



2014-06-27

The Status of CSR in Corporate America: A Content Analysis of the Organizations with the Top-Performing CSR Programs Within the Fortune 500

Laura C. Thomas

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Thomas, Laura C., "The Status of CSR in Corporate America: A Content Analysis of the Organizations with the Top-Performing CSR Programs Within the Fortune 500" (2014). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 4185.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/4185>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

The Status of CSR in Corporate America: A Content Analysis of the
Organizations with the Top-Performing CSR Programs

Within the *Fortune 500*

Laura C. Thomas

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Pamela Brubaker, Chair
Kenneth D. Plowman
Robert Wakefield

Department of Communications

Brigham Young University

July 2014

Copyright © 2014 Laura C. Thomas

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The Status of CSR in Corporate America: A Content Analysis of the Organizations with the Top-Performing CSR Programs Within the *Fortune 500*

Laura C. Thomas
Department of Communications, BYU
Master of Arts

Corporate social responsibility has become an accepted part of business for organizations of any size. Organizations are not only expected to be profitable and successful, but they are also expected to be responsible global citizens. However, though this has become an accepted part of business, there remain many areas of CSR research that are under researched.

This study examined the top 16 CSR programs of organizations headquartered in the United States to better understand what they communicate about their programs, their relationship with both the news media and government entities, which issues they address the most, and where they implement their programs throughout the world.

This study found that the organizations examined concerned themselves the most with stakeholder involvement and engagement. It also found that nearly half of the initiatives analyzed centered around environmental issues. These organizations implemented programs that had a strong fit both with what they as an organization do well and also with issues that align with their corporate values.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility, content analysis, agenda setting, stakeholder, sustainability

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to express my deepest thanks to Dr. Pamela Brubaker for her patience, mentorship, and encouragement throughout this process. I could not have done this without you! Thank you for calming me down the many times I stressed out on you. I would also like to thank Dr. Ken Plowman and Dr. Rob Wakefield for their advice, council, and flexibility with me throughout this process.

To my family: You've been an incredible support to me throughout my whole graduate school experience. Thank you for going on this adventure with me. I know I've complained probably more than I should have, but you have all borne it well. Thank you!

I would also like to thank my Method Communications family, first, for employing me, and second for being understanding as I have been working to finish school. You have all been so understanding. Thank you.

Lastly, I would like to thank my dear cohort members. We made it through! Thank you for carrying me through this program with you! I never would have finished without all of you. You are forever my grad school family.

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	viii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Literature Review	2
Benefits of Corporate Social Responsibility	4
Criticisms of Corporate Social Responsibility	8
CSR, Agenda Setting, and Agenda Building	13
Chapter Three: Method	18
Sample	18
Units of Analysis and Coding Procedure	19
Data Gathering	20
Coder Training and Reliability Analysis	22
Data Analysis	23
Strengths and Weaknesses	23
Chapter Four: Results	25
Overview of Entire CSR Population	25
CSR Overview by Organization	26

Results for RQ1	33
Results for RQ2	34
Results for RQ3	37
Results for RQ4	39
Results for RQ5	45
Chapter Five: Discussion	48
Influence of Stakeholders	48
Governance	50
Public Policy, Working with Government.....	52
CSR Implementation Methods and Brand Fit.....	53
News Coverage	55
Issues Addressed by CSR Programs	56
Geographic Placement of CSR Programs	61
Chapter Six: Conclusion	64
Limitations	65
Future Research	66
References	68
Appendix A	77
Appendix B	78
Appendix C	81
Appendix D	83
Appendix E	100

List of Tables

Table 1: Mentions of Triple Bottom Line.....	34
Table 2: Frequency of CSR Initiatives by Region.....	35
Table 3: Most Frequently Mentioned Countries.....	36
Table 4: Most Frequently Mentioned Countries by Organization.....	37
Table 4: Organizations Working with Government Entities.....	38
Table 5: Frequency of Most Important Issues.....	39
Table 6: Frequency of Environment-Related Issues.....	40
Table 7: Frequency of Health-Related Issues.....	41
Table 8: Frequency of Children-Related Issues.....	42
Table 9: Frequency of Poverty-Related Issues.....	42
Table 10: Frequency of Poverty-Related Issues.....	43
Table 11: Comparison of Most Important Issues to Sample Population.....	44
Table 12: How Organizations Approach CSR Initiatives.....	45
Table 13: How Organizations in the Population Implement CSR Initiatives.....	46
Table D1: Mentions and Frequencies for Entire Population.....	83
Table D2: Mentions and Frequencies for 3M.....	84
Table D3: Mentions and Frequencies for Cisco.....	85
Table D4: Mentions and Frequencies for Colgate-Palmolive.....	86
Table D5: Mentions and Frequencies for Dell.....	87

Table D6: Mentions and Frequencies for Ford	88
Table D7: Mentions and Frequencies for GE	89
Table D8: Mentions and Frequencies for Intel	90
Table D9: Mentions and Frequencies for Marriott International.....	91
Table D10: Mentions and Frequencies for Microsoft.....	92
Table D11: Mentions and Frequencies for Nike.....	93
Table D12: Mentions and Frequencies for PepsiCo	94
Table D13: Mentions and Frequencies for Starbucks.....	95
Table D14: Mentions and Frequencies for UPS	96
Table D15: Mentions and Frequencies for Xerox.....	97
Table D16: Mentions and Frequencies for Coca-Cola	98
Table D17: Mentions and Frequencies for Walt Disney	99

List of Figures

Figure 1: Most Frequently Mentioned Words in Values Statements..... 25

Chapter One: Introduction

Corporate social responsibility has become a buzzword in the business world. More and more companies are incorporating philanthropic and sustainability initiatives into their business practices. While there are many benefits of having CSR initiatives in an organization, there have also been significant criticisms. It has become well established that CSR initiatives aid in improving stakeholder relationships (Du, Bhattacharya, & Sen, 2010); however, the link between CSR and financial performance has been tenuous at best (Husted & Allen, 2007).

When a company is socially responsible, they take ownership over their social, environmental, and ethical actions (Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) can be evident through such efforts as corporate sponsorships, initiatives to clean up the environment, or programs to give back to the community.

This study is a content analysis of the top-performing United States CSR programs to gain a better understanding of what these organizations are communicating about their programs, which issues they are working toward solving, how they are approaching their program, and how they view themselves with regard to CSR.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Corporate social responsibility is a necessary component in the overall strategy of an organization. Davis (1977) defines corporate social responsibility as “the firm’s consideration of, and response to, issues beyond the narrow economic, technical, and legal requirements of the firm. . . . It is a firm’s acceptance of a social obligation beyond the requirements of the law” (1977, p. 312-313). Maon, Lindgreen, and Swaen (2010) examined all of the definitions on corporate social responsibility and found that, for the most part, CSR is driven by a moral obligation, it is ethical, political, integrative, and instrumental in nature, with the focus on affecting shareholders, stockholders, and society at large (p. 24). Campbell (2007) continues that socially responsible companies “must not knowingly do anything that could harm their stakeholders—notably, their investors, employees, customers, suppliers, or the local community within which they operate” (p. 951).

This literature review will first provide background information on CSR strategy, second, how to implement a CSR program and its necessary communication, third, the benefits of corporate social responsibility and stakeholder theory, fourth, the criticisms of corporate social responsibility, and finally, the relationship between CSR and agenda setting theory.

Implementing a Program

There are many reasons why corporations should be socially responsible. Davis (1977) provided the following reasons: “long-run self-interest,” “public image,” “viability of business,” “avoidance of government regulation,” “sociocultural norms,” and “stockholder interest,” among others (p. 313–317). The reasons for why an organization implements CSR initiatives drive how an organization approaches its CSR efforts. If an organization is concerned with public image,

they may choose an area they are weaker in and incorporate CSR initiatives that will serve to garner a more positive public image.

Organizations must be strategic in which channels they choose to use in their CSR efforts when they are choosing how they will approach their initiatives.

A company can communicate its CSR activities through official documents, such as an annual corporate responsibility report or press releases and dedicate a section of its official corporate website to CSR; it can also use TV commercials, magazine or billboard advertisements, and product packaging to communicate its CSR initiatives (Du, Bhattacharya, & Sen, 2010, p. 13).

Once the channel of communication has been decided, the messaging must be consistent with the goals put forward by the organization. Du, Bhattacharya, and Sen (2010) found, “There are several factors that the company can emphasize in its CSR communication, such as its commitment to a cause, the impact it has on the cause, why it engages in a particular social initiative, and the congruity between the cause and the company’s business” (p. 11). The effectiveness of CSR communication is dependent not only upon the company’s strategy, but also upon how it positions its CSR program (Du, Bhattacharya, & Sen, 2010, p. 14–17). CSR programs should be consistent in their communication so that employees, outside vendors, and stakeholders are aware of their programs and initiatives. Communication internally and externally should communicate to stakeholders what the company is socially responsible for (Clarkson, 1995, p. 98). Communicating effectively will increase the number of benefits that can come from a CSR program.

Benefits of Corporate Social Responsibility

Words like *sustainability*, *green*, and *impact* have inundated the business world as CSR has become a priority for organizations. Many companies have incorporated CSR programs in their business strategies. It is no longer enough to simply focus on the bottom line. Now organizations include a strategy that is referred to as a “Triple Bottom Line” or “People, Planet, Profit” (Elkington, 2004; Norman & MacDonald, 2004). Stated more plainly, companies now concern themselves with more than just profitability. They also concern themselves with maintaining positive relationships with their stakeholders by ensuring that they take care to be environmentally and socially responsible global citizens (Saxena & Kohli, 2012).

In today’s society CSR has become the norm in business. It has “become the hallmark of a mature, global civilization” and is seen as “necessary for an interdependent one world” (Davis, 1977, p. 321). With the rise in globalization, companies have begun to realize that they cannot live in a “moral vacuum” (Pratt, 2006) while conducting their business. One study has even found through a survey of the top performing companies with CSR programs that there is a positive correlation between CSR and economic development and between CSR and countries with a strong social democratic tradition like Germany, Norway, and Canada (Welford, 2004). That is, “Generally the more developed the country, the higher the incidence of policies in the area of CSR” (Welford, 2004, p. 52). Thus indicating that the more developed a civilization, the more companies within those civilizations will take measures to act in socially responsible ways.

Corporate social responsibility can also serve to improve working relationships with those in the public sector. Government regulations on the state and federal level and other monitoring companies, such as non-governmental organizations (NGO) and environmental agencies, can act as an impetus for companies to adopt more socially responsible practices.

These practices, if already in place, can serve to make working in certain areas more amicable (Campbell, 2007).

Improved relationships with stakeholders. One of the most important, and most broadly noted, benefits of CSR is the improved relationship and perception that is gained with and by stakeholders (Dentchev, 2004; Husted, 2003). As stated by Dentchev (2004, p. 403), “The most supported positive effect of CSP [corporate social performance] is the improvement of stakeholder relations.” These benefits affect all stakeholders associated with an organization, both those within the company—the management and the employees—and those outside of the company—the shareholders, customers, suppliers, etc. For those outside of the company, CSR can generate a favorable attitude of the company, strengthen stakeholder-company relationships, increase the likelihood of investment in the company, and improve the advocacy behaviors of stakeholders (Du, Bhattacharya, & Sen, 2010).

Many studies have found a relationship between CSR and improved relationships with stakeholders. Glavas and Godwin (2013) noted that “a company’s CSR behaviors do significantly affect employees within the company” (p. 15). Turban and Greening (1997) found that CSR is positively related to a good corporate reputation. This benefit can contribute to greater employee loyalty, which increases productivity that would otherwise be lost by frequent turnover of employees.

Another way that an organization can improve relationships with stakeholders is by aligning their CSR program with a social issue (or issues) that fit well with the organization’s overall mission or with their organizational strengths. If an organization has a close relationship with a social issue, cause-related marketing can do much for the organization—so long as both the organization and the social issue serve the same consumer market or if both parties share a

similar value (Nan & Heo, 2007). Stakeholders respond more favorably when organizations have a personal connection with the cause they are aligning themselves with (Ratner, Zhao, & Clarke, 2011). Corporations can receive a more favorable reception of their CSR program by aligning themselves with a cause that is related to their overall mission and organizational values.

Stakeholder theory. Corporate social responsibility programs put emphasis on addressing current social issues. They include their stakeholders as a primary focus in these programs. Stakeholder theory therefore goes hand-in-hand with the study of organizational CSR programs. Maon, Lindgreen, and Swaen (2010) stated the following regarding this relationship:

This is one of the foundational theories with which to analyze CSR. ‘It helps to rectify the groups or personas to whom companies are responsible and provides a foundation for legitimizing stakeholder influences on corporate decisions; consistent with Kantian moral philosophy, stakeholders cannot be treated merely as means to corporate ends, but rather are valuable in their own right and as ends in themselves’ (as cited in Evan and Freeman, 1988, p. 23).

Thus stakeholders play an important role in the strategic decisions organizations make. Maon, Lindgreen, and Swaen (2010) also argue that using stakeholder theory along with CSR is “a necessary process in the operationalization of corporate social responsibility” (as cited in Matten et al, 2003, p. 111).

Stakeholder theory focuses on a business’s relationships internally and externally. Stakeholder theory examines how companies manage their relationships with their stakeholders and how these relationships in turn affect a company’s actions. Clarkson (1995) developed a stakeholder framework to determine the corporation’s purpose in relation to stakeholders of which he admonished that “the survival and continuing profitability of the corporation depend

upon its ability to fulfill its economic and social purpose, which is to create and distribute wealth or value sufficient to ensure that each primary stakeholder group continues as part of the corporation's stakeholder system" (p. 110). Clarkson (1995) continued that failing to maintain positive relationships with stakeholders can be detrimental to the overall success of an organization. Applying stakeholder theory to this study will help understand why an organization implements particular CSR programs.

Increased marketability and competitiveness. As the marketplace becomes even more competitive, many companies are creating and implementing their own CSR programs as a way to get an edge and beat out their competitors. Firms are becoming more innovative in their approaches to CSR to meet these ever-increasing economic and social demands (Husted, 2003). There is a belief within the business world that CSR is good for business. CSR has been attributed with giving companies the increased competitiveness and marketability that they desire. In fact, Fontaine (2013) found that there is a positive relationship between CSR and profitability. This belief in increased profitability that comes with CSR often serves as the motivation for having a CSR program "based on the reasoning that organizations create a competitive advantage by integrating non-economic factors" (as found in Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010, p. 3).

By investing in social initiatives, a company will not only be able to generate favorable stakeholder attitudes and behaviors (e.g. purchase, seeking employment, investing in the company), but it will also, over the long run, be able to build corporate/brand image, strengthen stakeholder-company relationships, and enhance stakeholders' advocacy behaviors for the company.

CSR programs can have more concrete effects than just improved relationships with stakeholders; they can also improve the overall brand and image of the company. Not only can CSR improve company image and branding, Romani, Grappi, and Bagozzi (2013) also found that “CSR does in fact engender feelings of gratitude in consumers”; however, it should be noted that this feeling of gratitude only impacts consumers “to the degree that consumers hold altruistic values of benevolence, universalism, and community” (p. 204). The various programs that contribute to social responsibility have been found to aid consumers in viewing companies in a more favorable light (Romani, Grappi, & Bagozzi, 2013).

CSR can also serve as a draw for potential consumers, increasing profitability and overall success of the company. As found by Margolis and Elfenbein (2008), there is less demand for products or services that do not have a CSR component. Consumers who value socially responsible practices are willing to pay a higher price for a product with those characteristics than for an identical product without those characteristics (2008). Thus it can be seen that consumers who value social responsibility are more drawn to firms that include a social responsibility element in their strategy.

Corporate social responsibility has become an accepted practice in the business world. It has been positively correlated with strong economies and social democracies. Some of the benefits that come to firms by having a CSR component as part of their strategy include improved stakeholder relations and increased marketability and competitiveness (Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010).

Criticisms of Corporate Social Responsibility

Although many benefits have been associated with CSR initiatives for the organizations that implement them, there have also been many criticisms of these programs. These criticisms

include reputation damage, detriment to core business goals and profitability, interference with company values, and lack of correlation with aiding firms (Dentchev, 2004).

Incorporating CSR components into a business strategy can be helpful in working with governmental and non-governmental entities. Companies may use CSR “as a strategic means to counter negative public sentiments, build reputational capital, and ultimately attain legitimacy essential for their long-term prosperity” (Du & Vieira, 2012, p. 414). All of these things are not in and of themselves negative. Obviously every company would want to gain a better reputation, have positive public sentiments, and be seen as credible. However, when viewed in this light, CSR can be seen merely as a public relations tactic, which may reflect negatively on the firm, especially in light of the several companies and corporate executives who were found guilty of illegal financial practices (such as the Enron Corporation, Sam Waksal, the former CEO of ImClone, and Steven B. Markovitz, a portfolio manager at Millennium Partners, a hedge fund), that occurred in the early 2000s, and increased public skepticism of corporations (Pratt, 2006). In its best form, CSR should be a strategic part of an organization, deeply embedded in company values, so that organizations can avoid the public viewing their CSR programs as being merely a pretty sheen covering up unethical behavior.

Publics may view these CSR efforts as being manipulative, or as trying to hide the ethically gray endeavors they are engaged in. However, this effect may be mitigated by increasing the transparency of the business practices the firm is involved in (Du & Vieira, 2012). Unfortunately many companies are reluctant, unable, or lack the necessary understanding to be completely transparent in their communication. As stated in Husted and Allen (2007), “Few firms are prepared to have their CSR programs evaluated in conjunction with other activities that may not shed a positive light on firm behavior” (p. 608). These businesses may lack the foresight

to understand that increased transparency, though it may uncover some negative things that reflect poorly on the company, may actually increase the trust the stakeholders have in the company. If companies communicate openly with their stakeholders, this view that CSR is merely for good press can be alleviated.

