



The Power Dynamics in Management Theories: A Framework For Determining Sustainability Goals in Corporate Communication

Deniz Gönç 

ABSTRACT

This review study examines how power dynamics influence management theories and corporate communication practices, aiming to support the adoption of sustainability goals in corporate governance and to discuss measures to maintain corporate identity amid potential governance shifts. From a Foucauldian perspective, which conceptualizes power as relational, embedded, diffuse, and productive, the study offers a novel lens on management literature and clarifies the often-invisible representations of governance approaches. The study subjects nine prominent theoretical frameworks—Institutional Theory, Representation Theory, Agency Theory, Strategic Leadership Theory, Stakeholder Theory, Contingency Theory, Resource Dependence Theory, Myopic Market Theory, and Transaction Cost Theory—to critical examination. Two guiding questions frame the analysis: How does Foucault's concept of power make inequalities in corporate governance visible? In what ways do governance models influence organizational behavior and strategic orientation, and under what conditions can sustainable corporate communication be realized? The theoretical models are categorized into four clusters—financial, power-balance, dynamic, and ethical—based on their assumptions and strategic priorities, and then aligned with the sustainability objectives they are most likely to support. In the analysis section, management theories are classified according to principles, priorities, and strategies, and related to sustainability objectives. From the perspective of corporate communication sustainability—which seeks to preserve the consistency of identity and communication while emphasizing trust-based, transparent, ethical, and harmonious stakeholder interactions—the study highlights guiding principles. The findings indicate that sector-specific expertise, regional urgencies, and managerial responsiveness are critical determinants shaping corporate sustainability strategies.

Keywords: Corporate Communication, Organizational Communication, Governance, Sustainability, Sustainability Communication, Public Relations, Management Theories

DENİZ GÖNÇ

Dr.

Bağımsız Araştırmacı

denizgonc@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8338-6476

Citation: Gönç D. (2025). The power dynamics in management theories: A framework for determining sustainability goals in corporate communication. *Journal of Selçuk Communication*, 18(2), 1043-1070. <https://doi.org/10.18094/josc.1690796>



Yönetim Teorilerinde Güç Dinamikleri: Kurumsal İletişimde Sürdürülebilirlik Hedeflerini Belirlemek İçin Bir Çerçeve

Deniz Gönç 

ÖZ

Bu inceleme, güç dinamiklerinin yönetim teorileri ve kurumsal iletişim uygulamalarını nasıl etkilediğini irdeleyerek, kurumsal iletişimde sürdürülebilirlik hedeflerinin benimsenmesine katkı sunmayı ve olası yönetim değişiklikleri karşısında kurumsal kimliğin korunmasına yönelik önlemleri tartışmayı amaçlamaktadır. Gücü ilişkisel, gömülü, dağınık ve üretken bir olgu olarak kavramsallaştıran Foucaultcu bir bakış açısıyla çalışma, yönetim literatürüne yeni bir perspektif getirmekte ve yönetim yaklaşımlarının çoğunlukla görünmez kalan temsillerini görünür kılmaktadır. Literatür taraması, gücün yönetim ve iletişim pratiklerindeki tezahürlerini ortaya koymaktadır. Kurumsal yönetim ve iletişim literatürü kapsamında yaygın olarak kullanılan dokuz teori — Kurumsal Teori, Temsilcilik Teorisi, Vekillik Teorisi, Stratejik Liderlik Teorisi, Paydaş Teorisi, Durumsallık Teorisi, Kaynak Bağımlılığı Teorisi, Miyop Piyasa Teorisi ve İşlem Maliyeti Teorisi — sistematik biçimde incelenmiş ve Foucault'nun güç kavramı temelinde değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışma şu sorulara odaklanmaktadır: Foucault'nun güç kavramı, yönetim modellerinin eşitsizlikleri sürdürme ya da dönüştürme biçimlerini nasıl görünür kılar? Farklı yönetim yaklaşımları örgütsel davranışı ve stratejik yönelimleri hangi koşullarda sürdürülebilir iletişimle ilişkilendirir? Seçilen teoriler finansal, güç dengesi, dinamik ve etik olmak üzere dört kümeye ayrılmış ve sürdürülebilirlik hedefleriyle ilişkilendirilmiştir. Bu çerçevede, kuruluşların benimsemeye eğilimli oldukları sürdürülebilirlik hedefleri belirlenmiş, ayrıca sürece etki eden temel parametreler değerlendirilmiştir. Güvene dayalı, şeffaf, etik ve uyumlu paydaş ilişkilerine vurgu yapan kurumsal iletişim sürdürülebilirliği perspektifinden yol gösterici ilkeler de ele alınmıştır. Bulgular, sektörel uzmanlık, bölgesel öncelikler ve yönetsel duyarlılıkların sürdürülebilirlik stratejilerinde kritik belirleyiciler olduğunu göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak, sürdürülebilir yönetim ve kurumsal iletişim için kapsayıcı, uyarlanabilir ve güç ilişkilerine duyarlı bir yönetim yaklaşımının gerekliliği ortaya konmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kurumsal iletişim, Örgütsel iletişim, Yönetişim, Sürdürülebilirlik, Sürdürülebilirlik iletişimi, Halkla ilişkiler, Yönetim teorileri

DENİZ GÖNÇ

Dr.

Independent Researcher

denizgonc@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8338-6476

Atıf: Gönç D. (2025). Yönetim teorilerinde güç dinamikleri: Kurumsal iletişimde sürdürülebilirlik hedeflerini belirlemek için bir çerçeve. *Selçuk İletişim*, 18(2), 1043-1070. <https://doi.org/10.18094/josc.1690796>

INTRODUCTION

Plato's assertion that "until political power and philosophy entirely coincide, cities will have no rest from evils, nor, I think, will the human race" (Plato, 2006, p. 202) highlights relationship between thought and action illustrates the connection between philosophy and behavior, a dynamic that extends beyond individuals to also encompass organizations. This study underlines the relationship between corporate governance and corporate communication through Foucault's (2012) concept of power providing a theoretical framework for understanding how power operates within organizational structures. Then matched the management theories by their philosophy and priorities and principles, with sustainability goals to provide a shortcut to adopting them for corporates. In this regard, the study identifies potential alignments between governance approaches and certain sustainability goals, while also discussing additional parameters to be considered in their adoption. Examining management theories after revealing the less visible aspects of power structures makes the link between management philosophy and corporate communication practices more apparent and facilitates a critical literature review. Literature on sustainability concepts and goals, approached through corporate philosophy and management perspectives, provides a basis for categorizing management theories according to their principles and priorities. Moreover, analyses highlighting organizations' inclination to adopt sustainability goals offer guidance for both management and corporate communication in advancing sustainable practices

Corporate governance is the way organizations achieve their goals by effectively managing relationships with stakeholders. Governance mechanisms define the interests of shareholders and managers to resolve conflicts between ownership and control. However corporate communication, a dynamic communication practice and field is a part of corporate management. Although often used interchangeably with governance and the terms may conflict, multidisciplinary insights are valuable (Gönç, 2019). Corporate governance is not only an efficiency-driven system based on economic rationality; it also produces norms, identities, and power relations within organizations and their environments. These practices appear not only in businesses but also in public institutions, NGOs, and the private sector, through standardized, efficiency-focused hierarchical structures.

