

6-7-2014

The Rhetoric of Corporate Identity: Corporate Social Responsibility, Creating Shared Value, and Globalization

Carolyn Day
University of South Florida, 2carolynday@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Communication Commons](#), and the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Day, Carolyn, "The Rhetoric of Corporate Identity: Corporate Social Responsibility, Creating Shared Value, and Globalization" (2014). *USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/5209>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Graduate Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

The Rhetoric of Corporate Identity:
Corporate Social Responsibility, Creating Shared Value, and Globalization

by

Carolyn Day

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Communication
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Co-Major Professor: David Payne, Ph.D.
Co-Major Professor: Jane Jorgenson, Ph.D.
Mahuya Pal, Ph.D.
Walter Nord, Ph.D.

July7, 2014

Keywords: Corporate Citizenship, Critical Rhetoric, Postcolonialism, Critical Management

Copyright © 2014, Carolyn Day

Acknowledgments

As a Master's student in Los Angeles, California, I spent many a late night staying up writing my thesis feeling sure like all other ambitious graduate students that my supportive friends and family would be interested in reading it once I was finished. With the rare exception, this did not come true. I find myself once again in that space of hope in my writing, but this time with assuredness that there might just be a small crew who would gladly read any publications that I may write. For me to feel so confident in my academic effort and its potential import on others I have many people to thank. First and foremost, I extend my gratitude to my advisor David Payne. Our journey together (so far) has included many deliberations about the ways in which corporations use rhetoric as just another example of Burke's form of social drama in which the ultimate motive of such language is to perhaps purge guilt while furthering the complicated motivations of capitalism. Such conversations were effortlessly interwoven with musings about the merits of various wine regions around the world, descriptions of moments of existentialist crises, and good bowls of pho, all of which nourished us both equally. As a steadfast advisor his unquestioning support, encouragement, and unfailing interest in my professional and personal development has left a lasting impact on my academic career, my teaching, and my leadership skills. Jane Jorgenson was a valued committee member and co-advisor that taught me that gentleness and understatement can be blended with intellectual rigor and fortitude. From Mahuya Pal, I am forever grateful for learning that critical research can be useful to not only address some of the world's more serious problems, but that it can also be infused with a touch of humor, lightheartedness, and optimism. Walter Nord rounded out this

exceptional committee encouraging me with a twinkle in his eye to be mischievous and to challenge conventional ways of thinking, particularly in the management discipline.

Unusual circumstances brought me to the Department of Communication at USF but it is there that I found my academic home. I was fortunate enough to be academically tempered and supported by some dedicated faculty members including Mariaelena Bartesaghi who insisted that I bring rigor and transparency to my work and teaching while demonstrating an unshakable belief in the potential for my manuscripts to be published. Similarly, Loyd Pettegrew treated me like an equal from day one and shared his resources, insights, encouragement and career advice, pushing me to be my best. I have formed lasting memories from my fellow Ph.D. students who taught me that moments of brilliance and lifelong friendship can be forged amongst the trials and tribulations of being a graduate student. It is in this department that I also met many individuals and undergraduate students that helped shape me into a better teacher, friend, and colleague.

I end by recognizing my close friends and family who provided unfailing support: Christine Burke who was always excited to hear of my developments and prompted me to appreciate that this journey was also a spiritual experience, Lisa (Watinkson) Oliver who lastingly reminded me of the privileged position that I was in as a Ph.D. student and that I possessed the tenacity and intelligence to finish, Paula Fleischer, Jennifer Warner, Amy Thompson, Rick and my “Florida family” who provided a safe haven outside of graduate school, Harrison Bates who quietly watched and applauded me from afar, Chris Day who gave me his gentle encouragement from the other side of the world, and finally, Bryon Cipriani who although he joined me towards the end, immediately fell into step beside me and opened his heart and home, altering what doors will open for me in the future.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iv
Introduction: The Rhetoric of Corporate Identity	1
Methodology and Sample	10
Rhetorical Criticism as Theory	11
Burke's theory of identification	14
Postcolonialism	17
Rhetorical Criticism as Praxis	22
Campbell's process of rhetorical criticism	25
Chapter Breakdown	29
Chapter 1: Corporate Identity	
Theory and Practice	33
Managing Corporate Identity: The Scholar's View	34
Organizational Communication	35
Management	38
Marketing	41
Strategic Forms of Organizational Influence	45
Organizational Rhetoric	47
Public Relations	52
Maintaining Corporate Identity Through Corporate (ir)Responsibility	55
Tracing the Beginnings...	56
Strategic Ambiguity	61
'Good' Corporate Citizens	63
Corporate citizenship	63
A rhetorical form of corporate governance	65
CSR as a legitimation Strategy	67
Construction of 'ethos'	68
Removed from reality?	70
Narrow view of stakeholder relationships	71
Conclusion	72

Chapter 2: Committed to Doing Some Good?	
The Rhetoric of Corporate Social Responsibility	75
BP & ‘Ethos’ as Ameliorating Rhetoric	79
Muddied Reputation	81
Narratives of Legitimacy	83
‘‘We have economic integrity’’	85
Paying the bills	86
But avoiding responsibility	88
‘‘We are building a sustainable future’’	89
A focus on safety	91
Investments in environment restoration	93
But the damage has already been done	94
Language, Power, and Corporate Identity Management	96
Hidden Interests	98
Conclusion	101
Chapter 3: Creating Shared ‘Value’	
Rhetorical Identification Consummated	105
The Rhetorical Reinvention of Capitalism	111
Gaining Momentum	114
Rhetorical Toolkit	120
Vision	123
‘‘Be innovative’’	124
‘‘Win the hearts and minds of those at the top’’	126
Strategy	128
‘‘Act in your own self-interest’’	128
‘‘Set ambitious goals’’	129
Delivery	131
‘‘Leverage corporate assets’’	132
‘‘Engage in a holistic vision’’	133
‘‘Form strategic partnerships’’	134
Performance	135
‘‘Measure Progress’’	136
‘‘Communicate wins and challenges’’	136
‘‘Be reflexive and learn’’	138
‘‘Address issues at scale’’	139
An Ongoing Conversation	140
Conclusion	143
A parasitic relationship	144

Chapter 4: Conceding to the Heavenly Call	
CSV as a Vocabulary of Motives	147
God and Devil Terms in Corporate Discourse	152
CSV as a Vocabulary of Motives	156
Nutrition	157
Sanctified Form of Social Intervention	162
(Mal)nutrition as a transcendent motive	164
Rural Development	166
Famer Connect Program	168
The god like burden of ‘development’	171
Conclusion	172
Chapter 5: Reaching Out to ‘Emerging Markets’	
Globalization, Neo-imperialism, and the Rhetoric of CSV	176
The Postcolonial Approach	179
Discursive Formation of the ‘Other’	180
The Colonizing Process Through Non-traditional Means	181
Management and Organizational Contexts	183
Geopolitical Context	184
The Impact of Imperialistic Practices	185
Your Health – Brought to You by...	188
Neo-imperial Forms of Management	190
Rhetorical Divide	191
New way of doing business	193
Political-economic dominance	196
Core-periphery divide	198
Resource extraction	200
Denationalization	201
Conclusion	203
Trouble in Paradise	205
Global (kool)Aid	207
Conclusion: Companies Doing Some Good	
Being Socially ‘Responsible’	212
Permanent Positive Change?	217
Unsustainable Forms of Sustainability	218
(non)Democratic Forms of Global Governance	220
Communication as a Framework for Responsibility	223
Bibliography	226

Abstract

In today's global political and media climate, the stakes are high for corporations, local or otherwise, to create and maintain an 'ethical' perception of not only their daily business activities and how they can benefit society or protect the environment, but also their enduring characteristics or 'corporate identity' (Conrad, 2011) for numerous, sometimes conflicting stakeholder audiences (Cheney, 1983). This dissertation examines how such forms of 'socially responsible' corporate identities are created and maintained through the use of persuasive language. In particular it examines the role and implications of rhetoric within the contexts of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), as well as Creating Shared Value (CSV) the latest management phenomenon embraced by academics and corporations alike (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011). The use of a critical rhetorical approach as both theory and praxis to these topics supports the idea that CSR rhetoric is a fruitful avenue for firms to generate a particular form of 'ethos' or social legitimation as reparation for the consequences of their actions (i.e. Ihlen, 2009, 2011). Meanwhile I illustrate how the conception of shared value itself functions as a rhetorical 'toolkit' of success or explicit set of instructions for corporations to follow that informs them on how to present to their stakeholder audiences what is supposedly a mutually beneficial social and economic agenda. While both approaches initially appear to be widely divergent, both pursue the same goal: to produce positive conceptions of a firm's identity as a form of rhetoric. Through the case studies presented here, I show how such rhetoric works to promote a sense of 'identification' (Burke, 1950) with stakeholder audiences through the common ground technique (Cheney, 1983) or 'god' terms (Burke, 1945) as a tactic of appeal wherein firms express concern

for their stakeholders and the environment as a way of engaging their ‘buy-in.’ Such a symbolic tactic takes place on a global stage and thus despite utopian promises of producing value for society, must continue to face the inherent political, historical, and economic issues embedded within the material inequalities between firms and civil society actors. A major contribution of such work is not to provide a ‘breakthrough’ analysis or documentation of corporate efforts towards social responsibility but rather to make accessible to researchers outside of rhetorical studies and even communication studies the importance of the role of rhetoric in constructing corporate identities within the contexts of social responsibility and globalization.

Introduction

The Rhetoric of Corporate Identity

A company needs to take a holistic view of communications because it is communicating all the time (even if it doesn't want to or doesn't realise it) to all of its publics. The communication which is taking place even if unplanned or unconscious, is creating impressions and images are being formed.

~ Bernstein (1984, p. 118)

In December of 2008 a new Canadian environmental coalition filed a misleading advertising complaint against the global corporate food giant Nestlé that drew a wide range of media attention. Specifically, the coalition challenged the company's full-page advertisement in support of the sale of their product *Nestlé Pure Life* that stated, that "*Nestlé Pure Life* bottled water is the most environmentally responsible consumer product in the world" and that "most water bottles avoid landfill sites and are recycled"(Anderson, 2008, para. 4). In contrast to these claims, coalition representatives argued that rather than being a responsible consumer product, "The truth is that many water bottles are not being recycled" by Nestlé Waters, and that "in direct contradiction to its own advertisement" the firm admits in its 2008 Corporate Citizenship Report that many of its beverage products end up in solid waste-streams and are not recycled ("Groups challenge," 2008, para. 6). Certainly, public criticism of Nestlé's business practices is not new. Nestlé, who self identifies as the "world's leading nutrition, health, and wellness company" faced a storm of controversy and public censure more than thirty years ago when they aggressively marketed infant formula milk to mothers in less economically developed countries

as a breast milk substitute. This action was a direct violation of a 1981 World Health Organization international code that restricted the marketing of formula milk to poorer populations.¹ In 2005 the International Labor Rights Fund sued Nestlé and two other companies for violations of child labor laws in West Africa for forced child labor (ILRF, 2014) and in 2006 the International Union of Food Workers accused the firm of violating labor laws by categorizing workers into “managerial positions” to exclude such employees from union membership (IUF, 2014). These controversies were closely followed in 2007 by accusations of fixing prices of chocolates in Canada (Gray, 2012) and ongoing opposition by local communities in the United States concerning Nestlé’s water operations (Mattera, 2014). More recently, in 2010 Greenpeace, the current world leader in independent environmental activism, successfully initiated a *Kit Kat Campaign* using social media for Nestlé’s use of palm oil in their products, arguing that such practices directly contribute to rainforest destruction in Indonesia and climate change (“Sweet success,” 2010). In the 2010 independent documentary *The Dark Side of Chocolate*, Nestlé was accused of purchasing cocoa beans from Ivorian plantations that use child slave labor (Mistrati & Romano, 2010). And if that is not enough, Nestlé’s pasta product *Buitoni* was removed from supermarket shelves in Italy and Spain in 2013 after tests revealed traces of horse DNA (Castle, 2013).

Given their beleaguered public relations history, it is perhaps not surprising that in 2006 Nestlé coined the term “creating shared value” (CSV)² to demonstrate their commitment to socially responsible behavior (FSG, 2011a, p. 12). Nestlé elaborated in their 2008 inaugural

¹ In her article, “Milking it” for example, Guardian news reporter Joanna Moorhead (2007) noted that such Nestlé continues to face ongoing boycotts of their products as they have violated the code “more than any other single company worldwide” and their infant milk formula products continue to flood health facilities in the developing world (para. 35).