Rawlins (2009) discusses the complexity of organizational transparency by explaining that transparency signifies more than simply disclosing information. Complete transparency may actually serve to obscure vital information, as interested parties may not be able to cull through the inundation of information. As explained by Martinson (1996, p. 43) the true aim of transparency is “to truthfully communicate the reality of a particular subject-incident-event-etc.” Thus, organizations, to be truly “transparent,” should fully disclose all *necessary* information. Along with this, organizations should aim to disclose the information that is relevant to their stakeholders (Hooks, Coy and Davey, 2002). Without this, transparency does not meet the needs of the audience that should matter most to organizations.

However, in some cases organizations are unable to be transparent in their communication of their business practices. In some cases, organizations cannot legally release all of the necessary information that all interested publics would like access to (Rawlins, 2009). In these cases, organizations should indicate these inabilities to release this information so as to indicate to publics their willingness to disclose as much information as is both needed and is legal to release.

Another criticism of corporate social responsibility is there is an insufficient positive correlation between CSR and improved performance for the firms that employ these programs. However, according to Lindgreen and Swaen (2010), though it has become widely accepted that CSR helps organizations build better relationships with stakeholders, there still exist various

problems with this belief. CSR does not necessarily improve stakeholder relationships and the results on the relationship between CSR and the financial performance of companies is mixed at best (Husted, 2004). Some studies have found a positive correlation, some have found a negative correlation, and some have found a neutral correlation. There is also a dearth of strategic theory for this area, which it is in great need of (Husted, 2004). Said more bluntly,

The best conceptualizations remain in their—to use a strong word—embryonic stages, and prescribed approaches to CSR seem perplexing to theorists and completely elude practitioners. This state of affairs probably impedes a full understanding among managers of what CSR should comprise and hinders further theoretical development of CSR (Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010, p. 1)

In order to further the understanding of the state of CSR programs among these organizations, it is necessary to understand the type of CSR programs and how businesses are implementing them. Within the literature there is a dearth of information regarding various areas of CSR research. Currently the state of literature is lacking in how CSR is being conducted and accepted in the developing world. This is a necessary area to further develop, especially as many of these countries are where large corporations, such as organizations in the electronics industry, gather the raw materials they need to conduct their businesses. Additionally, the relationship between CSR and the news media leaves much to be desired, as the information points that there is a possible negative relationship between CSR and the news coverage these programs receive. The relationship of CSR and government entities has also been researched very little, especially in the area of how CSR programs try to influence public policy, if they try to at all. This study will undertake to better understand what the state of CSR is in these areas for the organizations included in this study.

Organizations have different ways that they can communicate their CSR programs. Many choose to use their corporate website as the main hub for this information. As websites are a dynamic platform, organizations can organize this information almost any way that they choose. To better understand CSR in the United States, this study will seek to answer the following question:

RQ1. What are organizations with the top-performing CSR programs within the United States communicating about their CSR initiatives on their corporate websites?

In other words, how do these organizations view themselves in relation to CSR? Do they view themselves as global citizens or as stewards over the earth or as members of a global economy? Why are they implementing CSR initiatives in their organizations? What is the motivation behind it? How easily accessible is this information?

Understanding of CSR and what organizations are doing in the developing world is still tenuous at best. A basic understanding of where these programs are being implemented is needed to further research in this area. Currently, there have not been other content analyses that have analyzed CSR in such a comprehensive manner. This study will gather data regarding what these top-performing organizations are communicating about where these organizations are implementing their CSR initiatives, so as to better understand this relationship. It will look at the triple bottom line to see if organizations discuss this overarching shift in mindset businesses have made from being focused solely on the bottom line to also being concerned with environmental impact and ethical approach (Elkington, 2004; Norman & MacDonald, 2004). Thus, this study will ask the following research question:

RQ2. Where are the organizations with the top-performing CSR programs within the United States focusing their initiatives?

In other words, are there specific regions within the world that are receiving more attention? Do organizations discuss why are they focusing their efforts there?

The relationship between CSR and government entities remains largely unknown, with virtually no research examining this interplay. As organizations have considerable influence in the economy, it is necessary to understand how these CSR programs, especially for organizations such as those included in this study, work with government entities and aim to influence public policy—if they do at all. Thus, this study will ask the following research question:

RQ3. Are the organizations with the top-ranked CSR programs within the United States working with government entities in various countries on their CSR initiatives?

In other words, are these organizations working toward changing public policy? Which governments are these organizations working with? Are they located nationally or internationally? What types of initiatives are organizations working on with government entities?

CSR, Agenda Setting, and Agenda Building

Agenda setting, pioneered by McCombs and Shaw in the 1970s, posits that the news media have an agenda (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). They transmit that agenda through various ways: amount of coverage, placement of coverage (top of the hour in broadcast, above the fold in print), quality of reporter, etc. (McCombs, 2005). It assumes the media do not tell the public what to think, but rather what to think *about*. It turns the head of the public in one direction or another (Cohen, 1963). This is evident each election cycle, most notably the presidential election cycles, when the news media cover different stories about each politician, giving some stories exhaustive coverage and not mentioning other stories at all. This coverage changes the importance of an issue, and possibly what the public's opinion is on that issue (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). However, while the public used to accept what the news media transmitted as truth,

or at least mostly truth, the public now views this information with deep skepticism and criticism (Matsaganis & Payne, 2005). What research has been done in showing the relationship between CSR and news coverage has shown that news coverage of CSR has mostly been negative in tone and has even misrepresented and misreported, though perhaps unintentionally, what the organization was actually doing (Tench, Bowd, & Jones, 2007).

The news media are not the only entities that have power in setting the agenda, large corporations also wield great power. They affect the global economy and have the power to affect public policy (Pollach, 2013). In the mid-1980s the disinvestment movement from South Africa began to take firm hold politically and socially, pressuring many multinational American corporations to pull out of doing business with South Africa. They did so with the intent of affecting the South African economy enough to end the practice of apartheid (Poskinoff, 1997). Congress also passed the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act, which prohibited any new business from the United States to South Africa. Though this course of action received considerable criticism, even by then President Ronald Reagan, it was effective in affecting their economy and by 1990 the government of South Africa officially ended apartheid (Poskinoff, 1997). This occurrence is considered the genesis of CSR and in this regard it served to affect a significant public policy.

Agenda-setting effects have largely focused on political communications and the mass media (Kiouisis, Popescu & Mitrook, 2007). However, these same effects apply to business communications, as corporations can also be agenda setters (Carroll & McCombs, 2003; Kiouisis, Popescu & Mitrook, 2007). Those in larger organizations receive more space to have a voice, especially those in the *Fortune 500* (Carroll & McCombs, 2003). Many voices speak out about CSR, such as journalists, NGOs and consultants, and while these are given room in the media,

journalists still have to allow these other entities to have room (Grafstrom & Windell, 2011).

Journalists still have the majority of the voice in the media and thus still have the majority of the control of the agenda (Grafstrom & Windell, 2011).

The selection of the issues organizations choose to target depends on where the organization is positioned within its industry, what type of industry it is located in, and the types of relationships it has with the other organizations within its field (Deephouse & Heugens, 2009). This issue selection is important because the more an issue is tied to an organization, the more likely the public is to associate that issue with that organization (Meijer & Kleninnijenhuis, 2006). However, the media discussion tends to go in cycles, with issues gaining greater salience at different times (Lee & Carroll, 2011). The media also have been shown to have a relationship that tends to mirror CSR agendas in some cases for environmental issues (Pollach, 2013) while CSR agendas show no such influence on the media's selection of issue coverage. Thus, the media ultimately carry great influence in affecting the issues organizations target in their CSR efforts.

Closely related to agenda setting theory is agenda building theory. While agenda setting focuses how the news media affects the salience of issues, agenda building focuses on what affects the agenda of the media, developing from the investigation of where reporters received their information during Watergate (Lang & Lang, 1981). As this theory analyzes how the media is influenced, it allows for multiple actors to influence the agenda building process. These actors, as outlined above, could be corporate spokespersons, NGOs, policymakers, or interest groups (Grafstrom & Windell, 2011). Kiousis, Popescu, and Mitrook (2007, p. 149) explain, "The broader concept of agenda-building views the process of salience formation as one involving reciprocal influence among multiple groups in addition to media and public opinion, such as

policymakers, interest groups, and corporations” (p. 149). Thus, this influence is not unidirectional; rather, it is a reciprocal exchange of influence between the news media and these other actors in building an agenda (Tedesco, 2001).

Like the state of the body of literature with agenda-setting theory, agenda-building has largely focused on political issues and political candidates, with little research having been done on the agenda-building effects in organizational communications. What research has been done, has largely focused on corporate reputation (Carroll & McCombs, 2003). This has been an area of focus, as a positive correlation has been shown between positive news coverage and better financial performance of organizations (Eberl & Schwaiger, 2005). It has been found that the coverage usually given to organizations by the news media is negative in nature (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990; Tench, Bowd, & Jones, 2007). Thus, organizations would likely desire to have a greater influence in the agenda of the media, as it would behoove them to be depicted positively.

Agenda setting and agenda building provide a framework with which to analyze how issues of importance to the general public relate to how corporations choose to attempt to solve them. The news media decide the agenda to give greater prominence to the issues they feel are most important, which in turn influences the stakeholders’ opinions of what is important. This, in turn, influences issues that organizations choose to incorporate into their CSR programs. Understanding agenda setting theory, stakeholder theory, and the surrounding literature on corporate social responsibility and its strategic nature, two research questions have been developed to better understand how CSR programs are being influenced.

Americans have identified many issues as being the most important issues facing the nation (Gallup, 2014). No study has analyzed what types of social issues CSR programs are trying to improve or and see how important these issues are actually viewed in the eyes of

stakeholders. Understanding this will help to reveal the reciprocal relationship the agenda of the stakeholders and the news media have with the issues being addressed by these organizations.

Thus, this study will ask the following research questions:

RQ4a. What issues are organizations focusing their CSR initiatives on?

RQ4b. Are organizations addressing the issues that are important to stakeholders?

In other words, are there any issues that are more prominent than others within this population and, if there are, how do they compare with the issues that are the most important among the national population? These questions will examine what relationship exists between the agenda of stakeholders and the CSR programs they have an influence over.

Organizations approach implementing CSR in different ways, often playing to their strengths as an organization. For instance, an organization may excel in product development, thus it may choose to engineer more environmentally friendly product that reduces the organization's carbon footprint. Thus, to better understand how the organizations are both approaching and implementing their respective CSR programs, the following question will be explored:

RQ5. What approaches are the organizations with the top-performing CSR programs within the United States taking to solve the issues they choose to address?

In other words, are organizations making brick and mortar changes to their facilities to be more environmentally responsible or are they reaching out to the community to provide support or are they donating funds to disaster relief or are they focusing on product development and innovation to provide solutions that do not yet exist?

These questions will serve as the guiding factor for understanding what these top-performing organizations are currently doing in their CSR programs.

Chapter Three: Method

This study was a content analysis of 16 corporate websites from organizations ranked as having the top-performing CSR programs within the *Fortune 500*. It was a descriptive content analysis that explored which social problems each organization aimed to solve, how it communicated its CSR initiatives, and how it approached each of its programs.

Sample

A list of the top performing organizations was compiled from a variety of lists rating the quality of CSR programs. Organizations were selected from five industry-recognized lists, including *Forbes*' 100 Best Corporate Citizens, *Fortune*'s Most Admired Companies in Social Responsibility, Reputation Institute's CSR RepTrak 100 Study, *PR News*' 2013 Overall Leaders in corporate social responsibility, and the Global 100 Index's Most Sustainable Corporations. All lists were taken from the 2013 year, as it was the most current information and also so all data were consistent.

The companies were then compared to the *Fortune 500* from 2013 to eliminate any organizations headquartered outside of the United States or those that lack influence in their respective industries. As there are thousands of organizations worldwide with CSR programs, this study has been delimited to study only organizations headquartered in the United States as this provides both a manageable population and a consistent set of issues. Of those organizations with top CSR programs, 106 of the 181 were based in the United States. This changed the sample size from 181 to 106 organizations. (These 106 organizations are listed in Appendix E). In order to obtain an exemplar of the best-performing CSR programs, the sample was limited to only those organizations that appeared on three or more of the lists. That brought the sample size down to 16 organizations: The 3M Company, Cisco Systems Inc., The Coca-Cola Company, The

Colgate-Palmolive Company, Dell Inc., The Ford Motor Company, General Electric, Intel Corporation, Marriott International, Microsoft Corporation, Nike Inc., PepsiCo, Starbucks Coffee Company, United Parcel Services, Walt Disney Co., and Xerox Corporation Ltd. Each of these 16 organizations CSR programs were examined.

Units of Analysis and Coding Procedure

The unit of analysis for this study was the content regarding CSR initiatives contained within each organization's website. Only content contained within the specific sections of each website regarding CSR initiatives was analyzed. Typically this information was contained within a separate tab on the website that was accessed from the homepage. There were 206 initiatives that were analyzed between April 3 and April 22, 2014. No other information was gathered from other locations on the corporate websites. CSR program was defined as the organization's entire CSR effort, comprising its various CSR initiatives.

In order to analyze this information, two coding sheets were created for this study. Both coding sheets included information regarding how the organization communicated about its CSR initiatives. One was created to capture each organization's general CSR information (see Appendix A). An additional coding sheet was created for each separate CSR initiative the organization communicated on its website (see Appendix B).

Additionally, a codebook was created to accompany the coding sheets (see Appendix C). This codebook included operational definitions of each of the terms on the coding sheet. This ensured that both coders were coding the sites in a uniform manner. This codebook, along with the coding sheet, allows for replication of this study.

Data Gathering

This study tested the assumptions of agenda-setting theory and the influence the media had on CSR programs. This method served as the best approach to analyze what these top programs in influential organizations were doing.

The research questions for this study served to guide the development of the coding procedures. In order to answer each research question, specific data points were developed within each coding sheet. The following describes how each question was answered within the coding parameters:

To answer research question 1, this study analyzed different ways organizations communicated their CSR initiatives. To answer this question, this study measured triple bottom line, which was defined as mentions (implicit or explicit) to people, planet, and profit (Elkington, 2004; Norman & MacDonald, 2004). References of media coverage mentioned on the corporate webpage were also measured to determine the importance organizations place in reporting the news coverage they receive on their CSR programs. How the organizations framed their CSR programs was also measured using Dahlsrud's (2006) five dimensions for framing CSR: social, environmental, economical, stakeholder, and voluntariness. For example, did organizations view themselves as global citizens or did they view themselves as stewards over the earth or did they perhaps view themselves as organizations with a responsibility to give back to the community? Dahlsrud (2006) defines environmental dimension as the natural environment or anything dealing with nature. The social dimension is defined as the relationship between business and society, such as organizations being global citizens. The economic dimension is defined as the socioeconomic or financial aspects of a business, such as mentions of a bottom line or the fiscal responsibility of an organization. The stakeholder dimension is defined as stakeholder groups or

stakeholders. The voluntariness dimension is defined as any actions that go beyond anything prescribed by law, such as volunteer endeavors or voluntary donations, etc. This study also collected data regarding how available this information was from the homepage by how many clicks it took to access that information.

To answer research question 2, this study analyzed whether the organizations with the top-performing CSR programs focused their initiatives in the United States (where they were headquartered) or internationally and which regions received the most attention.

To answer research question 3, this study analyzed which organizations were working with government entities and, if so, where these government entities were located.

To answer research question 4, this study looked at whether there were issues these organizations were addressing through their CSR programs that were a reflection of the issues Americans identified as being the most important issues facing the nation. A list was created of important social issues considered the most important issues in the United States. These issues came from a Gallup poll conducted January 5–8, 2014, which surveyed respondents with the following question: “How important is it to you that the president and Congress deal with each of the following issues in the next year?” This question, as presented by Gallup, was followed by a list of most important issues and its ranking of importance of the issue according to the American public. The issues listed were the economy, education, healthcare, Social Security and Medicare, terrorism, poverty and homelessness, military and national defense, crime, taxes, distribution of wealth, energy policy, environment, gun policy, immigration, abortion, and minority issues. This list comprised the basis for the issues listed. Additions were also made to this list of issues based on issues that had salience within the consensus of the literature: women’s issues, children’s issues, health, employee engagement, and disaster relief.

To answer research question 5, three governance options were measured in this study from Husted (2003), who discussed three types of governance an organization could take: ownership of program, partnering, and sponsorship. In this study, he posits that ownership is the best approach for organizations to take, as the organization has the greatest investment and control over its CSR program through this approach. In creating measures to gather this data, the information presented on the initiatives were also coded regarding the implementation methods these organizations chose to use with each initiative, such as community involvement or product development. Additionally mentions of any matching programs, as many organizations incentivize employees to give back by utilizing matching initiatives. Also whether or not an organization has created its own nonprofit to conduct its CSR initiatives will be measured, as well as how often they communicate running their initiatives through these nonprofit foundations. How these organizations implemented their program (i.e. through community involvement, supply chain ethics, brick and mortar innovation, product development, lobbying, and sponsorship) was also measured. These items were culled from CSR programs not included in the sample population.

Coder Training and Reliability Analysis

Two coders collected data for this study. To test the coding instruments, these coders analyzed 10 percent of the population (two organizations), selected randomly from the sample and coded independently for training. Holsti's (1969) formula was used to discover inter-coder reliability for nominal level data (94.9 percent agreement), along with Cohen's kappa (81.6 percent). Once intercoder reliability was established, the coders discussed their areas of difference until a consensus was reached and then the remaining organizations were divided between the two coders equally and coded.