In management studies and industrial relations, Weber's (1947) concept of bureaucracy provides conceptualizes of legitimate authority as deriving primarily from legal-rational foundations. Weber's (1947) typology of authority, legitimate power is generally based on legal-rational foundations. Bureaucracy, characterized by hierarchical structures, rule-based authority, and clearly defined roles,

ensures predictability and efficiency in organizational operations. Bureaucratic organisations prioritize control, order, and efficiency. They enforce discipline through surveillance and regulation while boosting productivity. Flexible, democratic structures decentralize authority and promote participation, but by requiring participation, they subtly enforce compliance. While bureaucratic power disciplines through direct control, democratic structures guide behavior through interaction, subtly shaping actions. Modern governance operates through multiple layers and mechanisms, shaping organizations both explicitly and implicitly. In corporate communication, bureaucratic structures prioritize control, order, and efficiency.

Whereas French and Raven stated it is reinforced through mutual recognition, consent, and dependence within organizational contexts, emphasized that power is not only a top-down control tool, but also a form of relationship that is reinforced by the production of mutual recognition and consent. Complementing these perspectives, Pfeffer and Salancik (2015) highlight the strategic role of power in shaping interactions between organizations and their external environments, laying the groundwork for resource dependency theory, which frames power as a function of control over critical resources.

Foucault conceives power as diffuse, operating through norms, discourse, and everyday practices rather than solely through hierarchical positions. This approach reveals how power permeates organizational life and social relations in subtle, often invisible ways, shaping behaviors, knowledge, and expectations. Foucault's conceptualization of power makes more understandable the dynamics described in Althusser's (2006) conceptualization of ideological state apparatuses, such as how power operates within corporations, shaping workplace hierarchies, labor policies, performance evaluations. Consequently, Foucault's framework provides a more detailed and realistic analysis of organizational power dynamics, capturing the informal, pervasive mechanisms that conventional theories may overlook.

Power Practices of Corporate Governance Approaches and Their Reflections in Corporate Communication

Corporate governance aims to help organizations achieve their goals by effectively managing relationships with stakeholders. It seeks to increase long-term shareholder value through managerial accountability and improved performance while addressing the principal-agent problem. Governance mechanisms define the interests of shareholders and managers to resolve conflicts between ownership and control. However, corporate governance is not only an efficiency-driven system based on economic

rationality; it also produces norms, identities, and power relations within organizations and their environments.

These practices appear not only in businesses but also in public institutions, NGOs, and the private sector, through standardized, efficiency-focused hierarchical structures. Managerial control works not only through laws and corporate policies but also through informal norms and expectations that shape individual behavior. Organizational discipline is maintained by wage policies, social benefits, union rights, performance evaluations, and working hours. Additionally, coercive practices such as expectations to work overtime, economic and psychological pressure, harassment, and mobbing reinforce control. Financial tools like bonuses, premiums, salary deductions, and incentives also influence employee behavior. The dark side of organizational behavior refers to harmful actions that disrupt operations and damage members, often caused by failure to follow routines. Examples include anti-productive behaviors, mobbing, rudeness, cynicism, harassment, silence, careerism, loafing, cyberloafing, revenge, gossip, and destructive politics, all which harm morale and productivity (Köse, 2023). Power relations are both repressive and productive. Disciplinary mechanisms not only enforce control but also shape identities and behaviors. Management processes influence how individuals see themselves and their roles, defining organizational culture and dynamics. Thus, corporate governance functions through hierarchical, bureaucratic structures as well as flexible, participatory models.

Power relations are both repressive and productive. Disciplinary mechanisms not only enforce control but also shape identities and behaviors. Management processes influence how individuals see themselves and their roles, defining organizational culture and dynamics (Ritchie, 2021). Thus, corporate governance functions through hierarchical, bureaucratic structures as well as flexible, participatory models. Managerial control works not only through laws and corporate policies but also through informal norms and expectations that shape individual behavior. Organizational discipline is maintained by wage policies, social benefits, union rights, performance evaluations, and working hours. Additionally, coercive practices such as expectations to work overtime, economic and psychological pressure, harassment, and mobbing reinforce control. Financial tools like bonuses, premiums, salary deductions, and incentives also influence employee behavior. The dark side of organizational behavior refers to harmful actions that disrupt operations and damage members, often caused by failure to follow routines. Examples include anti-productive behaviors, mobbing, rudeness, cynicism, harassment, silence, careerism, loafing, cyberloafing, revenge, gossip, and destructive politics, all which harm morale and productivity (Köse, 2023). Financial tools like bonuses, premiums, salary deductions, and incentives

also influence employee behavior. The dark side of organizational behavior (Köse, 2023) refers to harmful actions that disrupt operations and damage members, often caused by failure to follow routines.

SUSTAINABILITY OF CORPORATE COMMUNICATION

Sustainability embodies a long-term ethical commitment to balancing human needs with ecological integrity, social justice, and economic viability. It is a transformative vision that redefines success beyond mere consumption and economic expansion, emphasizing harmony, adaptability, and collective well-being. In its resolution of 25 September 2015 entitled 'Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development' the United Nations (UN) General Assembly adopted a new global sustainable development framework. Sustainable development goals of United Nations are shown in figure 1.



Figure 1 Sustainability goals
Source: (United Nations, 2025)

According to United Nations (2025) the sustainability goals are numbered as 1 No Poverty, 2 Zero Hunger, 3 Good Health and Well-Being, 4 Quality Education, 5 Gender Equality, 6 Clean Water and Sanitation, 7 Affordable and Clean Energy, 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth, 9 Industry Innovation and Infrastructure, 10 Reduced Inequalities, 11 Sustainable Cities and Communities, 12 Responsible Consumption and Production, 13 Climate Action, 14 Life Below Water, 15 Life on Land, 16 Peace Justice and Strong Institutions, 17 Partnerships for the Goals. In this sense, sustainability is a fundamental prerequisite for fostering a just, stable, and thriving global society. Integrating corporate sustainability into communication strategies enables organizations to convey their social, environmental, and economic commitments, thereby fostering stakeholder trust, enhancing reputation, and supporting long-term business success (Riteska &Boztepe, 2023).

However, it also requires structural reforms in global economic and governance systems, which are often resistant to change due to political and financial interests. Overcoming these challenges demands collective action from policymakers, businesses, and NGOs to reshape institutional frameworks. In corporate communication sustainability goals adopted by many ways. For example, ethical business practices, responsible resource management, and inclusive policies reduce inequalities, and foster long-term prosperity. By integrating sustainability into governance, business, and daily life, societies can ensure resilience, mitigate risks, and create a more just and sustainable future. The goals of governance must include fostering a diverse, healthy culture where employees feel respected and have equal opportunities for promotion, regardless of gender or race (Hays, 2022).

Institutional Theory

Corporate governance is a mentality, that direct and control organizations, ensuring accountability, transparency, and long-term stakeholder value (Keasey & Wright, 1997; Tricker, 2015). Institutional theory defines institutions as structures and actions that stabilize social behavior by aligning with environmental norms and regulations, helping businesses build relationships and gain legitimacy. Institutionalization, crucial for maintaining legitimacy and resources, is an adaptive process that reduces uncertainty through shared values (Apaydin, 2008).

The institutional approach, founded on justice, responsibility, independence, impartiality, transparency, and accountability, balances power between management and owners by promoting accountability, cultural development, and professionalism to address both internal and external pressures (Apaydin, 2008; OECD, 2016). As businesses expand and ownership structures evolve, management and control separate, and while there is no the best model exists, good corporate governance principles adopt an outcome-oriented approach emphasizing common elements of effectiveness (Clarke, 2004).