² Not to be confused with shared “values” or clearly articulated organizational values shared between employees and their firm’s performance.

“Creating Shared Value Report” that for “*business to be successful in the long term it has to create value, not only for its shareholders but also for society*” by “assuring compliance and sustainability” and compliance with national and international laws while assuring that their “actions are environmentally sound, socially just and economically viable” (Nestlé, 2008, n.p., my emphasis). In keeping with this agenda Nestlé documented their efforts to reduce their environmental footprint, improve business related costs and activities, and most importantly, advance social and stakeholder³ relations with the premise that sharing ‘value’ – through the infusion of economically based activities into strategically chosen social issues – would be mutually beneficial.

Although first devised by Nestlé, the CSV concept has since become an ongoing managerial and academic phenomenon and Harvard business guru Michael Porter, a world leader in competitive strategy and his colleague Mark Kramer advocate for its application (2006, 2011). Indeed, Porter and Kramer’s (2011) article “Creating Shared Value: How to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and growth” won the 2011 McKinsey Award as one of the most significant articles published in the annual *Harvard Business Review* (HBR, 2012).⁴ The authors list within this article several major global companies that have undertaken this new way of thinking as part of their corporate DNA including GE, Wal-Mart, Intel, and Wells Fargo (Porter & Kramer, 2011). By offering a contemporary and economically based form of ‘social responsibility,’ Porter and Kramer (2011) propose that CSV can interlink businesses with social issues through local investments or product innovations that benefit the specific communities where they do business including that at the bottom of the pyramid (BOP) or the greatest number

³ Freeman (1984) and Fassin (2009) define a stakeholder as anyone who has an interest in the firm including employees, business partners, shareholders, governments, and clients.

⁴ A simple web-based search in Google Scholar revealed that the article has produced a total of more than 1362 citations as of April 24, 2014.

of the world's poor (Prahalad & Hammond, 2002). The sponsoring of social interventions in these communities is conducted with the goal to “unleash the next wave” of innovation and productivity through global growth and competitive advantage (Porter & Kramer, 2011, p. 65). Two kinds of “value” are presented within this promise of success: *business* (economic interests of the company, competitive strategy, and competitive advantage) and *social* (philanthropic activity, solving of social problems, and contributions to governance) (Aakhus & Bzdak, 2012). Both interests reportedly align strategic philanthropic and contemporary interpretations of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activities with a company's value chain and local communities to maximize the benefits or ‘value’ that each receive – thus presenting a ‘win-win’ for all involved (ibid.; Porter & Kramer, 2011).

Ostensibly then, creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) presents the idea that corporations can, and should be, organizations that actively benefit both local communities and corporate stakeholders (including especially their shareholders) through the infusion of capitalistic interventions into social issues and previously untapped markets most notably those in poor or disenfranchised populations. Such a practice is not new. We have long seen evidence of economic infusions by corporations into social issues as expressions of social innovation. Starbucks sells Fair Trade coffee for instance while Hewlett Packard has made social innovation a core tenet of their business model infusing corporate resources into areas such as education, the environment, and local communities (www.hp.com). Business participation in this context more often than not serves as a research and development (R&D) exercise rather than charity (Kanter, 1999).

But there is no doubt that by adopting the language of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) and treating it as a form of strategic rhetoric, corporations can also perform

a major reorientation of their public relations and business strategies within the rubric of good “corporate citizenship” (Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009). Barnard (1938) claims that an organization is synonymous with communication (as cited in Tompkins, 1984). That is, organizations are inherently rhetorical (Cheney, 1991) and any form of communication, from or within, is a distinct form of rhetoric or persuasion (Edwards, 2011) that can communicate a corporation’s values to various stakeholders. Such corporate forms of meaning are also material, brought into existence through the rhetorical process itself (ibid., p. 532). Critics argue that CSR serves to represent an element of publicity in which corporations tell “everyone about what you are doing (even when some companies don’t deliver)” (Einstein, 2012, p. 58). In contrast, the ‘rhetoric’ of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) prompts corporations to take on a proactive form of social responsibility in which not only are promises of doing some “good” an essential feature of social intervention, but such promises can also be rather transparently legitimized by the infusion of economic resources into strategically chosen social issues. In this framework of ‘social responsibility’ corporations can explicitly make a profit while promising to share the benefits of such capitalistic interventions as a form of ‘value’ to others. To counter accusations of inadequate or self-interested forms of authenticity, transparency, legitimacy, and sustainability, the rhetoric of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) enables corporations to offer then a much needed healing ointment, panacea, “snakeoil” or “cure” for what ails society (Burke, 1973, p. 192). Such rhetoric becomes a new way to talk about the identity of a corporation as responsible, and as an active citizen – it therefore is a case of corporate identity’s rhetorical management.

In this study I explore the possibilities for such rhetoric to offer us new ways of thinking about corporations and their role in society including if the ‘win-win’ promised by shared value

(Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) can indeed be a catalyst for positive social change and more inclusive forms of democracy. This is particularly important for troubled firms such as Nestlé. It is evident that in adopting the rhetoric of CSV Nestlé was perhaps hoping to create a new public and positive form of identity for their corporation. Peter Brabeck-Letmathe, then Chairman and CEO of Nestlé emphasized this point. As he argued in the inaugural CSV report's introduction in 2008: "*Creating Shared Value* means thinking long term, while at the same time delivering strong annual results. One of the fundamental Nestlé Corporate Business Principles is that 'we will not sacrifice long-term development for short-term gain.'" (Nestlé, 2008, n.p.) He further elaborated: "The strength of the Nestlé brand, including its performance in this [global] arena, is fundamental to the success of our Company. It is a result of taking our relationship with society seriously over many decades, and building a brand based on *Creating Shared Value*" (ibid., p. 2, original emphasis).

With its emphasis on providing a long-term and forward thinking positive focus to Nestlé's and other organizational activities, the 'rhetoric' of Porter and Kramer's (2006, 2011) conception of shared value attempts to cement the relationship between corporations and their stakeholders by explicitly encouraging terms of goodwill. Such goodwill is offered through the successful integration of the newly introduced social issue agenda – one that privileges economics – as an effective solution to social ills. Embodied in such rhetoric, however, is also an opportunity for corporations including troubled ones such as Nestlé to obscure or reverse their former PR disasters by promoting a proactive and positive form of corporate identity while promising long-lasting, albeit utopian solutions, to global social concerns. It is this rhetorical ability of the concept of CSV to transform a corporation's identity in the most proactive and positive sense that is the central topic in this dissertation. Ehninger (1994) comments that

rhetoric or practical discourse is “an organized, consistent, coherent way of talking about practical discourse in any of its forms or modes” that “seeks to inform, evaluate or persuade,” and that is in alignment with the rhetorician’s present purpose (p. 319). Corporations use communication, in other words rhetoric, to issue strategic messages that unify disparate voices and encourage stakeholder audiences to align with their values and goals (Cheney, 1983; Cornelissen, 2011). From my point of view, Porter and Kramer’s advocacy of this powerful reconfiguration of a company’s relations to the communities it serves (and from which it draws profits), constitutes a specific form of rhetoric that explicitly recognizes the importance of constructing a proactive and positive sense of a corporation’s identity. Such an identity is organized, consistent, and coherent in the role that corporations can play in society to resolve social ills, while tailoring its strategies for the contemporary business context of increased globalization and transcultural business. Creating shared ‘value’ (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) currently appeals to a wide variety of audiences and advances the conventional rhetoric that “what is good for business is good for society” although it also seems to emphasize that, “what is good for society is also very good for business” building on the time-worn conception of the invisible hand that removes actors from the market that are overly opportunistic (Hill, 1990).

As I attempt to illustrate in the subsequent chapters, such rhetoric focuses unashamedly and rather transparently on an exclusive for-profit economic agenda. It is not surprising then that such rhetoric is gaining in popularity in the corporate sector, providing corporate practitioners with a generative and allegedly transformative way of reconceiving public relations—or, at least, a way of talking about them—without materially transforming audience expectations. CSV is also taking hold in non-profit organizations as the lines between capitalistic activities and social issues become increasingly blurred (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011). This rhetoric, this new way

of *talking* about a corporate identity, is perceived as so effective it can be imported to non-profit efforts when the motives, role, and citizenship of the organization are not even in question. In the following pages I show in what ways the rhetoric of CSV as designed by Porter and Kramer (2006, 2011), and in use by the sullied Nestlé organization and the global pharmaceutical corporation GlaxoSmithKline, is yet another instance of persuasion in a long line of rhetorical ‘packages’ that address the importance, ends, and means of strategically managing one’s corporate identity. This latest addition to the genealogy of corporate rhetoric is, I believe, part and product of our increasing sophistication about symbols and language, awareness of the politics of public forms of ‘identity,’ the contemporary complex but totalizing media environment, and, most recently, the global context that transnational corporations must face. A large part of the reason for the emergence of this rhetoric may be the changed circumstances of corporate identity itself: no longer are companies based in specific communities, regions, or even nation states -- their brand is a media creation from start to finish -- and often these brands and identities are only loosely attached to specific products or areas of commerce.

Indeed, in the age of mergers and mega-corporations, the identity of a particular corporation has become almost a legacy or an anachronism that has mostly symbolic value rather than a way of identifying a specific product for specific customers (Conrad, 2011). Boeing builds airplanes (and other things) that enables the corporation to have a distinct product identity, but mega-corporations such as Boeing including Monsanto, Archer Daniels Midland, and The Dow Chemical Company (“Dow”) and so on, are almost mythical creatures that name an economic chimera rather than a central geographic or economic center. It is in this sea of symbolic culture and media ecology that the contemporary rhetoric of corporate identity must function to create, manage, maintain, and transform the publically held identity of a corporation for both current

and future generations. An awareness of this sophisticated response to the demands placed on global corporations to remain competitive lends to the importance of this study.

Emerging awareness of the concept and importance of corporate identity can be seen in both academic study and common practices of the management and business world. Within the past few decades scholars and corporate practitioners have paid increasing attention to how organizations can proactively manage conceptions of their corporate identity (i.e. Cornelissen *et al.*, 2007; Lievens *et al.*, 2007; Otubanjo, 2011). While the concept of ‘corporate identity’ itself continues to be widely debated (i.e. Balmer & Wilkinson, 1991; van Rekom, 1997), two different definitions have persisted. In the management discipline, scholars have proposed that corporate identity should be defined as the enduring, “essential and central features that differentiate the organization and make it unique” (Pérez & de Bosque, 2012, p. 146). This is a distinctly different approach to marketing circles that define it “in terms of the means through which the organization presents itself to stakeholders” (van Riel & Fombrun, 2007, p. 146) such as overall corporate behavior and more formal communication tools such as advertisements and events. Both approaches illustrate how corporate stakeholders can form an almost prescribed overall impression of the organization in question based on current corporate activities (see Bravo *et al.*, 2012; Otubanjo & Amuju, 2012, for examples) and the importance of this kind of identity as a means to an end.

Yet even though management and organizational scholars continue to explore the different empirical, theoretical, and multidisciplinary issues embedded in the various aspects of corporate communication, corporate images, and organizational identities, it has been rare for such researchers to look at these activities as essentially rhetorical. Pedagogically, public relations scholars tend to refer to such considerations as “strategic communication,” eschewing

still the traditional perspective that these are resources and strategies of persuasion (i.e. Hayes *et al.*, 2013). There may be several reasons for this avoidance, perhaps chief among them the negative connotations of the word “rhetoric” as used by the public, suggesting it is “mere rhetoric” or language meant only to flatter or deceive, without content or morality (Conrad, 2011, p. 201). Few individuals have especially engaged these activities as managing corporate identity although they have criticized notions of CSR and corporate citizenship. Rhetorical scholars who attend to corporate and organizational rhetoric, however, have not been so remiss as to ignore the fact that organizations and corporations are key voices in our global society today, issuing strategic, persuasive messages to both their employees, their stockholders, their consumers, and the public at large who must sometimes endure their mistakes and consequences (i.e. Waeraas & Ihlen, 2009) as a specific form of managing their corporate identity (see Conrad, 2011). This dissertation will show the importance and character of such rhetoric and the ways in which ideas surrounding ‘social responsibility’ can be utilized by corporations as a central strategy for exploiting general anxieties concerning the role of corporations and social issues today while remaining firmly embedded in the service of the free-market.