Data Analysis

The data for this study was analyzed using Statistical Product and Service Solutions, or, as it is more commonly known, SPSS. This program provides statistical analysis for several fields, including the social sciences. Using this program, the data was then analyzed by looking at the frequency and number of mentions. These frequencies and percentages were then interpreted to understand the recurring patterns in the organizations.

The values statement for each organization were also gathered to better understand what organizations are communicating about their CSR programs and how they see themselves in relation to CSR, such as if they are global citizens or environmental stewards. These were analyzed in NVivo, a software program widely used for textual analysis. These statements were analyzed to see which patterns emerged and what words were most common.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Content analyses prove to be an inexpensive method for gathering large amounts of data. This approach can gather a large set of varied data, differing from a more specialized qualitative approach. This method is also easier to replicate than other approaches, as it avoids the complications that arise from using living subjects when gathering data, and ensuring reliability is more straightforward than with other methods.

Though there are numerous strengths to using a content analysis, there also exist some weaknesses. There is the possibility of large amounts of data, which is time consuming to sift through and code for. Content analyses are also only descriptive. This method cannot explain why patterns are occurring, but merely what is occurring or how often or how much it is occurring.

Additionally, this study does not use a random sample, and is not, therefore, generalizable to the entire population of large U.S. organizations. However, as these are the top-rated CSR programs across several surveys, it is presumed that they are influential in the world of CSR and that other programs that are not top rated will seek to emulate their practices, including the issues that they approach.

Chapter Four: Results

This section will outline the results for this study, beginning with the overall results found within the entire sample. It will be followed by the results of each organization's CSR program. The results for each research question will then be outlined.

Overview of Entire CSR Population

Among the 16 organizations analyzed there were 206 total initiatives. Overall the number of initiatives per organization ranged from six to 24, with an average of 12.25 initiatives per organization in the population. Ford and Xerox had the fewest initiatives, each with six. Dell had the most with 24 initiatives. All organizations in the population had CSR pages and it took an average number of 1.53 clicks ($SD=.74$) to get to the information on CSR from the homepages of these organizations. The titles of the various CSR pages fell into five categories:

"Responsibility," five used "Citizenship," three organizations used "Sustainability," Xerox used "What We Believe," while Colgate-Palmolive used "Governance" and "Community Programs."

These organizations were also coded to see how they viewed themselves in relationship to CSR. It was found that each company considered itself an advocate for the environment, social issues, and stakeholders. Fifteen of the organizations mentioned their relationship with the economy, Xerox being the only organization that made no mention of an overall relationship with the economy, and 14 mentioned their relationship with voluntariness, Cisco and Nike being the only companies that made no mention of an overall relationship with voluntariness.

Through analyzing the value statements relating to CSR of each organization it was found that (in order from most frequent to less frequent) business ($n=20$), communities ($n=12$), global ($n=11$), commitment ($n=10$), people ($n=8$), value ($n=8$), environmental ($n=8$), company ($n=8$), serve ($n=8$), technology ($n=7$), corporate ($n=7$), world ($n=7$), social ($n=7$), sustainability

on recycling, and two each (11.8 percent) on energy, clean water, water scarcity, and conservation. The only other organization to have as many initiatives focused on emissions was GE. 3M had more emphasis on product development than most other organizations with 64.7 percent of its initiatives (11 initiative) focused on this method of implementation. 3M did not have any initiatives focused on the economy. It had less emphasis on employee engagement (11.8 percent, two initiatives), supply chain ethics (17.6 percent, three initiatives), community involvement (23.5 percent, four initiatives) and sponsorship (29.4 percent, five initiatives) than other organizations.

Cisco Systems, Inc. Overall Cisco had 12 initiatives in its CSR program. Cisco had the highest percentage of initiatives that implemented community involvement with 91.7 percent of its initiatives (11 initiatives) using this method. It also had a high percentage of partnerships with 50 percent of its initiatives (six initiatives) being run through partnering, as well as a higher percentage of initiatives that implemented sponsorships (66.7 percent, eight initiatives). With regard to the issues it focused on, Cisco also had a high percentage of initiatives focused on healthcare (41.7 percent, five initiatives), education (50 percent, six initiatives), and the economy (41.7 percent, five initiatives). Cisco also implemented disaster relief in 33.3 percent of its initiatives (four initiatives). It mentioned working with the government on 41.7 percent of its initiatives (five initiatives), with four of those initiatives with foreign governments. One-third of its initiatives mentioned volunteerism, which was higher than the average frequency of 13.6 percent for the entire population. Cisco had a lower frequency of initiatives focused on the environment (8.3 percent, one initiative), supply chain ethics (8.3 percent, one initiative), and stakeholder engagement (41.7 percent, five initiatives).

The Coca-Cola Company. Overall Coca-Cola had 13 initiatives in its CSR program. Coca-Cola had a higher frequency of mentions of running their programs through their nonprofit foundation with 30.8 percent (four initiatives). Starbucks was the only other organization with as many mentions. Coca-Cola also had more women-related initiatives than any other organization with three initiatives (23.1 percent), as well as more children-related initiatives with five initiatives (38.5 percent). It also had a higher percentage focused on health-related issues (46.2 percent, six initiatives), half of which focused on public health and disease prevention and treatment. It also had a higher frequency of government involvement with 46.2 percent (six initiatives), all of which were with foreign governments and four of which (30.8 percent) were with the United States government. 92.3 percent of its programs were implemented internationally. It also had a higher frequency of both mentions of philanthropy (30.8 percent, four initiatives) and community involvement (61.5 percent).

The Colgate-Palmolive Company. Colgate had the highest number of initiatives with 22, nearly doubling the average of 12.86 initiatives across the population. Its CSR program was the only to mention animal rights, having two initiatives focused on helping animals (animal adoption and animal testing). It also focused on oral health and hand washing. It had the second lowest percentage of sponsorship within the population with 13.6 percent (three initiatives).

Dell Inc. Overall Dell had 15 initiatives in its CSR program. Dell had a significant emphasis on reducing the environmental impact of its products, from how they were designed and manufactured, to delivery, to how users could recycle them once they were done with them. This emphasis made up 33.3 percent (five initiatives) of its initiatives. Dell also emphasized volunteerism, also with 33.3 percent (five initiatives) focusing on this approach. It also had less emphasis on sponsorship than most of the population with 26.7 percent (four initiatives).

The Ford Motor Company. Overall Ford had six initiatives in its CSR program. In addition to initiatives focused on the environment, water, employee engagement, and supply chain ethics, Ford has programs to design safer vehicles and also to train people to be safer drivers. All of Ford's initiatives (six) are run through ownership, excluding any mention of partnering or only sponsoring any initiative. One-third of the initiatives (two initiatives) include water scarcity, as well as brick and mortar innovations. Two-thirds (four) include product development as an implementation method. Ford made no mention of working with any government entity, nor were there any initiatives focused on health-related issues. Ford also implemented supply chain ethics 16.7 percent of the time (in one initiative), less than the average 30.1 percent seen in the population. Half of Ford's initiatives (three initiatives) were implemented nationally, less than the average 77.7 percent seen in the population.

General Electric. Overall GE had 13 initiatives in its CSR program. GE placed a large emphasis on environment-related initiatives with 76.9 percent (10 initiatives), having, among others, initiatives that aid developing countries gain access to energy, with energy comprising 61.5 percent (eight) of the total initiatives, as well as focusing on water scarcity, which contributed to 30.8 percent (four initiatives) of the total initiatives, and emissions, which added up to 46.2 percent (six initiatives). GE also focused more on crime-related issues with 30.8 percent (four initiatives) of its initiatives referencing some crime-related issue, such as corruption, human rights, conflict materials, fraud, bribery, and money laundering. Healthcare was also referenced in 46.2 (six initiatives).

Intel Corporation. Overall Intel had 17 initiatives in its CSR program. Like Dell, Intel is also focused on product development and end of life cycle recycling for its products, with 41.2 percent (seven initiatives); however, its CSR program also focuses on community involvement

with 35.3 percent (six initiatives) of its programs involving the community. Intel did not include any information about where its initiatives are being implemented. Aside from this difference, Intel's CSR program followed the overall trends across the population.

Marriott International, Inc. Overall Marriott had 12 initiatives in its CSR program. Marriott's program included three main emphases between business values, people, and the environment. Among its implementation methods, Marriott focused mainly on stakeholder engagement (66.7 percent, eight initiatives), with a secondary emphasis on sponsorship (41.7 percent, five initiatives). Marriott placed emphasis on mentioning minimizing water and energy consumption among its hotels across the world with five initiatives that were focused on energy policy and water scarcity, comprising 41.7 percent of its total initiatives.

Microsoft Corporation. Overall Microsoft had 11 initiatives in its CSR program. Microsoft focused on using technology for good, both in the community and for the environment. All of its initiatives were run through ownership. Microsoft had 36.4 percent of its initiatives (four initiatives) that mentioned working with the government, each of those mentioning working with the United States government and three of them mentioning working with governments internationally, though no specific countries were mentioned. Nearly all of its initiatives were implemented nationally (90.9 percent, 11 initiatives). Microsoft also had a higher than average percentage of initiatives that mentioned diversity with 27.3 percent (three initiatives) mentioning diversity. Microsoft also mentioned employee engagement frequently with 45.5 percent of its initiatives (five initiatives) dealing with engaging employees. It also had three initiatives (27.3 percent) of its initiatives dealing with crime-related issues, such as human rights, bribery, and corruption. Microsoft placed less emphasis on environment-related issues (18.2 percent, two initiatives) and product development (18.2 percent, two initiatives).

Nike, Inc. Overall Nike had 10 initiatives in its CSR program. Most of its initiatives dealt with environment-related issues with 60 percent (six initiatives) relating to some type of environment-related issue, such as energy, clean water, water scarcity, recycling, climate change, and emissions. All of its initiatives were run through ownership by Nike. It had no initiatives that dealt with education, economy, or health related issues. It also had only one initiative that dealt with employee engagement (10 percent of its initiatives). Its implementation method differed from the average of the total population in that it heavily focused on supply chain ethics (80 percent, eight initiatives), with emphasis placed on an ethical use of its labor force, and product development (70 percent, seven initiatives), with less emphasis on community involvement (20 percent, two initiatives) and sponsorship (10 percent, one initiative).

PepsiCo. Overall PepsiCo had 15 initiatives in its CSR program. As with Coca-Cola, PepsiCo placed emphasis on disclosing that its company does not market to children under 12 years old, unless those products meet certain nutritional standards. PepsiCo's CSR program followed the averages of the population, except that it made no mention of where its initiatives were being implemented, nor did it have any initiatives that implemented stakeholder engagement. It did have a higher emphasis on supply chain ethics than the average with 46.7 percent of its initiatives (seven initiatives) dealing with this method.

Starbucks Coffee Company. Overall Starbucks had 18 initiatives in its CSR program. Starbucks emphasized environment-related initiatives, having half of its initiatives (nine initiatives) dealing with the environment. Many of its programs dealt with its supply chain in some way, from farmer engagement and support to the materials it used for its cups, having 38.9 percent of its initiatives (seven initiatives) dealing with the supply chain. Other environment-related issues it approached were waste management, bio diversity, clean water, water scarcity,

and emissions. Five of its initiatives (27.8 percent) dealt with the ethical sourcing of its products in countries like Guatemala, Thailand, China, Costa Rica, Colombia, and Ethiopia. One-third of its initiatives (six initiatives) were economy related. Most of its initiatives were implemented internationally with 72.2 percent (13 initiatives) in foreign countries and 61.1 percent (11 initiatives) implemented nationally. It placed less emphasis on product development than most organizations in the population with 11.1 percent (two initiatives) focused on this method.

United Parcel Service. Overall UPS had 10 initiatives in its CSR program. UPS places a large emphasis on community involvement and giving back to the community. Almost all of its initiatives (eight of 10) use community involvement as one of its implementation methods. It also has a program to pay \$3,000 for part-time employees' schooling each year. UPS also uses sponsorship 80 percent of the time as one of its implementation methods, as well as stakeholder engagement 90 percent of the time. It places less emphasis on product development (utilized 10 percent of the time) and supply chain ethics (utilized 20 percent of the time). Only 10 percent of its initiatives (one initiative) were environment related. UPS placed high emphasis on education (80 percent, eight initiatives), the economy (30 percent, three initiatives), employee engagement (50 percent, five initiatives), and diversity (30 percent, three initiatives). It also used partnering 30 percent of the time (three initiatives), higher than the average 16.5 percent. It made no mention of implementing its initiatives nationally; however, 40 percent of its initiatives (four initiatives) mentioned being implemented internationally, though no specific countries were mentioned.

The Walt Disney Company. Overall Disney had nine initiatives in its CSR program. Disney focuses on its overall environmental footprint in 55.6 percent (five initiatives) of its initiatives; however, they have no initiatives that mention energy. They make note of their

resource consumption on their cruise ships and have a goal to have zero waste in the future. They only had one initiative (11.1 percent) focused on children's issues. Disney had an emphasis on diversity, with 44.4 percent (four initiatives) mentioning diversity. Disney also had the highest mentions of news stories in its initiatives, with 44.4 percent (four initiatives) mentioning news stories. There was no mention of where their initiatives are implemented, either nationally or internationally.

Xerox Corporation Ltd. Overall Xerox had six initiatives in its CSR program. Xerox emphasized diversity, with half of its initiatives (three initiatives) mentioning diversity and one-third (two initiatives) mentioning minority groups. Additionally, one-third of its initiatives mentioned news stories. It made no mention of where its initiatives were being implemented, whether national or international. With regards to its implementation methods, it had a higher percentage of supply chain ethics (50 percent, three initiatives) and sponsorship (83.3 percent, five initiatives); however, it made no mention of stakeholder engagement.

Results for RQ1

Research question 1 asked how the different organizations communicated their CSR initiatives. To answer this question, this study looked at references to media coverage to see if this was of value to the organizations. It also looked at the triple bottom line to see if organizations discussed this overarching shift in mindset businesses have made from being focused solely on the bottom line to also being concerned with environmental impact and ethical approach (Elkington, 2004; Norman & MacDonald, 2004).

In addition to the overall results, which also serve to answer this research question, each company was coded for references to media coverage. There were 13 total mentions of news coverage about the CSR initiatives, comprising 6.3 percent of the total sample. The Walt Disney

Company had the most mentions, with four initiatives (44.4 percent of Disney's initiatives) mentioning news coverage.

Mentions of triple bottom line (people, planet, profit) were also measured. Table 2 shows how often each of these concepts were mentioned within each initiative.

Table 1
Mentions of Triple Bottom Line

Coded Terms	Number of Initiatives	Percent
People	13	6.3%
Planet	14	6.8%
Profit	11	5.3%

Note: Total initiatives=206

Table 2 shows that mentions were fairly consistent across the entire population, comprising 7.8 percent (16 initiatives) of the entire population. People, planet, and profit were collectively mentioned 38 times (18.4 percent). 3M, Coca-Cola, and Intel each had three initiatives that mentioned the triple bottom line, making up 17.4 percent of 3M's and Intel's initiatives and 23.1 percent of Coca-Cola's initiatives.

Results for RQ2

Research question 2 asked about where these organizations with the top-performing CSR programs were focused their initiatives, and whether they focused their initiatives more nationally or internationally. It was found that the organizations within this population focused their efforts in the following regions:

Table 2

Frequency of CSR Initiatives by Region

Region	Number of Initiatives	Percent
North America	168	81.55%
Asia	88	42.72%
Latin America	79	38.35%
Sub-Saharan Africa	75	36.40%
Europe	63	30.58%
Middle East and North Africa	15	7.28%
Pacific	10	4.85%

Note: Total initiatives=206. Additionally, Latin America includes Mexico, Asia includes Southeast Asia, and North America includes the United States and Canada.

As can be seen by this table, 81.55 percent of initiatives mentioned being implemented in North America, with 160 in the United States and eight in Canada. Asia was the second most mentioned region with 42.72 percent (88 initiatives) mentioning initiatives being implemented in this region. The study used the definition created by the United Nations to determine the division between North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Of the 206 initiatives analyzed, 160 (77.7 percent) were implemented nationally and 151 (73.3 percent) focused internationally. These programs were implemented in 105 countries. The most frequently mentioned countries are outlined in Table 2.

Table 3
Most Frequently Mentioned Countries

Countries	Number of Initiatives	Frequency
India	22	10.68%
China	21	10.19%
Mexico	18	8.74%
Brazil	15	7.28%
Kenya	11	5.34%
South Africa	11	5.34%
Thailand	8	3.88%
Canada	8	3.88%
Australia	7	3.4%
Philippines	6	2.91%
Colombia	5	2.43%
Ethiopia	5	2.43%
Germany	5	2.43%
Rwanda	5	2.43%
Tanzania	5	2.43%
Uganda	5	2.43%
Argentina	4	1.94%
Guatemala	4	1.94%
Haiti	4	1.94%
Italy	4	1.94%
Japan	4	1.94%
Malaysia	4	1.94%
Nigeria	4	1.94%
Russia	4	1.94%
Singapore	4	1.94%
Turkey	4	1.94%
United Kingdom	4	1.94%

As can be seen in the table above, India, China, Mexico, Brazil, Kenya, and South Africa were the most frequently mentioned countries.

Table 4
Most Frequently Mentioned Countries by Organization

Organization	Brazil	China	India	Kenya	Mexico	South Africa
Starbucks	1	1	1		1	
Coca-Cola	1	4	4	4	3	4
Intel			1	1		
GE	2	3	5	2	2	
Ford		1	1		1	
Colgate-Palmolive	1	2	4		5	3
3M	6	3	3		3	1
Dell	1	3	2	1	2	1
Cisco	3	2		3	1	2
Marriott		1	1			
PepsiCo		1				
Total	15	21	22	11	18	11

Note: Only 11 of the 16 organizations mentioned specific countries where their initiatives were implemented.