Institutional theory shapes corporate culture and communication by promoting collaboration, teamwork, joint decision-making, and democratic practices that value stakeholder input, especially in public relations. The increasing use of advanced information technologies has strengthened corporate cooperation with customers. Motivated by shared goals, customers actively participate in initiatives such as sponsorships, social events, campaigns, social media engagement, and gamified marketing strategies. The assumption that all individuals and groups within an institution work toward common objectives

fosters an organizational climate based on mutual trust. This, in turn, reinforces corporate identity, positioning the organization as a trustworthy entity.

Agency Theory

Conflicts of interest are inherent in most organizations, including families, which rarely operate as fully cooperative systems. In principle–agent relationships, a fundamental divergence often exists between property owners (principals) and managers (agents), causing misaligned goals and priorities. Agency theory, based on the self-interest-driven homo-economicus model, views subordinates as individualistic and opportunistic (Davis et al., 1997). Decision-makers' strategic priorities affect long-term value practices like R&D, change management, HR, employee satisfaction, and social responsibility. While owners focus on profitability despite risks, managers prioritize job security and income stability, tending to avoid risk (Fama & Jensen, 1983). As a result, managers may inefficiently allocate resources even when aiming to maximize financial outcomes. Agency theory supports professional management within corporate structures, yet information asymmetry arises as managers hold more detailed knowledge than shareholders, hindering oversight and weakening shareholder power (Esen, 2015; Koçer, 2006).

The theory is criticized for focusing solely on shareholders and limiting managerial motivation to material incentives (Barney & Ouchi, 1986). This bipolar structure permeates internal and external corporate communication—from shareholder relations to public engagement—and shifts in governance may produce an inconsistent and unreliable organizational image. These discrepancies between decision-makers and managerial representatives shape corporate communication. While such initiatives may not offer immediate returns, they significantly affect institutional image, culture, and external communication. In contrast, profit-driven strategies often manifest through sales-oriented, competitive, and aggressive tactics aimed at short-term gains.

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory is a management approach emphasizing an organization's responsibilities to employees, managers, suppliers, customers, and the public. Its core principle is defining the enterprise's purpose and obligations to stakeholders (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). It views businesses as socio-economic entities creating value not only for shareholders but for all stakeholders. As Freeman (2023) explained, stakeholders are individuals and groups whose interests are affected by the organization's activities, including governments, political groups, financial and trade associations, protection agencies,

and both central and private enterprises. Therefore, corporate governance should prioritize the well-being of employees, suppliers, creditors, customers, government, and society (Doğan, 2018; Koçer, 2006: 21).

It is important to emphasize that stakeholder theory prioritizes fostering positive relationships with the organization's environment based on responsibility rather than profit motives (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). Organizations create wealth by integrating stakeholders into a cohesive corporate community. According to Halal (2000), modern stakeholders collaborate with managers to align interests and enhance profitability, fostering collective success. Donaldson and Preston (1995) highlight the social and communicative depth of stakeholder theory, distinguishing it from other management approaches. Another key difference is the lack of a shared purpose between property owners and proxy managers. The theory emphasizes corporate management's role in balancing diverse interests, with the board serving as a forum for unity (Helal, 2000, p. 10).

The stakeholder approach promotes a participatory, customer-centric model where customers engage in digital initiatives like co-creation and brand advocacy, fostering loyalty and strengthening corporate identity. Synchronous interactive multimedia applications—social media, web chats, forums, omnichannel platforms, ATMs, kiosks, voice calls, websites—offer personalized experiences via wearables and mobile apps. Additionally, organizational philanthropy, avoiding unfair competition, and fostering trust with suppliers are hallmark trends (Ertuğrul, 2008, p. 216). Project-based initiatives and flexible employment reflect the adaptability of the approach. However, frequent changes can undermine trust and corporate loyalty, potentially risking the brand's reputation.

The Stewardship Theory

Stewardship theory is a corporate governance framework that reflects differences in shareholder rights and ownership structures, emphasizing the alignment of managerial behavior with organizational goals. This approach provides to aligning management with shareholders, promotes critical thinking, ensures fiduciary responsibility in nonprofits, advances social and environmental sustainability, optimizes public resources. By examining the entrepreneur–manager relationship, stewardship theory highlights tensions in risk-taking, strategic planning, and profit orientation, assuming managers act as stewards prioritizing the company's long-term interests while portraying subordinates as collectivist and trustworthy; however, effective governance also requires mechanisms to ensure executive behavior remains motivated and aligned with corporate objectives (Davis et al., 1997, p. 37;

Menyah, 2013; Keasey & Wright, 1997). Despite its contributions, stewardship theory has been criticized for its limitations in realism and relevance (Chrisman, 2019). If conflicts within the organization are not properly managed, they can paralyze the management function (Mizruchi, 1993).

Organizations that deprive professional managers of decision- making authority often exhibit a supervisory, property-oriented, and institutionalist approach, resulting in a repressive organizational climate. A repressive organizational climate can also exacerbate poor management practices, such as increased surveillance, lack of privacy protections, and heightened control. In such environments, the pressure exerted by upper management often cascades to lower levels, leading to widespread stress. Factors such as poor business design, inadequate leadership, low organizational moral standards, excessive workloads, and insufficient training may in workplace issues, including mobbing and emotional harassment. The theory, which advocates for ethical governance by balancing supervision and empowerment to cultivate a healthy organizational culture attempts to reconcile these tensions by proposing a model based on subordinates' psychological attributes and the organization's situational characteristics.

Resource Dependence Theory

Resource Dependency Theory explains how organizational behavior and strategy are influenced by external resource providers. Firms must interact with external actors who control essential inputs such as materials, labor, or technology to ensure operational continuity (Doğan, 2018, p.89). Since organizations cannot fully control these inputs, securing resources remains a persistent challenge (Zahra & Pearce, 1989). An enterprise's scale, determined by establishment costs and institutional expenses such as contracts, transactions, production, raw materials, stocking, coordination, and learning, influences its size in terms of price and production (Meydan, 2010, p. 27). Effective resource use prioritizes invaluable and irreplaceable assets. The managers playing a key role in securing critical resources and maintaining external relationships thus board becomes the most important mechanism for ensuring the company's access to critical resources and communication with its environment.

Strategies derived from the Resource Dependency Theory include conciliatory management behaviors, managerial transfers, the involvement of prominent individuals, gentlemen's agreements, production and management contracts, stock acquisitions, and joint ventures. According to this theory, which emphasizes the importance of external relationships and institutional adaptation, corporate governance requires strong connections with public and social stakeholders to identify opportunities and

secure financial support. Resource Dependency Theory emphasizes organizational reliance on external actors and the strategic management of these dependencies to reduce uncertainty. Organizations adopt strategies such as alliances, influence, and negotiation to maintain stability in resource-constrained environments. Aligned with stakeholder theory and the contingency approach, this perspective highlights organizational adaptability and external engagement. Rather than enforcing rigid hierarchies, firms adopting this model promote a participatory corporate identity. Clients are viewed as integral stakeholders, especially in digital contexts where they contribute to brand advocacy, co-creation, and social media initiatives. This inclusive approach fosters brand loyalty and reinforces a dynamic, stakeholder-oriented corporate identity.

Myopic Market Theory

Myopic Market Theory is a managerial approach that the targets are planned long-term according to the priorities of the management decision-makers, and short-term decisions are expected to remain within these frameworks. Myopic market theory, prevalent in Anglo-Saxon systems (Alp & Kılıç, 2014: 45), argues that corporate decision-making prioritizes short-term financial gains over long-term stakeholder welfare. Rather than focusing on sustainable growth, financial movements are driven by immediate increases in share value and profitability. As corporate executives are the final decision-makers, they prioritize short-term profitability, share value appreciation, and resource protection to secure their positions, often avoiding long-term investments that benefit stakeholders (Davis et al. 1997). This approach was called myopic market theory because the markets could not see the distance due to their focus on short-term profitability.

