

**MGMT 209: The Political and Social Environment of the Multinational Firm:
Aligning Stakeholder Analytics & Strategy**

*DRAFT SYLLABUS FOR SPRING 2020
November 24, 2019*

Witold Jerzy Henisz
Deloitte & Touche Professor of Management
Phone: 215-898-0788
Email : henisz@wharton.upenn.edu

OH: by appt.
3107 SH-DH

Course Objectives:

Managers, consultants, investors and creditors increasingly acknowledge the importance of stakeholder opinions of the acceptability of a company's operations for that company's ability to achieve its organizational mission and to deliver a financial return. The rhetoric that companies must manage their stakeholder relations as well as shareholder relations is rapidly shifting from a philosophical critique of the functioning of the capitalist system to a strategic, financial, operational and societal imperative. Managers, consultants and investors are increasingly drawing on new unstructured data on the identity and issues of concern of stakeholders to align corporate and investment strategy with stakeholder demands on issues ranging from environmental externalities (e.g., climate change) to human rights.

This course provides students the latest tools to use this data for stakeholder and issue mapping as well as financial valuation. It also offers more behavioral skills critical for external stakeholder engagement including trust building and communications as well as internal stakeholder engagement. In short, it prepares students to engage in Corporate Diplomacy (i.e., to influence or assess external stakeholders' opinions of the acceptability of a company's operations at a moment in time and to convince internal stakeholders to adapt their behaviors, systems and outputs` when necessary).

Advocates (i.e., potential recruiters) of students gaining these skills include

- the largest asset managers (e.g., [Black Rock](#), [State Street](#) and [Vanguard](#)) and [investment managers](#) more broadly including those controlling [\\$30.7 Trillion \(39% of total global Assets Under Management\)](#) weighting Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Issues;
- activist hedge funds (e.g., Jana Partners, Blue Harbour Group, Impactive and Apache Capital Management), [private equity](#) and [venture capital](#) investors recognizing the importance of stakeholder issues of concern;
- consultancies variously advocating for [external engagement](#), [long-termism](#) or [long-term value](#), [purpose](#), [geostrategy](#), [geopolitics](#), [managing global risks](#), or [creating shared value](#);
- the CEOs of the Business Roundtable, their [C-suites](#) and [Corporate Boards](#); as well as
- public-sector, intergovernmental, civil society, and philanthropic organizations and various cross-sector initiatives.

Course Policies

Classroom Conduct

- Arrive on time, ready to begin, and minimize disruptions throughout the session.
- Display your Wharton name tent to allow for a personalized classroom experience.
- Turn off and put away your phone. If you must keep a phone on by reason of a personal emergency, you must inform the instructor before class begins.
- Do not use your laptop or tablet except for during small group exercises where such use is explicitly allowed.
- Respect the physical environment by maintaining classroom cleanliness.

Preparation and Interaction

- To achieve positive learning outcomes for you and other students, be prepared to engage fully in each session through your focused attention and active involvement.
- Encourage an inclusive learning environment and show respect for the point of view of others.

Students not adhering to these policies are subject to penalty in their participation grade. Students repeatedly in violation may be asked to withdraw from the course.

Text and Readings

Readings are provided in a bulk pack via Study.net available through the Canvas coursepage. Some readings (e.g., the latter parts of a multi-part teaching case) are added to Canvas after class begins. Role-specific information for our multi-part roleplay will be distributed to team folders specific to those roles to which you will be randomly assigned in Canvas.

Ethics

Please note that any quotations of longer than a phrase must be explicitly noted in the text of your assignments. Insufficient attribution to extended quotations from external sources may result in grade penalties up to a failing grade in course as well as formal charges of plagiarism to the office of student conduct.

As part of the effort to insure adherence to this policy, assignments will be submitted through TurnItIn for verification of originality. Instructions can be found at the top of each assignment on Canvas.

Students may and are encouraged to discuss readings and their responses to discussion sections outside of class but all polls and written assignments are to be completed independently with the exception of the team research paper for which team members may collaborate as they see fit.

Faculty Lunches

I am available for numerous student-faculty lunches for which you may sign up on Canvas.

Assessment and Grading: Attendance, Participation, Assignments and Research Paper

Regular attendance is required. Students who fail to regularly attend the class will not receive course credit. Assessment for regularly attending students will be based on:

(1) Class participation and engagement including attendance, participation in online polling, constructive engagement in class discussions (35%)

(2) A 35-40 page team paper assignment whose grade constitutes 45% of the course grade but is divided into individual (25%) and group (20%) assignments as follows

a. Individual assignments (each team member completes ONE of the following which counts for 25% of that team member's course grade)

i. A ~8 page + exhibits stakeholder and/or issue mapping assignment that compares two possible strategies (if team 5 or 6 people, two team members can submit separate analyses of different strategies)

ii. A ~8 page + exhibits financial valuation or business case assignment that compares two possible strategies (if team 5 or 6 people, two team members can submit separate analyses of different strategies)

iii. A ~8 page discussion and analysis of personal trust-building for one or more strategies

iv. A ~8 page discussion and analysis of openness elements for one or more strategies

b. Group evaluation (the team collectively submits each of the following which together count for 20% of each team member's course grade)

i. A 3-5 page paper proposal (5%)

ii. A final paper submission that includes an introduction and conclusion as well as integrates and extends the prior submissions and responds to feedback received (15% but can be distributed unevenly across team members based on the relative strength of their revised —component)

(3) Team (Randomly assigned teams of 4 members) simulation score (10%)

(4) Two peer reviews of individual assignments (2 X 5% = 10%)

There is no midterm or final exam for the course.