Methodology and Sample

My research engages a critical rhetorical approach that seeks to make salient the power dynamics that underpin the organizational phenomena of the rhetoric of ‘social responsibility,’ primarily within the context of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) and its potential import on our culture. Specifically, following the work of McKerrow (1989) and his orientations towards critical rhetoric as both theory and praxis, I seek to “unmask or demystify” the integration of such discourses of power within society in order to explore “possibilities for change” (p. 91). The primary perspective of a critical rhetorical approach is not to assess whether

the rhetoric of CSV and its close cousin CSR is good or bad, but rather to ask the overriding question(s): What does this (rhetoric) *do*? Who gets placed into positions of authority? What do such inequalities of power perpetuate? Who is harmed? In what ways?

Engaging in the basic assumptions of poststructuralism, McKerrow (1989) argues that “rhetorical criticism” must also see itself as its reverse being “critical rhetoric” or a self-reflective, political performance that is both derived from, and contributes to, fragments of cultural discussions. For Ono and Sloop (2002), “rhetorical criticism” or the practice of critiquing the “relationship between politics and civic life” (p. 7) historically was viewed as the way to “improve the abilities of public speakers who engage in civic life” (p. 8). Yet they note that during the 1980s in the humanities and social sciences disciplines, politically engaged forms of rhetorical emerged wherein rhetorical criticism also came to represent the “employment of criticism itself as a direct performance of a political act” (p. 8) for it is through the critical analysis of culture and cultural texts that we can see how such texts play a “material role in shaping culture” (p. 9). In this situation the authors elaborate, the analyst becomes another voice in the ongoing struggles of meaning rather than simply recording the effects of it (p. 11). Such a process of social transformation through text analysis thus also relies on the understanding of how decisions by scholars have corresponding meaning and impact on today’s culture. Rather than affixing determinate meanings onto the objects of our study, critical rhetorical scholars work through how the analysis of cultural texts can potentially incite social change, a fundamental and overriding purpose of the creation of this text.

Rhetorical Criticism as Theory

Critical rhetoric informs both my methodology and praxis. As a philosophical approach it recalls Plato’s critique of rhetoric that such discourse manipulates appearances while obscuring

the truth (McKerrow, 1989). McGee (1999) states that, “we must begin with the supposition that reality is hidden by appearance, truth by discourse.” (pp. 66-67). McKerrow (1989) elaborates stating that critical rhetoric demonstrates “the silent and often non-deliberate ways in which rhetoric conceals as much as it reveals through its relationship with power/knowledge” (p. 92). My use of a critical approach to the embedded power relationships within the rhetoric of ‘social responsibility’ assumes the burden of identifying what potential hidden meanings may be present in corporate discourses in today’s competitive business climate. I consider how such discourses may further issues of influence and control by the involved corporations. I recognize in this exercise, however, that my critique itself is “not detached and impersonal” but rather “has as its object something which it is “against”” (McKerrow, 1989, p. 92). That is not to say that I am imputing ‘motives’ or particular forms of intention to the corporations that I study, but rather I analyze their discourses to understand how such organizations use rhetoric to “explain, account, justify or rationalize” their behaviors (Benoit, 1996, p. 75) in order to promote favorable interpretations of their values by stakeholder audiences. Rather than simply assuming or condemning corporations as being entities that exclusively dominate societal relationships with no recourse or resistance, I engage a critical rhetorical perspective to dig a little deeper into the particular practices of corporations, primarily in the context of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) to further understand their role and potential for political influence in the contemporary global economy instead of simply taking such roles for granted.

In that vein, it is my job as a critical researcher to ask questions about *how* and *why* the rhetoric of ‘social responsibility’ in the context of creating and maintaining a corporate identity works to alter perceptions and behaviors of corporate stakeholders. Equally as significant, it is my role to interrogate the moral consequences of this form of persuasive corporate discourse

both as language *and* as an instrument of power⁵ that potentially can minimize or gloss over conflicts in disparate corporate audiences. I rest the strength of my argument on my ability to prompt the reader to consider these differing perspectives and thus punctuate the expected or common ‘reading’ of corporate texts. Keeping in mind that my very own analysis of the rhetoric of social responsibility, including that of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) is in itself a performance or act of persuasion (rhetoric) (McKerrow, 1989), I perceive the answers to these questions to be open for interpretation and as stimulus for further discussions, resting the strength of my argument on my ability to prompt the reader to consider these differing perspectives and thus punctuate the expected or common ‘reading’ of corporate texts concerning this topic.

As a methodology, a critical rhetorical orientation also influences the structure of my chapters enabling me to group together thoughts on the rhetoric of CSR and shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011). Such topics demand contextualization to illustrate not only in what ways the rhetoric at hand has developed or is being utilized by transnational organizations, but also the future potential of such discourses to offer opportunities for influence and control by such corporations on their various stakeholder audiences. In arguing that CSR rhetoric can construct a particular corporate ‘ethos’ as a legitimation strategy by BP for example in Chapter 2, I holistically examined numerous documents and website pages generated by BP and their critics concerning the outfall of the *Deepwater Horizon* disaster. Similarly, on viewing the rhetoric of shared value as what I term a ‘toolkit’ or specific set of instructions that informs corporations on how to engage in this concept, I reviewed the growing body of academic literature on the concept including that generated by its creators Porter and Kramer (2006, 2011), documents

⁵ Using Fairclough’s (1980) definition I recognize power to be social, economic, and political influence that is generated through organizational forms of talk and persuasion between social agents.

produced by their consulting firm FSG, annual social responsibility reports by multinational corporations that are engaged in this concept, as well as numerous websites and CSV reports created by such entities that engage with this concept such as the *Shared Value Initiative* (www.sharedvalue.org).

Burke's theory of identification

The attempts by corporations to create and project a certain identity, and invite employees, clients, and other stakeholders to regard it and relate to this identity as a public character, would seem rather transparently to be part of the rhetoric of identification (Burke, 1950) wherein corporations use proactive and positive forms of rhetoric to mitigate different and sometimes conflicting stakeholder audiences (Cheney, 1983). As a fundamental theory to my dissertation, I aim to show how corporations engage in strategic messages, tactics, and symbols to potentially negotiate and motivate into action the increasingly complex political framework of organizational stakeholder groups. Such actions are undertaken to support connections between a firm, its various stakeholders, the free-market, and popular opinion while inducing disparate corporate audiences into cooperative action under the guise of using capitalistic activities to alleviate societal ills (Burke, 1950). Audience participation is key to this concept – it is more than ‘relating to’ each other, but making it *part of* one’s own identity – a form of “cooperative response” (Cheney, 1983, p. 145) or working together. Through such a rhetorical analysis I seek to make explicit how the design and rationale of these symbolic choices is essentially to *persuade* by creating a sense of *identification* (Burke, 1950) with a corporation by the complex political framework of stakeholder audiences and that this kind of language use has *consequences* for those involved.

Noted literary theorist and philosopher Kenneth Burke (1950) argues that through identification a rhetor can become substantially one with their audience member through either explicit or implicit forms of acting together (p. 22). In understanding how we can be “substantially one” with another yet retain our own uniqueness (p. 21), he maintains that we *identify* with others through things that we may share in common. Specifically he states, “A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A *is identified* with B. Or he may *identify himself* with B even with their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so.” (p. 22, original emphasis) That is, through the process of identification corporate stakeholders may align with the persuasive message of an organization even if it goes against their own best interests as seen in the examples of workers laboring without unionized protection, voters voting for a particular candidate against their own interests, or assigning the caretaking of a local community’s environment to a corporation who then in turns utilizes such resources exclusively for extractive and capitalistic purposes.

Cheney (1983) later extended this conception of identification by identifying three formal types of identification in the organizational setting. Such types include: 1) the *common ground* technique wherein the organizational rhetor identifies themselves with their audience in an overt manner; 2) the *identification through antithesis* technique that unites the organization and audience against a common enemy; 3) an assumed or transcendent “*we*” that subtly appeals to identification between two parties that may otherwise have very little in common (p. 148). Cheney also described a fourth type that he termed *unifying symbols* that combine visual and verbal elements as a powerful means of persuasion (p. 155; Cheney & McMillan, 1990, p. 100). All types of identification illustrate the potential of businesses to use strategic and symbolic

organizational messages to exercise “subtle and covert” forms of persuasion and unobtrusive forms of decision-making control (Meisenbach & McMillan, 2006, p. 111).

The last sixty years of scholarship on rhetoric, largely inspired by Burke’s and Cheney’s social theories of language use, moves us well beyond the understanding of rhetoric as empty persuasion or gratuitous style. Instead, such approaches consider rhetoric to be a “realistic function” of society (Burke, 1950, p. 43) by which people use language to cooperate and (re)form social order through the coordination of social conduct. Rhetoric provides us with a perspective in which we can articulate concerns that face contemporary societies including the issues of “power, ideology, leadership, and social change” (Lucaites & Condit, 1999, p. 13). Rhetoric most often represents the deliberate and “human use of symbols to communicate” from which we create our realities (Foss *et al.*, 2002, p. 1). What is significant about the rhetoric of identification (Burke, 1950; Cheney, 1983) is that when successful, the recipient of the rhetorical message is often compelled to take action based on symbolic constructions of discourse. Again we are acting together, not as separate agents. Rhetoric addresses this phenomenon explaining how such symbolic constructions are inherently persuasive and correspondingly can mitigate audience concerns that may be at odds with one another while compelling (persuading) them to take action.

A critical approach and focus on the language of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) through the concept of identification (Burke, 1950) in our current public discourse and media ecology as praxis has the potential to reveal the role of this contemporary form of corporate discourses in our ways of organizing and accomplishing society itself particularly as such organizations use rhetoric to reduce conflict whenever and wherever possible. Studying the concept of corporate identity and the rhetoric of CSV exclusively within the context of

identification profitably extends existing empirical and theoretical studies that have focused on the links between corporate identity and an organization's underlying culture or received images. Such studies are limited to perceptions of *shared meanings* by stakeholders, rather than in what ways these individuals can be *compelled to take action* (Burke, 1950). The primary focus of this dissertation is to examine in what ways the rhetoric of CSV can be a proactive form of stakeholder management in the realm of social responsibility in this manner.

Postcolonialism

Before I advance much further, however, I must recognize the second major philosophical approach that influences my methodology and that is the idea of postcolonialism, or the study of the politics of different kinds of anti-colonial struggles, and the economic dominance of the Westernized "North" over the Global "South" (i.e. Banerjee, 2003a). I use the term "postcolonialism" not to infer that 'colonialism' (physical occupation, conquest, and administration by one country of another) has ended (as in "post" colonialism), but rather to suggest ways of thinking about neocolonialism, or Western colonization by nontraditional means (Young, 2001) and its consequences (Prasad, 2003, p. 27). Broadly, a postcolonial approach prompts researchers to investigate and articulate in what ways asymmetrical power relations between organizations and contemporary society manifest in modern forms of Western colonialism, the impact of such relations on democratic processes, and non-Westernized forms of resistance to such relations (i.e. Prasad, 2003). Researchers who use postcolonial theory in the organizational context seek to evaluate universalizing and totalizing discourses or coordinated form of social practices that constitute knowledge (Weedon 1997) of management and corporate practices and the ongoing "significance of the colonial encounter" between the West and non-West (Banerjee & Prasad, 2008, p. 90).

Postcolonialism as an interdisciplinary study is not limited to the problems of colonization and decolonization exclusively, but is itself a highly emancipatory political endeavor that is “interventionist” and committed to methodological reflexivity while theorizing *why* colonial conditions can be (re)done through geographical, geopolitical, and historical forms of knowledge production (Shome & Hegde, 2002, p. 250). In their discussion of the rhetoric of multiculturalism and commodification of cultures for instance, Shome and Hegde (2002) recognize that the “native” often gets “resurrected in essentialist trappings and fixed in static categories of ethnic culture” (p. 263). They elaborate that this correspondingly “reproduces the violence of colonial modernities and fixes difference in a spectacle of otherness” that promotes the “interests of transnational corporatism” while also serving as a “politically correct gesture” (p. 263). Similarly, Banerjee and Linstead (2004) illustrate how indigenous thought is “masked” and correspondingly “subverted” in their study of anthropological accounts of indigenous management in the Westernized field of anthropology. Within this context, although an “indigenous land ethic” is recognized by researchers, such an ethic has “limited, if any, relevance to current management theory and practice” as it is “disembedded” from any “economic, social and political history” (p. 222).