Gönç (2019) stated this financial behavior-oriented theory also influences corporate communication. The equation of corporate success with financial decision-making reinforces a profit-driven corporate identity. In organizational communication, this manifests in customer relations, after-sales support, loyalty programs, product positioning, marketing strategies, and pricing approaches. While profit-oriented organizations emphasize financial success, those adopting short-term strategies are often perceived as dynamic in favorable conditions but opportunistic in crises.

Transaction Cost Theory

Transaction Cost Theory (TCT), introduced by Coase in 1937, explains firms' choices between internal production and external procurement by highlighting their role in reducing negotiation, contracting, and monitoring costs compared to market mechanisms. Williamson's (1996) the best

strategy is economy motto, is valid for the theory. Doğan (2018) describes transaction costs as a series of exchanges between suppliers, labor, and consumers, often associated with the transfer of ownership rights. Transaction costs are caused by four main factors, such as time and effort required to find suitable partners, suppliers, or resources. Secondly, the costs of negotiating and formalizing agreements, bargaining, and contracting. Thirdly, expenses related to ensuring compliance with contractual terms, monitoring, enforcement, and handling disputes. Finally, the risk of one party acting in self-interest, leading to inefficiencies or contractual failures.

Transaction costs, arising from negotiations, contract enforcement, and regulatory compliance, impact market prices. However, technologies like blockchain, AI, and cloud computing reduce these costs by automating processes, optimizing decision-making, and eliminating intermediaries in financial transactions and supply chain management. Organizations managed with a transaction cost approach focus on economic behavior and profitability. Prioritizing cost reduction, this strategy shapes corporate behavior, brand management, and customer relations. However, its structured and systematic nature limits agility and flexibility compared to other approaches.

The Contingency Theory

The contingency approach is a theory that emphasizes the dynamic relationship between an organization and its environment, asserting that a universal model for corporate communication is impossible and that strategies should adapt to varying conditions. It gives weight to analysis of factors such as technology use, internal and external environmental influences, business size, leadership structure, technology use, stakeholder relations, market structure, production processes, and corporate culture (Donaldson, 2006).

Thus, while environmental factors shape organizational structure, technology use, and differentiation, an organization's behavior becomes more organic and integrated (Gönç, 2019). Additionally, the approach emphasizes the significance of property-management relations, organizational structure, strategy, and size when determining management models (Davis et al.; 1997; Short et al., 1999). According to Jensen (1994) applying administrative tools in conjunction with theoretical knowledge requires adaptation to the specific conditions and circumstances of the organization. Organizations that adopt the contingency approach in corporate communication management are often described as flexible, dynamic, and innovative because they can make quick decisions, analyze data swiftly, and apply knowledge to action. Due to this agile management philosophy,

strategies are tailored to regional and local differences, enabling the development of special offers, customized pricing strategies, and individualized employee management practices. Although this approach fosters dynamic and youthful corporate identities, the frequent implementation of systematic changes may make it difficult to build trust, which is the foundation of corporate loyalty, especially among consumers. It can even lead to crises that quickly damage a successful brand's reputation, making it appear unreliable. For example, organizations with inconsistent retail or social media visibility, frequently changing prices, and fluctuating selling points or dealers may be perceived as unstable and untrustworthy.

Strategic Leadership Theory

Leadership manages change through innovation and transformation, while strategic leadership emphasizes vision, values, ethics, and the political management of power dynamics, stakeholder engagement, and institutional representation (Rowe, 2001; Pisapia, 2009). Strategic leadership requires a leader who commands legitimacy both within the organization and in the public sphere, as this dual resonance strengthens stakeholder confidence and institutional reputation. Strategic leaders build support, inspire confidence, and foster employee growth through integrity and rapid feedback. Result of these, their success is measured by problem prevention, opportunity maximization, and high performance (Charan, 1998). Beyond oversight, the board supports leadership by evaluating opportunities, offering diverse perspectives, and guiding key processes such as talent selection, CEO evaluation, and succession planning (Charan, 1998, p. 200). The organizations which managed in strategic leadership approach have a consistent and credible institutional identity because a well-defined public face of the organization enhances brand coherence, instills trust among stakeholders, and facilitates agile decision-making and implementation. However, despite its participatory nature, this approach carries the inherent risk of consolidating power in a single leader, potentially leading to an authoritarian management style. A lack of credibility may lead to disengagement and diminished trust. Thus, effective leadership entails balancing centralized decision-making with distributed influence to avoid excessive power concentration.

METHOD

This study, rooted in the corporate communication and corporate governance literature, employs a comprehensive critical review of secondary data sources drawn from the fields of organizational communication, public relations, governance, and business management. This study

examines how Foucault's concept of power is reflected in institutional conventions through specific tools and mechanisms. Aim is to construct a theoretical framework for identifying the managerial priorities that drive the adoption of sustainability-oriented corporate communication strategies. The study's original contribution lies in uncovering these governance-based priorities as key determinants influencing sustainability-focused organizational communication. In order to assess how Foucauldian power relations permeate corporate governance, the analysis is structured around nine widely adopted theoretical frameworks: Institutional Theory, Agency Theory, Stewardship Theory, Strategic Leadership Theory, Stakeholder Theory, Contingency Theory, Resource Dependence Theory, Myopic Market Theory, and Transaction Cost Theory. These frameworks were selected according to their prevalence in the scholarly discourse.

The study maps the mechanisms through which Foucauldian power dynamics are reproduced in corporate life and highlights the factors that influence firms' adoption of sustainability goals. Research questions

1. How can corporate governance approaches be examined through Foucault's concept of power relations to clarify their roles in sustaining or redressing inequalities?
2. How shape organisational behaviour and strategies corporate governance models and how is ensure sustainable corporate communication?

By analyzing governance approaches to reveal institutional priorities, the study categorizes these priorities and derives a list indicating which sustainability goals particular organizations are most likely to adopt. This integrative approach illuminates the interface between corporate communication and governance practices. Nevertheless, because every organization has a unique structure and a dynamic culture, the governance priorities and sustainability inclinations identified here are context-specific rather than universally generalizable. Factors such as corporate philosophy, sectoral trends, regional conditions, global crises and opportunities, and managerial sensitivities exert varying influences that cannot be objectively standardized. Accordingly, the article offers a tentative, non-generalized framework linking power relations, governance priorities, and sustainability goals within the context of organisational communication.

FINDINGS

Sustainability has become a central concern for organizations seeking long-term resilience, ethical responsibility, and regulatory compliance. However, the extent to which sustainability goals are

adopted varies significantly. Understanding these factors provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing the conditions under which sustainability initiatives are effectively integrated into organizational structures.

A Framework Based on Priorities and Sustainability Goals Determined by Power Dynamics in Governance

Governance theories are analyzed in this study and classified into four groups in table 1, based on organizational philosophies that define managerial priorities. Sovereignty balance often shows focused to conflict of interest and power struggles and authority dynamics, where governance is most visibly exercised. Financial priorities focused strategies include cost-reduction strategies fiscal adjustment policies emphasizes commercial risk, profitability differences, and the costs associated with transactions and management. Dynamic management strategies represent leader's opinions more than other approaches. Considers internal and external environment, the strategic leader's role, and institutional resource dependencies. The ethical priorities governance approaches: centers on institutionalization principles and stakeholder rights. Table 1 shows different ways of thinking about organizations, based on what they prioritize financially, how they balance power, how they deal with change, and their ethical beliefs. Each of these ways of thinking comes with its own approach to how the organization is run, what strategies it uses, and what it focuses on in terms of long-term well-being.

