Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

Original Research
Received 24 May 2026
Revised 23 June 2026
Accepted 19 July 2026

Natural Resources for Human Health 2026, Vol. 6(9s): 1662–1678

KEYWORDS:
Stakeholder Management, Mission Drift, Business and Social Goals

Stakeholder Management and Mission Drift: A Conceptual Structure for Juggling Business and Social Goals

Liang Xiaodan[1], Tan Seng Teck[2]*, Sam Toong Hai[3], Eddie Eu Hui Soon[4], Suhaimi Bin Mohd Yusoff[5], Reynold Tom Fernandez[6]

[1]Liang Xiao Dan, INTI International University, Malaysia, liang12292022@163.com
[2]Tan Seng Teck, INTI International University, Malaysia, sengteck.tan@newinti.edu.my
[3]Sam Toong Hai, INTI International University, Malaysia, toonghai.sam@newinti.edu.my
[4]Eddie Eu Hui Soon, INTI International University, Malaysia, euhui.soon@newinti.edu.my
[5]Suhaimi bin Mohd Yusoff, INTI International University, Malaysia, muhdsuhaimi.yusof@newinti.edu.my
[6]Reynold Tom Fernandez, INTI International University, Malaysia, reynoldtom.fernandez@newinti.edu.my
*Corresponding author: sengteck.tan@newinti.edu.my

ABSTRACT: In today's world, financial sustainability is a big challenge for contemporary organisations to achieve alongside social and societal goals. This tension exists especially for social enterprises and hybrid organizations where there are competing stakeholder expectations which may shape organizational priorities and resource allocation. This paper conceptualizes the stakeholder management and the phenomenon of mission drift and provides a conceptual framework to explore them. The study is based on theoretical and conceptual insights, which incorporate theories and concepts of stakeholder interests, stakeholder power, resource dependence, institutional pressures, organizational governance, and competing organizational logics. The analysis suggests that mission drift is not inevitable in the process of commercialisation, but can occur when powerful commercial actors have a greater influence than others on strategic decision-making, performance measurement and allocation of resources. Meanwhile, social stakeholders can play a part in mission preservation if their interests are taken into account, in a meaningful way, as part of governance and accountability practices. The paper suggests that business–social balancing is an organizational ability that can be developed continuously with the involvement of stakeholders, the diversification of resources, the integration of performance measurement, management and leadership based on mission and clear governance. The resulting framework characterizes the process of mission alignment as a dynamic product of organizational mechanisms that buffer and negotiate conflicting stakeholder demands while maintaining financial viability and substantive social purpose.

1. INTRODUCTION

Today's businesses are more likely to be called on to perform economically and socially at the same time. There has been a growing questioning of the traditional view of the firm being first and foremost concerned with profitability, and its ability to deliver value to other stakeholders, including its employees, customers, communities, beneficiaries, governments, and other stakeholders impacted (Camilleri, 2017). This is especially important for social enterprises, hybrid organizations, purpose-driven businesses, and organizations that have explicit social goals that incorporate commercial activities (Battilana, 2018). These institutions have to acquire funding and make themselves viable as institutions while committing to social functions that go beyond the limited scope of the institution. Given the multiple goals that affect the same organization, there is a constant tension between them as financial sustainability might involve making choices that don't align with social priorities at that moment (de Almeida Barbosa Franco et al., 2024). Stakeholder theory offers a useful basis to explore this tension, as organizations are surrounded by various actors with varying interests, expectations and capacities to influence organizational decisions (Ashrafi et al., 2020). Stakeholders can offer resources, legitimacy, knowledge, market access or social support as well as expect results that can be competitive with the stakeholders' core work (Taliento et al., 2019). Stakeholder management is then not just about sustaining positive relationships and it is also about an organisation's ability to decide whose interests it is going to pay attention to and how competing interests are integrated into strategic decision-making (Newman et al., 2020).

One ramification of this tension is a "mission drift," where over time the organization detracts from its original purposes of social or societal involvement due to commercial considerations. Mission drift is especially important for hybrid organisations because their stability and existence can be contingent upon markets, investors, donors, customers, government institutions or other providers of resources which may not share the same social mission (Malik et al., 2021). The impact of resource dependence can then shift the priorities of organizations, and institutional pressures can push organizations toward action that is seen as legitimate or necessary in competitive settings, even if it is not commercially dominant (Anh et al., 2022). Stakeholder salience also adds to the complexity of this process as stakeholders have varying levels of ‘power, legitimacy and urgency,' and so the economically powerful may end up being more attended to by the manager than the beneficiaries or communities whose interests are central to the organisation's mission (Bansal & Song, 2017). It is important to note, however, that mission drift does not necessarily mean a shift from a “social” to a “commercial” mission; mission drift is not synonymous with a shift from “social” to “commercial” (Staessens et al., 2019). When there is a strategic tie between the organization's revenues and its social purpose, commercialization can reinforce an organization's ability to deliver social outcomes. When the intentions of the organization are increasingly defined by its business goals and no longer by its purposes, the theoretical challenge occurs: How does the business goal redefine the priority of the organization, their resource allocation, their evaluation of performance and their perception of organizational success? (Cappelen & Pedersen, 2021). Given the importance of relationships between stakeholder power, resource dependence, organizational governance, institutional expectations and organizational purpose, understanding mission drift requires attention to these. (Bruder, 2025)

In this context, this paper proposes a conceptual structure to discuss the balancing of business sustainability and social mission in the management of organizations. In the paper, the authors do not see business and social goals as opposite choices, but complementary and even paradoxical, since there is a constant balancing of activities within the organization that is necessary for achieving both of them (Raisiene & Urmanavičienė, 2017). The main idea is that stakeholder management can be a useful tool by which organizations can negotiate and sustain competing demands and mission alignment. To successfully manage stakeholders, mission critical stakeholders need to be identified and included alongside economic powerful stakeholders, participative governance processes need to be established, and resource chains need to be diversified and performance systems need to be created that reflect financial as well as social outcomes (Muñoz & Kimmitt, 2019). These mechanisms can help build the capacity of the organization to react to commercial pressure but can also help prevent commercial pressure from overtaking the original social purpose. Stakeholder theory, resource dependence theory, institutional theory, agency theory, and paradox theory are thus combined in the paper to illustrate the conditions that can lead either to an increase or to a restriction of mission drift in stakeholder relationships (Chanase, 2023). Power asymmetry, external resource dependence, the nature of governance, organizational identity, accountability and performance measurement are particularly examined as drivers of the tension between business and social goals (Henderson & Lambert, 2018). The paper aims to conceptualize mission drift as a dynamic process, not just as an organizational failure, as competing stakeholder demands and organizational responses shape this phenomenon (Brown, 2021). The proposed structure thus offers a theoretical framework to explain how organisations can sustain financial viability and yet continue to keep the social purpose that lends their activities legitimacy and meaning (Lutz & Petrini, 2020).

1.2 Background: Business–Social Tensions in Contemporary Organizations

The interplay between business activity and social purpose has evolved into a much more complicated scenario, where organizations are required to respond to the multiple demands of economy, society, environment and institutions at the same time. While conventional business models focus on profitability, growth, efficiency, competitiveness, and economic value creation, socially oriented organizations have a greater focus on inclusion, community welfare, empowerment, social justice and collective value creation (Battilana, 2018). For that reason, these orientations have come closer together and forced organizations to go for business sustainability while solving the social issues, as a result of the rise of social enterprises and hybrid organizations. These organizations can no longer depend on just social legitimacy or market revenues, but need to constantly work through divergent expectations regarding the purpose of the organization and its beneficiaries (Awa et al., 2024). This situation produces an inherent conflict as resources are finite and strategic decisions often have costs to some stakeholders and benefits to others. Stakeholder theory is a useful lens on this complexity as organisations relate with a variety of actors that potentially influence their activities or are influenced by them (Carroll, 2021). A customer might want something to be affordable and good, an investor might want financial return, an employee might want to be paid fairly and have something to do with, a government might want something to be compliant with regulations and a community or a beneficiary might want something to have long-term social value. The expectations may overlap in some cases, but they can also clash, creating one of the most important challenges for an organization – stakeholder management.