While an extensive review of postcolonialism is beyond the scope of this discussion (for excellent overviews see Young, 2001; Prasad, 1997a, 2003, 2012; Ashcroft *et al.*, 2006; Jack *et al.*, 2011) it serves as a productive theoretical approach to understanding how the (re)packaging of “otherness” can promote the interests of transnational corporations. In general, postcolonial studies rest on the primary ambition of exploring the decolonization of the tenets of *representation* (Hall, 1996) of the West and non-West, as demonstrated through societal and organizational discourses (Jack *et al.*, 2011; Scott, 2001). Renowned postcolonial scholar

Edward Said (1978) first explicated this idea arguing that discourses of European colonialism juxtaposed the West and non-West into asymmetrical and binary terms with the former considered to be “superior, civilized, developed, moral, scientific” and the latter to be “inferior, uncivilized, backward, immoral and superstitious” (Jack *et al*, 2011, p. 277). Other leading postcolonial theorists have since significantly expanded Said’s orientation including Bhabha’s (1994) work on cultural hybridity or in-between spaces, and Spivak’s (1987, 1988, 1996, 1999) ideas regarding the subaltern and the legacy of colonialism.

This process of *othering* or the discursive construction and portrayal of the ‘other’ as being unequal (i.e. Non-West as being inferior to the West) continues today in countless forms (Karner, 2011) and is a theme that I consciously look for when holistically analyzing the corporate texts. I use a postcolonial approach as a methodology to mark, question, and unpack how the colonial legacy often associated with corporate forms of rhetoric, in this case within the contexts of CSR and CSV perpetuate sanitized versions of difference. Given this focus on creations of representation of the ‘other’ that is often unequal, as a methodology a postcolonial approach is thus resoundingly critical. That is, it is less concerned “about the objects that constitute otherness than in understanding the process of construction and representation” (Banerjee & Linstead, 2004, p. 242). As an exercise of making salient power relations, it illuminates what inequalities may be present in the complex relations between the “presenter and the represented, the knowledge producer and knowledge object, the cataloguer and catalogued” (ibid, p. 242). It also examines ideas surrounding environmental managerialism in which the environment becomes an “indispensable construct” or a view of nature in which it becomes a ‘resource’ to be ‘consumed’ (Escobar, 1995).

Prasad’s (1997b) ideas of postcolonialism are perhaps the most useful for making the

argument that a critical approach can make its home in the business and management arena and this particular study. To paraphrase, Prasad focused on seven features of a postcolonial approach: 1) the language and rhetoric of imperialism, 2) re-historicizing of the West's accounts, 3) the notion of hybridity or bastardization of the colonizer's original message sometimes as an act of resistance, 4) traumatic effects of the colonizing experience, 5) the limited outreach of Western scholarship, 6) effects of the deconstruction of the nation-state, and, 7) problematization of discourses of development (Prasad, 1997b as cited in Jack *et al.*, 2011, p. 281). Prasad (2003) considered imperialism to represent colonization without physical occupation as exercised through economic, cultural, or political power (p. 5). Jack *et al.* (2011) added three additional categories to the postcolonial dimension that include: critique of the political economy, impact of transnationalism, and studies of resistance (p. 281).

Scholars within the fields of critical management and organization studies have built on the work of what some researchers consider to be the holy trinity of postcolonial studies (Bhabha, Said and Spivak) since the emergence of the field in the early 1990s (Jack *et al.*, 2011). Such scholars challenge business and management practices and their “neo-functionalist and neo-positivist orthodoxy” and “universalistic and totalizing pretensions” (*ibid.*, p. 280). Subsequently, whole areas of management scholarship have been critiqued through the utilization of a postcolonial perspective including topics such as the epistemological underpinnings of science (Prasad, 1997a), comparative and cross-cultural management (Jack & Westwood, 2011), business management (Banerjee & Prasad, 2008), and African leadership in Management and Organization Studies (Nkomo, 2011).

Individuals in organizational studies who engage in postcolonialism as a methodology seek to defamiliarize and analyze how corporate practices appropriate, displace, marginalize or

destroy the knowledge systems of the rest of the world through intellectual, economic, or cultural forms of imperialism (Prasad, 2003; Jack *et al.*, 2011, p. 283). In that vein researchers explore westernized ideas of ‘progress’ and ‘development’ (Escobar, 1995; Banerjee, 2003a; McKenna, 2011), globalization (Ganesh *et al.*, 2005; Dussel, 2006; Banerjee *et al.*, 2009), neoliberalism (Harvey, 2005), managerialism (Cooke, 2010), intellectual imperialism (Misoczky, 2011), and modernity and rationality (Townley, 2002). Such foundational articles provide significance for the context of this study that heavily relies on a postcolonial understanding in analyzing corporate management texts. Researchers have also examined how Westernized organizations construct representations of management, business, and specific stakeholder groups. Critical management scholar Banerjee is outspoken on this subject and has written numerous works that include topics such as the discourses of corporate social responsibility (2007), necrocapitalism (2008a), and translocal movements (2011).

Using a critical approach we can see that corporate rhetoric is not something that occurs in a vacuum then, but rather happens in a dynamic, cultural, economic, and political context that furthers unequal social and economic relations. A growing body of research is demonstrating for instance that corporate forms of colonialism can be resisted (Bhabha, 1994) as shown in excellent explorations that reflect the field of the subaltern that include Beverley’s (2004) ideas on the limitations of academic knowledge or Basu’s (2010, 2011) to include marginalized voices. With sensitivity to these dynamic power relations and the privilege that I hold as a researcher within the academy (Beverley, 2004), I follow the advice advocated by Banerjee (2003a) and I am cautious about the use of various terminologies throughout this work. For example the terms “developing nations” or “developing countries” appear throughout this document in various contexts. In some instances I use this term as a reference to the essentialist and binary nature of

developed and underdeveloped countries as viewed by the Western world, not to condone such political disparities, but rather to deploy such language strategically in order to name and understand the context that such disparities present themselves. I do this to belie the political undertones of such language as a subtle political act and to implicitly draw attention to how such assumptions often underpin the construction of knowledge about the communities in question (Banerjee, 2003a). Significantly, such terms and their Westernized use more predominately appear throughout the annual reports or websites of multinational corporations (MNCs) or reports by supranational organizations such as the World Health Organization and United Nations. I am fully aware that inclusion or incorporation of such terminology in this context may politically reify the embedded assumptions that are made by such Western-oriented organizations. Noting the critical undertones of this work, however, my usage of such politically sensitive terms does not merely refer to the context in which they are situated, but rather I hope that they can be key entry points for future discussions on the implications of using such language to think about, refer to, and even resist Westernized forms of domination in today's globalized business climate.

Rhetorical Criticism as Praxis

I also draw heavily on McKerrow's (1989) principles for the use of rhetorical criticism as a form of praxis. McKerrow argues that in order to analyze what impact discourses of power have on society, it is important to recognize that critical praxis should encompass both "the critique of domination and of freedom" as "neither critique, although it may be carried out alone, is ultimately "complete" without attention to the other," (p. 101). That is, discourses of power (including that by corporations) can be oppressive or repressive and accessible to critique, yet he also recognizes that such repressive discourses can also be "potentially productive" (p. 101)

reinforcing Burke's (1950) notion that rhetoric provides language that promotes cooperative action. The task of the researcher McKerrow (1989) asserts is thus to pay attention to each dimension and re-create or construct an argument that "identifies that integration of power and knowledge and delineates the role of power/knowledge in structuring social practices" (p. 102). Eight key principles are offered by McKerrow (1989) to support this critical orientation: (1) engagement of critical rhetoric not only as a *method* but also as *practice* wherein "understanding and evaluation are one," (2) recognition that the discourse of power is material or "real" in social relations, economic, social and political contexts, (3) an understanding that critical rhetoric is *doxastic* or focused on what symbols do in society as contrasted to their *epistemic* function or what they are, (4) a reinterpretation of rhetoric as *nominalist* or contingently (context) based, (5) adherence to the claim that *influence* is not *causality* but is at least its potentiality, (6) recognition that *absence* is as important as *presence* in understanding and evaluating symbolic action, (7) engagement of fragments as containing the potential for *polysemic* rather than *monosemic* interpretations, and, (8) the idea that criticism is a *performance* or argumentative activity (pp. 102–108). Such principles provide an avenue for understanding how rhetorical forms of organizational identification produced within the contemporary context of social responsibility by corporations can reinforce particular kinds of knowledge and power relationships between firms and their stakeholders.

Cheney, May and Munshi (2011) write that "Communication is not a linear series of independent acts chosen by purely autonomous agents; it is an ongoing process of social interaction from which actions, meanings, and identities all continually emerge" (p. xii). In other words the language used by actors in society and corporations is not simply just 'language' but rather a form of 'persuasion' or 'rhetoric' that is mutually constitutive in which material objects

and communication become entwined (Putnam & Nicotera, 2009, p. x) to produce particular shared meanings. As this work primarily is a communication study, I seek to illustrate how corporations symbolically encode stakeholder relationships through the rhetoric that they use to communicate to others their objectives and values (Cheney, 1991). Such language is not only strategic and stylized (Burke, 1941), but also oftentimes strategically ambiguous (Eisenberg, 2007) to constrain, perpetuate, or change certain stakeholder relationships as corporations manage human events and affairs. It is in scrutinizing such corporate language choices as a form of praxis that we can discern in what ways corporations use ‘rhetoric’ to effectively manage such relationships in order to maximize their economic value. Certainly, corporations use language as a form of marketing, to gain a broad acceptance or approval of their involvement in social causes, or to rationalize their economic agendas (Conrad, 2011). Such factors contribute to creating a frame of reference for corporate stakeholders to make sense of an organization’s actions and their influence within the political sphere (*ibid.*, p. 171) as verbal forms of communication present powerful references for such audiences to identify and analyze (Waeraas & Ihlen, 2009, p. 85).

Although there are many existing critiques of CSR (i.e. May *et al.*, 2007, Banerjee, 2008b) and now a growing body of research on creating shared value (Aakhus & Bzdak, 2012; Crane *et al.*, 2014), it is quite difficult to get empirical data on how such discursive practices affect the lives of individuals and the cultures in which these practices manage economic relations. What I can do, however, is access corporate forms of discourse, the language choices themselves, and through critical analysis demonstrate to readers how such language serves as a form of persuasion that creates the potential for such corporate practices of social responsibility to replicate and mask well-worn patterns of power and subordination. In asking how such

language can constitute particular forms of corporate identities in the context of social responsibility, I thus searched for secondary corporate texts that circulate in today's business climate including the websites of transnational corporations and supranational organizations, corporate blogs, as well as several corporate annual reports that address the topic of social responsibility. Special attention was paid to annual corporate reports that addressed Porter and Kramer's (2006, 2011) conception of 'creating shared value' or the topic of corporate social responsibility and sustainability explicitly.⁶ A broad range of transnational corporations were included in this search encompassing firms such as Nestlé, Citi®, Unilever, Starbucks, Disney, Vodafone, Novo Nordisk, and GlaxoSmithKline. On identifying such corporate texts I examined them closely to explore how the corporations attempted to convincingly describe their expressions of good social citizenship through their environmental initiatives, employee and supplier relationships, stakeholder relationships, and corporate values in general. When choosing the particular corporations to use as case studies, I considered several factors including: their prominence as 'leaders' in the social responsibility movement, how long they had publically engaged in such values, their 'clout' in the global political economy, criticisms that they had received (or not) for such actions, and the reputations that they held.

Campbell's process of rhetorical criticism

To analyze such potential case studies I adhere to Campbell's (1972) process of rhetoric criticism. Campbell argues that three processes of criticism are required with this approach: descriptive, historical-contextual, and interpretive analysis. First, Campbell's "descriptive analysis" or discovering the "unique and defining characteristics" that make discourses of corporate identity distinctive in the contexts of CSR and shared value was performed (p. 14).

⁶ English speaking texts only.

Recent developments in ideas of corporate citizenship, sustainability, and especially shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) as discursive formations of corporate identity are part, product, and productive of expanded ideas of globalization and transnational corporate politics more generally. Thus I narrowed the potential case studies are narrated above to case studies that directly contained language that addressed social responsibility directly by the organizations in question as a strategy to promote positive audience perceptions of their identities. To generate texts for my analysis of shared value explicitly, I noted examples of corporations that used this language.

On narrowing my selection of texts, I then turned to Campbell's (1972) second stage process of critical examination being "historical-contextual analysis" (p. 19) in which I conducted further research on the historical and cultural contexts of the rhetorical acts. Broadly I considered historical movements within the corporate sector such as the growth of neoliberalism (Harvey, 2005) and its ties to the free-market and globalization. I reflected on what audience attitudes and beliefs would correspondingly be discovered when considering the how the corporations had engaged in such forms of persuasive discourse within the context of these market forces. This stage provides a much needed sense of relativism to my analysis as such corporate rhetoric as with all rhetoric is "time- and culture-bound" (Ehninger, 1994, p. 327). I also checked the validity of the claims made by the corporations concerning their supporting evidence. When examining Nestlé's CSV reports concerning the global water crisis or state of malnutrition in the world's poorest populations for instance, I verified the credibility of their supporting evidence via the World Health Organization and United Nation's websites.