The Financial Priority perspective emphasizes Resource Dependence Theory, Myopic Market Theory and Transaction Cost Theory, leading to Cost-Reduction Strategies and Fiscal Adjustment Policies, with sustainability linked to basic needs and resource efficiency (Zero Hunger, No Poverty, Responsible Consumption and Production, Affordable and Clean Energy). The Sovereignty Balance category incorporates Agency Theory, Stewardship Theory, and Strategic Leadership Theory. Governance focuses on balancing ownership power, while strategies address potential Conflicts of Interest. Sustainability outcomes include foundational well-being and institutional strength (No Poverty, Quality Education, Reduced Inequalities, Peace Justice and Strong Institutions).

Table 1 Theoretical Classification of Governance Approaches Based on Organizational Philosophy and Managerial Priority

Philosophy	Governance approach	Strategies	Sustainability
Financial priority	Resource Dependence T. Myopic Market T. Transaction Cost T.	Cost-Reduction Strategies Fiscal Adjustment Policies	Zero Hunger (1) No Poverty (2) Responsible Consumption and Production (12) Affordable and Clean Energy (7)
Sovereignty Balance	Agency T. Stewardship T. Strategic Leadership T.	Conflict of interest	No Poverty (2) Quality Education (4) Reduced Inequalities (10) Peace Justice and Strong Institutions (16)
Dynamic	Strategic Leadership T. Contingency T. Resource Dependence T. Stakeholder T.	Leader's structure Dynamic internal and external environment Resource linkage with others	Good Health and Well-Being (3), Affordable and clean energy(7) Sustainable Cities and Communities (11) Partnerships for the Goals (17)
Ethical	Stakeholder T. Institutional T.	Democratic Participation, Human Rights Rule of Law Public Ethics Accountability Openness and Transparency Efficient, Effective, and Sound Administration Leadership, Capability, and Capacity Responsiveness Sound Financial and Economic Management Sustainability and Long-Term Orientation Openness to Change and Innovation	Zero Hunger (1) No Poverty (2) Quality Education (4) Gender Equality (5) Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure (9) Responsible Consumption and Production (12)

The Dynamic organizational philosophy integrates Strategic Leadership Theory, Contingency Theory, Resource Dependence Theory, and Stakeholder Theory. Strategic considerations involve Leader's structure, internal and external environmental dynamics, and resource linkages. Sustainability goals encompass broader societal well-being and infrastructure development (Good Health and Well-Being, Affordable and Clean Energy, Sustainable Cities and Communities, Partnerships for the Goals).

The Ethical philosophy prioritizes Stakeholder Theory and Institutional Theory. Strategies emphasize Democratic Participation, Human Rights, Rule of Law, Public Ethics, Accountability, Openness and Transparency, Efficient and Effective Administration, Leadership and Capacity Building, Responsiveness, Sound Financial and Economic Management, Sustainability and Long-Term Orientation, and Openness to Change and Innovation. Sustainability outcomes are diverse, ranging from basic needs and equity to innovation and responsible practices (Zero Hunger, No Poverty, Quality Education, Gender Equality, Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure, Responsible Consumption and Production). These theories primarily address power dynamics within the board of directors, focusing on how potential conflicts of interest between owners, managers, and stakeholders can be anticipated, managed, or mitigated through governance mechanisms and strategic leadership.

Managerial Failure: Power Imbalances and Mismanaged Conflicts

Power in corporate governance and communication permeates all organizational levels, shaping behavior and ideology. Drawing on Foucault (2012, 2019), power is not only disciplinary but also productive, negotiated, and embedded in knowledge systems. It operates relationally, legitimizing authority through institutional discourse and reproducing control within governance. Power becomes visible through hierarchy, division of labor, span of control, specialization, formalization, centralization, decision-making authority, access to strategic information, signature rights, and discretionary control over resources. Beyond formal structures, power manifests implicitly in hierarchical rigidity, corporate messaging, compensation policies, and spatial arrangements like office layouts and executive seating (Betts, 2006). Unchecked power risks systemic inequalities: thus, governance must ensure fairness, transparency, accountability, and responsibility as ethical safeguards against rigid, asymmetrical power, promoting adaptability.

Power struggles among board members, influenced by organizational culture, affect decision-making and leadership. These conflicts can appear as strategic sabotage, interpersonal clashes, excessive scrutiny, smear campaigns, exclusion, or disregard for members' input. The dark side of organizational behavior includes anti-productive actions such as mobbing, workplace rudeness, cynicism, harassment, organizational silence, careerism, social loafing, cyberloafing, revenge, gossip, and destructive politics. Power is evident in manager-employee relations, shown by decision-making authority, information access, signing rights, and resource control. Examples include rigid hierarchies, restrictions on personal freedoms, pressure to hide beliefs, managerial oversight of employees' social media, limiting participation, interrupting speech, assigning responsibilities without authority, and blaming individuals for organizational errors. Gender pays gaps, unreasonable overtime, and denied leave also reflect power imbalances, affecting governance and strategy. These issues may stem from board-level decisions and impact external stakeholders, including notifications discourse, authority distribution in retail, exclusion of dealers, poor supplier communication, imbalanced customer relations, dysfunctional complaint handling, inadequate financial communication, stock speculation, restricted information access, and inefficient public forums. Such conflicts harm board effectiveness, underscoring the need to prevent misconduct like mobbing and ensure fair treatment.

Key Elements Influencing the Adoption of Sustainability Goals in Organizations

The sustainability objectives adopted by organizations are influenced by factors such as organizational philosophy, corporate identity, culture, governance approaches, institutional vision, sectoral expertise, board sensitivities, and regional needs. These elements also shape corporate communication strategies, including CSR and philanthropic activities.

Organizations prioritized ethical considerations and managed under institutional and stakeholder theories tend to align with sustainability goals focused on social justice, education, and environmental stewardship. Stakeholder theory promotes protecting minority rights and fostering democratic organizational cultures, supporting peace and justice in socially responsible institutions.

Ethical-first organizations emphasize urgent goals like zero hunger, no poverty, climate action, life below water, and life on land, while also aligning with quality education, gender equality, innovation, responsible consumption, and decent work. Governance models balancing sovereignty often appear in emerging or unstable organizations with complex ownership, making a unified philosophy difficult to discern. In contrast, institutions following Agency or Stewardship theories typically display proactive cultures where board members' values strongly influence sustainability priorities.

Dynamic approaches emphasize leaders' sensitivities and decision-making, making power and accountability central to adopting sustainability goals. This explains why goals like Good Health and Well-Being (3), Affordable and Clean Energy (7), Sustainable Cities (11), and Partnerships (17) depend on leader-driven, participatory initiatives

Organizations, financial predence governance policies, usually adopt competitive, short-term strategies but may still focus on cost-effective goals such as no poverty, responsible consumption, and affordable clean energy. For example, resource dependence and conteignency approaches sometimes fostering collaboration within the organizations.

Organizations naturally focus on sustainability issues tied to their industries and stakeholders. Manufacturers should prioritize sustainable production and climate action, while food companies focus on zero hunger, health, life below water, and responsible consumption. Energy, mining, and logistics sectors—major sources of environmental harm—must address clean energy, water sanitation, climate action, poverty, and decent work, also prioritizing life below water to reduce ecological damage. Construction should emphasize sustainable cities and life on land. Regardless of sector or size, all organizations should tackle reduced inequalities, responsible consumption, education, gender equality,

peace, justice, strong institutions, and partnerships. Service industries like finance are expected to address poverty, gender equality, economic justice, and access to quality education.