These four components are discussed in more detail below.

(1) I expect a high-level of interactive and integrative discussion in every class. You should carefully prepare for each class, contribute productively as well as listen carefully to others. The emphasis on case analysis and the large class size combine to make it crucial that preparation for and participation in class is of consistently high quality. Please consider the following guidelines for high quality class participation:

- **Relevance:** Are your comments clearly related to the case and to the comments of others?
- **Advancement:** Does your comment move the class discussion forward? Does it take the discussion farther or deeper than the previous comments?
- **Fact-Based:** Have you used specific data from the case, from conceptual or background readings, or from personal experience to support the assertions that you are making?
- **Logical:** Is your reasoning consistent and logical? Do you use economic concepts correctly?

To help you prepare I have included discussion questions for each class and online polls. If you answer the poll, you may be called upon to justify your answer. We will also employ additional in-class polls, small group discussions, debates, role play exercises and other activities in which you are expected to take part.

Frequent but low quality participation and/or distracting behavior (e.g., use of internet or PDAs, side conversations, late entries, early departures, ...) hinders our progress and will be penalized.

A pattern of absences can result in LT/D/F grades for the course

(2) Teams consisting of FOUR, FIVE OR SIX students (preferably maximizing diversity in background, functional expertise, major, ...) will identify a corporation that faced a dilemma relating to the management of external stakeholder relations.

- a. Team paper proposals should highlight the key components of the paper's structure within 3-5 pages. More thorough outlines elicit more helpful feedback. At a minimum, each outline should include
 1. Key information on context
 2. Two or more strategic choices that will be the focus of your analysis
 3. A preliminary stakeholder roster
 4. A preliminary list of the largest revenue or cost drivers influenced by stakeholders
 5. A preliminary list of factors that negatively (or positively) impact trust building with stakeholders
 6. A preliminary list of communications messages, targets and ideas to maximize the likelihood that the message is received by the target
 7. The identification and allocation of team members to the various elements of the paper.
NB: For teams of more than four people, up to two team members may submit Due Diligence and Integration assignments. In such cases, the range of strategic options should be 4-6 instead of 2-3 with each team member analyzing the stakeholder environment and financial implications of 2-3 strategies. The Personal Trust Building and Openness sections and the final paper may focus on the 'best' 2-3 strategies overall.
 - a. Due Diligence
 - b. Integration
 - c. Personal Trust Building
 - d. Openness

- b. Nine basic components should be found in the final submitted 35-40 page paper. Page lengths described for each component are suggestions of a normal distribution across sections only and should not be considered binding if your topic merits relatively more/less detail in a given section. However, the complete paper must fall within the page limit and formatting requirements described.

Note that —drafts of the four emboldened components below are separately graded as individual assignments. Each of these four components of the group paper will be submitted through TurnItIn for originality checking. Instructions can be found at the top of each Assignment description on Canvas.

- 1) An unnumbered title page that identifies all team members and contains an executive summary which summarizes the strategic problem, the choices that you are analyzing, the choice that you are recommending and the key assumptions or factors leading to that recommendation.
- 2) An introduction that identifies a specific company and a specific strategic choice that it faces that clearly involves a (potential) conflict with a set of external stakeholders (1 page);
- 3) An elaboration upon the conflict in a general context but with examples or emphasis upon the particular country and industry setting that you have chosen. You should try to link your example to other similar conflicts in the same firm, industry or country. (3-5 pages);
- 4) **Use your choice of stakeholder or issue mapping tools (e.g., power X salience, Salience X SLO, power X salience X SLO, issue map, stakeholder network, issue network or stakeholder-issue network) to generate insight into the degree of stakeholder support for two or more strategic options possibly including the use of the GIST tool. Stronger insight is typically provided by complementary visuals and textual analysis of the assumptions and data input that generated those visuals. (~6-8 pages);**
- 5) **An assessment of the relative financial impact of these proposed strategies possibly including the use of the FVTOOL or the HBR spreadsheets. Use the SASB materiality map <https://www.sasb.org/materiality/sasb-materiality-map/> to identify relevant risks and, if possible, accounting metrics that for this project or comparables allow you to quantify estimates of direct short-term costs and benefits as well as longer-term costs avoided, risks mitigated (i.e., reduced likelihood and/or severity), revenues generated or opportunities promoted. This assessment should culminate in a specific actionable recommendation as to which strategy will be implemented in the second half of the team paper and an attempt to identify the key assumptions or contingencies that impact this recommendation (i.e., sensitivity analysis). It should be clear to the reader under which conditions you would alter your recommendation. (~6-8 pages)**
- 6) The discussion of key aspects of implementation of the recommended strategy including