This can be especially critical when organizations rely on external stakeholders for critical resources. According to the Resource Dependence Theory, organizations cannot be completely independent as it depends on what resources they have and who supplies them with financial, material, informational, and political resources (Latapí Agudelo et al., 2019). An organization that has a reliance on commercial investors can be put under pressure for growth and financial results, whereas an organization that depends on donors or public institutions can be put under pressure for measurable social outcomes and accountability. Likewise, companies in competitive industries might be tempted to focus on short-term revenue or cost-cutting and/or business activities that could be attracting economically valuable customers. These pressures can slowly shift the allocation of organizational focus and resources. The institutional theory also indicates that the organizations react to the wider institutional context where specific values and practices are accepted or appreciated as legitimate and desirable (Carroll & Brown, 2018). Competition, efficiency, commercialism, and financial measurement can be normalized in market oriented institutions while equity, responsibility, participation and community welfare can be emphasized in social institutions. Hybrid organisations thus exist in the space between potentially conflicting institutional logics. This tension does not necessarily mean dysfunction in the organization. Commercial activities can help to reinforce social programmes and social legitimacy can build trust, customer loyalty, employee commitment and access to new resources (Bromley & Meyer, 2017). The challenge comes when one logic starts to prevail and take over the other. Mission drift is a special kind of concern as the organization may continue to state its social purpose while increasingly making decisions that are more commercial in nature (Malik et al., 2021).

Business–social tension should therefore be seen as a continuous balancing process, not a limited conflict which can be solved once and for all. The question is not just about which goals – business or social ones – should prevail, but about how to organise the goals and ensure that they stay related to the basic purpose of the organization. Stakeholder salience is especially salient as stakeholders have varying power, legitimacy and urgency combinations that impact the degree to which their claims are metered to the managerial agenda (He & Harris, 2020). Legitimacy can be high while economic power can be strong among beneficiaries, but weak among investors/large customers. When stakeholders' powers are the key determinants of decisions, marginalization of socially important but less powerful groups can result. On the other hand, governance systems that engage a wide range of stakeholders may be useful in detecting conflicts in advance of their becoming entrenched in strategy and resource allocation processes (Missimer & Mesquita, 2022). The modern problem is thus how to find mechanisms that can keep organizations receptive while at the same time not being redefined by powerful commercial interests. This needs to be addressed with regard to governance, accountability, organizational identity, resource diversification, stakeholder participation and measuring performance. A balanced approach takes a pragmatic view of financial sustainability—that is, that it must be achieved for any organization to be sustainable—that also considers social purpose as an substantive test of organizational decisions (Cheema et al., 2020). The conceptual underpinning of this business–social tension is then used to explore the potential of stakeholder management to exacerbate or reinforce a drift away from the mission of the business and to serve as a tool to defend and sustain an organization's mission.This business–social tension is then utilized as a conceptual lens to explore how stakeholder management can either amplify or strengthen mission drift and how it can serve as a tool for protecting and reigniting mission.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Social Enterprises and the Challenge of Competing Goals

Social enterprises hold a unique organizational place as they are expected to have social goals as well as being financially robust enough to continue operations. This two-sided nature sets social enterprises apart from traditional profit-driven businesses and non-for-profit organizations. Social enterprises are thus increasingly described in the literature as hybrid organisations that combine social and economic goals, which need to be negotiated continually. Social enterprises rely on entrepreneurial practices to raise income and build viable business models and their legitimacy is linked to their social impact. This creates a natural conflict between financial viability and mission attainment, especially when there is limited resources in the organization. For instance, Nkabinde and Mamabolo (2022) show how financial reliance on external funders can lead to tensions that can then put social enterprises at risk of mission drift.

Multiple objectives do not necessarily mean an organizational weakness. Chang and Loots (2024) propose that goal multiplicity can create a situation of "hybridity advantages" for an organization, enabling it to tap multiple resources and inspire creative practices. The authors analyze the case of commercial art galleries, and argue that organizations can sustain multiple logics and strategically manage conflicting performance goals over time. This viewpoint is significant for the study of social enterprise because it questions the notion that conflicting goals will invariably lead to organizational failure and/or mission displacement. Instead, rather than the goal plurality, the organisations need to be equipped with the right mechanisms to handle competing goals and demands, and goal plurality can be a strategic flexibility.

But balancing multiple goals is still organizationally challenging. Horak, Kakabadse and Clegg (2025) define social enterprises as spaces where the ethical challenges of organizing, belonging, learning and performing are interwoven. Their perspective on business ethics as a practice argues that a single universal rule cannot be applied to ethical decision-making, as social enterprises have to deal with the changing and context-specific pressures. As a result, new actors in the organization need to be flexible and be able to summon various moral arguments to meet the situation.

2.2 Mission Drift in Social Enterprises

Mission drift has become a major issue in the social enterprise literature because it signals the potential for the practice of an organization and its priorities to drift away from the social purposes for which it was founded. This debate has been furthered by Bruder (2025) who suggests that the process of mission drift is not always linear, but is more of a journey of organizational change. Adopting a practice-based lens, Bruder conceptually develops the notion of practice drift, defined as a process which arises out of tensions within the organization, which can be unintended, unnoticed, and even unwanted by organizational actors. This method extends the traditional definition of mission drift by accounting for different types of mission drift such as partial mission drift, economically motivated practice drift, and mission-drifted practice drift.

It is important to note that mission drift and practice drift are two different things, as one organization can diverge from the mission without actually changing the formal mission. Maîtrot (2019) provides an ethnographic account of how the practices of the frontline workers at microfinance institutions in rural Bangladesh can gradually erode the social goals of such institutions. The lack of a top-down transformation of the organizational mission did not lead to practices like weak client-selection standards, aggressive loan selling, compulsory loan renewal, insufficient monitoring of the usage of the loans, and coercive collection strategies, but to practices that emerged from a decentralized process of decision-making. Therefore, the design of organizational systems and management processes may lead to the informal exclusion of the social mission of the organization to the front line, and operations can be conducted in ways that are inconsistent with the formal mission.

This practical knowledge offers a valuable enhancement to previous attempts at mission drift. Instead of just being considered a planned action towards commercial goals, the literature indicates that drift can happen quite slowly over time as a result of many decisions made during the day, performance pressures, resource limitations, and the decentralized nature of implementation. This lens moves the focus of analysis from statements of organizational mission to the ways the mission is lived out. The resulting research agenda thus needs to pay more attention, therefore, to the micro-level processes of how organizational actors interpret and enact the competing objectives.

2.3 Institutional Context and the Scaling of Social Enterprises

Growth is another significant source of mission tension. Ometto et al. (2019) explore the issue of scaling as it can be challenging to balance multiple missions within social enterprises. They have studied I-BUS, a student organization at a private university in Brazil, and learned that the I-BUS could at first achieve the balance of several objectives, but then encountered problems as they expanded. Thinning or scaling can create a sense of compartmentalization within an organization, reducing institutional linkages and negotiation opportunities needed to ensure mission alignment.

The conclusions of this argument are not limited to the fact that larger organizations are more complex. Scaling alters the pattern of organizational architecture in which competing goals are coordinated. The social mission can grow further removed from day-to-day operational decisions as activities, actors, locations and stakeholders multiply. Therefore, Ometto et al (2019) argue that it is necessary to create both "spaces of negotiation" and "herding spaces" which link organizational activities to their broader institutional environment. They have discovered that if the organization does not have the appropriate integrative mechanisms, scaling without such mechanisms can reduce the organization's capacity to maintain its hybrid identity.

This argument complements Bruder's (2025) practice-based conceptualization. While Bruder points out unintended drift in the organizational practices, Ometto et al. (2019) illustrate how structural changes related to organizational growth can put conditions in place that contribute to the increasing difficulty of mission balancing. All of these studies point to the need to consider mission drift as both a processual and structural phenomenon.