Regional socio-economic conditions and crises strongly shape sustainability priorities. In Africa, basic needs like Zero Hunger, Clean Water and Sanitation, and Quality Education are critical. In Turkey, given frequent human rights violations (HUDOC, 2024), Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions should be central to corporate responsibility. Similarly, in Iran and Pakistan, where gender inequality remains entrenched (WEF, 2024), Gender Equality must be a core focus. Regardless of sector or size, all organizations must prioritize goals such as Climate Action, Clean Water and Sanitation, Affordable and Clean Energy, Life Below Water, and Life on Land. Sustainable development is both an institutional duty and essential for long-term economic and social stability, requiring proactive, well-structured initiatives aligned with these objectives.

Adapting Corporate Communication to Governance Changes

In the short term, it is not possible to change organizational philosophy or management approach. However, due to the emergence and adoption of global and local conditions or new technologies, sudden changes in strategic objectives may be required. In such cases, corporate communication tools should be revised, and communication strategies must be designed to involve all stakeholders. It should be emphasized that corporate communication practices are a direct reflection of governance approaches, and preserving institutional identity and culture is essential when determining management strategies. While goals, behaviors, and priorities may evolve, the institutional identity rooted in its philosophy must remain intact. In these situations, corporate communication strategies should be adapted to ensure that all stakeholders, including the public, are informed of these transformations. This awareness can be achieved through:

- Aligning stakeholder communication channels with governance changes to ensure consistent and effective messaging,
- Developing social media strategies that reflect emerging governance priorities and corporate positioning,
- Launching marketing and advertising campaigns to communicate key changes and reinforce institutional identity,
- Utilizing brand ambassadors and refined slogans to concretize and communicate new corporate priorities,

- Training field teams and customer-facing personnel to effectively convey changes in strategy and governance,
- Investing in projects aligned with the new governance priorities to demonstrate commitment to the transition,
- Implementing corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives to strengthen the organization's evolving ethical, social, and environmental commitments.

By strategically balancing management transitions with solid communication efforts, organizations can ensure that transformations are not only effectively implemented but also widely understood and embraced by both internal and external stakeholders. Ultimately, maintaining transparency, trustworthiness, and alignment with corporate identity is crucial for sustaining long-term organizational success.

DISCUSSION

Management literature has generally focused on the sources of power that organizational members use to influence decisions and the relationships between these power sources and decision-making processes (Bayraktaroğlu, 2000). As in the management theories discussed in this study, power in organizations and governance is evaluated alongside terms such as legitimacy, authority, influence, control, will, dependency, leadership, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, pressure, and motivation, consistent with the literature. In this concept Foucault's concept of power offers a useful lens for examining how corporate governance structures reproduce or reduce inequality.

Ashforth's (1994) petty tyranny describes chronic managerial abuse through daily control and domination. Similarly, Foucault conceptualizes power as dispersed, relational, and disciplinary, operating through normalized surveillance and behavior regulation. However, unlike Ashforth's focus on managerial abuse as negative control, Foucault's framework views power as a dynamic process that also produces subjectivity and can enable resistance. Petty tyranny operates through normalized, micro-level mechanisms of control embedded in daily interactions. Similarly, it overlaps with Foucault's notion of "capillary power," wherein domination is enacted through the fabric of organizational life, rendering managerial authority not only a functional tool but also a vehicle for the internalization of control and the production of compliant organizational subject's power term as a dispersed, relational, and disciplinary embedded within everyday practices. Both approaches conceptualize power as a tangible, measurable "thing" concentrated in the hands of certain actors. However, Foucault challenges this view

by understanding power as a dynamic process continuously produced and resisted, carrying both oppressive and liberating potentials within power relations. From a Foucauldian view, this power is not just top-down but dispersed and exercised through routine, disciplinary practices.

This understanding of power provides a useful lens for linking organizational dynamics to the broader discourse on sustainability (Risteska, & Boztepe Taşkıran, 2023). Sustainability is defined not only as the ability to meet present needs but also as a commitment to ensuring that future generations can meet theirs. Sustainable governance refers to decision-making processes and institutional structures that prioritize long-term environmental, social, and economic sustainability while ensuring accountability, transparency, and inclusiveness. Corporate sustainability into communication strategies enables organizations to convey their social, environmental, and economic commitments, thereby fostering stakeholder trust, enhancing reputation, and supporting long-term business success (Harolds, 2018). It constitutes a responsibility that an organization holds toward society, natural resources, and its own continuity, and it should be integrated into both corporate governance and corporate communication practices.

As examined in the critical literature review, financially oriented approaches, such as Resource Dependence, Myopic Market, and Transaction Cost theories, prioritize economic rationality, focusing on capital mobility, efficiency. They probably are more sensitive to sustainability principles in production and financial processes. In contrast, they may often neglect social and environmental values and potentials (Meydan, 2010; Davis et al., 1997; Coase, 1937). Agency, Stewardship, and Strategic Leadership theories classified as sovereignty-focused approaches focus on conflict of interests, including emphasizing organizational stability and control, providing robust frameworks for hierarchy, performance monitoring, and professional management (Esen, 2015; Koçer, 2006; Menyah, 2013; Mizruchi, 1993; Rowe, 2001). The dynamics among stakeholders represent a field of struggles (Herold, 2018).

Power struggles are expected to intensify and become particularly evident in the distribution of decision-making rights, especially regarding senior management and financial matters. Consequently, corporations that strategically balance financial imperatives with governance sovereignty are more likely to pursue sustainability goals that align with their sectoral experiences and long-term economic advantages.

Contingency (Donaldson, 2006), resource dependence (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2015), stakeholder (Donaldson & Preston, 1995), and strategic leadership theories (Pisapia, 2009) emphasize responsive,

participatory organizational behavior, highlighting the importance of sustainability partnerships and compliance with external demands. Agile approaches prioritize leaders' personal traits, adaptability to dynamic environments, and resource coordination, underscoring the critical role of managerial sensitivity in shaping sustainability goals. In such contexts, power dynamics become more pronounced in decision-making, risk-taking, and initiative, as both agile and leader-centric organizations promote flexible accountability.

In stakeholder and Institutional management approaches given priorities ethical values than others. Ethics-centered approaches, represented by Institutional and Stakeholder theories, prioritize social justice, environmental ethics, and stakeholder inclusivity, countering the hegemonic effects of centralized power and reinforcing ethical corporate culture (OECD, 2016). In conclusion, meaningful and enduring sustainability requires not only strategic alignment and economic efficiency but also the consistent integration of ethical principles into organizational structures.

CONCLUSION

This study proposes a theoretical framework that aligns governance philosophies with their likely sustainability priorities, categorized into four broad perspectives: Financial, Sovereignty Balance, Dynamic, and Ethical. Financially oriented organizations predominantly could tend to cost-efficient targets such as resource optimization and poverty alleviation, whereas Ethical and stakeholder-driven models could be emphasized systemic global challenges including climate change, social equity, and institutional justice. Dynamic and sovereignty-based governance could adopt contingent strategies shaped by leadership influence, environmental contingencies, and intra-organizational power struggles. This classification serves as a conceptual model to understand how different organizational management approaches tend to influence the emphasis placed on various sustainability goals. However, it should be understood as an interpretive construct rather than a definitive or rigid typology.