- a) **Mechanisms to build interpersonal trust with external stakeholders including possible application of tools from the ‘Breaking Ground’ McKinsey Rebuilding Reputations and Pirson & Malhorta readings (6-8 pages); and**
 - b) **Mechanisms to effectively communicate the goals, design and implementation of the initiative to external and internal stakeholders including the messenger, target, message content and message salience as well as risks associated with perceptions of manipulation or propaganda drawing from New Rules for Crisis Management, UN PRI and ThinkParallax readings (6-8 pages).**
- 7) Succinctly summarize the key takeaway of the case (i.e., what lessons can other firms facing similar challenges take from your analysis and recommendations?) (1 page)
 - 8) A list of references that includes both secondary (newspaper or magazine) **AND** primary (company newsletter, press release, annual report, company internet site or conversations with individuals familiar with the corporate response to the strategic choice) sources. Please provide enough information so that a reader can easily find the reference.
 - 9) A set of exhibits that complement your written analysis (do not count towards the page limit but should be complementary not superfluous).

Text should be double-spaced with 1” margins in a 12-point times new roman font. References, and exhibits (i.e., tables, charts and figures) do not count towards the page limit but should be used only when they complement the text.

Examples of exceptional papers will be provided on Canvas. Please note that the course assignment evolves each year so past exemplars may not follow the structure above.

- (3) Each student will be randomly assigned to a 4-person team whose collective performance in the KEROVKA crisis management simulation as measured by the change in their company’s share price as compared to peer teams will constitute 10% of each team member’s course grade.
- (4) Each student will be asked to assess the individual submission of two peers. Each peer evaluation will constitute 5% of your grade for a total of 10%. These assignments will be made on components of the paper that you do **not** have responsibility for on your own team. In this manner you will have responsibility for writing or give feedback on three of the key elements of each paper. Strong peer reviews for the four components provide constructive feedback on the following points

Due diligence

- a. Completeness of the stakeholder and issue rosters and suggestions for additions
- b. The parameterization of the stakeholder and issue data (i.e., relative power of stakeholders, their issue prioritization and the linkages between stakeholders and issues)
- c. Feedback on the strategic options chosen particularly with regard to whether they constitute the best set of mutually exclusive options

Integration

- a. the revenue and cost estimates of various stakeholder (in)actions and the data provided to justify them; and
- b. the scenario probabilities and the data provided to justify them

Personal

- a. Identification of trust barriers
- b. Feasibility of overcoming these trust barriers using mechanisms identified
- c. Suggestions on alternative or additional trust building mechanisms

Openness

- a. Feedback on efficacy of message
- b. Feedback on likelihood target of message will receive it
- c. Suggestions for additional communication strategies

Assignments and Due Dates

Wednesday, February 5 12pm - Team Paper Proposal

NB: Each individual member of a team will submit one of the following assignments based on the sign-up sheet in Canvas and evaluate two of peer assignments of different types as assigned on Canvas

Wednesday, February 26, 12pm – Due Diligence

Wednesday, March 4, 12pm - Peer Feedback on Due Diligence

Wednesday, March 18, 12pm - Integration Assignment

Wednesday, March 25, 12pm - Peer Feedback on Integration

Wednesday, April 1 12pm - Personal Assignment

Wednesday, April 8 12pm - Peer Feedback on Personal

Wednesday, April 15 12pm - Openness

Wednesday, April 21 12pm - Peer Feedback on Openness

Monday, April 27 In-Class Simulation

Monday, May 11 12pm - Final Team Paper

Feedback

I encourage anyone with specific or general questions regarding the course structure, content or discussions to drop by during my office hours or by appointment or to contact me via email or phone. There will be a detailed mid-course evaluation whose results I will present in class. If desired, we can form a quality circle to anonymously gather additional feedback.

Research Tools

Resources to aid you with your background research are compiled in an online research guide available in Canvas prepared by the staff of Lippincott Library specifically for this course. The author of the guide Marcella Barnhart (Director, Lippincott Library) is available for consultations with your team to help improve your research capability. Contact her at bmarcell@wharton.upenn.edu

About the Instructor

Witold J. Henisz is the Deloitte & Touche Professor of Management in Honor of Russell E. Palmer, former Managing Director at The Wharton School, The University of Pennsylvania where he directs the Wharton Political Risk Lab and spearheaded the creation of the ESG Analytics Lab. He received his Ph.D. in Business and Public Policy from the Haas School of Business at University of California, Berkeley and previously received a M.A. in International Relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.