2.4 Stakeholders, Resource Dependence, and Mission Preservation

Stakeholder relations is also a form of mission tension. Social enterprises are often reliant on outside parties for financial, technological, institutional and social resources. This interdependence can offer some means of change and growth for the organisation, but it can also potentially create external expectations which could be in conflict with the original organisation's mission. In a study based on resource dependence theory, Nkabinde and Mamabolo (2022) study 13 social enterprises from South Africa and conclude that a number of strategies are employed to safeguard the mission of the social enterprise in the relationship with its funders. They have identified social-impact project prioritization, application of social effectual logic in decision making, building more robust hybrid business models and building strong leadership and governance processes as their focus.

The resource dependence perspective thus presents an interesting paradox. The resources external stakeholders bring to an organization may also put strain on its mission integrity, yet they may be essential to the survival of the organization. Preserving the mission is then not just about defending against external stakeholders, but also building organisation skills to handle them. Governance, leadership, contractual clarity and prioritisation can become tools that enable organisations to move from potentially conflicting relationships to a more mission-compatible partnership.

Similarly, Ko and Liu (2025) highlight the need for stakeholder engagement in the creation and spatialisation of social enterprises. Their research pinpoints three bricolage strategies based on status-related marketing resources and three based on the available technological resources, and reveals that these strategies are partially dependent on stakeholder involvement. Community participation and employee participation can thus serve differently in supporting the organization's expansion and social impact.

The results suggest that stakeholders should be understood beyond the prism of pressure. They can also be providers of resources, sources of legitimacy, sources of knowledge, sources of participation, and sources of mission support. Stakeholder relations and the organization of rules for the resolution of conflicting expectations are thus the key questions.

2.5 Responsible Value Creation and Business Model Adaptation

An additional strand of research on responsible innovation brings value creation into the discussion, linking social enterprise goals with wider value creation processes. Lehoux et al. (2021) review the organizations involved with the creation of responsible health innovations and construct a three-level framework that links entrepreneurial practices (micro level), organizational management (meso level), and dynamics of innovation systems (macro level). What they have discovered is that organizations need to dynamically change various elements of their business-models based on multiple challenges, and their ability to keep alignment is fragile. It is not enough to have entrepreneurial skills and attributes to create responsible value, but responsibility to create value needs organizational skills and support from other stakeholders of the innovation process.

It is important to remember this point for social enterprises, as it proves that organizational responsibilities can't be achieved with mission statements alone. It relies on the coherence of entrepreneurial practices, organizational structures, business models and institutional environments. So business model adaptation can either be a means to maintaining the mission, or a risk of mission displacement, depending on the nature of the organizational changes.

Loukopoulos et al. (2026) build on this conversation by analysing the changes in HR roles and competences that occur in European social enterprises as a result of business-model renewal. Their results show that new demands for competences arise due to the business model hybridization, digital coordination, sustainability demands, and impact measurement. Roles that connect beneficiaries and customers gain in importance, as do the competencies for impact measurement, digital technologies, sustainability accounting, and collaboration in order to enable organizational adaptation.

The new capabilities suggest that mission preservation is a part function of organizational learning and human resources capability. When employees and managers are not skilled to reconcile commercial, social and technological and sustainability needs, the tensions that arise in the mission may worsen the process of organizational adaptation.

2.6 Accountability, Social Impact Measurement, and Mission Integrity

Another area of potential conflict for mission-oriented organizations is accountability and social-impact measurement. Handley (2025) shows that there are significant challenges for small nonprofit organizations in turning socially valuable, intangible activities into tangible social-impact metrics. Stakeholder interviews reveal issues linked to the challenges of measuring organizational value, reliance on trusted key individuals, and unclear boundaries among stakeholders making accountability unclear.

Measuring social impact can be hard, which can generate a paradox. While organisations are being increasingly asked to report on measurable outcomes, the social value they can generate may be relational, intangible or not easily measured by traditional indicators. Too much focus on the measurable outputs can then result in organizations focusing on the more easily measurable activities instead of the most mission-related ones.

To overcome this challenge, Atay (2026) suggests a values-based approach to organizational resilience – principled resilience. Mission fidelity, process orientation, and outcome independence are interdependent capacities that can be leveraged for responsible organizational adaptation, as identified by the framework. It does not only focus on survival after disruption but centers on the concept of value coherence, responsible governance, reflection and resistance to over-reliance on short-term measures of performance.

This viewpoint adds to mission drift literature by focusing on organizational resilience as a measure of more than just surviving and growing. Resilience also includes maintaining the organization's mission and its ethical standing for mission-oriented organizations. Thus, accountability systems must be structured in such a way as to strengthen mission fidelity.

2.7 Synthesis and Research Gap

The literature reviewed confirms that mission tension is multidimensional for social enterprises. One of the key things that all social enterprises have to continually deal with is the balancing of social goals with financial sustainability. Second, mission drift can happen in unintended ways that are not necessarily a result of explicit mission decisions made. Third, mechanisms to ensure mission alignment can become less effective as organizations grow and scale. Fourth, external actors like funders, staff, community, and institutional actors, can also offer important resources and competing demands at the same time. Lastly, there can be pressures if there is a complex social value that is simplified into short-term and easily measurable outcomes and is mandated through accountability and impact-measurement systems.

These developments have not yet been synthesized in the literature, and it is still divided between the various theoretical approaches. Practice theory addresses how drift occurs in daily practice; resource dependence theory focuses on the pressures from external stakeholders; institutional approaches address the implications of scale and institutional context; the paradox perspectives address the tension between competing goals; and the resilience perspectives focus on the need to safeguard values in the face of uncertainty. The central research opportunity, then, is to link these views together in a more integrated theory of the ways in which social enterprises deal with the competing demands of their stakeholders and continue to maintain their mission over time.

One major implication of the literature is to avoid considering mission drift as a dichotomy between maintaining or discarding the mission. But drift can happen slowly, incrementally and at various levels of the organization. Formal mission statements can remain constant while the way in which the mission is carried out evolves over time, including through changes in operational practices, resource allocation, performance priorities or stakeholder relationships. This study should therefore view the relationship between organizational structures, pressures from stakeholders on the processes, daily practices, governance mechanisms and mission results over time. Such an approach would help explain not only why mission drift occurs but also how social enterprises develop organizational capacities that enable them to balance hybridity, commercial sustainability, stakeholder demands, and enduring social purpose.

3 STATE OF RESEARCH

The research on stakeholder management has progressed significantly from initial views of organizations as primarily shareholder-oriented to approaches that better understand stakeholder groups as stakeholders in the creation of value in the organization. The stakeholder theory was introduced as an important theoretical approach to the relationship between organizations and other actors that can influence and be influenced by the activities of an organization (Fontaine et al., 2006). Further research has investigated the impact of stakeholder identification, prioritization, engagement and relationship management on the organizational decision-making and performance. The stakeholder salience model which claims that stakeholders' power, legitimacy, and urgency affect managerial attention. This is especially important for social mission organizations, which might be more interested in stakeholders with significant economic power than those with claims that it deems more legitimate but less powerful. Studies on corporate social responsibility have also re-affirmed the need to build social expectations as part of the core of the organization's strategy and not as a separate and additional task. These contributions confirm that stakeholder management is not just about keeping people happy, it is about allocating attention, resources and decision-making power among competing interests. While stakeholder scholarship has tended to emphasize value-creation, organizational performance, and stakeholder relationships, insufficient attention has been given to understanding how unequal stakeholder influence can over time change an organization's core mission.