Finally I engaged in Campbell's (1972) third state of criticism "interpretative analysis" (p. 21) to offer engaging evaluations of the texts in order to increase the reader's evaluation of

the corporate discourses. In this stage I imagined how various corporate stakeholder audiences could respond with the potential for identification with the organizations in question and in what ways such firms could use such language to strategically mitigate potential conflicts. Within this critique I also considered the distinctive features of the corporate forms of rhetoric including what media were utilized to convey the persuasive messages. My interpretative evaluations are made while being mindful of the ethical framework that I utilize to judge such works and in what ways I could make cogent and intelligent conclusions about my interpretations. Given this, I consciously considered what arguments would be more sympathetic or antagonistic for the reader concerning these corporate forms of rhetoric.

My awareness of the impact of interpretative analysis on the reader stems from the belief that corporations and their persuasive messages *can* fulfill a constructive role in society yet that it is the role of the critical rhetorician to identify not what good or bad properties are contained within such public forms of corporate discourse but rather to ask, “what does it *do*?” Paradoxically, I am also aware that such basis of constructive criticism is in itself a rhetorical expression that does certain persuasive things with words, that is, it should illuminate rather than entertain, and that I should thus be fully aware of what message I am trying to convey (Kock, 2004). My orientation towards such an analysis is to communicate how “contingent truths” are offered by the corporations that balance the ideal with the utilitarian while serving a means to an end (Ehninger, 1994, p. 327) as a form of corporate self-interest. In doing so I recognize that the fundamental action to be performed by organizational rhetoric is to be pragmatic: to come into existence for the sake of something beyond itself; to perform some task and to produce “action or change in the world” (Bitzer, 1971, p. 384). To “alter reality” by engaging corporate stakeholders in discourse that in turn, becomes a “mediator of change” (ibid., p. 384). My analysis is oriented

towards drawing attention to this strategic form of communication as an everyday business practice while reflexively considering my own role as a researcher and analyst.

Such an approach coupled with the case studies at hand causes me to ask broadly: *What role does the rhetoric of CSR and shared value play in the expressions of corporate identity?* More specifically: How does the rhetoric of shared value present attractive propositions of ‘social responsibility’ to corporate stakeholder audiences with which they can then identify with? What is the appeal of such pro-social ideas of corporate citizenship and corporate values? And, in what ways does such rhetoric perpetuate certain cultural and business norms that emphasize capitalistic activities and corporate forms of self-interest in today’s global political economy? Recognizing in what ways organizations proactively use the rhetoric of identification within the contexts of CSR and shared value to symbolically manage global corporate identities in local communities has profound implications for understanding how audiences of such expressions can identify with such organizations, experience organizations in the future, and how ideas of social responsibility have evolved more generally to reflect this orientation. Thus in the most general terms, the purpose of this work is to illustrate what beneficial insights the application of a critical rhetorical perspective will bring to the interdisciplinary conceptions of corporate identity within the context of contemporary forms of social responsibility and globalization.

Building on Ehninger’s (1994) articulation of systems of rhetoric and their import on society and what role corporate rhetoric plays in perpetuating unequal power relations, this study serves four central objectives: 1) To demonstrate that those practices related to a corporation’s manipulation of its public identity through the premise of identification and the concepts of CSR and shared value (Porter and Kramer, 2006, 2011) can be understood as a kind of rhetoric, and that viewing this activity as such helps to reveal their stylized, strategic rationale to influence

public perceptions, employee behavior, and customer acceptance and loyalty; 2) to distinctly characterize the evolution of the rhetoric of corporate forms of ‘social responsibility’ thus providing for the reader an understanding of how such rhetoric has evolved more generally in form and substance in reflection of market forces and the public arena, 3) to direct attention to how firms are changing their rhetoric to meet the changing needs of the future while paradoxically returning to the past in their perpetuation of ‘difference’ between various groups of stakeholders as a form of corporate self-interest, and, 4) to help solidify the place of rhetorical approaches to organizational studies within the broader missions of Organizational Communication and Critical Management Studies.

Chapter Breakdown

In the chapters that follow, this dissertation examines the practices of creating, maintaining, and changing corporate identity as dramatic cases of the rhetoric of identification in the contexts of CSR, shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011), and globalization. Using research from the organization communication, management, and marketing disciplines in Chapter 1, “Why Corporate Identity? Negotiating the different dimensions,” I examine in what ways corporations can use rhetoric to produce strategic conceptions of their corporate identity. While the broad field of CSR continues to be thoroughly researched and debated (i.e. May *et al.*, 2007), the same cannot be said for the role that corporate identity explicitly plays in this context: that is how efforts to construct and manage multifaceted forms of enduring corporate character through sophisticated rhetorical campaigns of social responsibility can potentially impact how audiences perceive, and expect, organizations to behave. For over 30 years, CSR has been a public relations paradigm and self-regulating mechanism that complies to legal, ethical and international norms advocated by academics and practiced by some corporations, yet the CSR

movement has also faced criticism that it may mostly serve as an image-building exercise (May *et al.*, 2007). With this in mind, CSR thus represents a lightning rod for an ideological and rhetorical criticism of this kind of identity rhetoric. To that end I review the prominent turning points of this organizational movement to pinpoint how specific ideas of corporate identity may possibly have emerged in conjunction with evolving ideas of social responsibility. In Chapter 2 “Committed to doing some good? The rhetoric of corporate social responsibility,” I expand on the previous chapter and Waeraas and Ihlen’s (2009) conception of environmental ethos to examine more closely in what ways CSR rhetoric and conceptions of ‘ethos’ can be utilized strategically to influence and legitimate stakeholder’s receptions of a firm’s identity management efforts. Using BP’s recent claims that they have ‘economic integrity’ and that they are building for us a ‘sustainable future,’ in the wake of their latest major oil spill *Deepwater Horizon*, this chapter unveils the taken-for-granted assumptions that corporate identities embody a background role in negotiations of social, political and environmental actions.

In Chapter 3, “Creating Shared ‘Value’: Rhetorical identification consummated,” I use Porter and Kramer’s (2006, 2011) series of articles on CSV together with the central documents of their consulting group known as Foundation Strategy Group (FSG) such as “Creating Shared Value: A how-to guide for the new corporate (r)evolution” (FSG, 2011a), to show how this relanguaging of corporate/community relations constitutes a rhetorical *toolkit* that purports to be morally, politically, and profitably transformative through the mutual creation of economic and social ‘value.’ While implicit in its approach, the toolkit encourages corporations to identify with explicit instructions that promise their success: to engage in an innovative vision for the firm, to invest in a corporate strategy that best reflects their own interests, to deliver such a strategy through investments in strategic partnerships, and finally to reflexively measure the firm’s

performance in this framework. This analysis is strengthened in Chapter 4, “Conceding to the Heavenly Call: CSV as a vocabulary of motives,” in which I argue that the shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) serves as a vocabulary of motives or ‘god term’ (Burke, 1945) that encourages corporate stakeholder audiences to identify with a firm and engage in cooperative actions through universally accepted and forward-looking subordinated concepts such as *nutrition* or *rural development*. I provide a background to the reader why such terms may be inherently persuasive by addressing the prevalence of god and ‘devil’ terms (Weaver, 1953) in corporate discourses within the past few decades.

The final chapter, “Reaching Out to ‘Emerging Markets’: Globalization, neo-imperialism, and the rhetoric of CSV” maps out how such rhetoric, particularly within the context of corporate identity, can contribute towards the discursive formation of problematic relations between a corporation and its stakeholders. Building on the previous two chapters, I bring into question the assumption that the rhetoric of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) is a neutral and isolated rhetorical tool of domination but rather effectively (re)produces neo-imperialistic relations by corporations that engage in such rhetoric via the perpetuation of a rhetorical divide and imperialistic forms of “globalization.” Using the case study of GlaxoSmithKline I show how such power differentials include the discursive constructive of a core-periphery divide between the corporation and disenfranchised populations, institutional forms of domination, and the denationalization (Sassen, 2006) of the involved nation-state. I close by discussing in my Conclusion how global markets and corporate stakeholder audiences are overwhelmingly receptive to such rhetorical constructions of global corporate identities as they engage in the ‘common ground technique’ (Cheney, 1983) wherein corporations express concern for the involved populations. I assess the extent to which CSR and CSV rhetoric as market-driven,

optimistic forms of managerial culture can provide the basis for permanent positive change by questioning the implications of their engagement including the prevalence of unsustainable forms of sustainability and (non)democratic forms of global governance.

Chapter 1

Corporate Identity

Theory and Practice

Corporations have neither bodies to be punished, nor souls to be condemned...

~ Edward, First Baron of Thurlow, (Poynder, 1844, p. 268)

As observed in the introduction, concern for corporate identity has been a steady evolution in both theory and practice, in corporate boardrooms and academia, in media, and in marketing circles for several decades. While corporations such as Avon are doing a poor job of recognizing the importance of their overall corporate identity, focusing instead on managing the outfall of their troubled reputation or performance on the stock market (Wahba, 2013), some global corporations such as The Walt Disney Company are also inherently sensitive to public perceptions of their company, strategically using such rhetoric to generate proactive and sophisticated expectations of predictable behavior of the both company's branding and marketing efforts and its employees. As illustrated by widely successful global corporations such as Disney, The Coca Cola Company, or Google, proper management of one's corporate identity helps a firm to gain a competitive advantage in their industry while communicating specific conceptions of their mission and values. In this chapter I argue that there is a "rhetoric" of corporate identity that circulates this concept in corporate discourses and media and academic venues, and that we can see its impact and relevance, especially for our era of globalization, in the discourses of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Creating Shared Value (CSV)

(Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011). Both of these discourses combine academic interests, management theory, and marketing-media practices in interesting ways. Both are responses to developments in the economy, practices in media and culture, and the increasing pressures of globalization. This fact by itself warrants the consideration of a ‘rhetoric’ of corporate identity, and especially the rhetorical critique of CSR that has taken place in communication studies (i.e. May *et al.*, 2007; Banerjee, 2008). In what follows I first provide a background in the academic research that funds contemporary notions of corporate identity and its expression in the context of social responsibility in the specific areas of Organizational Communication, Management, and Marketing. We see in such disciplines different perspectives towards this topic, but a convergence on the creation, maintenance, and transformation of corporate identity through the resources of communication and media. Then I examine in what ways such rhetoric forms a basis for strategic forms of organizational influence particularly within the areas of organizational rhetoric and public relations. Finally, the criticism of CSR has been an active topic amongst rhetorical scholars in the last decade as corporations face ever-increasing pressures to perform financially and generate positive conceptions of their corporate identity while minimizing their impact on the environment and stakeholder relations (i.e. Frynas, 2008; Perrini *et al.*, 2011; Michelin *et al.*, 2013). I examine this topic in more detail to understand how the idea of corporate identity can serve as a useful form of “rhetoric” for the communication of a firm’s value-laden strategies.

Managing Corporate Identity: The Scholar’s View

Mired in the complexities of today’s media and business climate, the notion of corporate identity is an evolving, sophisticated concept focused on presenting a positive conception of a firm that will encourage various stakeholders to identify (Burke, 1950) with a corporation. In

what follows I explore three key academic disciplines that treat corporate identity as a progressive and increasingly important concept: organizational communication, management, and marketing. I first turn to the organizational communication discipline and its recognition that corporate forms of language act as a form of persuasive symbolic action and creative strategy.

Organizational Communication

Studying various forms of communication by businesses, early organizational communication researchers realized that an inextricable relationship existed between organizations and their communication (i.e. Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983; Taylor, 1993). Such scholars viewed organizational communication as a “practice *in* complex organizations” or the “communication structure *of* organization” (Redding, 2006, p. 20, emphasis added) as a formal means of organizing that utilized internal and inefficient lines of authority (Tompkins, 1984). For instance, management principles were communicated to workers to promote productive workplaces under the premise that scientific based ideas of corporate authority would show that “management knows best” (Tompkins, 1984; Redding, 2006, p. 29). While such ideas served to formulate specific corporate practices, this early organization-communication relation focused exclusively on communication that was conducted inside or outside an organization. This perspective neglected “the contribution symbolic processes make to the production of socio-material systems” (Smith, 1993, pp. 1, 39) or how stakeholders could view the organization and their actions. Moreover, such an approach served to codify a *container* perspective that reified a firm’s boundaries while overlooking the importance and meta-management of stakeholder relationships (ibid., pp. 39; Cheney & Christensen, 2001).