Of the companies that communicated which countries they implemented their CSR initiatives in Coca-Cola and Dell all mentioned working in all six of the most frequently mentioned countries. Coca-Cola implemented at least four initiatives in China, India, Kenya, and South Africa; GE implemented five initiatives in India; Colgate-Palmolive implemented four initiatives in India and five in Mexico; and 3M implemented six initiatives in Brazil.

Results for RQ3

Research question 3 asked which organizations worked with any government entities and, if so, where these government entities were located. It also asked if they were working with these government entities on public policy, and, if stated, which policies.

Table 4
Organizations Working with Government Entities

Coded Term	Number of Initiatives	Frequency
Government Overall	41	19.9%
National Government	26	12.6%
Foreign Government	28	13.6%
Public Policy	10	4.9%

Note: Total initiatives=206

Table 5 shows working with the government comprised nearly 20 percent of the population and that initiatives working with national and foreign government were fairly even. Working on public policy comprised only 4.9 percent of the entire population, almost one quarter of the initiatives that communicated working with the government on any initiative. The organizations that mentioned work on public policies were Dell (1 initiative, 6.7 percent of its initiatives), GE (3 initiatives, 23.1 percent of its initiatives), Intel (1 initiative, 5.9 percent of its initiatives), Microsoft (2 initiatives, 18.2 percent of its initiatives), Nike (1 initiative, 10 percent of its initiatives), and Starbucks (1 initiative, 5.6 percent of its initiatives). Microsoft was the only organization that mentioned anything specific it was doing with public policies. It mentioned working on policies that relate to law enforcement, technology and surveillance. Coca-Cola had the most mentions and the highest percentage of mentions of working with foreign governments with six separate initiatives (46.2 percent of its initiatives).

Of the 28 initiatives that communicated working with foreign governments, six companies, including Cisco, Coca-Cola, Colgate-Palmolive, Dell, PepsiCo, and Starbucks, mentioned specific countries they were working with. These countries were China, Canada, Jordan, India, Brazil, Canada, Guatemala, Ghana, Mali, and Indonesia.

Results for RQ4

Research question 4 asked which of the most important issues were most widely covered by these top-ranked organizations' CSR programs.

Table 5
Frequency of Most Important Issues

Issue	Number of Initiatives	Percent
Environment	92	44.7%
Employee Engagement	66	32%
Education	50	24.3%
Health	34	16.5%
Economy	31	15%
Children's Issues	28	13.6%
Poverty	20	9.7%
Minority Groups/Diversity	18	8.7%
Women's Issues	16	7.8%
Disaster Relief	15	7.3%
Military	7	3.4%
Privacy	1	0.5%
Immigration	1	0.5%
Gun Policy	0	0%

Note: These items were not mutually exclusive.

Table 6 shows overall, environment-related issues were most widely covered with 92 separate initiatives and 44.7 percent working on some type of environmental issue.

Table 6
Frequency of Environment-Related Issues

Issue	Number of Initiatives	Percent
Environment Overall	92	44.70%
Energy	35	17%
Clean Water	21	10.20%
Water Scarcity	32	15.50%
Recycling	32	15.50%
Climate Change	21	10.20%
Emissions	39	18.90%
Waste Management	15	7.28%
Conservation	12	5.83%
Pollution	10	4.85%
Other	8	3.88%

Note: These items were not mutually exclusive.

Table 6 shows the frequency of different environment-related issues, showing that emissions and energy were covered most frequently, with recycling and water scarcity being covered with the same frequency. Other issues included in the environment category were renewable materials, agriculture, and fuel economy. 3M had the most environment-related initiatives with 14 initiatives, making up 82.4 percent of its initiatives.

Health-related issues comprised 16.5 percent of the issues covered from the total population with 24 separate initiatives. Table 8 shows the frequencies of health-related issues.

Table 7
Frequency of Health-Related Issues

Issue	Number of Initiatives	Percent
Health Overall	34	16.50%
Healthcare	18	8.70%
Public Health	13	6.30%
Disease Treatment/Prevention	10	4.85%
Obesity	8	3.90%
Exercise	3	1.46%
Smoking	0	0%
Drugs	1	0.50%
Mental Health	2	1%
Other	3	1.46%

Note: These items were not mutually exclusive.

As can be seen by the above table, healthcare was the most frequently covered health-related issue with 18 separate initiatives being covered. Issues coded as health-related were medicine, stress management, and cancer-related programs. GE had the highest percentage of health-related initiatives in its CSR program with four initiatives, making up 30.8 percent of its initiatives.

Economy-related issues comprised 15 percent of the total population's initiatives. Sixteen separate initiatives dealt with unemployment, comprising 7.8 percent of the total population. Starbucks had the highest percentage of economy-related initiatives with 50 percent (six initiatives) of its initiatives being economy-related initiatives.

Children-related issues made up 13.6 percent of the issues covered by the population.

Table 9 shows the frequencies of the subcategories of children-related issues.

Table 8
Frequency of Children-Related Issues

Issue	Number of Initiatives	Percent
Children's Issues Overall	28	13.60%
Child Abuse	4	1.90%
Malnutrition	7	3.40%
Education	10	4.85%
Health	11	5.34%
Children's Other	6	2.91%

Note: These items were not mutually exclusive.

As can be seen by the above table, children's education and children's health were the most prominent of the issues relating to children. Coca-Cola had the most children-related initiatives with five of 13 initiatives, making up 38.5 percent of its initiatives.

Poverty-related issues were addressed by 9.7 percent of the population, with 20 total initiatives. Table 10 shows the frequencies of the subcategories of poverty-related issues.

Table 9
Frequency of Poverty-Related Issues

Issue	Number of Initiatives	Percent
Poverty Overall	20	9.7%
Homelessness	5	2.4%
Hunger	9	4.4%
Food Security	6	2.9%
Poverty Other	1	0.5%

Note: These items were not mutually exclusive.

Hunger was addressed by nearly half of the total initiatives that had poverty-related issues with 9 initiatives and 4.4 percent of the population. UPS had the most poverty-related initiatives with four initiatives or 40 percent of its initiatives.

Women-related issues made up the least-covered category that had subcategories. This category was addressed by 7.8 percent of the population and 16 separate initiatives. Table 11 shows the frequency of the subcategory of women-related issues.

Table 10

Frequency of Poverty-Related Issues

Issue	Number of Initiatives	Percent
Women's Issues Overall	16	7.80%
Abortion	0	0%
Domestic Abuse	1	0.50%
Prostitution	0	0%
Empowerment	9	4.37%
Education	4	1.90%
Women's Other	5	2.43%

Note: These items were not mutually exclusive.

Issues covered in the “other” section include Internet access for women, women’s health, and equal employment opportunities. Coca-Cola had the most women-related initiatives with three initiatives or 23.1 percent of its initiatives.

Education, diversity, disaster relief, military, immigration, gun policy, and privacy were all issues without subcategories. Education was covered by 24.3 percent of the population, being the third-most addressed issue in this population. Many of these education initiatives addressed children’s education (4.85 percent) and a lesser number covered women’s education (1.9 percent). Diversity was covered by 8.7 percent of the population. The organizations that included diversity in their initiatives did things such as partnering with minority groups or making mention of not hiring based on gender or race. Military-related issues were addressed by 3.4 percent of the population. Organizations that included military or veteran related issues had hiring initiatives for veterans. Disaster relief was addressed by 7.3 percent of the population with 15 initiatives. Cisco, being the organization with the largest number of disaster relief related

initiatives, had four initiatives, making up one-third of its initiatives. Microsoft and Dell each had two initiatives that handled disaster relief, while 3M, Coca-Cola, Colgate-Palmolive, Marriott International, PepsiCo, UPS, and Walt Disney each had one initiative that dealt with disaster relief. UPS was the only organization to have an immigration-related initiative and Xerox the only organization to have a privacy-related issue. None of the organizations in the population had initiatives that addressed gun policy.

The following table shows the comparison between the most important issues according to the nation and the most frequently mentioned issues in this sample.

Table 11
Comparison of Most Important Issues to Sample Population

Issue	Most Important Issues	Focus of CSR Initiatives
Economy	89%	15%
Education	81%	24.3%
Healthcare	77%	8.7%
Social Security and Medicare	73%	0%
Terrorism	72%	0%
Poverty and homelessness	69%	9.7%
Military and national defense	68%	3.4%
Crime	68%	11.2%
Taxes	62%	0%
Distribution of wealth	57%	0%
Energy policy	56%	17%
Environment	55%	44.7%
Gun policy	54%	0%
Immigration	50%	.5%
Abortion	39%	0%
Minority issues	39%	8.7%

Note: The items listed under the focus of CSR initiatives column were not mutually exclusive.

As can be seen in Table 14, the issues that are most important to the national population are different from those that are communicated by this sample. A much higher emphasis is placed on environmental issues than on issues that have a higher national importance, such as the

economy, education, or healthcare. Additionally, there were no initiatives that mentioned Social Security, terrorism, taxes, distribution of wealth, gun policy, or abortion.

Results for RQ5

Research question 5 examined the approaches organizations implemented in their initiatives. To answer this question the organizations in the population were coded to see if they took ownership of their programs, partnered with other organizations, or if they used sponsorship of time, money, or goods. Table 12 shows the dispersion of how the organizations in the population approach CSR.

Table 12
How Organizations Approach CSR Initiatives

Approach	Number of Initiatives	Percent
Ownership	145	70.4%
Partnering	34	16.5%
Sponsorship	27	13.1%

The majority of the initiatives owned the various programs making up 70.4 percent of the population, with 16.5 percent using partnering, and 13.1 percent using sponsorship. This makes up one of the largest majorities in this study.

These organizations were also coded to understand how they conduct their initiatives. This proved the most variable within the dataset. Table 13 shows the distribution of these types of approaches.

Table 13

How Organizations in the Population Implement CSR Initiatives

Method of Implementing Program	Number of Initiatives	Percent
Supply Chain Ethics	62	30.1%
Community Involvement	93	45.1%
Stakeholder Engagement	160	77.7%
Sponsorship	85	41.3%
Product Development	82	39.8%
Brick and Mortar Innovations	39	18.9%
Lobbying	1	0.5%

It should be noted at this point that these variables were not mutually exclusive, allowing for selection of multiple approaches. Thus one initiative could have as many as seven approaches, with the most any one initiative had was six, an initiative called “Supporting Conservation Globally” by Marriott International. Sponsorship of money, time, or goods was the most utilized implementation method. This differs from the aforementioned sponsorship of how each initiative is approached. An initiative may be owned by the organization and also implement elements of sponsorship. Thus it could be coded as both owned or partnered as an approach, while being implemented using sponsorship as a method.

Organizations were also coded to see if there was any type of mention of a matching program, it was found that 11 initiatives mentioned a matching program of some sort, being utilized by 5.3 percent of the population.

Additionally, organizations were coded to see how frequently they mentioned running their initiatives through nonprofits. It was found that seven organizations made no mention of creating a separate nonprofit and nine did create separate nonprofit foundations, always named after the organization, such as “The Coca-Cola Foundation.” Of those nine organizations, there were 15 initiatives that mentioned using nonprofits, equaling 7.3 percent of the total population.

Coca-Cola and Starbucks both mentioned using their nonprofit foundations to run their programs the most, with four initiatives each that are run through separate nonprofits.

For additional information, please see Appendix D, which contains the number of mentions and the percentages for each of the variables measured for each organization.

Chapter Five: Discussion

This study set out to understand what these top-performing organizations were communicating about their CSR programs, what their relationship with government entities was, where and how these programs were being implemented throughout the world, and what issues these programs were striving to approach and how they relate to issues that are the most important to stakeholders. This study found that the information conveyed on these corporate websites reveals that these organizations value stakeholders above all other variables measured and that they focus on the environment second most. They mention a surprisingly large involvement with government entities, national or foreign, along with surprisingly little mention of news coverage about their CSR initiatives, such as news reports or articles.

This study provides a unique perspective on the state of CSR in corporate America, as no other study has done as comprehensive an analysis for as many large organizations. Thus this study can speak with some authority about what these large organizations value, which may, in turn, affect how other organizations conduct their CSR programs, as these are the leaders in the field.

Influence of Stakeholders

This study found that stakeholder engagement was overwhelmingly the most frequently communicated aspect of CSR. Within this sample, companies mentioned stakeholder engagement either in a majority of their initiatives, (at least 60 percent of the time) as found in all but five of the organizations, or they did not communicate it at all (as found with Dell, Disney, PepsiCo, and Xerox). This shows that the majority of these organizations highly value the input and opinion of their stakeholders and they want to communicate it.

Valuing the opinion of stakeholders is reasonable for organizations, as CSR has been

shown to garner a positive relationship with stakeholders, earning them social capital (Godfrey, 2005). These organizations must also maintain a positive relationship with their stakeholders, as, in many cases, these organizations have contracts with their stakeholders, which drives how they go about making management and organizational decisions (Jones, 1995). By its very nature, CSR concedes that organizations must conduct their business differently. As stated by Doh and Guay (2006), “CSR suggests that companies have responsibilities beyond those of their shareholders to include those of other stakeholders (employees, suppliers, environmentalists, communities, etc.) and the broader society in which they operate” (p. 65). These stakeholders influence the high-level decisions of what to include in a CSR program and whether or not to have one at all. Rather than the media serving to directly set the agenda for these organizations, it serves to indirectly influence the agenda by telling stakeholders what to think about. These stakeholders then in turn influence these organizations to address certain topics, though, obviously, it depends on the power the stakeholder holds within the organization (Tench, Bowd, & Jones, 2007). Those stakeholders with more of a stake in the organization will be able to exert the most influence over the organization’s agenda.

However, organizations can only do so much to please stakeholders. They must also move forward their business goals. The issue of pleasing stakeholders is only growing more demanding with the rise and mainstreaming of CSR in large organizations. As stated by Pearce (2005):

The more prickly aspect of CSR is that for all of their resources and capabilities, corporations will face growing demands for social responsibility contributions far beyond simple cash or in-kind donations. Aggressive protesters will keep the issues hot;

employees will continue to have their say; and shareholders will pass judgment with their investments — and their votes (para. 48).

This study only proved to show the power that stakeholders have in affecting the agenda that organizations have in their CSR programs. For example, Colgate-Palmolive has an initiative called “Supporting Colgate People” that provides professional development, gives seed money to Colgate people to develop innovative products and give back to the community, supports diversity and inclusion, and promotes the health, wellness, and safety of Colgate-Palmolive’s employees. More than any other element examined in this study, organizations mentioned stakeholders, such as employees who volunteered to give back or shareholders who espouse their corporate values, and their involvement in their CSR programs. For organizations such as those included in this study, stakeholders wield great power, as these types of organizations are the organizations that hold immense power in the global economy. Better understanding the agenda of these stakeholders and how they assert their influence would serve to enrich the study of CSR.

Governance

Organizations have three different options for how they want to govern their CSR programs: they can run the program in-house and have sole ownership, they can collaborate with another organization (typically a nonprofit organization) and act as a partner, or they can give charitable contributions of time, money, or goods and be a sponsor (Husted, 2003). Husted (2003) found that most organizations were giving charitable contributions as their form of CSR. Contrary to this finding, this study found that the vast majority of the initiatives were run in-house and were owned entirely by the organization being studied. This could indicate a shift in how CSR programs are governed. Rather than simply giving donations, which is the least time-

intensive of the options, these large corporations are becoming more involved and taking a much more time-intensive approach to how they are governing their CSR programs.

This shift in governance toward organizations running their programs in-house seems entirely reasonable. If organizations have their names attached to any type of effort (philanthropic or otherwise) they would most likely want those efforts to reflect well on their organization. The best way to ensure that a CSR effort is reflecting well on their organizations is to have the greatest amount of control over it, which they get through running their own programs and initiatives.

As nonprofit organizations and for-profit ventures have complimentary resources, they often make good pairings (Jamali & Keshishian, 2009). However, partnerships only comprised 16.5 percent of the initiatives in the population. According to Seitanidi and Crane (2009) partnerships between businesses and nonprofit organizations are becoming increasingly important for businesses in their CSR implementations. Though it appears that many of these organizations within this sample population (nine of 16) have created their own nonprofit organizations, typically named after the organization (e.g. The Coca-Cola Foundation). Along with this, it was unclear from much of the information presented on the corporate websites examined if the organization was running their CSR initiatives through their own nonprofit organizations or if the nonprofit organization was involved in something else entirely.

Thus, more research is needed in this area. This study was unable to ascertain clearly what the relationship was between the parent organization and its nonprofit organization, if there was any mention of one to begin with. In order to better understand the relationship between CSR and the news media, perhaps a study could conduct interviews with the organization and its nonprofit organization. If news coverage does exist that paints the organization in a favorable

light, the organization should include this in their CSR pages so as to increase its transparency. Obviously, organizations would not want to include negative coverage, thus objective research would need to be conducted to ascertain if there is a positive or negative correlation between CSR and the news media. It also remains to be seen whether having ownership of CSR programs is the most effective approach for organizations to take. As the organizations in this study largely run their own programs, it would be beneficial to conduct further research to verify if this is, indeed, the best route for organizations to take as they endeavor to develop, modify, and implement CSR initiatives in their organizations.