Another line of inquiry has explored hybrid organizations, social enterprises and hybrid organizations with commercial and social goals. The unique difficulties of sustaining more than one institutional logic within an organization have been described by scholars. For instance, Mair et al. (2015) describe tensions that occur in hybrid organizations, where different organizational forms and logics were once distinct, but have been merged. The same theme of mission preservation is echoed by Mair et al. (2015), who also see it as one of the key governance issues for organisations striving for social impact and financial sustainability. Mission drift is therefore a key research topic within the field of social enterprise and microfinance, especially where the pursuit of commercial growth, investor expectations and financial performance can lead to a reorientation of the organisation towards disadvantaged beneficiaries. It also offers an explanation for these developments in the form of resource dependence theory which shows how reliance on other resource providers can limit organizational autonomy and shape strategic decisions (Pfeffer and Salancik 1978). This is complemented by the institutional theory that explains why organizations adjust to external expectations to gain legitimacy and keep their foothold in institutional settings (Suchman 1995). The collective findings of these studies indicate that mission drift can happen when there is a gradual drift in resource dependence, stakeholder influence, institutional expectations, and organizational practices, and not necessarily when there is an explicit decision to discard social objectives.

However, these valuable works, for all their merits, are scattered between stakeholder management, social enterprise, organisational governance, institutional theory and mission-drift scholarship. The theory of stakeholders identifies the multiplicity of interests and positions of a company's stakeholders, the theory of resource dependence describes the impact of external providers of resources and the theory of institutionalism attributes pressure from the broader social and market context. In addition, according to paradox theory, conflicting aims can exist concurrently and strategies for balancing are needed, not just choosing one aim over the other. However, the need for a more integrated conceptual structure is still present to explain the interaction of these perspectives in creating a relationship between stakeholder management and mission drift. Specifically, less focus has been placed on how organizations can recognize powerful stakeholders in the market while not compromising the interests of their mission-critical social stakeholders. The literature also shows the importance of governance, accountability, organizational identity, resource diversification and integrated performance measurement, but these mechanisms are not necessarily linked into a single framework of mission protection. It is the conceptual divide upon which the current study is based. The paper does not see a dichotomy between business sustainability and social purpose, but rather explores stakeholder management as a possible balancing mechanism for accommodating commercial pressures and keeping mission alignment. The concepts of sensitizing the theoretical analysis of stakeholder power, resource dependence, institutional pressures, mission drift and business–social balancing are therefore further developed in the following part.

4 SENSITIZING CONCEPT: STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT AND MISSION DRIFT

Stakeholder management offers a theoretical basis to consider the role of organizations in managing multiple demands while striving to maintain their organizational purpose. Stakeholder theory departs from the idea that organisational actions should be based on shareholder needs and focus more on the relationship between the organisation and several other actors who have a stake in what the organisation does and is affected by what it does (Freeman 1984). In organizations with multiple stakeholders that is working to achieve both business and social goals, stakeholder management is especially important since the goals of each may mean different things to them. Financial outcomes can be the focus of investors, quality and affordability can be the focus of customers, fair treatment and meaningful work can be the focus of employees, and social outcomes can be the focus of communities and beneficiaries. It is therefore the duty of the organisation to develop strategies on how to acknowledge, prioritise and incorporate these interests into decisions. Stakeholder management is not just about ensuring that each stakeholder is satisfied – there can be competing demands from stakeholders and limited resources within the organization. Instead, it is a commitment to principles that enable conflicting claims to be judged in the light of an organization's purpose. From this point of view, the purpose of the organization is a relevant benchmark for assessing the extent to which the responses from the stakeholders enhance or hinder the alignment with the mission. If commercial objectives are increasingly driving strategic priorities, to the detriment of social ones, then stakeholder management can be a route to mission drift. On the other hand, inclusive stakeholder governance can contribute to the legitimacy, accountability, and sustainability of the organisational mission.

4.1 Stakeholder Theory and Organizational Purpose

Stakeholder theory is a theory that sees organisations as a web of relationships rather than as an organisation that exists for the benefit of its owners. Freeman (2002) believes that organizations should be cognizant of the interests of various stakeholders since activities have consequences for various groups. This is especially helpful when examining organizations that are not just about creating financial value. Organizational purpose is a normative tool used to identify the major interests of those who are part of an organization and the relative importance of conflicting demands. Therefore, Stakeholder management encompasses identifying stakeholders, their expectations, their influence and preparing key organizational reactions that are coherent with the overall purpose. Donaldson and Preston (1995) identify descriptive, instrumental and normative aspects of stakeholder theory, suggesting that stakeholders can be included not just because they impact on organizational performance, but because the interests of stakeholders are intrinsically relevant. Distinction is critical for social purpose organisations as beneficiaries and communities can continue to be at the heart of the mission despite having less economic influence. When management decisions are increasingly made with the interests of those who provide money as the primary driver, then the purpose of the organisation might start to take a back seat to business goals. Stakeholder theory therefore offers a theoretical basis to study the issue of mission alignment as an ongoing organizational duty. The question is not whether stakeholder interests should be recognized or not, but how organizations can avoid the danger of the influence of stakeholders on the organization to renegotiate its purpose or rationale.

4.2 Stakeholder Salience and Power Asymmetry

Stakeholder salience theory is the theory that explains why some stakeholder claims get more attention by managers than others. Mitchell, Agle, and Wood (1997) posit three factors that help determine stakeholder salience: power, legitimacy, and urgency. Organizations with a small number of stakeholders with power — or many with limited power — are at a disadvantage of gaining the same attention as other groups, even if their claims are valid. This poses an important challenge for organisations that seek to achieve social goals: they may have a high degree of legitimacy but a relatively low level of economic and political power among the beneficiaries or marginalised groups or the broader public-interest group. Conversely, investors, large customers, lenders or strategic partners can have significant influence, due to their need for key resources. Who takes the initiative to turn which interests into strategic priorities can thus influence the power dynamics. Stakeholder management then needs to attend to not only competing claims, but to unequal stakeholder power to drive organizational decisions. If left unchecked, resource use, the tracking of results and strategic planning can be increasingly influenced by strong commercial interests over time. This does not necessarily imply mission drift, but it can lead to mission-related priorities being diminished. Theoretical thinking then means that the organisations have to separate out the relevance of their mission from the power of its stakeholders. Asymmetries can be mitigated with participatory governance, accountability mechanisms, decisions made through transparency, and representation of less powerful stakeholders.

4.3 Resource Dependence and Commercial Pressures

One important explanation of the influence of external stakeholders on organizational priorities comes from resource dependence theory. According to Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) organisations require external environments as a source of resources to sustain their existence and are thus dependent on external actors. There may be strategically important resources such as financial capital, customers, suppliers, employees, government support, knowledge and legitimacy. The level of dependence affects bargaining power of stakeholders and the ability of the organization to stand up to external demands. The reliance on commercial resources may pose strong pressures on revenue generation, growth, cost reduction and financial performance for organizations that have a business and social mission. The investor can hope for higher profits, the customer for a lower price, and the lender for proof of financial stability. These pressures can impact managerial focus even if they are not explicitly directed toward organizational purpose change. As the years go on, strategic choices that are made to create financial sustainability can shift funds into the more profitable direction of commercially viable activities and out of the less profitable direction of social activities. Resource dependence can therefore be a mechanism by which mission drift can occur slowly over time. But, commercial resources do not need to be an impediment to social goals. Revitalized organizational autonomy and funding of social initiatives through revenue generating activities can occur if appropriately governed. The main theoretical questions are thus one of resource dependency and organizational control. A strategy of resource diversification, coupled with accountability to stakeholders, and mission-focused governance, can help minimize over-dependence and enhance the organization's ability to sustain its social mission.