Subsequent research in the communication discipline by interpretive researchers began to view interacting individuals communicating *as* organization (Tompkins, 1984). Scholars

promoted the idea that organization⁷ is *synonymous with communication* (ibid.; Smith, 1993) and that external corporate messages simultaneously could impact internal corporate audiences (Cheney & Christensen, 2001). Under this premise, academics challenged notions of organizations as being fixed or bounded entities but rather viewed them as fluid arenas in which “individuals and groups of individuals perform their actions” (Tompkins, 1984, p. 661; Cheney & Christensen, 2001) as a constant stream of social order (i.e. Deetz, 1982; Tompkins, 1984, p. 661; Conrad, 1988; Smith, 1993; Putnam, 1983; Modaff *et al.*, 2008). Such a gestalt perspective privileges communication as the “principle constitutive element in the process of organizing” instead of being something that is “relatively peripheral to organizational life” (Mumby & Stohl, 1996, p. 67). Some contemporary organizational communication scholars now consider the emergent character of communication to be primary (Christensen & Cornelissen, 2010) and have embraced the interactional approach (see Cooren & Fairhurst, 2009; Putnam & Nicotera, 2009; Hewes, 2009; Mumby, 2011) redefining organizational communication as a dynamic relationship between communication and organizations that each produce, and are produced by, the other (Mumby, 2013, p. 15). The interactional approach to organizations helps us to understand how a firm’s corporate identity is closely linked to the ways in which an organization can organize its “world” in terms of communication (Cheney & Christensen, 2001, p. 241). Communication scholars no longer conceptualize corporate identity as merely a preoccupation with external corporate communication or visual design, but rather as a focus on “what the organization is” or how it can encompass organizational specific strategies, culture, and broader social ideas and

⁷ Here organization refers to a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons (Barnard, 1938, p. 73 in Tompkins (1984)).

issues (Balmer, 1995, pp. 32-27, 1998; Cornelissen *et al.*, 2007, p. S7).⁸ This concept of corporate identity refers to “the general *meaning* of a corporate entity that resides in the values, beliefs, roles and behaviour of its members as well in the shared symbols and other artefacts that they create” (Cornelissen *et al.*, p. S7).

Organizational communication scholar and rhetorician Charles Conrad (2011) furthered such studies when he argued that an organization’s *identity* represents audience perceptions of an organization’s “central, enduring character, which includes expectations about how its members will act in the *future*” (p. 168, my emphasis) that is (re)produced through organizational forms of rhetoric. He elaborated that closely inter-related to an organization’s *image*, or the symbolic and rhetorical representation of select elements of its *current* identity, a key feature of an organizational identity is “stability and predictability,” or the provision of a “frame of reference” that enables organizational stakeholders to make sense of its activities and rhetoric (p. 171). While this form of identification with the organization by stakeholders is key to its success, Conrad argues that organizational identities are often filled with contradictions and challenges and that some stakeholders may “dis-identify” (p. 173) with an organization if different expectations are held. This dis-identification may ironically manifest itself during time of crisis he remarks, when an organization’s “positive pre-crisis” identity paradoxically can make it more vulnerable by increasing the expectations of its stakeholders. This move away from the long-held idea of organizations as discrete units of communication towards conceptualizing a corporate identity that is symbolically shared by audiences through observing corporate behaviors, images, and values, is particularly pertinent to the present study. Today’s corporations are faced with increasingly blurred boundaries between the firm and the outside world, and the problem of

⁸ Organizational communication scholars now argue that it is nearly impossible to explicate an organization’s own identity from identifiable issues (Cheney & Christensen, 2001, p. 233).

being visible in an environment increasingly saturated corporate messages (Cheney & Christensen, 2001, p. 233). Despite best efforts by organizations to use a “unifying voice” and to promote the expression of multiple voices, stakeholder identities, cultures, images and interests, there inevitably is some suppression (ibid., p. 233). Such issues highlight the ongoing struggle of organizations of most kinds to establish a distinctive and dynamic corporate identity while being maximally persuasive and effective in the face of a globalized marketplace and public media that demand singularity. This points to the importance of the role of communication in creating corporate identity as a way to unify disparate voices.

Management

Organizational communication scholars primarily have thus examined how organizations *interactively* manage their environments through communication (i.e. Cheney & Christensen, 2001). In contrast, management scholars generally consider corporate identity to be derived from the *shared affinity* that members of an organization generate from the enduring “essential and central features that differentiate the organization and make it unique” (Pérez & del Bosque, 2012, p. 146). Critics of the shared affinity approach, however, have challenged the common perception that corporations have a central, enduring, and distinctive character of an organization. Jack and Lorbiecki (2007) for instance argued that an organization can have multiple identities that are more “in flux and flow” (p. S81). Such identities, they believe act as destabilizing forces and dynamics that require organizational members frequently to “revise or reconstruct their organizational sense of self” (p. S81).

Concepts of corporate identity held by management scholars thus rely heavily on the conception and expression of communication in the management of a corporate identity. Unlike communication scholars who see communication constitutive of the organization itself (i.e.

Putnam & Nicotera, 2009; Mumby, 2013), management scholars see a corporation as distinct, but having three components of unilateral communication present: a *corporate image* (what it is, does, and how it does it competitively) (i.e. Olins, 1990; Gatewood *et al.*, 1993), *corporate personality* (set of essential features that differentiate an organization from its competitors through expressions of individuality such as its mission, vision, and value statements) (Olins, 1978), and *corporate reputation* (synthesis of a businesses' brands, products, consumers, and country) (Worcester, 2009). From a management perspective, organizational leaders and employees play an important role in building and communicating the 'ethics' of a corporate identity (Kleyn *et al.*, 2012) and competitive advantage that revolves around unilaterally presenting a positive corporate image while reinforcing a firm's primary message and superior reputation (Balmer & Gray, 1999). This approach has many practical applications such as *employer branding*, or the creation of an image of a firm as a desirable and distinct employer (Lievens *et al.*, 2007) that is then supported by employees as ambassadors to what a company says and does (Powell *et al.*, 2009) or managing stakeholder relationships within the context of CSR (Hillenbrand *et al.*, 2013).

Perhaps the closest that management scholars have gotten to theorizing organizations as interactive entities that are constitutive of communication (i.e. Putnam & Nicotera, 2009) was their pursuit of viewing such entities in the realm of metaphors. Following the surge of interest in the symbolic dimensions of organizational life, management scholars examined how stakeholders consider the value and heuristics of organizational identity as a metaphor (Dutton *et al.*, 1994; Cornelissen, 2002). This focus presented conceptualizations of *organizational identification*, (Mowday *et al.*, 1979) which in the management context means the social, emotional or cognitive identification with a metaphorical corporate identity by individuals (i.e.

van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). ‘Identification’ in this instance is often coupled with an awareness of self that is based on the membership or perceptions of belongingness to an organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Lievens *et al.*, 2007). For instance, diversity can become a basis for shared organizational identity if differences amongst team members are congruent with the norms and expectations of the firm (Rink & Ellemers, 2007, p. S17). Alternatively, “a *social (collective) identity* not a personal one” can be both the result of an internal psychological process that takes places in the mind of an individual, *or* as a collective result of such processes and activities (Haslam *et al.*, 2003, p. 359).

Broadly, such studies provide us with insights into how various stakeholders of an organization can potentially align themselves with an organization’s *identity anchors* or unique organizational traits that give an organization its competitive edge while being stable over time (Albert & Whetten, 1985). A rhetorical approach to this aspect of corporate identity furthers such research by enabling us to look at how corporations can persuasively reinforce and unify popular attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of organizational stakeholders, including management and employees with their own goals. But, more importantly, *how* corporations can then utilize such persuasive narratives to subsequently guide and constrain multiple interpretations of individual and collective realities, providing a specific corporate vocabulary that prompts individuals to codify, interpret, or correct the situation in question to their advantage (Conrad, 2011). The significance of this contribution lies in its ability to rethink the commonly accepted and psychological or social identity approach towards corporate identity by corporate stakeholders advocated by management scholars (i.e. Haslam *et al.*, 2003). We should question in what ways organizations can *symbolically* provide such identity anchors or specific orientations to various firm situations to persuade organizational members to act in accordance with broader

organizational objectives rather than treating such forms of communication as a unilateral form of interaction.

Marketing

Marketing scholars have recognized in recent decades that it has become, if not fashionable, at least increasingly urgent for organizations to pay attention to not only their relationships with customers, but also the overall perceptions held of an organization by a wide variety of stakeholders (i.e. Abratt, 1989; Markwick & Fill, 1997). Thus, similar to the organization communication and management scholars narrated above, marketing researchers consider communication (both external and internal) to be a foundational tenet of how corporations are perceived by stakeholder audiences. They diverge from management's shared affinity and organizational identification approach (i.e. Albert & Whetten, 1985), however, towards more sophisticated ideas of how a corporate identity is actually *communicated* to various stakeholders. Specifically, individuals in the marketing discipline define corporate identity to represent "the means through which the organization presents itself to stakeholders" such as overall corporate behavior and more formal communication tools such as advertisements and events (van Riel & Fombrun, 2007, p. 146).

Marketing researchers thus explore how corporate stakeholders can form an almost prescribed overall impression of the organization and its identity based on current corporate activities (i.e. Bravo *et al.*, 2012; Otubanjo & Amujo, 2012) and corporate messages. Studies examine ideas surrounding *corporate marketing* or an intersection of corporate identity, corporate branding (personification of the attitudes and values of a company; Balmer, 2001), or corporate image, and corporate reputation with corporate communications (Balmer & Greyser, 2006). Certainly, the popularity of the 'branding' movement also exemplifies this idea as this

movement prompts firms to communicate a type of “mythology” about their products or service, in the meantime informing stakeholders of their corporate values (Einstein, 2012, p. 18). Apple, the corporation that some say is the most valuable brand in the world for instance, communicates its values of innovation and design through the functional aesthetics, transformational technologies, and simplicity of its products (Forbes, 2013), heralding their latest product innovations through hyped up media product launches. Such studies are helpful in understanding how a corporation’s identity is communicated to various stakeholders but they stop short in viewing organizations as interactive entities.

More recent studies explore deeply interrelated concepts such as the strategic alignment of multiple corporate identities as a form of *strategic identity management* (Balmer *et al.*, 2009) or a focus on external and internal symbolic forms of organizational communication (Pérez & del Bosque, 2012). Examples include *corporate brand exuberance*, or well intentioned yet unrealistic or fanciful brand promotion (Balmer, 2010). Other marketing scholars investigate the concept of corporate ethical identity or the “set of behaviors, communications, and stances that are representative of an organization’s ethical attitudes and beliefs” anchored by ethical forms of corporate marketing (Berrone *et al.*, 2007, p. 36; Balmer *et al.*, 2011). Similar to management circles, marketing scholars recognize that employees play an important role within the organization as ambassadors that can promote positive (or negative) affiliations of the firm in the minds of stakeholders (i.e. Otubanjo *et al.*, 2010). Informal forms of corporate identity can be “misaligned” with a corporate manager’s formal forms of corporate identity communications that can result in a distortion of a firms’ perception amongst stakeholders (Otubanjo & Amujo, 2012).

A second way that marketing diverges from the organizational communication and management disciplines is the conception of ‘identification’ (Burke, 1950) in the corporate

arena. Marketing researchers view this concept more broadly as a form of *alignment* and *transparency*, or the state in which the internal identity of a firm positively corresponds to that of corporate stakeholders at multiple levels (Cornelissen *et al.*, 2007, p. S7) together with the emotional significance of this (Haslam *et al.*, 2003; Rink & Ellemers, 2007). For example, Tuškej and Podnar's (2013) study attempted to measure how consumers identify with a brand. Marketing and management researchers and corporate practitioners agree on how such forms of identification (Burke, 1950) can be measured often utilizing the "ACID test" of corporate identity management as a conceptual model of alignment. This test examines the actual identity of an organization (what we are), the communicated identity (who we say we are), ideal identity (what we ought to be), desired identity (what we wish to be), conceived identity (what we are seen to be) and covenanted identity (what the brand stands for) (Kleyn *et al.*, 2012). Individuals use this test to synthesize all aspects of corporate identity and identify potentially harmful *misalignments* in order to gain a competitive advantage for organizations (Balmer & Soenen, 1999; Balmer & Greyser, 2002). A rhetorical approach to corporate identity expands this narrow focus on 'alignment' and 'misalignment' by focusing instead on how corporations can intentionally bridge theoretical areas of estrangement through a change in attitude or action by audiences through a more symbolic form of corporate identification (i.e. Conrad, 2011). Rhetoric addresses these points of division by encouraging stakeholders to see things from a corporation's perspective for the purposes of cooperation (Cheney, 1983).