Public Policy, Working with Government

Remarkably, very little research has been done in the area of CSR and its involvement in the government, especially as CSR interfaces with public policy. Thus, it is difficult to place this in the larger context of CSR in general; however, this study serves to act as part of the foundation for this area of CSR research. For this sample population, as was outlined previously, there was a somewhat large number of initiatives that mentioned working with a government entity, with a fairly even split between the United States government and foreign governments. The relationship between these organizations and the governments they had a relationship with was rarely explicitly defined. However, these organizations typically worked in conjunction with governments in times of disaster, aiding in the relief of those who were affected. There was also mention of working on public policy in some of these initiatives.

Interestingly, some companies mentioned working toward affecting public policy (e.g. Microsoft) as part of its role as a global citizen. However, other companies (e.g. Colgate-Palmolive) specifically mention no attempts to influence public policy, as they viewed it as unethical to be involved in those endeavors. Future research should ascertain what the role of

business should be in attempting to influence public policy, or if, in fact, it has no place in the public sphere.

CSR Implementation Methods and Brand Fit

Many organizations have adopted CSR programs to garner a more favorable response from consumers and stakeholders (Nan & Heo, 2007). Cause-related marketing can do much for a company if it has the correct brand fit with a social issue, so long as both the organization and the social issue serve the same consumer market or if both parties share a similar value (Nan & Heo, 2007). Research has shown that people respond more favorably when people, or organizations, have a personal connection with the cause they are aligning themselves with (Ratner, Zhao, & Clarke, 2011). Corporations can do this by aligning themselves with a cause that is related to their overall mission and the values they espouse.

This study set out to understand the implementation methods that organizations used in their CSR programs, such as whether they use community outreach, brick and mortar innovations, product development, lobbying, stakeholder engagement, supply chain ethics, or a combination of these factors. This study found that many of the organizations that were studied tended to choose implementation methods and topics that were closely tied to their brand. For companies that were more product-driven, such as Dell, they implemented CSR initiatives that were also more product driven, such as designing products with less of a carbon footprint or products that were easier to recycle. Dell includes this in part of its mission statement, “Through innovations in packaging, energy efficiency and e-recycling, we're giving our customers the power to do more while consuming less to minimize their eco-footprint.” By closely aligning its CSR program with its mission statement, Dell can foster greater trust in its brand by promoting social issues that are a good brand fit.

Additionally Coca-Cola, for example, has done extensive community outreach, specifically in health initiatives. This may seem counterintuitive for a brand that is largely known for selling sugary beverages; however, Coca-Cola has many brands that are also aligned closely with a healthy lifestyle, such as Evian, Odwalla and Honest Tea. These initiatives align closely with part of Coca-Cola's values statement, which states, "Sustainability is at the heart of the Coca-Cola story. Together with our bottling partners, we've long worked to build stronger, healthier, more active communities and advance environmental conservation. Why? Because we know our business can only be as healthy, vibrant and resilient as the communities we proudly serve." Here the company mentions valuing the community and health, which it then implements in its CSR program.

For companies, such as Marriott International, that were based in physical facilities, like hotels, they tended to make more brick and mortar changes to their operations and implement those as CSR initiatives, such as Marriott International striving for LEED certification on their hotels. This can be seen in part of Marriott International's value statement, "Our decades-long commitment to the environment starts at the top, with our executive-level Global Green Council. We aspire to be the global hospitality leader in demonstrating how responsible hotel management can create economic opportunities and be a positive force for the environment." Marriott International has a brand that has a larger carbon footprint than a software company would have, thus its concern with the environment is a good brand fit, as it has a vested interest in ensuring the environment remain at a satisfactory level to sustain Marriott International's operations.

For companies who have a somewhat delicate supply chain, as Starbucks has with their coffee, cocoa, and tea sourcing, they tended to emphasize their ethics in their supply chain.

Starbucks also made it clear it was not violating any human rights through its product sourcing. This can be seen in part of its value statement, which states, “So it is our vision that together we will elevate our partners, customers, suppliers and neighbors to create positive change. To be innovators, leaders and contributors to an inclusive society and a healthy environment so that Starbucks and everyone we touch can endure and thrive.” Starbucks has a vested interest in ensuring its supply chain is ethical, as stakeholders uncovering nefarious practices would likely damage the trust of the stakeholders and perhaps the brand would also take a hit.

Organizations are wise to choose implementation methods and issues that are closely aligned with their brand. It will most likely be viewed with less skepticism by the organization’s stakeholders, as they will be able to more clearly see the rationale behind the selection of these CSR elements. These stakeholders are probably more likely to buy in to the CSR initiatives of the organizations that choose CSR initiatives with a strong brand fit.

News Coverage

Economic firms, such as large corporations, are dependent upon the news media to cover stories about their CSR programs so that information makes it to more of their stakeholders (Einweller, Carroll, & Korn, 2010). News coverage of CSR is mostly negative in tone and can even misrepresent and misreport, though perhaps unintentionally, what the organization is actually doing (Tench, Bowd, & Jones, 2007). CSR can be viewed based on either its strengths or its weaknesses. While companies have much more flexibility when it comes to the strengths of its CSR programs, it only has so much space to improve its weaknesses. These weaknesses often stem from the industry wherein the company is located, such as the environmental impact that an oil company has (Zyglidopoulos, Carroll, Georgiadis, & Siegel, 2012). However, CSR can also serve to bolster the reputation of the company (Godfrey, Merrill, & Hansen, 2009). Perhaps this

boost in reputation could serve to offset the negative depictions by the news media or even skew public opinion in favor of the organization. More research will need to be conducted to test the correlation of this relationship.

Notwithstanding these findings, there has been little research dedicated to the relationship between CSR and the news media. Within this study, there was little mention of any news coverage, such as links to news articles, of the CSR initiatives included in this study, only six organizations mentioned any type of news coverage, Disney mentioning news coverage the most out of the sample. This study shows that organizations either do not value the news coverage that is created about its CSR initiatives or there is little coverage of these initiatives. These negative depictions of their CSR programs would likely dissuade the organizations from putting any indication of news coverage on their websites, as they would likely want their CSR programs to be viewed in a positive light. There is possibly little these companies can do to mitigate the negative media coverage they receive, which could come from the industry that these organizations are located within. However, more research needs to be done in this area to better understand this relationship. Future studies could interview these organizations about their views on media coverage and their relationship with news media. This could work in conjunction with an analysis of the news coverage of these CSR initiatives to gauge how positive or negative it is to understand if there is perhaps some correlation between the two.

Issues Addressed by CSR Programs

Clarkson (1995, p. 100) stated, “It is necessary to distinguish between stakeholder issues and social issues because corporations and their managers manage relationships with their stakeholders and not with society.” Thus, corporations are more concerned with the issues that

are of importance to their stakeholders, rather than those that are of most importance to society as a whole.

Within this study, the top six issues approached by these organizations were the environment, education, the economy, crime, poverty and homelessness, and healthcare. Of these six, the economy, education, and healthcare were the top issues listed in the most important issues list gathered by Gallup. This could indicate some influence by the public at large for the agenda of these CSR programs, or it could indicate the influence of the public on the organizations' stakeholders, or perhaps these variables are all unrelated, though this is unlikely. Further research would need to prove some type of positive correlation between these issues and the issues approached by these CSR programs. It's entirely possible that organizations include initiatives that address these issues either because they are the proverbial low hanging fruit (i.e. it is much easier to incorporate a corporate recycling program than it is to stop violence against women) or because they have received negative news coverage in that past (i.e. for unethical treatment of those in its global supply chain, such as farmers and miners) and they are using CSR to help bolster their public reputation. The aforementioned discussion by Clarkson (1995) could explain why the remaining issues these organizations communicated about did not align with the priority of the issues that are the most important in the nation. For instance, the environment ranked in the bottom third of the most important issues, and yet it was twice as prevalent as education, the second-most mentioned issue in this study.

It is likely that the agenda of the awards these companies were listed in has an influence on the agenda of these organizations' CSR programs. For example, *Forbes* 100 Best Corporate Citizens places greater emphasis on programs that include environmental impact and employee relations initiatives, whereas the RepTrak100 rated organizations based on their stakeholder

relations in various aspects of the entire organization's governance. These awards could serve to drive the agenda of these CSR programs, as winning an award would likely foster positive feelings toward the organization among stakeholders. Additionally, the news media may influence the agenda of these awards by influencing what Americans identify as the most important issues. These issues then comprise the agenda for the awards that these organizations strive to receive.

Environment. This study showed a strong emphasis in organizations communicating about environmental issues. Each organization in this sample had at least one initiative that focused on some type of environmental issue, ranging from recycling to water issues to climate change. Many of the organizations within the sample had entire sections of their CSR program dedicated to communicating about their dedication toward sustainability. One such example is Marriott International, which had its CSR program split into three sections, one of which was dedicated to sustainability and the environment.

It is likely that this issue, as with the other issues, are influenced by the attention given to it by stakeholders and the media, as well as the criteria for these prestigious awards. As found by Liu, Lindquist, and Vedlitz (2011), attention-grabbing factors like crises, political debates, or scandals tend to give issues greater salience. Thus, these issues are likely to fluctuate as they go in and out of favor with the public and with the media. Holt and Barkemeyer (2012, p. 13) discuss the current upswing in the salience of this issue in society today in the following passage:

In the climate change there is a clear delineation between the previous periods before 2003 and the increasing levels of coverage from this point on. The release of *An Inconvenient Truth* in 2006 may have played an important role in promoting this rise, as

there is no doubt that being associated with the political figure of Al Gore it was more likely to attract the attention of the newspaper media.

There are, of course, many factors that would give this issue greater salience, but it is evident that this issue is a widely accepted issue within the business world. Businesses likely feel pressure to adopt sustainability and other environment-focused practices and initiatives in their overall strategy, as was found by Babiak and Trendafilova (2011). It is clear, however, that stakeholders play a role in determining the salience of this issue, and other issues (Babiak & Trendafilova, 2011).

Ethical Sourcing/Human Rights. Within this study, the issues regarding ethical sourcing, human rights, and business ethics (such as anti-corruption, anti-bribery, and anti-fraud) arose frequently. On Aug 13, 2003, the United Nations Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights approved the “Norms on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises with Regard to Human Rights” (Weissbrodt & Kruger, 2003). One of the pillars of these norms apply to corporations. This portion of the norms dictate that organizations must avoid infringing on the rights of workers and they must also address any negative impacts they’ve had (Weissbrodt & Kruger, 2003). It would follow that this resolution has influenced multinational organizations

The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) has been going through a civil war for decades, killing millions. One of the facets of that conflict have been the minerals that are mined and used in many consumer electronics, such as cell phones and computers (Raj, 2010; Epstein & Yuthas, 2011). Stakeholders are seeking to interrupt the supply chain of these companies to mitigate the conflict in the DRC and encourage a different management of these supply chains (Epstein & Yuthas, 2011).

Surprisingly, there has been little current research into the ethical sourcing of coffee, tea, and cocoa. What little research has been done on this topic is nearly a decade old, which was nearly at the beginning of the mainstreaming of CSR across major corporations. As such, the research available discusses how the concerns of the growers are not included in corporate CSR programs, rather the corporation seeks to advance its viewpoints on ethical trade without taking into consideration the viewpoints of the growers (Blowfield, 2004). However, Starbucks, the organization in this sample that concerns itself with this issue, has several initiatives aimed at improving the conditions of the growers and ensuring their economical future. It cannot be determined at this time whether this meets the needs of the growers; though it is likely that Starbucks has partnered with these growers and is invested in keeping their relationships intact so they continue to help provide the necessary products for the company's overall success.

To gain a more updated and comprehensive view of these issues, further research should be conducted. Future studies could replicate past studies regarding these issues to understand how they have developed in the past decade. Additionally, perhaps a field study could be conducted to observe and understand the complexity of these issues for both the organizations and the farmers.

Education. Education has long been an important issue within the realm of CSR. Matten and Moon (2008) found that education was the second-most prominent stakeholder issue within their study, though it was significantly less prominent in other countries. Thus, education is likely a more important issue to Americans than to other nationalities. Education is an oft-touted issue in modern-day politics and in the news media. Seemingly innumerable nonprofits aim to improve education both in the United States and abroad. Additionally, the future of these organizations depends on the rising generation. Without an educated workforce, from the lowest

levels to the highest levels, these organizations will not have any future. Thus, it is unsurprising that this study also found that education was the second most frequently mentioned issue within this sample. It is an important issue in the minds of American stakeholders and, as these major organizations aim to please their stakeholders, it would follow that they would highly emphasize education in their initiatives—especially the education of women and children, a currently hot topic within the social innovation realm.

Geographic Placement of CSR Programs

Within the area of CSR and geographical focus, there was a large emphasis placed on initiatives that were implemented in the North American region, with the majority of those initiatives being implemented in the United States. As this is the area that has the most stakeholders for these organizations, it seems logical that these organizations would want to focus a significant portion of their philanthropic efforts where the largest contingents of their stakeholders reside. These stakeholders would be able to more readily see the impact of these positively intended programs, as they are located within areas that are likely to be more visible.

Among the other areas of the world, the Asian, Latin American, and Sub-Saharan African regions were the most frequently mentioned international areas of emphasis. These areas are likely areas of interest because of their relationships with the organizations that are implementing programs there. They could either be areas where they have a supplier base or plant or where they have a population of customers.

The research regarding CSR in developing countries is currently a contentious and polarized area of study, where, as Blowfield and Frynas (2005, p. 499) state,

A critical agenda is needed because many policy-makers see business as important in meeting development challenges: not just those of economic growth, but also in areas

such as combating HIV/AIDS, reducing poverty and building human capital. Moreover, government, civil society and business all to some extent see CSR as a bridge connecting the arenas of business and development, and increasingly discuss CSR programmes in terms of their contribution to development.

Business has now become more than simply business. It is seen as an actor in the policy-making and development arenas. Researchers must view these contributions objectively so as to accurately assess whether the impact of CSR is, in fact, a positive one.

The areas of CSR are so broad and diverse that there still exist many gaps in the research. In many ways, these programs are still in their infancy as organizations, governments, and communities grapple with how to best alleviate the issues that plague the developing world, trying to find the balance between the role of the state in development against the role of business to contribute to society (Peinado-Vara, 2006). Some wonder what the function of CSR serves for these developing countries, as CSR is “clearly a Western construct” (Hilston, 2012, p. 132).

It is unlikely that organizations will halt doing business or implement CSR programs in developing countries as they are some of the most rapidly growing economies. They are also where many social and environmental issues are located (Visser, 2008). Large organizations have much to be gained by investing in these developing countries. They offer a venue for financial prosperity and for social good. However, though the benefits may be many for the organization implementing the CSR program, the developing countries on the receiving end of these programs may actually be impeded in their progress (Blowfield & Frynas, 2005; Hilston, 2012).

When developing countries distort rules and incentives for business, for example, they

penalize productive companies. Such countries are doomed to poverty, low wages, and selling off their natural resources. Corporations have the know-how and resources to change this state of affairs, not only in the developing world but also in economically disadvantaged communities in advanced economies (Porter and Kramer 2006, p. 91–92).

This dynamic of having organizations conduct CSR programs in developing countries is obviously a complicated issue and, as recent literature states—and applies to many of the areas of CSR research—“[it] is certainly a gray area in need of further research” (Hilston, 2012, p. 135–136).

Chapter Six: Conclusion

Unsurprisingly, stakeholder engagement was the prevalent similarity among this sample population. Though this study did not determine the relationship of different elements within CSR programs, stakeholder engagement appears to be the driving force behind what issues organizations incorporate in their initiatives, their involvement with government entities, and their inclusion, or, in the case of the organizations in this sample, exclusion, of news coverage of these initiatives. It appears that it is not the news media who set the agenda for these organizations, it is as those in their supply chain, employees, shareholders, and other stakeholders. These are the publics that matter to these organizations, whether because they have contracts with them or because they are the ones who affect their reputation and their stock value.

Brand fit, or the relatedness of CSR initiatives with overall branding and organizational strengths, was also an emergent theme within the realm of this study, with many organizations approaching issues and solutions in a way that aligned closely with business value statements and strengths. It seems logical that organizations would want to promote issues and implementation methods that go with their brand, both so people trust that these organizations know what they are doing and also so they can strengthen their own brand and align it with these socially promotional causes.

The environment was an area of huge emphasis for this population with nearly half of the initiatives discussing this area. The reasons for this emphasis could not be ascertained with this type of approach. However, it could be because of the salience of this issue in society today or it could also be because these type of tangible efforts resonate better with stakeholders, rather than

a more nebulous issue like poverty. It could also be because initiatives aligning themselves with environmental issues are a better brand fit for these organizations.

If an organization would like to, at the very least, receive one of the top awards these organizations in this study earned, they would do well to follow the patterns of these top-performing organizations. These organizations serve as an exemplar of best practices for CSR programs for other organizations to follow. The organizations in this study reveal certain patterns in their CSR programs, such as running their own CSR initiatives, rather than choosing sponsorship through money, goods, or time or partnering with other organizations. Additionally, they keep their CSR programs aligned with their strengths and with their brand, revealing that other organizations would do well to choose CSR efforts that have a good brand fit. These organizations also value stakeholder input in their programs along with focusing on the environment. It is simply smart business to pay attention to the needs and wants of an organization's stakeholders, as they have the most vested interest in the success of that organization. If they remain happy, they will remain invested in the organization.

Limitations

There were several limitations within this study. Its inherently descriptive nature limits the ability to understand the motivations behind these trends and also the relationships among these elements. Additionally, as the unit of analysis was the self-selected information these organizations communicated on their websites, the information was inherently biased toward the organization, as the organizations would inevitably put a positive spin on what they share. Other research methods will need to be used in future research to better explain and explore the findings of this study.