4.4 Institutional Logics and Competing Goals

The institutional theory focuses on the fact that organizations are embedded in sets of norms, values, expectations and practices. As described by Suchman (1995), organizations are attempting to gain legitimacy by showing conformity to expectations that are deemed appropriate within their institutional setting. In organizations that have more than one institutional logic because they have both business and social goals, there can be a mix of institutional logics. A market based or economic logic might focus on competition, efficiency, profitability, growth, and customer value, while a social or community-based or values-based logic might focus on equity, inclusion, welfare, participation, and collective benefit. These logics offer alternative logics for what constitutes good organizational action and can thus create enduring conflicts. Competing expectations have to be managed in hybrid organisations and neither one logic should be fully replaced by the other. Market logic practices can be fostered by commercial actors, and social purpose expectations can be conveyed by beneficiaries, workers, civil society groups, or public agencies. These logics do not necessarily lead to organizational failure. Instead, organizations can create a plan for integrating, differentiating, and/or selectively responding to competing demands. Social goals, however, can be redefined by commercial criteria when market-oriented practices begin to gain more and more influence. It can lead to mission drift even if the organisation's formality documents its social purpose. Mission drift is thus not only the product of managerial acts and decisions, but can also be understood through institutional logics. It can also take the form of a process of institutionalization, of adaptation to the expectations of institutions, the demands for "legitimacy" and the "normal" routines of institutional life which redefine the meaning of value or success.

4.5 Mission Drift in Hybrid Organizations

Mission drift occurs when the organisation's original social or public mission is gradually altered by changing priorities in the course of their operations and strategies. The idea is highly applicable to hybrid organisations, as these strive to achieve both financial sustainability and social goals. Battilana and Lee (2014) define a hybrid organization as an organization that has features of two or more organizational types and institutional logics, which poses unique management and governance challenges for such organizations. Battilana, and Mair (2019) state that the challenge of maintaining mission integrity is a governance issue because the social enterprise needs to raise adequate resources and be accountable to the intended beneficiaries. When commercial performance is the key measure of organizational success, mission drift can result. Higherly profitable activities might be allocated more resources, and low revenue activities that are socially important may be overlooked. Drift may also occur when there are shifts in target populations, service design, pricing, organizational identity, and/or performance measures. Importantly, a mission drift is not a sudden disavowal of a social purpose. May be a gradual process with each step made in an individually rational way due to a variety of financial constraints, stakeholder pressures, or competitive environments. This makes mission drift challenging to detect and control. The idea thus needs to be addressed in terms of the link between mission statements and the practices of organizations. Good governance is about understanding and continually evaluating strategic decisions, resource priorities, stakeholder priorities and results against the organization's purpose and values.

4.6 Business–Social Balancing as a Theoretical Perspective

Business–social balancing offers a theoretical approach to understanding the ways business can strive for financial sustainability while not losing its social purpose. This approach does not consider business and social objectives as conflicting options, but rather sees them as competing yet possibly complementary businesses demands. Financial resources are often needed to maintain social activities in hybrid organizations, and social legitimacy and social mission can increase the trust of stakeholders, employee engagement, and long-term organizational resilience. So the key problem is not how to remove tension, but how to find ways to control tension. Theory of stakeholders is one to consider all competing interests (Freeman 2002); the theory of resource dependence focuses on pressures to which one is subjected because of dependence on external resources (Pfeffer and Salancik 1978); and the institutional theory of competing logics highlights the effect of competing logics on organizational expectations (Suchman 1995). These views then indicate that balance should be created with intentional structures within the organization. Governance structures can be used to ensure protection of mission critical interests, diversified resources can help minimise reliance on powerful commercial interests, and integrated performance systems can assess both financial and social outcomes. By involving stakeholder participation, there is the possibility of further strengthening of accountability through having less powerful but mission-relevant groups visible in organisational decision making. Business–social balancing should, therefore, be seen as a process not a state of organization. It relies on the ability of the organization to identify tension, negotiate stakeholder expectations, track mission commitment and adapt without compromising its core mission. This view is used to create a conceptual framework that connects stakeholder management mechanisms to the prevention and/or exacerbation of mission drift.

5 METHODOLOGY

In this study, a theoretical and conceptual analysis is conducted to understand the relationship between the stakeholder management and mission drift in organizations that have both business and social goals. The study does not rely on the collection of empirical data, but instead builds on and draws from a wide range of existing theories, conceptual approaches and previous research on stakeholder relationships, organizational purpose, resource dependence, institutional pressures, hybrid organizations and mission preservation. The goal is to combine these views in an attempt to create a unified picture of how multiple stakeholder demands affect organizational priorities. Business and social goals are considered as mutually dependent part of organizational decision making and not as independent goals. Special emphasis is placed on how organizations recognize and react to various stakeholder interests; allocate organizational resources; balance competing expectations; and maintain its primary purpose. The theoretical approach enables the study to consider mission drift as a gradual process of organizational change that can occur as a result of changing strategic directions, and not as a deliberate discarding of social goals.

The analytical process includes identifying major concepts and relationships that are relevant to stakeholder management and mission drift, and looking at their theoretical relationships. Stakeholder management is considered in terms of stakeholder interests, power, legitimacy, urgency, participation and accountability. Resource dependence is examined with regards to organizational reliance on external financial, material, informational and institutional resources. Institutional pressures are explored in the context of market and social expectations, and hybrid organizational arrangements in that of financial sustainability and social purpose. These dimensions are systematically contrasted and woven together in order to determine how and when the stakeholder pressures might reinforce organizational goals and/or result in mission displacement. The analysis also highlights differences between organizational commitments, expressed formally, and organizational decision-making practices, especially regarding resource allocation, strategic priorities, performance measurement, and stakeholder engagement. This way, the study can explore the extent to which seemingly reasonable organizational decisions can come together to lead to a shift in mission orientation over time.

The last phase of the Methodology is to create a conceptual structure that links stakeholder management to possible mission drift or avoidance of mission drift. The framework connects together pressures from stakeholders, power imbalances, resource dependency, institutional expectations, governance arrangements, and organizational outcomes. It highlights some mechanisms that can be used for balancing, such as involving stakeholders, good governance, resource diversification, integrated performance measurement, accountability mechanisms and mission-oriented leadership. These mechanisms are seen as organizational options that may help keep the commercial sustainability and social purpose relationship at an appropriate level. No empirical causal inferences or statistical testing of propositions are being made in the study. Rather, it brings together and combines all of the existing theoretical knowledge to structure a problem explanation. The methodological approach then facilitates conceptual development by highlighting important aspects and analysing their interconnections, as well as creating a comprehensive analytical framework including them. This can then be used as a framework for empirical research on stakeholder management, mission drift, and business–social balancing in various organizational settings.

6 ANALYSIS

The analysis builds a relationship between stakeholder management and mission drift by exploring a set of interrelated conceptual dimensions. The analysis does not take for granted that the integration of business and social goals will inevitably lead to conflict between stakeholders, but rather considers how the interests, power, resource dependence, institutional expectations, and governance structures of stakeholders can influence organizational priorities. The analytical structure separates out actors who are creating competing claims, the processes by which these claims come to have organizational influence and the consequences that ensue for organizational purpose. The distinction is significant as it is not enough to say commercial pressure is the only reason for mission drift. Drift is a dynamic that arises when pressures are combined with organisational vulnerabilities, decision-making arrangements and accountability mechanisms. The framework thus takes into account not only the tension itself, but also the organization in which tension could be negotiated. The following analytical dimensions enable a systematic analysis of the extent to which stakeholder management can be used as a tool for mission preservation or can (indirectly) enable mission displacement.

6.1 Stakeholders as Competing Organizational Actors

In both business and social contexts, organizations are created based on relationships with stakeholders with differing and not necessarily equal interests. Different stakeholders are at different places within the organizational environment with differing measures to the organizational performance. Stakeholders are not just a number but have diverging expectations in their stakeholder relationship with the organization and hence analytical significance. For financial stakeholders, success might be characterized by revenues and market expansion, productivity and financial returns, while for social stakeholders it could be seen as an increase in accessibility and inclusion, welfare, empowerment and long-term effects on the community.

The differences create a challenge of organizational prioritization for stakeholder management. The capacity of management to respond to all demands in the same manner is limited by resource, managerial attention and institutional capacity. Pricing, target beneficiaries, product development, geographic expansion, staffing, and investment decisions all result in distribution of benefits and costs among the stakeholders. To this end, stakeholder management can be seen as an ongoing process in which the priorities of the organization are continually built and rebuilt.