His research examines the impact of political hazards on international investment strategy including efforts by multinational corporations to engage in corporate diplomacy to win the hearts and minds of external stakeholders. In a National Science Foundation funded project he showed that markets value stakeholder engagement twice as much as the net present value of the gold ostensibly controlled by 19 publicly traded gold mining companies. He then assesses the contingencies that influence the choice of which stakeholder these firms should reach out to in order to positively influence valuation as well as how to best develop a cooperative relationship with that stakeholder. He draws upon these insights as well as examples from large scale construction management, sustainable tourism, development and military counterinsurgency in his book project *Corporate Diplomacy: Building Reputations and Relationships with External Stakeholders*. His most recent work extends this analysis to firm strategy on Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) issues. His earlier work analyzed (1) the political and economic determinants of government attempts to redistribute investor returns to the broader polity; (2) the strategic responses by organizations to such pressure; and (3) the determinants of the success of individual organizations in withstanding such pressure. His research has been published in top-ranked journals in international business, management, international studies and sociology. He served as a Departmental Editor at The Journal of International Business Studies and now serves as an Associate Editor at Strategic Management Journal. He is a Fellow of the Academy of International Business.

Witold has won multiple teaching awards at the graduate and undergraduate levels including being named **Iron Prof in 2019** for his elective courses that highlight the importance of achieving alignment between stakeholder issues of concern and an organization's global or investment strategy. These courses incorporate multiple cases that he has authored as well as capstone KEROVKA crisis management simulation for which he served as the academic director. He led the redesign of the global required course in the Wharton curriculum. He teaches extensively on the topic of 'Corporate Diplomacy' in custom executive education programs.

Witold is currently a principal in the political risk management consultancy PRIMA LLC whose recent consulting clients include Anglo Gold Ashanti, Rio Tinto, Lockheed Martin, Shell Corporation, Dundee Precious Metals, Gabriel Resources, Calvert Funds (Eaton Vance), EY, Maritime Financial Group, The World Bank, The Inter-American Development Bank and the International Finance Corporation. He previously worked for The International Monetary Fund.

1. Conceptual Introduction (Wednesday, January 15)

Readings

Benioff, Marc (2019) “A New Capitalism” *New York Times*

Sampson, Rachelle & Witold J Henisz (2018) Redesigning Management Education for the Long-Term *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 9/25/18

BSR (2018) “Doing Business in 2030”

Discussion Questions

1. How well do you think capitalism is working? Do you agree with Marc Benioff and/or Paul Polman? Why or why not?
2. Is traditional business school pedagogy and content reflective and/or responsible for any shortfalls in the efficacy of capitalism? Explain.
3. Are the questions Rachelle and I suggest be asked in every case discussion in business school useful primes for discussion? Why or why not?
4. Which of the BSR Scenarios in 2030 do you find most and least compelling (i.e., likely to be accurate)? Why?
5. What skills do you as future financiers, consultants, managers, policymakers and civil society leaders need in order to act to enhance the efficacy of the capitalist system?

2-4. Introductory Case & Due Diligence: Power Trip or Power Play (Wednesday/Monday/Wednesday, January 22/27/29)

Readings

Henisz, Witold (2014) —Due Diligence: Mapping and Analysis of Your Stakeholders

Henisz, Witold J. & Bennet A. Zelner (2006) Power Trip or Power Play: AES-Telasi (A) & (B) [(B) CASE TO BE DISTRIBUTED AFTER 1st CLASS]

Discussion Questions

1. Why do state-owned infrastructure service providers underperform?
2. Will privatizing them necessarily improve performance?
3. What stakeholders were supportive or opposed to AES’ ownership and operations? Why?
4. Which stakeholders were relatively more or less powerful? Why?
5. What were the major differences in the stakeholder environment of Georgia as compared to the dozens of other countries in which AES had previously operated?
6. How did these differences negatively impact the performance of AES-Telasi?
7. How should Scholey adapt his strategy in the (A) case? Why?

[FOR 3rd Class]

8. What were the strengths and weaknesses of Scholey's revised strategy in the (B) case?
9. ***What changes to Michael’s strategy (if any) would you recommend that Ignacio Iribarren (Michael Scholey’s successor) implement upon his arrival?***
10. Did Mike & Ignacio’s actions move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?