In short, research on the concept of corporate identity within the disciplines of organizational communication, management and marketing help us to understand how corporate identity can be formally or informally conceptualized through particular ideas of external corporate communications, including branding, or internal forms of corporate behavior such as

the training of employees to reflect a firm's mission and values. Collectively, such disciplines recognize the important role of corporate communication or the managerial instrument through which internal and external forms of communication are utilized to create a favorable corporate climate (van Riel, 1992) or impression of the firm (Hooghiemstra, 2000). Yet, with the exception of organizational communication, they stop short in viewing corporations, and perhaps even their identities, as constitutive forms of communication (i.e. Putnam & Nicotera, 2009; Mumby, 2013). Within the fields of marketing and management, however, a number of important links in the study of corporate identity exist that are helpful for this study including recognition of the links between corporate identity and corporate image, strategic management, the corporate personality, or the set of essential features of expression that enable organizations to appear as individuals in order to differentiate themselves from others (i.e. Olins, 1978; Abratt, 1989; Markwick & Fill, 1997, p. 402) such as branding (Balmer, 1991; 2010).

Studies in the management and marketing disciplines are also useful in understanding how verbal and nonverbal conditions can promote specific ideas associated with the overall identity of a corporation. Yet they are remiss of deeper examinations of how organizations can symbolically and simultaneously manage multiple and perhaps conflicting ideas of audiences' identities (including that of their own) through the practice of identification (Burke, 1950, Cheney, 1983) and persuasive use of such conditions in order to induce cooperation (Christensen & Cornelissen, 2010) or coordinate stakeholder actions to resolve societal ills. We thus need to further our theoretical understandings of *how* strategic corporate messages (such as logos, brands, or employees) can strategically produce salient ideas of an ethical, consistent, and branded form of corporate identity that is dynamic and symbolic rather than fixed that can subsequently propel various stakeholders to resolve their differences or conditions of natural

estrangement.⁹ In the following chapters I hope to demonstrate how unifying and *primarily rhetorical* corporate messages not only can serve to communicate a particular corporate identity to stakeholder audiences but also possess the ability to influence their ideas of social responsibility, justify economic forms of social intervention, and (re)produce neo-imperial relations by a firm in today's global political economy. In the following section I first explore the importance of the utility of such unifying strategic messages.

Strategic Forms of Organizational Influence

Researchers from various disciplines and accounting firms have become increasingly aware that corporations are progressively and deliberately incorporating broad or deceptively vague descriptions of corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities into their daily operations. Such firms create separate CSR or nonfinancial¹⁰ reports to express their environmental concerns and initiatives or social relations as a standard evaluation tool for investing decisions (Nadesan, 2011; Cho *et al.*, 2012). Indeed, sustainability reporting or descriptions of a firm's CSR performance have become an important way for businesses to communicate their disclosures of environmental and social issues to corporate stakeholders and are spending increasing amounts of money in pursuit of this goal (Lynch *et al.*, 2014). An example of this emerging trend of in-house standards setting is Intuit's inaugural publication of their sustainability report in 2011 that discusses as its highlights Intuit's commitment to their stakeholders and 'green' environmental and energy initiatives (Intuit, 2012). They elaborate:

⁹ I refrain from using the narrow conception of 'alignment' here as used in the marketing and management discipline as the focus of rhetoric is to induce cooperation through symbolic means (Burke, 1950), a broader conception of identification.

¹⁰ One area in which CSR disclosures are commonly used to formulate social knowledge through rhetoric is in environmental transparency. Communication professor Najia Nadesan (2011) notes that environmentalists have long called for greater transparency by corporations with this call to action spurring the creation of voluntary CSR accountability protocols and NGOs that advocate for greater corporate accountability (p. 261). Nadesan remarks that such measures, coupled with demands for corporations to be transparent in terms of their labor relations, have linked corporate CSR transparency directly with corporate citizenship.

At Intuit, corporate social responsibility is more than just good public relations. It's a fundamental part of our culture. It's volunteering in diverse communities. It's supporting customers, nonprofits and small businesses – in good times and hard times. It's bridging the digital divide. And making the Earth a green place. Caring and giving back to our communities and the environment, both locally and globally is who we are and what we do. (Intuit, 2012, p. 3).

Similarly, the rather successful transnational consumer goods corporation Unilever heralds their 'sustainable living' plan that embeds 'sustainability' into their business practices as a top priority (www.unilever.com). Illustrating this logic new standards of environmental and social reporting have emerged including the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI),¹¹ the "third-generation" approach (Thompson, 2012), triple bottom line (TBL) reporting that encompasses economic, environmental, and social performance indicators as being synonymous with corporate sustainability¹² (Milne & Gray, 2013), or specialized forms of assurance such as the "stakeholder or specialist review" (Junior *et al.*, 2014). Such reports help to make corporations look like they are being "good" corporate citizens.

What is clear in these uses of CSR and the specific message acts of making CSR reports for stakeholders and publics to hear or read is that CSR is a contemporary form of organizational rhetoric (Cheney & McMillan, 1990). And, just as in classical political rhetoric, the 'ethos' or moral character of the speaker/corporation is the most important element (Aristotle, 1991), creating trust, ethical identity, and authority for the organization, assuring the audience it has its best interests at heart, and that it is, in essence, a moral entity. CSR is perhaps discussed and adopted in all sincerity by corporations as a concept to guide them towards good forms of

¹¹ The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is an organization that "promotes the use of sustainability reporting as a way for organizations to become more sustainable and contribute to sustainable development" encouraging multinational corporations to use such standards when reporting on their CSR activities ("Global Reporting Initiative," 2014).

¹² A move that Milne and Gray (2013) claim paradoxically often sidelines concerns for their ecological impact.

citizenship and socially responsible action (while still making a profit) – that does not have to be debated. But when corporations or other organizations *use* CSR to craft appeals to their stakeholders and publics, they are engaging in strategic forms of influence; and that influence, at its base, is the attempt to create or change a corporate identity, one that is a “good citizen” (i.e. Waddock, 2007, 2009), and one that serves trust and authority (ethos) because it is “socially responsible.”¹³ In what follows I review the research on organizational rhetoric as it is used to create, manage, and maintain dynamic and symbolic forms of corporate images and identities or to improve muddled reputations through the co-creation of specific meanings with organizational audiences. I then turn to the converging context of public relations to illustrate in what ways organizational rhetoric can be used to strategically create and maintain particular conceptions of a corporation’s identity while furthering a firm’s perceived interests.

Organizational Rhetoric

In this section I provide a brief history of the study of organizational rhetoric and the role it plays in the positive reception of organizational identities by stakeholder audiences.

Organizational rhetoric, recognized as a sub-discipline of organizational communication, serves to name or define corporate situations for stakeholder audiences in a particular manner through creative and strategic organizational messages. Within this sub-field a growing body of literature is presented that finds its earliest roots in the 1980s within scholarship on organizational communication (i.e., Crable & Vibbert 1983; Sproule, 1988; Cheney, 1983). Specifically, during this decade leading communication scholars Donald Cushman and Phillip Tompkins (1980) recognized that audiences of such rhetoric are more sophisticated than in previous decades. They

¹³ Aristotle’s (1991) three components of “ethos” are “intelligence,” “moral character,” and “good will” are clearly present. To be aware of the social role and impact of the company, to care about that role and impact responsibly, and to enact “goodwill” toward the public are obviously the goals of a program of Corporate Social Responsibility.

claimed that corporate audience members experience divergent ideologies or varying representations of their imaginary relationship to their real conditions of existence (Althusser, 2006, p. 100). Cushman and Tompkins (1980) thus argued that a *contemporary theory of rhetoric* could be used in understanding how audiences perceive organizations. Such an approach argued that audiences could be made of one mind by organizational forms of rhetoric while allowing them to be of different opinions through the location or establishment of commonalities of reference (p. 59). This insight gave us our first glimpse into how corporations can use rhetoric to unify various, sometimes disparate stakeholder audiences when presenting their overall objectives.

Subsequent to Cushman and Tompkins' findings, research on organizational rhetoric has rapidly grown. Contemporary understandings of persuasion unavoidably affect how we view modern organizations (Cheney & McMillan, 1990). Organizations are viewed as being fundamentally rhetorical in nature with *corporate messages* (directives, memorandums, advertising, issue advocacy and so on) (ibid., p. 99) being produced by corporate or collective sources that may be shaped by unknown corporate actors or mediated individuals (i.e. Crable, 1990). Such messages address specific groups of organizational stakeholders that may include external publics as well as mutually informed internal ones with the ultimate goal of managing multiple and at times, conflicting, organizational and audience identities (Cheney & McMillan, 1990; Cheney, 1991). Thus, rhetoric is recognized as being key to not only unifying various stakeholder audiences, but also in building a foundation for how audiences perceive an organization and their overall identity.

Broadly this rhetorical view of organizations reminds us that “communication is inherently about meaning-generation” wherein an organization and their stakeholders can reach a

mutually agreeable compromise (Edwards, 2011, p. 532) that is fundamental to the enactment of civil society (Taylor, 2009). Expanding this idea, research of *external organizational rhetoric* follows several themes including how organizational rhetoric: a) weighs self-interest against others' enlightened interests and choices, b) is context relevant and achieves its goals, and c) weighs the relationship between non-neutral language and ideas of power that can be advanced for narrow, shared, or hidden interests (Boyd, 2009; Palenchar, 2011, p. 570). This insight is useful for understanding how strategic messages created in the interests of a particular corporation can reflect the interests of multiple audience members most specifically external ones while simultaneously managing the tensions, differences, contradictions or resistance between such groups. Such forms of persuasion inherently involve *negotiations of power* (specific forms of social influence that are co-constructed) (McMillan, 1990) that makes them potentially "potent tools for the exploration of the uneven symbolic playing field of the typical organization" (Meisenbach & McMillan, 2006, p. 102).

In general, scholars of organizational rhetoric recognize that this sub-discipline is a unique field of study due to three fundamental factors: 1) it recognizes that the corporate message is ambiguous in its portrayal of how it is constructed, authored, or originated; 2) as just noted, that multiple and often overlapping audiences are present (such as internal and external ones); and 3) the corporate rhetor (speaker) supports particular organizational values (Cheney, 1990, pp. 4-8). Thus, significance should be attributed towards the idea that corporate messages strategically portray the rhetor or speaker of such messages "not as someone that we see and hear, but as an organization that we neither see nor hear" (Crable, 1990, p. 124). This decentering of an organizational voice illustrates one of the complexities and fundamental tenets found within the field of organizational rhetoric and helps us to understand why audiences might

be receptive to specific constructions of corporate identities and assign authority to an organization despite the absence of a specifically identified author (Cheney & McMillan, 1990, pp. 96, 97). The minimization of the individual self is most often found within corporate messages while a greater proportion of authority to the organization is fore-fronted (ibid.). Authors Meisenbach and McMillan (2006) argue that this issue calls for several fundamental questions that should be asked of all organizational rhetoric efforts such as: “When an organizational representative speaks, who is responsible?” “Can we place blame?” and, “Can the organizational rhetor speak as an independent agent?” (p. 101). Such questions have enormous ramifications for how corporate identities can be conceptualized by stakeholder audiences for as the authors note, the role of rhetoric within such strategic messages inherently involves issues of truth and claims of knowledge.