Organizational management approaches fundamentally shape the distribution of power and authority, influencing formal structures like shareholder voting rights, compensation, and workspace allocation, as well as everyday practices such as communication, employment organization, and behavior. Using Foucault's framework, this study examines how governance mechanisms—ranging from formal authority and resource control to subtle forms like agenda obstruction, speech interruptions, and psychological coercion—perpetuate or challenge inequalities within organizations.

Even when informal or implicit, these dynamics should analysis critically for sustainable governance and ethical organizational practice.

Sustainability is framed not merely as environmental conservation but as an ethical mandate encompassing intergenerational justice, social equity, and organizational legitimacy. In a context of deepening inequalities, profit-driven organizations bear a profound moral responsibility to prioritize collective welfare and actively address systemic injustices. Corporate communication emerges as a pivotal strategic tool, facilitating transparent, inclusive, and coherent governance transitions that preserve institutional identity and underpin sustained social legitimacy. Ultimately, sustainability is inseparable from ethical governance and foundational to organizational resilience in a rapidly evolving global landscape. Neglecting sustainability constitutes a fundamental ethical failure that jeopardizes long-term viability and societal trust.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Bu inceleme çalışması, güç dinamiklerinin yönetim teorilerini ve kurumsal iletişim uygulamalarını nasıl etkilediğini inceleyerek, kurumsal yönetimde sürdürülebilirlik hedeflerinin benimsenmesini desteklemeyi ve olası yönetim değişimleri sırasında kurumsal kimliği korumaya yönelik önlemleri tartışmayı amaçlamaktadır. Sürdürülebilirlik, toplumsal adalet, çevresel denge ve ekonomik devamlılık arasında uzun vadeli uyum gözeterek, bireylerin ve kurumların yalnızca bugünü değil, gelecek kuşakların yaşam hakkını dikkate alan sorumluluk temelli bir yaklaşımdır. 2015 yılında Birleşmiş Milletler tarafından kabul edilen Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma, doğal yaşamın korunması, yoksulluğun ortadan kaldırılması ve eşitsizliklerin azaltılması gibi küresel sorunları hedefler. Mevcut kaynakların aşırı tüketimi gelecek nesillerin refahını riske attığından, sürdürülebilirlik hedefleri devlet kurumları, sivil toplum kuruluşları ve kâr amaçlı örgütleri kapsayacak şekilde benimsenir. Varlıklarını uzun vadede sürdürmek isteyen kurumlar için sürdürülebilirlik söylemi, kurumsal iletişim pratikleri ve stratejik karar süreçlerinde yer bulur. Kurumsal iletişimde sürdürülebilirlik hedefleri, güç ilişkilerinin şekillendirdiği yönetim ve kurumsal kültürün belirlediği öncelikler doğrultusunda benimsenir.

Bu çalışmada, yönetim literatürü ve kurumsal pratikleri farklı bir perspektiften değerlendirebilmek için iktidar, Foucault'nun kavramsallaştırmasıyla, gündelik yaşamda görünen, dağınık, yaygın ve ilişkisel bir yapı olarak ele alınmıştır. Tarihsel, bağlamsal ve bilgiye dayalı bir kavram olarak direniş ve üretime açıktır. Modern iktidar biyopolitik pratikler üzerinden işlerken bilgi, norm, öznellik ve kimlikler üreterek üretken ve dönüştürücü doğasını ortaya koyar. Tüm toplumsal pratiklere gömülü modern örgütlerde gözetim, normleştirme, dağıtım, dışlama, sınıflandırma ve bireyselleştirme

pratikleriyle bireyleri ve kurumları şekillendiren disipliner bir mekanizmadır. Gücün disipline edici işlevi, kurumlarda katı yasal çerçeveler yoluyla totaliter hiyerarşilerde otoriteyi sağlamlaştırırken, bürokratik kontrol yoluyla itaatsizliği engeller, bireyleri otoriteyi içselleştirmeye ve kurumsal normlara uymaya zorlar. Ayrıca örgütsel davranışın karanlık yönleri—cinsel taciz, mobbing, kabalık, alaycılık, toplumsal şiddet, dedikodu—kurumsal kültürü ve örgütsel felsefeyi görünür kılar.

Kurumsal yönetim literatüründe yaygınlık ölçütüne göre belirlenen sistematik bir derlemeye Kurumsallık, Temsilcilik, Vekilharçlık (Emanet), Stratejik Liderlik, Paydaş, Durumsallık, Kaynak Bağımlılığı, Miyop Piyasa ve İşlem Maliyeti teorileri güç ilişkileri ve örgütsel yönetim öncelikleri bakımından incelenmiştir. Bu yaklaşımlar, yönetsel odakları ve öncelikleri bakımından dört ana sınıfa ayrılmıştır. Egemenlik odaklı yaklaşımlar (Sovereignty Balance), Temsilcilik Teorisi (Agency Teorisi), Vekilharçlık Teorisi (Stewardship Teorisi) ve Stratejik Liderlik Teorisi ile temsil edilir. Çıkar çatışmalarının yönetimi, otorite ve hiyerarşinin merkezileştirilmesi, üst düzey yönetim kontrol mekanizmaları önceliklidir. Bu yaklaşımlarda sürdürülebilirlik hedefleri: Yoksulluğa Son (2), Nitelikli Eğitim (4), Eşitsizliklerin Azaltılması (10), Barış, Adalet ve Güçlü Kurumlar (16) olarak öne çıkar.

Finansal öncelikli yaklaşımlar (Financial Priority), Kaynak Bağımlılığı Teorisi, Miyop Piyasa Teorisi ve İşlem Maliyeti Teorisi ile karakterizedir. Maliyet azaltma stratejileri ve mali uyum politikaları uygulanır. Öncelik verilen sürdürülebilirlik hedefleri: Açlığa Son (1), Yoksulluğa Son (2), Sorumlu Tüketim ve Üretim (12), Erişilebilir ve Temiz Enerji (7), İnsana Yakışır İş ve Ekonomik Büyüme (8).

Dinamik yaklaşımlar (Dynamic), Stratejik Liderlik Teorisi, Durumsallık Teorisi, Kaynak Bağımlılığı Teorisi ve Paydaş Teorisi ile temsil edilir. Lider yapısının uyarlanması, değişken iç ve dış çevreye esnek yanıt ve kaynak bağlantılarıyla iş birliği stratejileri ön plandadır. Bu yaklaşımlarda sürdürülebilirlik hedefleri: Sağlık ve Kaliteli Yaşam (3), Erişilebilir ve Temiz Enerji (7), Sürdürülebilir Şehirler ve Yaşam Alanları (11), Amaçlar İçin Ortaklıklar (17) olarak belirlenir.

Etik merkezli yaklaşımlar (Ethical), Paydaş Teorisi ve Kurumsal Teori ile temsil edilir. Demokratik katılım, insan hakları ve hukukun üstünlüğü, hesap verebilirlik, şeffaflık, etkin yönetim, liderlik kapasitesinin geliştirilmesi, sürdürülebilir ve uzun vadeli odak ve yeniliğe açıklık önceliklidir. Bu yaklaşımlarda sürdürülebilirlik hedefleri: Açlığa Son (1), Yoksulluğa Son (2), Nitelikli Eğitim (4), Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eşitliği (5), Sanayi, Yenilikçilik ve Altyapı (9), Sorumlu Tüketim ve Üretim (12).

