Performance. *Personnel Psychology* 46, 27-48.
- Thanopoulos, G., (2003). *Business Ethics and Deontology* [in greek], Interbooks.
- Thatcher, J. (2002). *Constructing Accessible Websites*. Birmingham: Glasshaus.
- The Cornell Club, (1999). *Corporate Social Responsibility: Paradigm or paradox?* Symposium, Cornell Law Review, 1283.
- Velasquez, M. G. (1992). *The Ethics of Consumer Production*. Published in *Ethical Theory and Business* (6th ed.).
- Velasquez, M. G. (2002). *Business Ethics: Concepts and Cases* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall (5th ed.).
- Velasquez, M., (1983). Why Corporations Are Not Morally Responsible For Anything They Do, *Business & Professional Ethics Journal* 2, 1-18.

- Velentzas, I. (2014). Economic Law, [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Broni, G. (2014). Business Ethics, Corporate Governance, Corporate Social Responsibility. Accounting & Auditing Ethics & Deontology [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Broni, G. (2012). Political Philosophy & Economy, [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Broni, G. (2012). Cybernetics and Strategy of Enterprises, [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Broni, G. (2009). Cybernetics as a Systemic Science. Semantics Information & Communication, [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Broni, G. (2010a). Business Ethics, Corporate Governance, Corporate Social Responsibility [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Broni, G. (2010b). The Corporate Governance, [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Broni, G. (2010c). Political Philosophy & Economy, 2nd ed. [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Kartalis, N., Broni, G. (2013). Auditing & Internal Audit, [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Kartalis, N., Broni, G. (2012). Auditing & Internal Standards on Auditing, [in greek], IuS.
- Velentzas, I., Mamalis, S., Broni, G. (2010). Communication, Public Relations & Advertisement, [in greek], IuS.
- Wartick, S.L., Wood, D.J. (1998). International Business & Society, Blackwell, Malden, MA, 76.
- Watricks, S.L., Cochran, Ph.L. (1985). The Evolution of the Corporate Social Performance Model, Academy Of Management Review, Vol. 10, No 4, 758-769.
- Weber, L.J. (2006). Profits before people? Ethical standards and the marketing of prescription drugs. Bloomington, In: Indiana University Press.
- Williams, R. (2003). Television: Technology and Cultural Form. Oxford: Routledge.
- Williams, R. (2006). Modern Tragedy. P. McCallum (Ed.). London: Broadview Press.
- Witman, A.B., Park, D.M., Hardin, S.B. (1996). How Do Patients Want Physicians to Handle Mistakes? A Survey of Internal Medicine Patients in an Academic Setting. Archives of International Medicine 156, 2565-2569.
- Zavlanos, M. M. (2002). Organizational Behavior [in greek] Athens: Stamoulis.