5. Due Diligence: Activist Shareholding in Russia (Monday, February 3)

Readings

Dyck, Alexander (2002) The Hermitage Fund: Media and Corporate Governance in Russia *HBS Case 9-703-010*

Discussion Questions

1. What are the various ways, particularly those that are peculiar to Russia as compared to the US, in which managers in Russia extract value out of their companies disproportionate to their equity stakes?
2. What institutions and mechanisms normally constrain such behavior?
3. Why don't these work in Russia?
4. What is Browder's strategy? How does it differ from traditional investing? Do you agree with Browder's contention that media attention limits corporate governance abuses in Russia? Elsewhere? How does the media effect governance in Russia? What is the mechanism that disciplines managers?
5. *If you were an investor in Hermitage in the summer of 2002, what would you advise Bill Browder to do? Should he refine or change his activist strategy?*
6. Did Bill Browder move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
7. *Would you want to participate actively or invest in similar strategies to those followed by Browder to create financial value while reducing corruption or other negative externalities (e.g., climate change or human rights abuses) in emerging markets? Why or why not?*

TEAM PAPER PROPOSAL ASSIGNMENT DUE WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5 12PM

6. Due Diligence: Environmental Activism in China (Wednesday, February 5)

Reading

Liu, Jianguo and Jared Diamond (2005) —China's Environment in a Globalizing World *Nature* 435(30):1179-1186

Lee, Jua, Erica Plambeck and Maria Shao (2009) Ma Jun and the IPE: Using Information to Improve China's Environment (Stanford Case SII 15)

Discussion Questions

1. Why are environmental externalities so large in China?
2. What are the key accomplishments of Ma Jun and the IPE so far? What were the drivers of their success?
3. How can Ma Jun increase the impact of his non-profit organization? Whom should he target? From whom should he raise funds?
4. *What, if any, changes should Ma Jun advocate in China's legal and regulatory systems?*
5. Did Ma Jun move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
6. How is Ma Jun's strategy different from that of Bill Browder? How is it similar?
7. *Would you want to actively participate in or financially support similar strategies to those followed by Ma Jun to address environmental and other externalities in China and other emerging markets? Why or why not?*

7. Due Diligence: Corruption in Indonesian Mining (Monday, February 10)

Readings

Gray C. & D. Kaufman (1998) Corruption and Development *Finance & Development*, March, pp. 7-10.

Bell, Jeffrey, Christine Dinh-Tan, Philip Purnama & Debora Spar (1997) Busang: River of Gold (A) (HBS Case 9-798-002)

Discussion Questions

1. How does corruption affect the development of the private sector?
2. Why is corruption so hard to combat?
3. Has Bre-X developed relationships in Indonesia? Does it need to? How? With whom?
4. ***How should David Walsh respond to Minister Sudjana's announcement? What options are open to him and to Bre-X?***
5. Did David Walsh move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
6. How is David Walsh's strategy similar to that of Bill Browder? How is it different?
7. ***Would you want to actively participate in or invest in similar strategies to those pursued by David Walsh to create financial value in emerging markets? Why or why not?***

8. Due Diligence: Stakeholder Mapping in a Thai Bankruptcy (Wednesday, February 12)

Readings

Henisz, Witold (2007) Thai Petrochemical Industry: Negotiating Debt after the East Asian Crisis (A)

Discussion Questions

1. ***Based upon your analysis of the stakeholder environment faced by Western creditors in Thailand, should they undertake a***
 - a. *Debt restructuring with Prachai and current TPI management as planner*
 - b. *Debt restructuring with an external planner—most likely, Effective Planner, the creditors' steering committee nominee after the disagreements with Prachai*
 - c. *Strategic partnership with a local company to restructure and manage TPI****Why or on what would it depend?***
2. Did western creditors and Prachai move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
3. How was the strategy of western creditors (and Prachai) similar to that of Bill Browder and David Walsh? How were they different?
4. ***Would you want to actively participate or invest in similar strategies to those pursued by western creditors (or Prachai) to preserve or create financial value in emerging markets in crisis? Why or why not?***

9-10. Integration: The Net Present Value of Sustainability (Monday/Wednesday, February 17/19)

Readings

Davis, Rachel and Daniel M. Franks et. al. (2014) —Conflict Translated Environmental and Social Risk into Business Costs| *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **111**(21):7576-7581.

Henisz, Witold J, Tim Koller & Robin Nuttal (2019) Five Ways that ESG Creates Value *McKinsey Quarterly* Forthcoming

Henisz, Witold (2012) —Calculating the Net Present Value of Sustainability Initiatives at Newmont’s Ahafo Mine in Ghana (A)

Discussion Questions

1. Where do failures of corporate diplomacy show up on the P/L statement?
2. Why has the sustainability budget at major mining companies been increasing?
3. Using what criteria (i.e., net present value or broader) should the decision be made as to what sustainability initiatives merit funding?
4. ***For which of the four initiatives described in the Ahafo case (i.e., Health, Water & Sanitation, Training & Education, the Foundation) should Newmont provide the requested increase funding? You may choose one or more. What are the critical assumptions that go into this calculation that you feel***
 - a. *are sufficiently justified or established?*
 - b. *require additional analysis or a stronger evidentiary base to justify?*
5. Did Newmont move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
6. ***Would you want to actively participate or invest in the development and deployment of tools that calculate the ROI on sustainability initiatives for major capex projects? Why or why not?***

11. Integration: True Value Accounting Outside of Major Projects (Monday, February 24)

Readings

Atz Ulrich, Tracy van Holt, Wlyse Douglas and Tensie Whelan (2019) “The Return on Sustainability Investment (ROSI): Monetizing Financial Benefits of Sustainability Actions in Companies” *Review of Business* **39**(2):1-31.