The analytical question is then relative influence. A stakeholder might play a key role in the organization's mission without having the ability to drive much strategic change. On the other hand, an actor that has significant economic power can have a significant influence that is disproportionate to its importance to the mission. When this imbalance is repeated in the organization's decision making, mission drift is possible. The competition of stakeholders is therefore an initial condition where the relationship between commercial sustainability and social purpose is analytically relevant.

6.2 Commercial Stakeholders and the Pressure Toward Mission Drift

Commercial stakeholders, as a group, have an influence primarily because of their revenue, investment, market and organisational growth linkages. Their precepts are not mutually exclusive to social purpose; in fact, commercial viability can be an important source of financial support for an organization to maintain socially valuable activities. The analytical issue comes from the fact that when commercial performance is the primary measure for evaluating organizational success, the focus is lost on the analysis. When profitability, scalability, market share, or investor satisfaction becomes paramount, activities that return limited financial benefits might become increasingly viewed as inefficient or part of the "periphery" of the business.

The possibility of mission drift may therefore occur as a result of regular strategic changes rather than a deliberate choice to let go of the organization's mission. It can shift its focus towards more affluent customers, implement price policies that reduce the appeal of services to the poor, phase out expensive services, or shift its focus to more profitable markets. Single decision can be explained based on sustainability or efficiency issues while a set of decisions can change the social orientation of the organization.

Thus, commercial pressure takes the shape of an incremental prioritization. It becomes more important when financial measures are used to assess organizational performance and other stakeholder interests are not institutionally represented. It is not an either/or choice between commercial and socially minded stakeholders as morally opposite ends of a spectrum, rather it is a choice between different types of organisational value and the measures used to define strategic importance. Mission-drift pressures come when the claims of commercial stakeholders systematically reconfigure organizational success. To prevent such displacement, it is important that organisations have clear mechanisms that ensure that social purpose is still a factor in resource allocation, performance measurement and strategic decision making.

6.3 Social Stakeholders and Mission Preservation

Social stakeholders sit on a unique place since their claims often give normative grounds to the organization's existence. Knowledge and legitimacy from beneficiaries, communities, employees, civil society organizations and other mission related constituencies can be forms of contribution that cannot be captured in monetary terms. They are able to determine if services are still relevant to social needs, and if strategic decisions continue to respond to social issues or problems that precipitated the organizational mission.

But mission relevance doesn't necessarily equal decision making influence. Organizational decisions can impact beneficiaries directly and they have some, but limited, bargaining power, financial resources, or formal authority. This results in a structural imbalance whereby those who are most impacted by mission-related decisions may be the least able to influence such decisions. There is therefore more to social stakeholder involvement than just consultation. If it is institutionalized in the form of representation, deliberation, feedback systems, and accountability processes, it can serve as a way to keep organizations responsive.

The ability of the organisation to convert the knowledge of the social stakeholders into strategic authority is key to mission preservation. This calls for deeper involvement and periodic references. Effective involvement should impact priorities, allocation of resources, design of services and ways that services will be evaluated. When social stakeholders are integrated into governance and organizational processes they can then act as a counterweight to commercial pressures. They should not be expected to be in opposition to commercial activity, but rather should ensure that commercial strategies are placed to the service of, or are clearly compatible with, the substantive social purpose of the organization.

6.4 Resource Dependence and Organizational Vulnerability

Resistance to stakeholder pressure is related to the resources that the organisation relies on for its sustainability. Financial capital, customers, donors, suppliers, skilled personnel, governmental support, information and institutional legitimacy are spread around the external environment. Organizations that rely heavily on a few resource providers have little strategic independence as their ability to rally resources can come at a high cost to the organization if it means they must rely on the conditional withdrawal or reduction of resources from those providers.

This establishes a structural link between resource dependence and mission vulnerability. An organization that is deeply entrenched in commercial investment might be less likely to ignore investor expectations, even if there are elements of their social mission that are at odds with the expectations. Likewise, reliance on a big customer, grantor or institutional partner may lead to strategic evolution in an attempt to maintain their relationship. This adaptation can be seen as pragmatic at first, but over time it can shift the focus of the organization.

The analytical value of resource dependence is in its ability to convert stakeholders' influence into constraint on the organization. Stakeholder power is more than just an interpersonal trait; it is part of the resource control patterns. It is easier for organizations that have a variety of revenue streams and diversified resource bases to negotiate conflicting demands than for those with a limited resource base. Resource diversification thus turns into a mission-protection mechanism as it makes it less possible for any single stakeholder to have undue influence on the mission of an organization. Organizational vulnerability must then be regarded as a kind of buffer between the demands on the organization and its mission.

6.5 Governance, Accountability, and Mission Protection

Governance influences the manner in which conflicting values or interests of stakeholders are converted into organizational decisions. If governance is focused on a few economically strong actors, priorities in the organization become more aligned with the interests of those actors. On the other hand, a governance system that takes into account multiple stakeholder groups can provide institutional space to resist the influence of a single group. Mission protection therefore requires formal and informal procedures for prioritising and reviewing and the values and norms of the organisation.

This is an important aspect of accountability, as it sets up structures for how an organization can hold itself accountable to its mission. Explicit accountability for finances alone can show organizational viability but not enough information on whether social goals are being met. A wider approach to accountability involves the social outcomes, experiences of stakeholders, distributional effects and impact of strategic decisions on mission groups.

Mission protection can then be thought of as a process, an institutional process, and not just a statement in a mission statement. Combination of governance bodies, representation by stakeholders, transparency in reporting, participatory mechanisms, ethical supervision, and periodic mission review can all help to check the process of normalisation of decisions that erode social goals. Good governance doesn't eradicate organisational conflict but makes it explicit and provides processes for managing it. Accountability also acts as a corrective mechanism and reveals the gap between rhetoric and practice. If the governance systems have the authority to question commercially rational decisions, if those decisions create significant mission consequences, then mission protection is strong.

6.6 Business–Social Balancing and Organizational Paradox

Having both business and social goals means there is an organizational paradox in that both may be needed at the same time but are also possibly conflicting. Financial resources can facilitate social interventions and social legitimacy can build organizational resilience and stakeholder commitment. Meanwhile, efforts to boost finances can change populations served, priorities of services, or organizational values. So the primary analytical dilemma is not to make the tension disappear, but what it means to use the tension in a productive way in organizations.

A paradox approach redirects thinking away from a dichotomy between commercial and social goals. Organizations can instead create strategies that keep both goals separate and distinct but pursue productive interdependence. Balancing takes an active role of management and management is an ongoing process as an arrangement, which is appropriate at one stage in an organization may become problematic as markets, dependencies of resources, or stakeholder relationships change. Balance is thus not static but dynamic.

The difference between "balance" and "compromise" is crucial. Compromise can mean compromising one thing to achieve another, while balance can mean finding organisational structures where commercial activity furthers the viability of social purpose without altering it. This needs to be done through several sets of performance criteria, engaging stakeholders with differing needs and interests, and being mindful of possible side effects. The organization should not only consider its financial viability, but how its financial viability helps or hinders mission success. Business–social balancing is therefore an ongoing ongoing effort to preserve organizational plurality and to not allow one value system to take institutionalized dominance.

6.7 A Conceptual Structure for Managing Competing Goals

The aforementioned dimensions could be incorporated into a conceptual framework that sees mission outcomes as the result of interactions between the influence of stakeholders, resource dependence, institutional pressures and organizational governance. The opening is poly-vocal, with claims from a variety of actors. The power of these claims shifts depending on the resources, legitimacy, urgency and authority of the stakeholder positions. The extent of management resistance or accommodation to these pressures will then depend on organizational dependence. Mechanisms of governance and accountability then act as an intermediary between competing claims and strategic priorities.