This study was also limited to the information that these organizations were willing to communicate. This significantly limits the discovery of whether what the organization is communicating is a truly transparent representation of what is happening in their programs; however, as this was a communications study, it was the aim of this study to understand what they were communicating, rather than how what they communicated was compared to the nature of these organizations' CSR programs. As some of the organizations were more expansive in their explanations than other organizations, it is possible that what these organizations are actually doing is different from the findings of this study. However, what they communicated was the aim of this study. Further research could delve into this comparison if an appropriate method were outlined.

Future Research

This area of communications research still needs much research done. This study served as a foundation for future studies, showing what patterns these top-performing organizations were following through analyzing which areas were most prevalent and which were not covered often. These trends can be further explored through other approaches so as to better ascertain the motivations behind them.

Although it seems a logical fit, due to the economic power that these large organizations possess, they do not entangle themselves in trying to influence public policy. In fact, some even state clearly that they think it unethical to be involved in politics and to try to influence lawmaking. More research will need to be done to truly understand this area of CSR not only to discover how organizations are involving themselves in affecting public policy, but also to understand whether or not this involvement is ethical in the first place.

Another area of research could include a better understanding of the news media's connection with CSR. This is an area that is gaining more traction; however, it is still underdeveloped and needs more research done to fully understand the relationship between these two entities.

Yet another area of research is the role of CSR in the developing world. There remain many unanswered questions regarding the benefit of CSR in these countries. CSR is, undoubtedly, a Western construct and it may or may not actually be beneficial to the countries that it's being implemented in. It is possible that different methods would be more effective than those that are currently being employed. Thus, future research could also aim to discover how effective these programs are. This study, being descriptive rather than exploratory, was limited in its ability to determine if these programs were making a positive impact in the areas it was attempting to aid and influence.

References

- Atkinson, G. (2000). Measuring corporate sustainability. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 43(2), 235–252.
- Babiak, K., & Trendafilova, S. (2011). CSR and environmental responsibility: motives and pressures to adopt green management practices. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 18(1), 11–24.
- Blowfield, M. (2003). Ethical supply chains in the cocoa, coffee and tea industries. *Greener Management International*, 2003(43), 14–24.
- Blowfield, M., & Frynas, J. G. (2005). Editorial. Setting new agendas: critical perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility in the developing world. *International Affairs*, 81(3), 499–513.
- Boyd, D. E., Spekman, R. E., Kamauff, J. W., & Werhane, P. (2007). Corporate social responsibility in global supply chains: a procedural justice perspective. *Long Range Planning*, 40(3), 341–356.
- Haigh, M. M., Brubaker, P., & Whiteside, E. (2013). Facebook: Examining the information presented and its impact on stakeholders. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 18(1), 52–69.
- Burke, L., & Logsdon, J. M. (1996). How corporate social responsibility pays off. *Long Range Planning*, 29(4), 495–502. doi:10.1016/0024-6301(96)00041-6.
- Campbell, J. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 946–967.

- Carroll, C. & McCombs, M. (2003). Agenda-setting effects of business news on the public's images and opinions about major corporations. *Corporate Reputation Review* 6(1): 36–46.
- Clarkson, M. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 92–117.
- Cohen, B. C. (1963). *The press and foreign policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 3–21.
- Davis, K. (1977). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities, In A.Carroll (ed.), *Managing Corporate Social Responsibility*, Little, Brown & Co. Boston, MA.
- Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 20-47.
doi:10.5465/AMR.1997.9707180258
- Deephouse, D.L. & Heugens, P.P. (2009). Linking social issues to organizational impact: The role of infomediaries and the infomediary process. *Journal of Business Ethics* 86(4): 541–553.
- Dentchev, N. (2004). Corporate social performance as a business strategy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 55(4), 397–412.
- Doh, J. P., & Guay, T. R. (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility, Public Policy, and NGO Activism in Europe and the United States: An Institutional–Stakeholder Perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(1), 47–73.

- Donaldson, L., & Davis, J. H. (1991). Stewardship Theory or Agency Theory: CEO Governance and Shareholder Returns. *Australian Journal of Management (University of New South Wales)*, 16(1), 49.
- Du, S., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2010). Maximizing business returns to corporate social responsibility (CSR): The role of CSR communication. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 8-19. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00276.x
- Du, S., Swaen, V., Lindgreen, A., Sen, S. (2013). The roles of leadership styles in corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(1), 155-169).
- Du, S., & Vieira Jr, E. T. (2012). Striving for legitimacy through corporate social responsibility: Insights from oil companies. *Journal of business ethics*, 110(4), 413-427.
- Eberl, M., & Schwaiger, M. (2005). Corporate reputation: Disentangling the effects on financial performance. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39, 838–854.
- Einwiller, Sabine A., Craig E. Carroll and Kati Korn (2010). Under What Conditions Do the News Media Influence Corporate Reputation? The Roles of Media Dependency and Need for Orientation. *Corporate Reputation Review* 12(4): 299–315.
- Elkington, J. (2004). Enter the triple bottom line. *The triple bottom line: Does it all add up*, 1–16.
- Epstein, M. J., & Yuthas, K. (2011). Conflict minerals: Managing an emerging supply-chain problem. *Environmental Quality Management*, 21(2), 13–25.
- Fombrun, C., & Shanley, M. (1990). What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 233–258.
- Fontaine, M. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and sustainability: The new bottom line? *International Journal of Business & Social Science*, 4(4), 110–119.

- Frey, L. R., & Cissna, K. N. (Eds.). (2009). *Routledge Handbook of Applied Communication Research*. Routledge.
- Glavas, A., Godwin, L. N. (2013). Is the perception of ‘goodness’ good enough? Exploring the relationship between perceived corporate social responsibility and employee organizational identification. *Journal of Business Ethics, 114*(1), 15-27.
- Godfrey, P. C. (2005). The relationship between corporate philanthropy and shareholder wealth: A risk management perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(4), 777–798.
- Godfrey, P. C., Merrill, C. B., & Hansen, J. M. (2009). The relationship between corporate social responsibility and shareholder value: An empirical test of the risk management hypothesis. *Strategic Management Journal, 30*(4), 425–445.
- Grafström, M., & Windell, K. (2011). The role of infomediaries: CSR in the business press during 2000–2009. *Journal of business ethics, 103*(2), 221-237.
- Hilson, G. (2012). Corporate social responsibility in the extractive industries: Experiences from developing countries. *Resources Policy, 37*(2), 131–137.
- Hooks, J., Coy, D., & Davey, H. (2002). The information gap in annual reports. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 15*(4), 501–522.
- Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis for the social science and humanities*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Holt, D., & Barkemeyer, R. (2012). Media coverage of sustainable development issues—Attention cycles or punctuated equilibrium? *Sustainable development, 20*(1), 1–17.
- Husted, B. (2003). Governance choices for corporate social responsibility: to contribute, collaborate or internalize? *Long Range Planning, 36*(5), 481–498.

- Husted, B. & Allen D. (2007). Strategic corporate social responsibility and value creation among large firms: Lessons from the Spanish experience. *Long Range Planning*, 40(6), 594–610.
- Jamali, D., & Keshishian, T. (2009). Uneasy alliances: Lessons learned from partnerships between businesses and NGOs in the context of CSR. *Journal of business Ethics*, 84(2), 277–295.
- Jones, T. M. (1995). Instrumental stakeholder theory: A synthesis of ethics and economics. *Academy of management review*, 20(2), 404–437.
- Kiousis, S., Popescu, C., & Mitrook, M. (2007). Understanding influence on corporate reputation: An examination of public relations efforts, media coverage, public opinion, and financial performance from an agenda-building and agenda-setting perspective. *Journal of Public Relations Research* 19(2): 147–165.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lang, G. E., & Lang, K. (1981). Watergate: An exploration of the agenda-building process. *Mass Communication Review Yearbook*, 2, 447–468.
- Lee, S. Y., & Carroll, C. E. (2011). The emergence, variation, and evolution of corporate social responsibility in the public sphere, 1980–2004: The exposure of firms to public debate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104(1), 115-131.
- Lindgreen, A. & Swaen, V. (2010, March). Corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 1–7. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00277.x.
- Luo, J., Meier, S., & Oberholzer-Gee, F. (2012). *No news is good news: CSR strategy and newspaper coverage of negative firm events*. Harvard Business School.

- Maloni, M. J., & Brown, M. E. (2006). Corporate social responsibility in the supply chain: an application in the food industry. *Journal of business ethics*, 68(1), 35–52.
- Maon, F., Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2010). Organizational stages and cultural phases: A critical review and a consolidative model of corporate social responsibility development. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 20–38. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00278.x
- Margolis, J.D. & Elfenbein, H.A. (2008). Do well by doing good? Don't count on it. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(1): 19–20.
- Matsaganis, M. D., & Payne, J. G. (2005). Agenda setting in a culture of fear: The lasting effects of September 11 on American politics and journalism. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(3), 379–392.
- McCombs, M. (2005). A look at agenda-setting: Past, present and future. *Journalism Studies*, 6(4), 543–557.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- McWilliams, A., Siegel, D. S., & Wright, P. M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: Strategic implications. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(1), 1–18. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00580.x
- McWilliams A. & Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 117–127.
- Meijer, M. M., & Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2006). Issue news and corporate reputation: Applying the theories of agenda setting and issue ownership in the field of business communication. *Journal of Communication*, 56(3), 543-559.

- Nan, X., & Heo, K. (2007). Consumer responses to corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives: examining the role of brand-cause fit in cause-related marketing. *Journal of Advertising, 36*(2), 63–74.
- Norman, W., & MacDonald, C. (2004). Getting to the bottom of “triple bottom line.” *Business Ethics Quarterly, 243–262*.
- Pearce, J. A., & Doh, J. P. (2012). The high impact of collaborative social initiatives. *Sloan Management Review, 46*(2).
- Peinado-Vara, E. (2006). Corporate social responsibility in Latin America. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship, 21*, 61–69.
- Pollach, I. (2013). Corporate environmental reporting and news coverage of environmental issues: An agenda-setting perspective. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.
- Porter, M.E., Kramer, M.R., 2006. The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review 84* (6), 1–14.
- Pratt, C. B. (2006). Reformulating the emerging theory of corporate social responsibility as good governance. *Public Relations Theory II, 249–277*.
- Raj, S. (2010). Blood electronics: Congo's conflict minerals and the legislation that could cleanse the trade. *S. Cal. L. Rev., 84*, 981.
- Ratner, R., Zhao, M., & Clarke, J. (2011). The norm of self-interest: Implications for charitable giving. In D. M. Oppenheimer & C. Y. Olivola (Eds.), *The Science of Giving* (113–131). New York: Psychology Press.
- Rawlins, B. (2008). Give the emperor a mirror: Toward developing a stakeholder measurement of organizational transparency. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 21*(1), 71–99.

- Romani, S. Grappi, S., Bagozzi, P. (2013). Explaining consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility: The role of gratitude and altruistic values. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(2), 193–206.
- Russo, A., & Perrini, F. (2010). Investigating stakeholder theory and social capital: CSR in large firms and SMEs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91(2), 207–221.
- Saxena, M. & Kohli, A. S. (2012). Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Corporate Sustainability: A Study of the Indian Banking Industry. *IUP Journal of Corporate Governance*, 11(4), 39-54.
- Skeat, J. J., & Perry, A. A. (2008). Grounded theory as a method for research in speech and language therapy. *International Journal Of Language & Communication Disorders*, 43(2), 95–109. doi:10.1080/13682820701437245
- Seitanidi, M. M., & Crane, A. (2009). Implementing CSR through partnerships: Understanding the selection, design and institutionalisation of nonprofit-business partnerships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(2), 413–429.
- Tedesco, J. C. (2001). Issue and strategy agenda-setting in the 2000 Presidential Primaries. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44(12), 2048–2067.
- Tench, R., Bowd, R., & Jones, B. (2007). Perceptions and perspectives: Corporate social responsibility and the media. *Journal of Communication Management*, 11(4), 348–370.
- Trumbo, C. W. (2004). Research methods in mass communication research: A census of eight journals 1990-2000. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(2), 417–436.
- Visser, W., 2008. Corporate Social Responsibility in Developing Countries. In: Crane, A., et al. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility in Developing Countries*. Oxford University Press, UK, pp. 473–479.

- Wang, A. (2007). Priming, framing, and position on corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 19(2), 123–145.
- Weissbrodt, D., & Kruger, M. (2003). Norms on the responsibilities of transnational corporations and other business enterprises with regard to human rights. *Am. J. Int'l L.*, 97, 901–922.
- Welford, R. (2005). Corporate social responsibility in Europe, North America and Asia. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 17(2), 33–52.
- Yin, R. (2014). Analyzing case study evidence. *Case Study Research*. (5th ed.) Los Angeles, Ca: Sage Publications, p.133–175.
- Young, W. & Tilley, F. (2006). Can businesses move beyond efficiency? The shift toward effectiveness and equity in the corporate sustainability debate. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 15(6), 402–415.
- Zyglidopoulos, S., Carroll, C., Georgiadis, A., & Siegel, D. (2012). Does media attention drive corporate social responsibility? *Journal of Business Research*, 65(11), 1622–1627.

Appendix A

Coding Sheet Entire Program

1. Name of Company: _____
 2. Date of Site Visit: _____
 3. URL: _____
 4. Do they communicate their CSR program on their website?
 - a. No (If no, then end) Yes (If yes, then:)
 5. CSR tab on main landing page: No Yes
 6. Title of CSR tab: Sustainability Citizenship Responsibility Other: _____
 7. How many clicks to get to CSR information: _____
 8. Includes a CSR report? No Yes
 9. Includes more than CSR report? No Yes
 10. Text only? No (If no, then skip to 11) Yes (If yes, then answer 10a and 10b)
 - a. Videos? No Yes
 - b. Images? No Yes
 11. How many initiatives does this company have? _____
 12. How do they run their program? (check all that apply)
 - a. Partnering? No Yes If yes, how many? _____
 - b. Sponsorship? No Yes If yes, how many? _____
 - c. Ownership of program? No Yes If yes, how many? _____
 13. Created nonprofit/foundation? No Yes If yes, how many? _____
- Framing of CSR initiatives (check all that apply)
14. Environmental dimension No Yes
 15. Social dimension No Yes
 16. Economic dimension No Yes
 17. Stakeholder dimension No Yes
 18. Voluntariness dimension No Yes

Appendix B

Coding Sheet Initiatives

1. Name of Company: _____
2. Title or description of CSR Initiative: _____
3. Date of Site Visit: _____
4. URL: _____
5. Approach (mark only one):
 - a. Ownership of program
 - b. Partnering
 - c. Sponsorship (If this is selected, please check all that apply)
 - i. Money
 - ii. Time
 - iii. Goods
6. Mention of matching program or similar? No Yes
7. Run through own nonprofit? No Yes

Which problems does the initiative address? (check all that apply)

8. Minority groups No Yes
9. Privacy No Yes
10. Immigration No Yes
11. Gun policy No Yes
12. Environment No Yes
 - a. Energy policy No Yes
 - b. Clean Water No Yes
 - c. Water scarcity No Yes
 - d. Recycling No Yes
 - e. Climate change No Yes
 - f. Emissions No Yes
 - g. Other _____
13. Women's issues No Yes
 - a. Abortion No Yes
 - b. Domestic abuse No Yes
 - c. Prostitution No Yes
 - d. Other _____
14. Children's issues No Yes
 - a. Child abuse No Yes
 - b. Malnutrition No Yes
 - c. Other _____
15. Crime No Yes
 - a. Anti-violence No Yes
 - b. Terrorism No Yes
 - c. Anti-slavery No Yes

- d. Other: _____
16. Poverty No Yes
- a. Homelessness No Yes
- b. Hunger No Yes
- c. Other _____
17. Healthcare No Yes
18. Education No Yes
19. Economy No Yes
20. Health No Yes
- a. Public health No Yes
- b. Obesity No Yes
- c. Smoking No Yes
- d. Drugs No Yes
21. Community Outreach No Yes
22. Employee Engagement No Yes
23. Diversity No Yes
24. Veterans/Military issues No Yes
25. Other No Yes _____
26. Reference to news story, news release, quote from news source, etc.? No Yes
27. Mention of triple bottom line? No Yes
- a. If yes, then which of these is mentioned? (Check all that apply):
- People Planet Profit
28. Mention of working with government on this initiative?
- No (If no, then skip to 25)
- Yes (if yes, then answer the following questions:)
- a. Where is it located?
- National Foreign (write all countries): _____
- b. Work on public policy? No Yes: _____
29. Where are these initiatives being implemented?
- National Foreign (write all countries): _____
30. Mention of “transparency”? No Yes
31. Mention of “philanthropy”? No Yes
32. Mention of “volunteer”? No Yes
33. Mention of “research and development”? No Yes: Industry? _____
34. Mention of “innovation”? No Yes: _____
35. Mention of acting ethically? No Yes

How they conduct program (check all that apply):

36. Supply chain ethics No Yes
37. Community involvement No Yes
38. Stakeholder engagement No Yes
39. Sponsorship No Yes

40. Product development/innovation No Yes

41. Brick and mortar innovations No Yes

42. Other No Yes _____

Appendix C

Codebook

Coding Sheet Entire Program

4. There should be a specific location for all CSR information on the company website. Do not code information that is embedded within other non-CSR initiatives. This study concerns itself with specific programs and initiatives run through these corporations.

12. Partnering: Working with another organization, for-profit, nonprofit, or in the public sector on a project.
 Sponsorship: Having no other involvement in an initiative other than contribution of money, time, or goods
 Ownership of program: Organization created program (or took over program from another organization) and runs the program exclusively

13. Created, not partnered with.

- 14–17. Framing: All of these intended to be a comprehensive view of how the company views their CSR efforts. Are they looking at themselves as environmental stewards? Do they concern themselves with their stakeholder relationships? Do they see their efforts as going beyond what is legally or financially expected of them?