Materials TBD on EY’s True Value Methodology and Application

Discussion Questions

TBD

DUE DILIGENCE ASSIGNMENT DUE WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 26 12PM

12. Integration: The ESG Investment Case (Wednesday, February 26)

Readings

TBD from in process case(s) on Parnassus Capital, Alliance Bernstein & Calvert (Eaton Vance)

Discussion Questions

TBD

13. Personal Trust with Communities: The Tintaya Copper Mine (Monday, March 2)

Readings

World Resources Institute (2009) Breaking Ground: Engaging Communities in Extractive and Infrastructure Projects.

Rangan, V. Kasturi (2012) Corporate Responsibility & Community Engagement at the Tintaya Copper Mine (A) HBS Case 9-506-023

Discussion Questions

1. What are the core elements of community engagement or consent processes designed to obtain and maintain the social license to operate?
2. Do they matter? Why? When?
3. What are the keys to success in developing trust and the social license? What are common mistakes?
4. ***Do you believe that the application of the dialogue table and other trust building processes made a difference in the Tintaya mine? Why or why not?***
5. Did BHP move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
6. ***Would you want to actively participate or invest in the process of mediated dialogue with the goal of enhancing stakeholder participation? Why or why not?***

14. Personal Trust with External Stakeholders I: AquaBounty (Wednesday, March 4)

Readings

Bonini, Sheila, David Court and Alberto Marchi (2009) “Rebuilding Corporate Reputations” *McKinsey Quarterly*

Pirson, Michael and Deepak Malhorta (2008) “Unconventional Insights for Managing Stakeholder Trust” *MIT Sloan Management Review*

Cutt, Julia (2018) “Aquadvantage Salmon: Communicating to Build Customer Confidence”

Discussion Questions

1. What response should Conley consider, as a result of the public reaction to the FDA approval announcement? What kind of public response should Conley anticipate following the Health Canada press conference?
2. ***Who are the key external stakeholders Conley needs to consider when preparing his communications strategy? How can AquaBounty work to build trust with these key stakeholders? Which key stakeholder should Conley prioritize? Why?***
3. What skills or experience does Conley bring to his current role that will be valuable during the Canadian launch of AquaAdvantage Salmon? What relationships with stakeholders might he be able to leverage?
4. AquaBounty received both negative and positive comments from consumers and public figures after the FDA approval announcement in 2015. Assuming the Health Canada approval leads to similar responses, what strategy should Conley adopt to manage these reactions? When and how should AquaBounty engage in public conversations?
5. Conley has just three days to prepare for Health Canada’s public announcement of its approval of AquaAdvantage salmon. What actions should he take immediately to positively influence public reaction to this approval, and which actions should be part of the long-term issues management plan?
6. Is Conley moving the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
7. ***Would you want to actively participate or invest in the rollout of a product like AquaAdvantage following the strategy deployed by Conley? Why or why not?***

15. Personal Trust with External Stakeholders II: IKEA & Human Rights (Monday, March 16)

Readings

Bachman, S.L. (2000) The Political Economy of Child Labor and its Impacts on International Business *Business Economics*, July, pp. 30-41)

Bartlett, Christopher (2006) IKEA's Global Sourcing Challenge: Indian Rugs and Child Labor (A) (HBS Case 9-906-414)

Discussion Questions

1. What are the drivers of the use of child labor?
2. What are the risks involved for IKEA in its treatment of child labor issues?
3. How should IKEA respond to the accusations leveled against it?
4. ***How should IKEA manage its policies with regard to child labor?***
 - i. ***Should IKEA sign on to Rugmark?***
 - ii. ***How should they deal with Rangan?***
5. Did IKEA move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
6. ***Would you want to actively participate or invest in companies that made the same decision as IKEA with respect to human rights (or other negative externalities) in their supply chain?***

INTEGRATION ASSIGNMENT DUE WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18 12PM

16. Openness: Managing a Nationalist Boycott (Wednesday, March 18)

Reading

Hunter, Mark Lee, Luk N. Van Wassenhove and Maria Besiou (2016) "The New Rules for Crisis Management" *MIT Sloan Management Review*

Shah, Grishma, Janet Rovenpur and Musa Jafar (2016) "A Brand Under Attack: The Boycott of Stolli Vodka and the Power of Social Media." *Case Research Journal* 36(2)