In this context, mission drift is not seen as a natural outcome of commercialization. It's one possible consequence of a balance that is skewed, as commercial considerations increasingly shape resource allocation, performance evaluation and organisational identity. A second type of mission alignment is when financial activities are linked to substantive social goals and mission-relevant stakeholders have continued to have meaningful influence. Organizational sustainability is another factor to consider because if mission preservation is not followed by a strong economic viability, then its social impact is equally likely to be jeopardized in the long run.

The conceptual structure thus regards balancing mechanisms as key intervening variables. A comprehensive performance measurement could avoid focusing a company's metrics only on financial results. Stakeholder discussion can uncover “hidden” conflict. Diversification of resources may help mitigate exposure to dominant funders/investors and mission-oriented leadership may strengthen organizational identity. Hybrid strategies may additionally permit commercial and social activities to support each other without being siloed. The result is considered a governance capability that is the ongoing management of stakeholders and in which organisations negotiate with each other about goals and safeguard the substantive integrity of the mission.

Table 1. Analytical Dimensions of Stakeholder Management and Mission Drift

Conceptual dimension	Key analytical elements
Business stakeholders	Investors, customers, markets, suppliers
Social stakeholders	Beneficiaries, communities, employees, civil society
Stakeholder power	Control of resources, influence, urgency
Mission pressures	Commercialization, growth, profitability
Mission protection	Governance, participation, accountability
Organizational mechanisms	Leadership, organizational identity, resource diversification
Outcomes	Mission alignment, mission drift, organizational sustainability
Balancing mechanisms	Integrated performance measurement, stakeholder dialogue, hybrid strategies

The table below establishes the analytical dimensions which will be used to discuss the stakeholder management-business/mission drift relationship. The first two sets of dimensions identify the different types of stakeholders, while stakeholder power refers to the ways in which these stakeholders can make a claim on the organization. Mission pressures are the forces which may cause the organization to veer away from its core goals, whereas mission protection refers to mechanisms which can prevent this from happening. Organizational mechanisms denote the processes through which organizations respond to stakeholder claims. Lastly, outcomes and balancing mechanisms relate to the way in which the discussed dimensions answer the main research question, namely: under what circumstances can business sustainability and social mission be both achieved?

7 SUMMARY

The analysis which has been presented above highlights the ways in which the stakeholder management-business/mission drift relationship can be understood. First and foremost, the discussion points to the complexity of the relationship between stakeholder management and mission drift due to the existence of the multiple stakeholder categories. As has been discussed in detail in the paper, not all stakeholders are equal in terms of their ability to influence the business model of the organization. While some stakeholders can only affect change through indirect means, others, such as large donors, have a significant degree of influence over the organization’s operations. At the same time, the analysis shows that stakeholder management practices are not purely reactive, in that they can serve to prioritize certain goals over others. The analysis shows that the concept of mission drift needs to be related to the power dynamics surrounding stakeholder management; in other words, the ability of specific stakeholders to advance their interests. Mission drift is more likely to occur when organizations become reliant on financially powerful stakeholders, as well as when financial success comes to be perceived as the primary indicator of success. In contrast, mission alignment is facilitated by the existence of social stakeholders and their ability to influence the organization’s operations. Thus, the analysis serves to highlight the nuances of the stakeholder management-business/mission drift relationship.

The analysis also clarifies the importance of the resource dependence theory by linking it to the rest of the discussed mechanisms. Becoming dependent on the resources provided by a particular stakeholder group will inevitably lead to the organization becoming more reliant on the values and goals of said stakeholder group. The analysis shows that resource dependence is closely linked to the differences between the business logic and the social logic. When an organization begins to operate primarily according to the principles of the business logic, it favors financial gains over social goals. However, the analysis provides grounds for viewing this development as a paradox, in that the principles of the social logic are also vital for the organization's proper functioning. Therefore, the most desirable outcome is not the overcoming of the fundamental opposition between the business and social logic but rather the ability of an organization to operate according to the principles of both. Governance and accountability mechanisms serve to highlight the ways in which the organization can serve the balance between its social and business goals. By examining these mechanisms, it becomes possible to identify the decision-making processes which allow stakeholders to influence the organization. As demonstrated by the analysis, mission protection is not simply a matter of articulating the organization's mission statement but rather a complex set of mechanisms by which the organization monitors its performance in accordance with the mission statement.

In essence, the analysis provides grounds for viewing stakeholder management as a mediating force which allows an organization to balance between its different goals. Thus, stakeholder participation allows mission responsiveness, whereas increased resource diversity allows reducing resource dependence, which in turn allows the organization to avoid an overly pro-business approach. At the same time, the analysis shows that accountability mechanisms allow the organization to operate according to the principles of both business and social logic. Finally, mission-driven governance allows mission protection. These points highlight the ways in which the organization can achieve sustainable hybridity. In other words, by implementing the mechanisms which utilize the potential of stakeholders to advance organizational goals, an organization can ensure a harmonious combination of its diverse goals. The analysis demonstrates the importance of shifting the focus away from the ways in which an organization can choose between its diverse goals in favor of exploring the ways in which it can operate in order to achieve all of its goals. The implications of the analysis can be applied to further research by providing a theoretical basis for investigating the ways in which social and business goals interact and influence one another.

CONCLUSION

The paper has examined the stakeholder management-business/mission drift relationship by analyzing the ways in which stakeholder management practices can contribute to mission drift. The analysis has demonstrated the necessity of utilizing a multi-faceted approach to understanding the central relationship. In particular, the discussion has shown that business stakeholders can provide the organization with essential resources, but their ability to influence the organization is directly related to their financial power as well as the organization's reliance on them. At the same time, social stakeholders serve to advance the organization's mission-related goals and values. The analysis has established the importance of viewing the stakeholder management-business/mission drift relationship as a complex interaction of various dimensions. The discussion has demonstrated that the implementation of certain governance mechanisms can facilitate stakeholder management and the balance between an organization's diverse goals. Thus, the analysis has provided grounds for viewing the relationship between stakeholder management and mission drift as a mechanism which depends on the power dynamics and organizational mechanisms involved. The analysis has highlighted the necessity of choosing between the goals of stakeholder management and mission drift on a case-by-case basis. The paper has demonstrated that the primary role of stakeholder management is to facilitate sustainable hybridity, which is vital for the long-term viability of any organization. The analysis has provided a conceptual basis for further research on the relationship between an organization's social and business logic.

REFERENCES

[1] Anh, D. B. H., Duc, L. D. M., Yen, N. T. H., Hung, N. T., & Tien, N. H. (2022). Sustainable development of social entrepreneurship: evidence from Vietnam. *International journal of entrepreneurship and small business*, *45*(1), 62-76.

[2] Ashrafi, M., Magnan, G. M., Adams, M., & Walker, T. R. (2020). Understanding the conceptual evolutionary path and theoretical underpinnings of corporate social responsibility and corporate sustainability. *Sustainability*, *12*(3), 760.