14. Environmental dimension: (dealing with the natural environment, sustainability, going green, environmental impact; ex. “a cleaner environment,” “environmental stewardship,” or “environmental concerns in business operations”)
15. Social dimension (Relationship between business and society; ex. contribute to a better society, integrate social concerns in their business operations, consider the full scope of their impact on communities)
16. Economic dimension (Describing CSR in terms of a business operation, incl. financial aspects; ex. Contribute to economic development, preserving the profitability, business operations)
17. Stakeholder dimension (Mention of interfacing with key publics/stakeholders; ex. Interaction with their stakeholders, how organizations interact with their employees, suppliers, customers and communities)
18. Voluntariness dimension (Actions not prescribed by law; ethics; ex. Based on ethical values, beyond legal obligations, voluntary actions)

Coding Sheet Initiatives

6. Mention of matching program: Some type of mention of “For every dollar you donate to X organization, we will match it up to X amount of money” or similar.

Types of issues:

8. Minority groups: Focus of campaign is on minorities (any non-Caucasian group, women not considered minority group in this instance)

9. Privacy: Anything dealing with privacy of individuals or groups, including any Internet-related privacy issues
11. Gun policy: Anything concerning Second Amendment rights, for or against
12. Environment: Anything dealing with nature, natural resources, going green, sustainability, etc.
- 12a. Energy policy: Any issue focused on the interface of public policy and the environment
13. Women's issues: Any issue dealing with women's rights at its core
- 13a. Domestic abuse: This does not include child abuse. Only abuse dealing wherein the woman (above age 14) is the victim. Does not need to be sexual in nature.
- 14a. Child abuse: Does not need to be sexual in nature. Children are considered those younger than 14.
15. Crime: Any type of law breaking, including white collar crime.
- 15c. Anti-slavery: Any type of human trafficking, national or international, child or adult.
16. Poverty: Living below the poverty line. Any problem that the company links to poverty is acceptable here.
21. Community Outreach: This refers to any initiative that mentions improving the communities it impacts.
22. Employee Engagement: This refers to any type of initiative that mentions improving the work lives of its employees
23. Diversity: Any initiative that mentions promoting any type of diversity (ethnic, gender, age, etc.)
24. Veterans/Military issues: Any type of issue that touches on the military or veterans of the military.

How they conduct program:

33. Supply chain ethics: This refers to any mention of behaving ethically within the supply chain. This includes suppliers, manufacturing, outsourcing, labor to get product made. Refers specifically to product supply chain, not services.
34. Community involvement: Working with local communities on initiatives.
35. Stakeholder engagement: Working with stakeholders (managers, employees, customers, suppliers, etc.)
36. Sponsorship: Publicly offering monetary support to an entity
37. Product development/innovation: Changes to products or innovating of products that have social impact
38. Brick and mortar innovations: Changes to physical infrastructures that have social impact

Appendix D

Table D1

Mentions and Frequencies for Entire Population

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	145	70.4%	Environment Overall	92	44.7%
Partnering	34	16.5%	Energy Policy	35	17.0%
Sponsorship	27	13.1%	Clean Water	21	10.2%
Money	27	13.1%	Water Scarcity	32	15.5%
Time	17	8.3%	Recycling	32	15.5%
Goods	15	7.3%	Climate Change	21	10.2%
Matching Program	11	5.3%	Emissions	39	18.9%
Nonprofit	15	7.3%	Environment Other	44	21.4%
News Stories	13	6.3%	Women's Issues	16	7.8%
Triple Bottom Overall	16	7.8%	Domestic Abuse	1	0.5%
People	13	6.3%	Women's Other	15	7.3%
Planet	14	6.8%	Children's Issues	28	13.6%
Profit	11	5.3%	Child Abuse	4	1.9%
Government	41	19.9%	Malnutrition	7	3.4%
National Government	26	12.6%	Children's Other	27	13.1%
Foreign Government	28	13.6%	Crime Overall	23	11.2%
Public Policy	10	4.9%	Anti-Violence	4	1.9%
National	160	77.7%	Anti-Slavery	6	2.9%
Foreign	151	73.3%	Crime Other	21	10.2%
Transparency	11	5.3%	Poverty	20	9.7%
Philanthropy	7	3.4%	Homelessness	5	2.4%
Volunteer	28	13.6%	Hunger	9	4.4%
Ethics	24	11.7%	Food Security	6	2.9%
Supply Chain	62	30.1%	Poverty Other	1	0.5%
Community Involvement	93	45.1%	Healthcare	18	8.7%
Stakeholder Engagement	160	77.7%	Education	50	24.3%
Sponsorship	85	41.3%	Health	34	16.5%
Product Development	82	39.8%	Public Health	13	6.3%
Brick and Mortar	39	18.9%	Obesity	8	3.9%
Other approach	1	0.5%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	18	8.7%	Drugs	1	0.5%
Privacy	1	0.5%	Mental Health	2	1.0%
Immigration	1	0.5%	Employee Engagement	66	32.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Diversity	16	7.8%
Economy	31	15.0%	Military/Veteran	7	3.4%
Unemployment	16	7.8%	Disaster Relief	15	7.3%
			Other	38	18.4%

Table D2

Mentions and Frequencies for 3M

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	11	64.7%	Environment Overall	14	82.4%
Partnering	3	17.6%	Energy Policy	2	11.8%
Sponsorship	3	17.6%	Clean Water	2	11.8%
Money	3	17.6%	Water Scarcity	2	11.8%
Time	2	11.8%	Recycling	4	23.5%
Goods	2	11.8%	Climate Change	1	5.9%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	6	35.3%
Nonprofit	2	11.8%	Pollution	7	41.2%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	0	0.0%
Triple Bottom Overall	3	17.6%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	2	11.8%	Women's Other	0	0.0%
Planet	3	17.6%	Children's Issues	1	5.9%
Profit	2	11.8%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	2	11.8%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	2	11.8%	Children's Other	1	5.9%
Foreign Government	0	0.0%	Crime Overall	0	0.0%
Public Policy	0	0.0%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	14	82.4%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	12	70.6%	Crime Other	0	0.0%
Transparency	0	0.0%	Poverty	1	5.9%
Philanthropy	1	5.9%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	2	11.8%	Hunger	1	5.9%
Ethics	0	0.0%	Food Security	1	5.9%
Supply Chain	3	17.6%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	4	23.5%	Healthcare	1	5.9%
Stakeholder Engagement	11	64.7%	Education	2	11.8%
Sponsorship	5	29.4%	Economy	0	0.0%
Product Development	11	64.7%	Unemployment	0	0.0%
Brick and Mortar	4	23.5%	Health	4	23.5%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	2	11.8%
Minority Groups	0	0.0%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	2	11.8%
			Diversity	0	0.0%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	1	5.9%
			Other	2	11.8%

Table D3

Mentions and Frequencies for Cisco

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	5	41.7%	Environment Overall	1	8.3%
Partnering	6	50.0%	Energy Policy	1	8.3%
Sponsorship	1	8.3%	Clean Water	0	0.0%
Money	1	8.3%	Water Scarcity	0	0.0%
Time	1	8.3%	Recycling	1	8.3%
Goods	0	0.0%	Climate Change	0	0.0%
Matching Program	1	8.3%	Emissions	1	8.3%
Nonprofit	0	0.0%	Environment Other	0	0.0%
News Stories	2	16.7%	Women's Issues	2	16.7%
Triple Bottom Overall	1	8.3%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	1	8.3%	Women's Other	2	16.7%
Planet	1	8.3%	Children's Issues	3	25.0%
Profit	1	8.3%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	5	41.7%	Malnutrition	1	8.3%
National Government	0	0.0%	Children's Other	3	25.0%
Foreign Government	4	33.3%	Crime Overall	0	0.0%
Public Policy	0	0.0%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	5	41.7%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	8	66.7%	Crime Other	0	0.0%
Transparency	1	8.3%	Poverty	2	16.7%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	4	33.3%	Hunger	1	8.3%
Ethics	0	0.0%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	1	8.3%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	11	91.7%	Healthcare	5	41.7%
Stakeholder Engagement	5	41.7%	Education	6	50.0%
Sponsorship	8	66.7%	Economy	5	41.7%
Product Development	3	25.0%	Unemployment	2	16.7%
Brick and Mortar	1	8.3%	Health	2	16.7%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	2	16.7%
Minority Groups	0	0.0%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	1	8.3%
			Employee Engagement	2	16.7%
			Diversity	0	0.0%
			Military/Veteran	1	8.3%
			Disaster Relief	4	33.3%
			Other	0	0.0%

Table D4

Mentions and Frequencies for Colgate-Palmolive

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	17	77.3%	Environment Overall	8	36.4%
Partnering	2	9.1%	Energy Policy	3	13.6%
Sponsorship	3	13.6%	Clean Water	2	9.1%
Money	3	13.6%	Water Scarcity	4	18.2%
Time	0	0.0%	Recycling	3	13.6%
Goods	3	13.6%	Climate Change	2	9.1%
Matching Program	2	9.1%	Emissions	3	13.6%
Nonprofit	0	0.0%	Environment Other	5	22.7%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	2	9.1%
Triple Bottom Overall	0	0.0%	Domestic Abuse	1	4.5%
People	0	0.0%	Women's Other	1	4.5%
Planet	0	0.0%	Children's Issues	4	18.2%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	1	4.5%
Government	5	22.7%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	3	13.6%	Children's Other	4	18.2%
Foreign Government	3	13.6%	Crime Overall	2	9.1%
Public Policy	0	0.0%	Anti-Violence	1	4.5%
National	18	81.8%	Anti-Slavery	1	4.5%
Foreign	15	68.2%	Crime Other	1	4.5%
Transparency	0	0.0%	Poverty	0	0.0%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	2	9.1%	Hunger	0	0.0%
Ethics	4	18.2%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	4	18.2%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	9	40.9%	Healthcare	0	0.0%
Stakeholder Engagement	14	63.6%	Education	3	13.6%
Sponsorship	3	13.6%	Economy	0	0.0%
Product Development	11	50.0%	Unemployment	0	0.0%
Brick and Mortar	4	18.2%	Health	5	22.7%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	2	9.1%
Minority Groups	1	4.5%	Obesity	1	4.5%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	6	27.3%
			Diversity	0	0.0%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	1	4.5%
			Other	6	27.3%

Table D5

Mentions and Frequencies for Dell

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	9	60.0%	Environment Overall	6	40.0%
Partnering	3	20.0%	Energy Policy	3	20.0%
Sponsorship	3	20.0%	Clean Water	0	0.0%
Money	3	20.0%	Water Scarcity	1	6.7%
Time	3	20.0%	Recycling	5	33.3%
Goods	2	13.3%	Climate Change	1	6.7%
Matching Program	2	13.3%	Emissions	2	13.3%
Nonprofit	0	0.0%	Environment Other	3	20.0%
News Stories	3	20.0%	Women's Issues	1	6.7%
Triple Bottom Overall	2	13.3%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	2	13.3%	Women's Other	1	6.7%
Planet	3	20.0%	Children's Issues	2	13.3%
Profit	1	6.7%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	3	20.0%	Malnutrition	1	6.7%
National Government	2	13.3%	Children's Other	2	13.3%
Foreign Government	1	6.7%	Crime Overall	2	13.3%
Public Policy	1	6.7%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	11	73.3%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	9	60.0%	Crime Other	2	13.3%
Transparency	1	6.7%	Poverty	1	6.7%
Philanthropy	1	6.7%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	5	33.3%	Hunger	1	6.7%
Ethics	1	6.7%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	4	26.7%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	6	40.0%	Healthcare	1	6.7%
Stakeholder Engagement	0	0.0%	Education	3	20.0%
Sponsorship	4	26.7%	Economy	0	0.0%
Product Development	6	40.0%	Unemployment	0	0.0%
Brick and Mortar	3	20.0%	Health	0	0.0%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	4	26.7%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	5	33.3%
			Diversity	0	0.0%
			Military/Veteran	2	13.3%
			Disaster Relief	2	13.3%
			Other	0	0.0%

Table D6

Mentions and Frequencies for Ford

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	6	100.0%	Environment Overall	3	50.0%
Partnering	0	0.0%	Energy Policy	0	0.0%
Sponsorship	0	0.0%	Clean Water	0	0.0%
Money	0	0.0%	Water Scarcity	2	33.3%
Time	0	0.0%	Recycling	1	16.7%
Goods	0	0.0%	Climate Change	1	16.7%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	2	33.3%
Nonprofit	0	0.0%	Environment Other	1	16.7%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	0	0.0%
Triple Bottom Overall	1	16.7%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	1	16.7%	Women's Other	0	0.0%
Planet	0	0.0%	Children's Issues	0	0.0%
Profit	1	16.7%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	0	0.0%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	0	0.0%	Children's Other	0	0.0%
Foreign Government	0	0.0%	Crime Overall	1	16.7%
Public Policy	0	0.0%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	3	50.0%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	4	66.7%	Crime Other	0	0.0%
Transparency	0	0.0%	Poverty	0	0.0%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	1	16.7%	Hunger	0	0.0%
Ethics	0	0.0%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	1	16.7%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	2	33.3%	Healthcare	0	0.0%
Stakeholder Engagement	4	66.7%	Education	2	33.3%
Sponsorship	1	16.7%	Economy	1	16.7%
Product Development	4	66.7%	Unemployment	1	16.7%
Brick and Mortar	2	33.3%	Health	0	0.0%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	0	0.0%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	1	16.7%
			Diversity	0	0.0%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	0	0.0%
			Other	1	16.7%

Table D7

Mentions and Frequencies for GE

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	11	84.6%	Environment Overall	10	76.9%
Partnering	1	7.7%	Energy Policy	8	61.5%
Sponsorship	1	7.7%	Clean Water	3	23.1%
Money	1	7.7%	Water Scarcity	4	30.8%
Time	1	7.7%	Recycling	2	15.4%
Goods	0	0.0%	Climate Change	3	23.1%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	6	46.2%
Nonprofit	1	7.7%	Environment Other	4	30.8%
News Stories	1	7.7%	Women's Issues	2	15.4%
Triple Bottom Overall	0	0.0%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	0	0.0%	Women's Other	3	23.1%
Planet	0	0.0%	Children's Issues	1	7.7%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	1	7.7%
Government	7	53.8%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	5	38.5%	Children's Other	2	15.4%
Foreign Government	3	23.1%	Crime Overall	3	23.1%
Public Policy	3	23.1%	Anti-Violence	2	15.4%
National	10	76.9%	Anti-Slavery	1	7.7%
Foreign	8	61.5%	Crime Other	5	38.5%
Transparency	2	15.4%	Poverty	1	7.7%
Philanthropy	1	7.7%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	1	7.7%	Hunger	0	0.0%
Ethics	5	38.5%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	5	38.5%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	4	30.8%	Healthcare	6	46.2%
Stakeholder Engagement	9	69.2%	Education	3	23.1%
Sponsorship	3	23.1%	Economy	4	30.8%
Product Development	7	53.8%	Unemployment	2	15.4%
Brick and Mortar	4	30.8%	Health	4	30.8%
Other approach	1	7.7%	Public Health	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	2	15.4%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	4	30.8%
			Diversity	0	0.0%
			Military/Veteran	1	7.7%
			Disaster Relief	0	0.0%
			Other	5	38.5%

Table D8

Mentions and Frequencies for Intel

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	10	58.8%	Environment Overall	8	47.1%
Partnering	2	11.8%	Energy Policy	5	29.4%
Sponsorship	5	29.4%	Clean Water	1	5.9%
Money	5	29.4%	Water Scarcity	2	11.8%
Time	2	11.8%	Recycling	1	5.9%
Goods	2	11.8%	Climate Change	1	5.9%
Matching Program	3	17.4%	Emissions	3	17.4%
Nonprofit	2	11.8%	Environment Other	4	23.5%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	2	11.8%
Triple Bottom Overall	3	17.4%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	2	11.8%	Women's Other	1	5.9%
Planet	3	17.4%	Children's Issues	1	5.9%
Profit	3	17.4%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	1	5.9%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	0	0.0%	Children's Other	1	5.9%
Foreign Government	0	0.0%	Crime Overall	1	5.9%
Public Policy	1	5.9%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	9	52.9%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	9	52.9%	Crime Other	1	5.9%
Transparency	1	5.9%	Poverty	0	0.0%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	1	5.9%	Hunger	0	0.0%
Ethics	1	5.9%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	2	11.8%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	6	35.3%	Healthcare	0	0.0%
Stakeholder Engagement	13	76.5%	Education	4	23.5%
Sponsorship	8	47.1%	Economy	2	11.8%
Product Development	7	41.2%	Unemployment	0	0.0%
Brick and Mortar	2	11.8%	Health	1	5.9%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	2	11.8%	Obesity	1	5.9%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	8	47.1%
			Diversity	0	0.0%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	0	0.0%
			Other	3	17.4%