Discussion Questions

1. Was the company's immediate response satisfactory? Evaluate the company's efforts.
2. Should Stolli vodka be considered a Russian brand? Why or why not?
3. How well have Stolli's products been managed in the US? What prior events are relevant to the case?
4. Use the twitter diagrams of Exhibit 8-10 and media coverage data in Exhibit 7 to diagnose the crisis.
5. ***Identify Stolli's stakeholders and a strategy to positively engage each of them after the crisis. How can Stolli best communicate with these stakeholders regarding its stand on LGBT issues?***
6. What else will it need to do to restore brand equity and maintain a favorable reputation?
7. Is Stolli moving the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
8. ***Would you want to actively participate or invest in Stolli given their strategy in this case? Why or why not?***

17. Openness: Communicating Corporate Diplomacy to Investors (Monday, March 23)

Readings

United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment (2013) “A Tool for Communicating the Business Value of Sustainability”

ThinkParallax (2019) “The Formula for Communicating ESG”

Discussion Questions

1. What are the key elements of an effective ESG Communications Strategy?
2. ***Look at the Sustainability and/or Financial report of the company your team is analyzing for the team paper (or a company we previously studies in class). Does it meet these standards? Why or why not?***

18. NO CLASS ON WEDNESDAY MARCH 25

19. Openness: Corporate Propaganda (Monday, March 30)

Readings

Bernays, Edward (1947) Engineering of Consent *Annals of the American Academy of Sciences* 113-120.

Callahan, Patricia & Sam Roe (2012) Fear Fans Flames for Chemical Makers *Chicago Tribune* 5/6/12

Merchant, Brian (2014) The Program Big Oil’s PR Firm Uses to ‘Convert Average Citizens’

Motherboard 11/18/14

Walker, Ed (2015) The Uber-ization of Activism *New York Times* 8/6/15

Voight, Joan (2015) It’s Not Just Coke: Big Food and the New Astroturf *US Campaign* 8/11/15

Benner, Katie (2017) Inside the Hotel Industry’s Plan to Combat Airbnb *New York Times* 4/16/17

Elgin, Ben & Zachary Mider (2017) Fossil Fuel’s Fishy New Friends *Bloomberg BusinessWeek* 11/16/17

Mider, Zachary & Ben Elgin (2018) How Hedge Funds (Secretly) Get Their Way in Washington

Bloomberg BusinessWeek 1/25/18

O’Donnell Jayne, David Robinson, Ken Alltucker & Liz Freeman (2018) Drug Co-Pay Groups:

Critical Patient Charities or Fronts for Drugmakers? *USA Today* 4/30/18

Discussion Questions

1. Where is the line between Corporate Diplomacy and Corporate Propaganda?
2. Should any of the examples described above be prohibited by regulation? Why or why not?
3. Are the sponsors of the campaigns moving the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
4. ***What steps can you take to insure your organizations don’t cross the line from corporate diplomacy to corporate propaganda?***

PERSONAL TRUST ASSIGNMENT DUE WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1 12PM

20-21. Openness in the Land of Dracula (Wednesday/Monday, April 1/6)

Readings

Zorilla, Carlos (2009) —Protecting Your Community Against Mining Companies and Other Extractive Industries

Henisz, Witold, Sinziana Popa and Tim Gray (2009) Rosia Montana: Political and Social Risk Management in the Land of Dracula (A) & (B) [(B) CASE DISTRIBUTED AFTER 1st CLASS]

Discussion Questions

1. Given the stakeholder landscape, assess Gabriel Resources's regulatory approval and stakeholder engagement strategies. Would you have done anything differently? Why?
2. ***Give an example of a tactic the NGO opposition might use to stop the momentum of Gabriel Resources. Highlight the target (i.e., whose opinion are you trying to change), the message (i.e., what is the message you want the target to receive) and the "hook" (i.e., how will you get them to notice it amidst all the messages and demands on their time)***
3. Did Stephanie Roth move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?

For 2nd Class:

4. What did Alan Hill and his management team do differently in the (B) case?
5. Do you agree with these changes? Why or why not? Do they constitute corporate propaganda?
6. What reactions did these changes elicit? Were these intended or unintended? Explain.
7. ***Give an example of a tactic a new management team might use to stop the momentum of the opposition. Highlight the target (i.e., whose opinion are you trying to change), the message (i.e., what is the message you want the target to receive) and the "hook" (i.e., how will you get them to notice it amidst all the messages and demands on their time).***
8. Did Alan Hill move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
9. ***Would you want to actively participate or invest in a company pursuing the strategies Alan Hill followed in the (B) case? Why or why not?***

22. Mindsets at Unilever (Wednesday, April 8)

Readings

Bartlett, Christopher (2015) Unilever's New Global Strategy: Competing Through Sustainability
Harvard Business Case **9-916-414**

Discussion Questions

1. How would you evaluate Paul Polman's 2010 decision to implement a new strategy based on the Unilever Sustainable Living Plan? What benefits did it offer? What risks did it present?
2. How effective has the implementation of the new strategy been to date? What had it done most effectively? What problems or concerns do you have with the implementation?
3. ***What actions should the company take now? Which of the three options identified at the end of the case would you recommend that management take? Why? How would you go about implementing your recommendation?***
4. Is Paul Polman move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
5. ***Would you want to actively participate or invest in companies with leaders like Paul Polman and mindsets and systems like Unilever?***