[3] Atay, E. (2026). Principled resilience in NGOs: a values-driven conceptual framework for sustaining mission integrity amid paradox and uncertainty. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 1-20.
[4] Awa, H. O., Etim, W., & Ogbonda, E. (2024). Stakeholders, stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility (CSR). *International journal of corporate social responsibility*, *9*(1), 11.
[5] Bansal, P., & Song, H. C. (2017). Similar but not the same: Differentiating corporate sustainability from corporate responsibility. *Academy of Management Annals*, *11*(1), 105-149.
[6] Battilana, J. (2018). Cracking the organizational challenge of pursuing joint social and financial goals: Social enterprise as a laboratory to understand hybrid organizing. *M@ n@ gement*, *21*(4), 1278-1305.
[7] Battilana, J. (2018). Cracking the organizational challenge of pursuing joint social and financial goals: Social enterprise as a laboratory to understand hybrid organizing. *M@ n@ gement*, *21*(4), 1278-1305.
[8] Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing–Insights from the study of social enterprises. *Academy of Management Annals*, *8*(1), 397-441.
[9] Battilana, J., Butler, B., Kimsey, M., Mair, J., Marquis, C., & Seelos, C. (2019). Problem, person and pathway: a framework for social innovators. In *Handbook of inclusive innovation* (pp. 61-74). Edward Elgar Publishing.
[10] Bromley, P., & Meyer, J. W. (2017). "They are all organizations": The cultural roots of blurring between the nonprofit, business, and government sectors. *Administration & Society*, *49*(7), 939-966.
[11] Brown, R. (2021). Mission-oriented or mission adrift? A critical examination of mission-oriented innovation policies. *European Planning Studies*, *29*(4), 739-761.
[12] Bruder, I. M. (2025). From Mission Drift to Practice Drift: Theorizing drift processes in social enterprises and beyond. *Organization Studies*, *46*(3), 385-407.
[13] Bruder, I. M. (2025). From Mission Drift to Practice Drift: Theorizing drift processes in social enterprises and beyond. *Organization Studies*, *46*(3), 385-407.
[14] Camilleri, M. A. (2017). Corporate sustainability and responsibility: creating value for business, society and the environment. *Asian Journal of Sustainability and Social Responsibility*, *2*(1), 59-74.
[15] Cappelen, S. M., & Pedersen, J. S. (2021). Hijacked by hope: Dynamics of mission drift and identity dilution in a nonprofit organization. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *61*, e20190432.
[16] Carroll, A. B. (2021). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the COVID-19 pandemic: Organizational and managerial implications. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, *14*(3), 315-330.
[17] Carroll, A. B., & Brown, J. A. (2018). Corporate social responsibility: A review of current concepts, research, and issues.
[18] Chanase, G. (2023). Exploring the potential effects of international donor funding on local NGO mission creep in Ghana. *Journal of African Political Economy and Development*, *8*(1), 1-15.
[19] Chang, E., & Loots, E. (2024). Learning to Juggle: How Commercial Art Galleries Strategically Manage Goal Multiplicity. *Available at SSRN 5055095*.
[20] Cheema, S., Afsar, B., & Javed, F. (2020). Employees' corporate social responsibility perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors for the environment: The mediating roles of organizational identification and environmental orientation fit. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *27*(1), 9-21.
[21] de Almeida Barbosa Franco, J., Franco Junior, A., Battistelle, R. A. G., & Bezerra, B. S. (2024). Dynamic capabilities: unveiling key resources for environmental sustainability and economic sustainability, and corporate social responsibility towards sustainable development goals. *Resources*, *13*(2), 22.
[22] Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of management Review*, *20*(1), 65-91.
[23] Fontaine, C., Haarman, A., & Schmid, S. (2006). The stakeholder theory. *Edlays education*, *1*(4), 1-33.
[24] Freeman, R. E., & Phillips, R. A. (2002). Stakeholder theory: A libertarian defense. *Business ethics quarterly*, *12*(3), 331-349.
[25] Gond, J. P., El Akremi, A., Swaen, V., & Babu, N. (2017). The psychological microfoundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *38*(2), 225-246.
[26] Handley, K. L. (2025). Accountability and social impact evaluation in a small NPO: stakeholder ambiguity, networks and trust. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *38*(9), 239-264.
[27] He, H., & Harris, L. (2020). The impact of Covid-19 pandemic on corporate social responsibility and marketing philosophy. *Journal of business research*, *116*, 176-182.

[28] Henderson, E., & Lambert, V. (2018). Negotiating for survival: Balancing mission and money. *The British Accounting Review*, *50*(2), 185-198.
[29] Horak, S., Kakabadse, N., & Clegg, S. (2025). Navigating ethical tensions in social enterprises: A business ethics as practice perspective. *European Management Review*.
[30] Jeter, T. M. (2017). *Exploring mission drift and tension in a nonprofit work integration social enterprise* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
[31] Ko, W. W., & Liu, G. (2025). Bricolage strategies, stakeholder engagement, and the geographic expansion of social enterprises. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *54*(3), 636-665.
[32] Latapí Agudelo, M. A., Jóhannsdóttir, L., & Davídsdóttir, B. (2019). A literature review of the history and evolution of corporate social responsibility. *International journal of corporate social responsibility*, *4*(1), 1-23.
[33] Lehoux, P., Silva, H. P., Denis, J. L., Miller, F. A., Pozelli Sabio, R., & Mendell, M. (2021). Moving toward responsible value creation: Business model challenges faced by organizations producing responsible health innovations. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *38*(5), 548-573.
[34] Loukopoulos, A., Sotiropoulou, A., Papadimitriou, D., Gómez González, F. J., Abril-Berodas, M., Gusmerotti, N. M., & Binci, D. (2026). Managing capability renewal in social enterprises: human resource roles, competence gaps and work-embedded training. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-based Learning*, 1-17.
[35] Lutz, F. G., & Petrini, M. (2020). Mission drift: What leads and how to avoid. *Anais do XLIV Enanpad, 2020, Brasil.*
[36] Mair, J., Mayer, J., & Lutz, E. (2015). Navigating institutional plurality: Organizational governance in hybrid organizations. *Organization studies*, *36*(6), 713-739.
[37] Maîtrot, M. (2019). Understanding social performance: A ‘practice drift’at the frontline of microfinance institutions in Bangladesh. *Development and Change*, *50*(3), 623-654.
[38] Malik, S. Y., Hayat Mughal, Y., Azam, T., Cao, Y., Wan, Z., Zhu, H., & Thurasamy, R. (2021). Corporate social responsibility, green human resources management, and sustainable performance: is organizational citizenship behavior towards environment the missing link?. *Sustainability*, *13*(3), 1044.
[39] Malik, S. Y., Hayat Mughal, Y., Azam, T., Cao, Y., Wan, Z., Zhu, H., & Thurasamy, R. (2021). Corporate social responsibility, green human resources management, and sustainable performance: is organizational citizenship behavior towards environment the missing link?. *Sustainability*, *13*(3), 1044.
[40] Missimer, M., & Mesquita, P. L. (2022). Social sustainability in business organizations: A research agenda. *Sustainability*, *14*(5), 2608.
[41] Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of management review*, *22*(4), 853-886.
[42] Muñoz, P., & Kimmitt, J. (2019). Social mission as competitive advantage: A configurational analysis of the strategic conditions of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Research*, *101*, 854-861.
[43] Newman, C., Rand, J., Tarp, F., & Trifkovic, N. (2020). Corporate social responsibility in a competitive business environment. *The Journal of Development Studies*, *56*(8), 1455-1472.
[44] Nkabinde, S., & Mamabolo, A. (2022). The South African social enterprises’ strategies to guard against mission drift when faced with tensions from the funders. *Cogent Business & Management*, *9*(1), 2135215.
[45] Ometto, M. P., Gegenhuber, T., Winter, J., & Greenwood, R. (2019). From balancing missions to mission drift: The role of the institutional context, spaces, and compartmentalization in the scaling of social enterprises. *Business & Society*, *58*(5), 1003-1046.
[46] Pfeffer, J. (1978). and Gerald R. Salancik. *GREAT WRITERS ON ORGANIZATIONS*, 79.
[47] Raisiene, A. G., & Urmanavičienė, A. (2017). Mission drift in a hybrid organization: how can social business combine its dual goals?. *Ekonomski vjesnik: Review of Contemporary Entrepreneurship, Business, and Economic Issues*, *30*(2), 301-310.
[48] Staessens, M., Kerstens, P. J., Bruneel, J., & Cherchye, L. (2019). Data envelopment analysis and social enterprises: Analysing performance, strategic orientation and mission drift. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *159*(2), 325-341.
[49] Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of management review*, *20*(3), 571-610.
[50] Taliento, M., Favino, C., & Netti, A. (2019). Impact of environmental, social, and governance information on economic performance: Evidence of a corporate ‘sustainability advantage’from Europe. *Sustainability*, *11*(6), 1738.