Table D9

Mentions and Frequencies for Marriott International

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	7	58.3%	Environment Overall	5	41.7%
Partnering	3	25.0%	Energy Policy	5	41.7%
Sponsorship	2	16.7%	Clean Water	1	8.3%
Money	2	16.7%	Water Scarcity	5	41.7%
Time	2	16.7%	Recycling	2	16.7%
Goods	0	0.0%	Climate Change	1	8.3%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	2	16.7%
Nonprofit	0	0.0%	Environment Other	3	25.0%
News Stories	1	8.3%	Women's Issues	0	0.0%
Triple Bottom Overall	0	0.0%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	0	0.0%	Women's Other	0	0.0%
Planet	0	0.0%	Children's Issues	2	16.7%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	1	8.3%
Government	1	8.3%	Malnutrition	1	8.3%
National Government	0	0.0%	Children's Other	1	8.3%
Foreign Government	0	0.0%	Crime Overall	3	25.0%
Public Policy	0	0.0%	Anti-Violence	1	8.3%
National	10	83.3%	Anti-Slavery	2	16.7%
Foreign	10	83.3%	Crime Other	1	8.3%
Transparency	0	0.0%	Poverty	3	25.0%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	1	8.3%
Volunteer	2	16.7%	Hunger	1	8.3%
Ethics	1	8.3%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	4	33.3%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	4	33.3%	Healthcare	1	8.3%
Stakeholder Engagement	8	66.7%	Education	2	16.7%
Sponsorship	5	41.7%	Economy	3	25.0%
Product Develop	3	25.0%	Unemployment	2	16.7%
Brick and Mortar	2	16.7%	Health	0	0.0%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	0	0.0%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	3	25.0%
			Diversity	0	0.0%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	1	8.3%
			Other	0	0.0%

Table D10

Mentions and Frequencies for Microsoft

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	11	100.0%	Environment Overall	2	18.2%
Partnering	0	0.0%	Energy Policy	1	9.1%
Sponsorship	0	0.0%	Clean Water	0	0.0%
Money	0	0.0%	Water Scarcity	0	0.0%
Time	0	0.0%	Recycling	1	9.1%
Goods	0	0.0%	Climate Change	1	9.1%
Matching Program	2	18.2%	Emissions	1	9.1%
Nonprofit	0	0.0%	Environment Other	0	0.0%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	0	0.0%
Triple Bottom Overall	0	0.0%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	0	0.0%	Women's Other	0	0.0%
Planet	0	0.0%	Children's Issues	0	0.0%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	4	36.4%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	4	36.4%	Children's Other	0	0.0%
Foreign Government	3	27.3%	Crime Overall	3	27.3%
Public Policy	2	18.2%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	10	90.9%	Anti-Slavery	1	9.1%
Foreign	9	81.8%	Crime Other	2	18.2%
Transparency	2	18.2%	Poverty	0	0.0%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	1	9.1%	Hunger	0	0.0%
Ethics	2	18.2%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	4	36.4%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	7	36.4%	Healthcare	0	0.0%
Stakeholder Engagement	10	90.9%	Education	2	18.2%
Sponsorship	7	36.4%	Economy	2	18.2%
Product Development	2	18.2%	Unemployment	1	9.1%
Brick and Mortar	1	9.1%	Health	1	9.1%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	1	9.1%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	5	45.5%
			Diversity	3	27.3%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	2	18.2%
			Other	2	18.2%

Table D11

Mentions and Frequencies for Nike

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	10	100.0%	Environment Overall	6	60.0%
Partnering	0	0.0%	Energy Policy	2	2.0%
Sponsorship	0	0.0%	Clean Water	2	2.0%
Money	0	0.0%	Water Scarcity	2	2.0%
Time	0	0.0%	Recycling	3	30.0%
Goods	0	0.0%	Climate Change	2	2.0%
Matching Program	1	10.0%	Emissions	3	30.0%
Nonprofit	1	10.0%	Environment Other	1	10.0%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	1	10.0%
Triple Bottom Overall	0	0.0%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	0	0.0%	Women's Other	1	10.0%
Planet	0	0.0%	Children's Issues	1	10.0%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	1	10.0%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	1	10.0%	Children's Other	1	10.0%
Foreign Government	1	10.0%	Crime Overall	0	0.0%
Public Policy	1	10.0%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	8	80.0%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	8	80.0%	Crime Other	0	0.0%
Transparency	0	0.0%	Poverty	1	10.0%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	0	0.0%	Hunger	0	0.0%
Ethics	0	0.0%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	8	80.0%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	2	20.0%	Healthcare	0	0.0%
Stakeholder Engagement	7	70.0%	Education	0	0.0%
Sponsorship	1	10.0%	Economy	0	0.0%
Product Development	7	70.0%	Unemployment	0	0.0%
Brick and Mortar	1	10.0%	Health	0	0.0%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	0	0.0%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	1	10.0%
			Diversity	1	10.0%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	0	0.0%
			Other	2	2.0%

Table D12

Mentions and Frequencies for PepsiCo

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	10	66.7%	Environment Overall	6	40.0%
Partnering	4	26.7%	Energy Policy	1	6.7%
Sponsorship	1	6.7%	Clean Water	3	20.0%
Money	1	6.7%	Water Scarcity	3	20.0%
Time	1	6.7%	Recycling	1	6.7%
Goods	1	6.7%	Climate Change	1	6.7%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	1	6.7%
Nonprofit	1	6.7%	Environment Other	1	6.7%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	1	6.7%
Triple Bottom Overall	0	0.0%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	0	0.0%	Women's Other	1	6.7%
Planet	0	0.0%	Children's Issues	4	26.7%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	2	13.3%	Malnutrition	2	13.3%
National Government	1	6.7%	Children's Other	3	20.0%
Foreign Government	2	13.3%	Crime Overall	1	6.7%
Public Policy	0	0.0%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	0	0.0%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	0	0.0%	Crime Other	1	6.7%
Transparency	0	0.0%	Poverty	2	13.3%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	2	13.3%	Hunger	1	6.7%
Ethics	2	13.3%	Food Security	1	6.7%
Supply Chain	7	46.7%	Poverty Other	1	6.7%
Community Involvement	8	53.3%	Healthcare	1	6.7%
Stakeholder Engagement	0	0.0%	Education	4	26.7%
Sponsorship	6	40.0%	Economy	0	0.0%
Product Development	6	40.0%	Unemployment	0	0.0%
Brick and Mortar	3	20.0%	Health	4	26.7%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	2	13.3%
Minority Groups	3	20.0%	Obesity	3	20.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	1	6.7%
			Employee Engagement	4	26.7%
			Diversity	1	6.7%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	1	6.7%
			Other	2	13.3%

Table D13

Mentions and Frequencies for Starbucks

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	11	61.1%	Environment Overall	9	50.0%
Partnering	4	22.2%	Energy Policy	2	11.1%
Sponsorship	3	16.7%	Clean Water	3	16.7%
Money	3	16.7%	Water Scarcity	2	11.1%
Time	2	11.1%	Recycling	2	11.1%
Goods	2	11.1%	Climate Change	1	5.6%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	3	16.7%
Nonprofit	4	22.2%	Environment Other	6	33.3%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	1	5.6%
Triple Bottom Overall	1	5.6%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	1	5.6%	Women's Other	1	5.6%
Planet	1	5.6%	Children's Issues	1	5.6%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	1	5.6%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	0	0.0%	Children's Other	1	5.6%
Foreign Government	1	5.6%	Crime Overall	5	27.8%
Public Policy	1	5.6%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	11	61.1%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	13	72.2%	Crime Other	5	27.8%
Transparency	1	5.6%	Poverty	1	5.6%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	1	5.6%
Volunteer	1	5.6%	Hunger	0	0.0%
Ethics	4	22.2%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	7	38.9%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	7	38.9%	Healthcare	0	0.0%
Stakeholder Engagement	14	77.8%	Education	3	16.7%
Sponsorship	9	50.0%	Economy	6	33.3%
Product Development	2	11.1%	Unemployment	3	16.7%
Brick and Mortar	5	27.8%	Health	2	11.1%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	1	5.6%
Minority Groups	2	11.1%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	5	27.8%
			Diversity	1	5.6%
			Military/Veteran	1	5.6%
			Disaster Relief	0	0.0%
			Other	2	11.1%

Table D14

Mentions and Frequencies for UPS

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	7	70.0%	Environment Overall	1	10.0%
Partnering	3	30.0%	Energy Policy	1	10.0%
Sponsorship	0	0.0%	Clean Water	0	0.0%
Money	0	0.0%	Water Scarcity	1	10.0%
Time	0	0.0%	Recycling	1	10.0%
Goods	0	0.0%	Climate Change	1	10.0%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	1	10.0%
Nonprofit	0	0.0%	Environment Other	1	10.0%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	1	10.0%
Triple Bottom Overall	0	0.0%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	0	0.0%	Women's Other	1	10.0%
Planet	0	0.0%	Children's Issues	2	20.0%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	1	10.0%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	1	10.0%	Children's Other	2	20.0%
Foreign Government	1	10.0%	Crime Overall	0	0.0%
Public Policy	0	0.0%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	0	0.0%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	4	40.0%	Crime Other	0	0.0%
Transparency	0	0.0%	Poverty	4	40.0%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	2	20.0%
Volunteer	2	20.0%	Hunger	3	30.0%
Ethics	0	0.0%	Food Security	3	30.0%
Supply Chain	2	20.0%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	8	80.0%	Healthcare	1	10.0%
Stakeholder Engagement	9	90.0%	Education	8	80.0%
Sponsorship	8	80.0%	Economy	3	30.0%
Product Development	1	10.0%	Unemployment	3	30.0%
Brick and Mortar	2	20.0%	Health	1	10.0%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	1	10.0%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	1	10.0%	Drugs	1	10.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	5	50.0%
			Diversity	3	30.0%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	1	10.0%
			Other	2	20.0%

Table D15

Mentions and Frequencies for Xerox

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	5	83.3%	Environment Overall	2	33.3%
Partnering	0	0.0%	Energy Policy	1	16.7%
Sponsorship	1	16.7%	Clean Water	1	16.7%
Money	1	16.7%	Water Scarcity	1	16.7%
Time	1	16.7%	Recycling	1	16.7%
Goods	1	16.7%	Climate Change	1	16.7%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	1	16.7%
Nonprofit	0	0.0%	Environment Other	0	0.0%
News Stories	2	33.3%	Women's Issues	0	0.0%
Triple Bottom Overall	1	16.7%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	1	16.7%	Women's Other	0	0.0%
Planet	1	16.7%	Children's Issues	0	0.0%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	1	16.7%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	1	16.7%	Children's Other	0	0.0%
Foreign Government	1	16.7%	Crime Overall	0	0.0%
Public Policy	1	16.7%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	0	0.0%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	0	0.0%	Crime Other	0	0.0%
Transparency	1	16.7%	Poverty	1	16.7%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	1	16.7%	Hunger	0	0.0%
Ethics	1	16.7%	Food Security	1	16.7%
Supply Chain	3	50.0%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	2	33.3%	Healthcare	1	16.7%
Stakeholder Engagement	0	0.0%	Education	2	33.3%
Sponsorship	5	83.3%	Economy	1	16.7%
Product Development	2	33.3%	Unemployment	1	16.7%
Brick and Mortar	1	16.7%	Health	3	50.0%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	1	16.7%
Minority Groups	2	33.3%	Obesity	1	16.7%
Privacy	1	16.7%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	0	0.0%
			Diversity	3	50.0%
			Military/Veteran	1	16.7%
			Disaster Relief	0	0.0%
			Other	2	33.3%

Table D16

Mentions and Frequencies for Coca-Cola

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	7	53.8%	Environment Overall	6	46.2%
Partnering	3	23.1%	Energy Policy	0	0.0%
Sponsorship	3	23.1%	Clean Water	3	23.1%
Money	3	23.1%	Water Scarcity	2	15.4%
Time	1	7.7%	Recycling	3	23.1%
Goods	1	7.7%	Climate Change	2	15.4%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	3	23.1%
Nonprofit	4	30.8%	Environment Other	5	38.5%
News Stories	0	0.0%	Women's Issues	3	23.1%
Triple Bottom Overall	3	23.1%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	2	15.4%	Women's Other	3	23.1%
Planet	1	7.7%	Children's Issues	5	38.5%
Profit	3	23.1%	Child Abuse	1	7.7%
Government	6	46.2%	Malnutrition	2	15.4%
National Government	4	30.8%	Children's Other	5	38.5%
Foreign Government	6	46.2%	Crime Overall	2	15.4%
Public Policy	0	0.0%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	11	84.6%	Anti-Slavery	1	7.7%
Foreign	12	92.3%	Crime Other	2	15.4%
Transparency	2	15.4%	Poverty	1	7.7%
Philanthropy	4	30.8%	Homelessness	0	0.0%
Volunteer	2	15.4%	Hunger	0	0.0%
Ethics	1	7.7%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	4	30.8%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	8	61.5%	Healthcare	1	7.7%
Stakeholder Engagement	11	84.6%	Education	3	23.1%
Sponsorship	7	53.8%	Economy	4	30.8%
Product Development	7	53.8%	Unemployment	1	7.7%
Brick and Mortar	3	23.1%	Health	6	46.2%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	3	23.1%
Minority Groups	1	7.7%	Obesity	2	15.4%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	5	38.5%
			Diversity	0	0.0%
			Military/Veteran	1	7.7%
			Disaster Relief	1	7.7%
			Other	6	46.2%

Table D17

Mentions and Frequencies for Walt Disney

Keyword	Mentions	Frequency	Keyword	Mentions	Frequency
Ownership	8	88.9%	Environment Overall	5	55.6%
Partnering	0	0.0%	Energy Policy	0	0.0%
Sponsorship	1	11.1%	Clean Water	0	0.0%
Money	1	11.1%	Water Scarcity	1	11.1%
Time	1	11.1%	Recycling	1	11.1%
Goods	1	11.1%	Climate Change	2	22.2%
Matching Program	0	0.0%	Emissions	1	11.1%
Nonprofit	0	0.0%	Environment Other	1	11.1%
News Stories	4	44.4%	Women's Issues	0	0.0%
Triple Bottom Overall	1	11.1%	Domestic Abuse	0	0.0%
People	1	11.1%	Women's Other	0	0.0%
Planet	1	11.1%	Children's Issues	1	11.1%
Profit	0	0.0%	Child Abuse	0	0.0%
Government	1	11.1%	Malnutrition	0	0.0%
National Government	2	22.2%	Children's Other	1	11.1%
Foreign Government	2	22.2%	Crime Overall	0	0.0%
Public Policy	0	0.0%	Anti-Violence	0	0.0%
National	0	0.0%	Anti-Slavery	0	0.0%
Foreign	0	0.0%	Crime Other	0	0.0%
Transparency	0	0.0%	Poverty	2	22.2%
Philanthropy	0	0.0%	Homelessness	1	11.1%
Volunteer	1	11.1%	Hunger	1	11.1%
Ethics	2	22.2%	Food Security	0	0.0%
Supply Chain	3	33.3%	Poverty Other	0	0.0%
Community Involvement	5	55.6%	Healthcare	0	0.0%
Stakeholder Engagement	0	0.0%	Education	3	33.3%
Sponsorship	5	55.6%	Economy	0	0.0%
Product Development	3	33.3%	Unemployment	0	0.0%
Brick and Mortar	1	11.1%	Health	1	11.1%
Other approach	0	0.0%	Public Health	0	0.0%
Minority Groups	0	0.0%	Obesity	0	0.0%
Privacy	0	0.0%	Smoking	0	0.0%
Immigration	0	0.0%	Drugs	0	0.0%
Gun Policy	0	0.0%	Mental Health	0	0.0%
			Employee Engagement	4	44.4%
			Diversity	4	44.4%
			Military/Veteran	0	0.0%
			Disaster Relief	1	11.1%
			Other	3	33.3%

Appendix E

3M Co.
Abbott Laboratories
Advanced Micro Devices Inc.
Agilent Technologies Inc.
Air Products & Chemicals Inc.
Allergan Inc.
Altria Group Inc.
Amazon.com
Apple
AT&T, Inc.
Ball Corp.
Baxter International Inc.
Biogen Idec Inc
Boeing Co.
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.
Campbell Soup Co.
CH2M Hill
Chevron Corp.
Cisco Systems, Inc.
Clorox Co.
Coca-Cola Co.
Coca-Cola Enterprises Inc.
Colgate-Palmolive Co.
ConocoPhillips
Darden Restaurants, Inc.
Dell Inc.
Dominion Resources Inc.
Dow Chemical Co.
Duke Energy Corp.
E.I. DuPont De Nemours & Co.
eBay
Eli Lilly & Co.
EMC Corp.
Entergy Corp.
Exelon Corp.
Exxon Mobil Corp.
Fedex Corp.
Ford Motor Co.

Freeport-McMoran Copper & Gold Inc.
Gap, Inc.
General Electric Co.
General Mills, Inc.
General Motors Company
Goodyear
Google
H.J. Heinz Co.
Hershey Company
Hertz Global Holdings
Hess Corporation
Hewlett-Packard Co.
Hormel Foods Corp.
Intel Corp.
International Business Machines Corp.
International Paper Co.
Johnson & Johnson
Johnson Controls Inc.
JPMorgan Chase & Co.
Kellogg Company
Kimberly-Clark Corp.
Kraft Foods
Lockheed Martin Corp.
Marathon Oil Corporation
Marriott International
Mattel, Inc.
McGraw-Hill Cos., Inc.
Merck & Co., Inc.
MGM
Microsoft Corporation
Monsanto Co.
Mosaic Company
Motorola Solutions Inc.
Nike, Inc.
Northeast Utilities
Occidental Petroleum Corp.
Oracle Corp.
PepsiCo Inc.
Pfizer
PG&E Corp.

Philips Electronics
PPG Industries, Inc.
Praxair, Inc.
Procter & Gamble
Prudential Financial Inc.
PVH Corp.
Raytheon Co.
Rockwell Automation Inc.
Sempra Energy
Southwest Airlines Co.
Spectra Energy Corp.
Sprint Nextel
Starbucks Corp.
State Street Corp.
Target Corp.
Texas Instruments Inc.
TJX Companies, Inc.
United Parcel Service, Inc.
Verizon Communications
Volkswagen
Walt Disney Co.
Weyerhaeuser Co.
Whirlpool Corp.
Whole Foods Market
Xerox Corp.
Yum! Brands Inc.