Yönetişim öncelikleri, kurumsal kültürü şekillendiren güç ilişkileri ve sürdürülebilir kurumsal iletişim bağlamında analiz edilen literatür, sürdürülebilirlik hedeflerinin benimsenmesini etkileyen

faktörleri ortaya koyar. Sektörel eğilimler—enerji yoğunluğu, hammadde erişimi, kurumsal bilgi birikimi, nitelikli emek gereksinimi, iş birliği ağları ve regülasyonların uygulanması—kritik belirleyicilerdir. Kurucu ve yöneticilerin ideolojik hassasiyetleri, geçmiş ayrımcılık deneyimleri ve faaliyet coğrafyasındaki çevresel krizler veya çatışmalar hedeflerin biçimlenmesini etkiler. Stratejik hedefler (kurumsal imaj, müşteri sadakati vb.) sürdürülebilirlik politikasını yönlendirir.

Sürdürülebilirliğin anlamlı ve kalıcı olması, yalnızca stratejik uyum veya ekonomik kazanımlarla değil, güçlü etik temelin kurumsal yapıya tutarlı biçimde entegre edilmesiyle mümkündür. Küresel ve yerel değişimler kısa vadede stratejik yönelimlerde ani değişiklikler gerektirebilir; bu gibi durumlarda kurumsal iletişim ve sosyal medya stratejileri güncellenmeli, gerekirse kurumsal kimlik revize edilmelidir. Reklam ve tanıtımlarda dönüşümü destekleyen mesajların iletilmesi, saha ekiplerinin bilgilendirilmesi ve sosyal sorumluluk projelerinin yeniden değerlendirilmesi kurumsal kimliğin güncellenme sürecinde uyumu artırır. Şeffaflık, güvenilirlik ve kurumsal kimliğin tutarlılığı hem iç hem dış paydaşların adaptasyonu ve sürdürülebilir başarı için kritiktir. Gelecek çalışmalarda mali rapor analizi ve yöneticilerle derinlemesine mülakatların birlikte kullanılması, sürdürülebilir kurumsal iletişime katkı sağlayacaktır.

Çıkar Çatışması/Conflict of Interest

Yazar çıkar çatışması olmadığını beyan etmiştir. /The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Yazarların Katkıları/Author Contributions

Makale tek yazarlıdır. /The article has a single author.

This work is licensed under **Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License** (CC BY-NC 4.0). 

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alp, A. & Kılıç, S. (2014). *Kurumsal yönetim nasıl yönetilmeli*, İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.
- Althusser, L. (2006). *Yeniden üretim üzerine*. (I. Ergüden, A. Tümertekin, Çev.), İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.
- Apaydın, F. (2008). Kurumsallaşmanın küçük ve orta ölçekli işletmelerin performansına etkileri. *Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi*, 4(7), 121-145.
- Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human relations*, 47(7), 755-778.
- Barney, J., & Ouchi, W. (1986). *Organizational economics*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Betts, J. (2006). Framing Power: The case of the boardroom. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 9(2), 157–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10253860600633887>
- Charan, R. (1998). *Boards At Work: How Corporate Boards Create Competitive Advantage*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.
- Chrisman, J. J. (2019). Stewardship theory: realism, relevance, and family firm governance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 43(6), 1051-1066. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258719838472>
- Clarke, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Theories of Corporate Governance*. The Philosophical Foundations of Corporate Governance. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D. & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward A Stewardship Theory of Management, *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 20-47. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9707180258>
- Doğan, M. (2018). Kurumsal yönetimin teorik temelleri. *Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi*.1(1), 84-96.
- Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy Of Management Review*, 20(1), 65-91. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9503271992>
- Donaldson, L. (2006). The contingency theory of organizational design: challenges and opportunities. *Organization Design: The evolving state-of-the-art*, 19-40.
- Esen, F. (2015). Finansal piyasalarda bilgi asimetrisi kaynakları ve içerideki bilgi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. 8(40), 700-707. <https://doi.org/10.17719/jisr.20154013951>
- Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 26(2), 301-325.
- Foucault, M. (2012). *İktidarın Gözü*. (I. Ergüden, Çev.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Foucault, M. (2019). *Özne ve İktidar*. (I. Ergüden, O. Akınhay, Çev.) İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Freeman, R. E. (2023). The politics of stakeholder theory: Some future directions. *R. Edward Freeman's Selected Works on Stakeholder Theory and Business Ethics* içinde (pp. 119-132). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

- Gönç, D. (2019). *The impact of call centers on recognition and representation of corporate identities: Research on Call Centers Association*. (Publication No. 544748), [Master Dissertation Thesis]. Yeditepe University Social Science Institute. YOK tez merkezi. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp>
- Halal, W. E. (2000). Corporate community: A theory of the firm uniting profitability and responsibility. *Strategic Leadership*, 28(2), 10-16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10878570010341582>
- Hays-Thomas, R. (2022). Race, Ethnicity, and Work. In *Managing Workplace Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion* (pp. 255-293). Routledge.
- Herold, D. M. (2018). Demystifying the link between institutional theory and stakeholder theory in sustainability reporting. *Economics, Management and Sustainability*, 3(2), 6-19.
- Jensen, M. C. (1994). Self-Interest, altruism, incentives and agency theory. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 7(2), 40-45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6622.1994.tb00404.x>
- Koçer, B. (2006). *İçsel bir yönetim mekanizması olarak yönetim kurulları: İMKB’de işlem gören şirketlerin yönetim kurulu yapısı ve işlevleri üzerine bir araştırma*. Ankara: Sermaye Piyasası Kurulu Yayınları.
- Köse, S. (2023). *The dark side of organizational behavior*. (Edt.K. Bozkuş) doi: 10.5772/intechopen.1001968, IntechOpen.
- Menyah, K. (2013). *Stewardship Theory*. In: Idowu, S.O., Capaldi, N., Zu, L., Gupta, A.D. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Corporate Social Responsibility* içinde. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28036-8_107
- Meydan, C. H. (2010). Kaynak bağımlılığı, işlem maliyetleri, örgütsel ağ ve yeni- kurumsal kuram ile örgütlerin ittifak oluşturma sebepleri üzerine bir inceleme, *Kara Harp Okulu Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(2), 17 – 40.
- Mizruchi, M. S. (1993). Who controls whom? an examination of the relation between management and boards of directors in large American corporations. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(3), 426- 435.
- OECD (2016), *G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance*: (Turkish version), OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264257443-tr>.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (2015). External control of organizations—Resource dependence perspective. In *Organizational behavior 2* (pp. 355-370). Routledge.
- Platon (2006). *Devlet*. (Trans.S. Eyüboğlu, M. A. Cimcoz). İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Pisapia, J. (2009). *The strategic leader*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishers.
- Ritchie, C. (2021). Understanding the policymaking enterprise: Foucault among the bureaucrats. *Learning Policy, Doing Policy*. 221.
- Risteska, M., & Boztepe Taşkıran, H. (2023). Kurumsal İletişim Açısından Sürdürülebilirlik Yönetimi Uygulamaları: Türkiye ve Kuzey Makedonya Karşılaştırması. *The Journal of International Scientific Research*, 8(3), 367-392. <https://doi.org/10.23834/isrjournal.1335210>

- Rowe, W. W. (2001). Creating wealth in organizations the role of strategic leadership, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 81-94.
- Short, H., Keasey, K., Wright, M., & Hull, A. (1999). Corporate governance: From accountability to enterprise. *Accounting and Business Research*, 29(4), 337-352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.1999.9729592>
- Tricker, R. I. (2015). *Corporate governance: Principles, policies, and practices*. Oxford University Press, USA. ISBN 978-0-19-870275-7
- United Nations. (2025, February 6). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
- Williamson, O.E. (1996). *The mechanisms of governance*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zahra, S. A. & Pearce, J. A. (1989). Boards of directors and corporate financial performance: A review and integrative Model. *Journal of Management*, 15, 291334