23. Mindsets at Choppies (Monday, April 13)

Readings

Abrami, Regina (2015) — Navigating Choppy Waters in Botswanan and Southern African Retailing

Discussion Questions

1. *Is the reputation of Botswana as an island of good governance in Africa deserved? Is Botswana a Miracle or a Mirage?*
2. *Is the national and regional expansion of Choppies an emerging market success story? Is Choppies making Botswana better or worse?*
3. Is Ram moving the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
4. *Would you want to actively participate or invest in companies with leaders like Ram and mindsets and systems like Choppies?*

OPENNESS ASSIGNMENT DUE WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15 12PM

24. Mindsets at Facebook (Wednesday, April 15)

Readings

Hoffman, Andrew (2019) “Facebook: Fake News, Free Speech, and an Internet Platform’s Responsibility” WDI Publishing Case W00C47

Discussion Questions

1. To what extent are social media companies responsible for protecting user data, and how much should they be able to exploit the data for profit?
2. Are user agreements in which individuals consent to the collection and sale of personal data sufficient or is their intentional complexity unethical?
3. Should social media companies such as Facebook act as platforms with minimal regulations or as publishers that regulate the content of posted materials?
4. *Should Facebook reconsider its business model of generating revenue from user data? What alternatives (if any) are viable? What other strategic responses could Facebook consider to address concerns regarding fake news?*
5. Is Mark Zuckerberg moving the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
6. *Would you want to actively participate or invest in Facebook given its strategic approach to fake news? Why or why not?*

25. Mindsets at Minas Rio (Monday, April 20)

Readings

Nadler, David A. & Michael L. Tushman (1980) A Model for Diagnosing Organizational Behavior: Applying a congruence perspective *Organizational Dynamics* 9(2):35-51.

Henisz, Witold J. and Bennet A. Zelner (2016) Designing and Implementing an Integrated Project Management System at Minas-Rio (A)

Discussion Questions

1. *Use the Nadler & Tushman reading, frameworks from other relevant classes, and your own experience with organizational change to develop specific suggestions for ensuring the implementation and strategic use of the PMO and ELO data at Minas Rio. Be specific in your recommendations with regard to the following items.*
 - a. *The characteristics of the individuals needed for the team*
 - b. *The tasks for which the team members will be responsible*
 - c. *The formal organizational structure in which the team members will operate*
 - d. *The informal culture that will reinforce the desired behaviors*
 - e. *The means to ensure fit across these organizational elements*
2. Did Paulo move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
3. *Would you want to actively participate or invest in a company or project that had an integrated management monitoring system such as developed at Minas Rio? Why or why not?*

26. Summary Case & Simulation Prep (Wednesday, April 22)

Readings

Henisz, Witold J. (2017) Pakistan Background Note

Henisz, Witold J. (2017) Abraaj Group's Integration of ESG Policies into the Turnaround of K-Electric (A)

Discussion Questions

1. Consider the comparison between the performance of AES-Telasi and KE. To what do you attribute the difference? Can you relate it to Corporate Diplomacy?
2. *What, if any, elements of the Corporate DIPLOMACY framework are still missing or relatively weak in Abraaj's strategy for KESC? How should they be incorporated or strengthened?*
3. Did Abraaj and its KESC management teams move the system towards one of the BSR 2030 scenarios? How?
4. *Would you want to actively participate or invest in a private equity investment following the strategy Abraaj pursued in KE? Why or why not?*

27. KEROVKA Crisis Management Simulation (Monday, April 27)

Readings

SG Energy Shale Gas Operation Kerovka (2018), Tazakstan Briefing Document

Discussion Questions

1. What stakeholders are more or less powerful? Why?
2. What issues are of most concern to each stakeholder? Why?
3. How can you earn stakeholders' trust?
4. What principles should guide your communications strategy?
5. How will you manage differences in opinion on the first four questions among your team?

28. KEROVKA Debrief & Course Wrap-up (Wednesday, April 29)

Readings

Kobrin, Stephen J. (2017) —Bricks and Mortar in a Borderless World: Globalization, the Backlash and the Multinational Enterprise. | *Global Strategy Journal* 7: 159-171

Henisz, Witold J. (2016) 12 Pitfalls to Avoid on the Path to Managing Reputational Risks IESE Insights

Henisz, Witold J. (2019) The ESG Performance of Wharton's Top 60 Recruiters

Discussion Questions

Wrap-up

1. *What are your most important takeaways from the course?*
2. *What lessons, frameworks or tools are you most likely to remember and use?*
3. *What will you do to move the system towards (or away from) one of the BSR 2030 scenarios?*

FINAL TEAM PAPERS DUE MONDAY, MAY 11 12PM