A second yet fundamental tenet to the organizational rhetoric perspective and how it influences our understandings of corporate identities is the function of identification of involved individuals with an organization (Burke, 1950; Tompkins *et al.*, 1975; Cheney, 1983; Cheney & McMillan, 1990). As elaborated on in my introduction, the concept of identification can be used by an organization to persuade an audience to agree or ‘identify’ with a rhetor’s goals by introducing persuasive accounts of estrangement that can be resolved through an individual’s unification with the organization (Burke, 1950, p. 22; Cheney, 1983). Such unification is presented as being inevitable and natural. When successful this strategy unifies dissimilar groups articulating them as being approving of the organization and their behavior. The theory of identification (Burke, 1950) is thus a useful approach for understanding how corporate identity is formulated within the contexts of corporate social responsibility and creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011). Specifically, it can explain how corporations: a) actively

legitimatize a firm's messages and the embedded instructions within in order to prompt audience members to share a perceived reality with that organization, b) use such messages as a strategic means of achieving differentiation from other firms as a form of competitive advantage, and, c) compel stakeholders to undertake concrete forms of action that reflect the firm's values and mission towards social responsibility. Given this insight, my work is driven in part by the absence of, or limitations of literature in the management and marketing disciplines in relation to the *function* of corporate strategic messages to create or maintain unified forms of corporate identities as an ongoing constitutive phenomenon (i.e. Mumby, 2013), as a means to induce cooperative action (i.e. Cheney, 1983) as well as how practices of organizational identification may come to rely on rhetorical forms of corporate domination. A critical rhetorical exploration of such ideas offers great potential for researchers of all related disciplines to explore and debate the boundaries and relationships between the ideal and real within organizational messages (Meisenbach & Feldner, 2011) and various forms of dominance that corporations rhetorically assign to themselves. Moreover, it offers opportunities for scholars to recognize the nuances of the contexts that corporate messages and corporate efforts towards the establishment of positive forms of corporate identity or reputation operate within.

Yet it should be recognized that challenges remain regarding a rhetorical perspective when studying the concept of corporate identity. Some researchers in the organizational communication discipline have argued that a rhetorical view has not yet fostered the "positive contributions to society" by organizations that scholars have hoped including engaging in dialogical efforts in the public sphere with marginalized voices (Meisenbach & Feldner, 2011, p. 561) and that overwhelmingly rhetoric can be viewed as a "synonym for lies" (Conrad, 2011, p. 201). In the context of corporate identity specifically, organizational communication scholar

David Bernstein (2009) noted that a form of *corporate dissonance* or “the difference between what a company says and what it does” exists and is otherwise known as the “promise/performance gap” that can result in bringing down the “wrath of liberal critics” (p. 609). This issue is of particular importance as corporations try to come across as ‘good’ or an “organization speaking well”¹⁴ (Edwards, 2011; Ihlen, 2009a, 2011a) while obfuscating their partisan and central concern of control (Cheney & McMillan, 1990). In keeping with the critical rhetorical methodological approach utilized in this dissertation, further applications of critical scholarship (Deetz, 2006) are required to increase the transparency and accessibility of external forms of organizational communication and organizational rhetoric in general (Boyd, 2009) in order to explore how such forms of strategic organizational messages, despite their sometimes questionable motives and actual material performance, can potentially impact society in the most positive sense.

Public Relations

Given the questions that organizational rhetoric raises concerning the integrity of corporate messages, a second important context to keep in mind is that of public relations, whereby corporations intentionally and transparently attempt to persuade stakeholders as to the validity of their products, services, and decisions. In some respects the discipline of organizational rhetoric converges with PR as both approaches influence the formation of corporate identities through corporate forms of advocacy. Such a link was first recognized in 1990 by a special issue of the *Journal of Applied Communication* that promoted ideas of corporate advocacy through PR from a rhetorical perspective (Meisenbach & McMillan, 2006). Subsequent to this publication, studies that explore the intersection between PR and

¹⁴ Updating Quintillian’s definition of rhetoric as a “good man speaking well.”

organizational rhetoric have examined: efforts at self-defense and image restoration by organizations during or after crisis situations, debates over ontological and ethical issues of PR approaches, the promotion of particular ideologies, and the influencing of various typologies of PR strategies that require issues management (Ihlen, 2011b, pp. 456-458). Careful use of strategic communication by organizations plays a critical role in corporate matters and the management of corporate identities in the long-term, particularly as organizations face ever increasing pressures to be transparent in their daily operations (Christensen and Langer, 2009).

While literature in the area of convergence between PR and organizational rhetoric is rather small, researchers in both disciplines are increasingly advocating the benefits of exploring this interdisciplinary avenue and how organizations can use rhetoric to be good or ‘speak’ well (Heath, 2001). For instance, maintaining positive relationships with stakeholders prior to a crisis is believed to productively create social capital with publics (Taylor, 2011) and is considered by some to be more important than individual crisis response strategies (Brown & White, 2011). Similarly, a rhetorical perspective to PR by organizations can reflect a long-term commitment towards reducing errors while maximizing the organization-social relationship (Kent, 2011). A rather small handful of PR investigators have noted that self-directed organizational efforts conducted via strategic messages may continue to facilitate the presentation of organizational self-interests over societal ones. In stark contrast to the catalyst form of issue management that focuses on the processes and utility of using communication to expand the number of people concerned about an issue and policy influence (Crabbe & Vibbert, 1985) for instance, scholars have observed that *self-regulatory discourses* by organizations can end public interest in an issue in order to create quiescence by (dis)empowering constituents (Coombs & Holliday, 2011, pp. 494-495). Such research reflects the long-standing tradition of PR scholars and corporate

practitioners to advocate the positive benefits of the use of strategic forms of communication. Yet such insights directly avoid conversations that address *how* and *why* such strategic messages can be inherently persuasive. It is this lacuna that the dissertation addresses as the deliberate use of symbolic forms of persuasion and PR by corporations can not only serve to silence dissent and unite disparate audiences by legitimizing their actions, but also strategically build and maintain trust in specific constructions of a firm's overall identity by deliberately choosing what issues we talk about.

Application of a rhetorical perspective towards PR is thus a productive way to explore what role rhetoric plays in the construction of corporate forms of influence in the public sphere. A rhetorical approach to *crisis communication* for instance, can enable an organization to craft a more effective response to crises through a focus on repairing their reputation (Coombs, 2009). Corporations can legitimate their actions, usefulness, and responsibility to external publics in order to exert social influence through *actional legitimacy*, or the creation of corporate dialogue (rather than a monologue as traditionally used in PR efforts) with its publics in order to influence corporate policies before any crisis occurs (Boyd, 2000, 2009, p. 346). These efforts can be an organization's greatest strength (or its greatest shortcoming) in issue management and crisis forms of communication when managing the impact of such crises on their corporate identity (Conrad, 2011). In a similar vein, a rhetorical approach towards the PR efforts of an organization can have powerful implications for how we recognize and examine their responsiveness or preemptive measures to dynamic changes and crises in the external world. Researchers in the PR discipline note that corporations can, and need to, manage their overall image including their external corporate communication efforts in order to successfully engage employees and other stakeholders (Gray & Balmer, 1998; Cornelissen *et al.*, 2007, p. S9). This dissertation explicitly

focuses on such matters in the present moment to gain an understanding of how rhetoric can be used to successfully engage corporate stakeholders in specific conceptions of a firm's characteristics in the long term particularly within the context of social responsibility.

In sum, strategic forms of organizational influence can be manufactured and managed through the primary efforts of organizational rhetoric and its converging context public relations as a basis for generating shared audience perceptions of a corporation's actions. Such rhetoric can positively contribute towards a corporation's overall identity while legitimating specific corporate policies within the public sphere (Waerras & Ihlen, 2009). Such a discussion advances existing contributions of the organizational rhetoric sub discipline that argue that rhetoric can make a difference in issue management situations (i.e. Cheney & McMillan, 1990). Moreover, it adds to our understandings of how corporations can, and should, attempt to create, manage, or influence specific forms of symbolic corporate identities through the use of strategic messages and the advocacy of "social responsibility." In the next section I explore this argument further to understand in what ways the rhetoric of 'social responsibility' is a fundamental part of concerns about corporate identity and its maintenance.

Maintaining Corporate Identity Through Corporate (ir)Responsibility

The emergence of corporate forms of social responsibility as a growing area of concern for today's businesses is one of the most visible and accessible ways to highlight the importance and merit of how organizations can express and maintain specific ideas of their corporate identities and corporate values within the global arena. Given the extensive amount of research on the topic of CSR what follows is thus not a comprehensive and detailed review of this topic, but rather a summary of some of the prominent turning points of this organizational movement (May *et al.*, 2007). The central concern of this review is to pinpoint how specific ideas of

corporate identity may possibly have emerged in conjunction with evolving ideas of social responsibility and how such rhetoric faces its own criticisms.

Tracing the Beginnings...

While colloquially thought of as being something that prominently emerged in the past 30 years, CSR has experienced ebbs and flows in its popularity and definition for much longer than this (May *et al.*, 2007). The earliest manifestations of CSR were seen in the rise of interest by academics in the conception of social responsibility by organizations as a product of industrialization and the rise of mega-corporations from the 1870s onwards (*ibid.*). Modern conceptualizations of the term “corporate social responsibility” first crystalized within management literature in the United States in the 1950s (Carroll, 1999). Scholars and managers viewed businesses as instruments of society that were obligated to further societal interests and the often-competing demands of corporate stakeholders (Banerjee, 2007). For instance, authors May, Cheney and Roper (2007) note in what could be deemed to be a now ironic twist of history, Frank Abrams, former Chairman of the Board of Standard Oil¹⁵ examined a corporation’s role in the general public and management’s responsibilities calling for organizations to adhere to what is best for the common good through a harmonious balance between the interests of stockholders, the corporation, employees, suppliers, customers and communities (Abrams, 1951). This move by firms to both consider, and publically respond to, issues beyond simply a narrow economic focus to a firm’s role within the public sphere may be one of the earliest manifestations of the implicit use of the rhetoric of social responsibility as a foundation of corporate identity and corporate citizenship.

¹⁵ Now Exxon, a corporation that is frequently involved in ongoing litigations for its detrimental treatment of the environment and various stakeholder communities.

In 1953, Howard R. Bowen, Professor of Economics at Williams College in Massachusetts, affirmed the role of corporations within society by creating the foundational text *Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. This text articulated one of the earliest formal conceptions of CSR (May *et al.*, 2007) in which Bowen (1953) called for corporations to subscribe to the production of social goods that are “desirable in terms of the objectives and values of our society” (p. 6). Yet nearly twenty years later Milton Friedman (1970), one of CSR’s most-cited critics to date, claimed that societal interests are best served when businesses legally maximize shareholder value rather than expanding the responsibilities of business. Friedman elaborated that businesses serve society best by operating efficiently and profitably in order to increase shareholder returns that will in turn benefit society. This message was delivered in a social context that promoted stronger societal pressures on businesses in order to hold corporations to new levels of accountability and transparency (May *et al.*, 2007).

Scholars such as Archie Carroll (1979) subsequently refined Friedman’s emphasis on the profit motive of corporations and legal compliance by extending his argument to organizational responsiveness to contemporary social issues. An interesting shift in ideas of what comprises of a socially responsible corporate citizen and perceptions of firms thus continued in spite of critics who warned that ideas of CSR could indeed be fundamentally used as a form of “window-dressing” (Banerjee, 2007, p. 6), a term that prefigured the concepts of “greenwashing” or “bluwashing” as totalizing strategies found in contemporary mainstream corporate lexicons (Laufer, 2003). This outlook was fueled by debates over the terminology of corporate citizenship versus CSR, the recognition of an increasingly broader set of corporate stakeholders (Freeman, 1984; Jones, 1980), the role of CSR in the shift towards favoring *laissez faire* forms of free market trade, and the mounting pressures of an ever-increasing global economy (May *et al.*,

2007). All such factors point to the emerging complexities involved in using CSR as a vehicle to enhance the legitimacy and overall positive reception of the corporate identity of a firm amongst relevant stakeholder groups and the growing awareness that corporate values and activities, indeed perceptions of a corporation itself, were now presented on a global stage. Despite the best efforts of corporations to be global citizens, by the late 1990s, major corporations faced a rising number of corporate scandals that fueled an overall discontent with corporate behavior (Carroll, 1999). Scholars from various academic disciplines responded to this negative view of corporate image management by developing more nuanced arguments regarding CSR. For example some researchers shifted corporate involvement in societal issues from the fulfillment of social obligations through the exercise of philanthropy exclusively to a more strategic and proactive approach (i.e. Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011; Waddock, 2009; Hillenbrand *et al.*, 2013).

Today, ideas of CSR practices have gained traction with many corporations, academics, and national and international associations (Waddock, 2007; Zorn & Collins, 2007). Critical management scholars recognize CSR to be “some sort of commitment, through corporate policies and action” (Banerjee, 2007, p. 16) that can correspondingly be reflected in a firm’s social performance with minimal impact on society and the environment (Utting & Clapp, 2008). Such researchers recognize that the tenets of CSR have become an integral component of global corporate marketing strategies (Marin and Ruiz, 2007; Banerjee, 2008b). Meanwhile, organizational communication and marketing scholars saw such practices to be integral components of communicating corporate identity policies, and mission and vision statements (Cheney & Christensen, 2001; Pérez, del Bosque, 2012). For others, the close alignment of CSR strategies and corporate personality are considered to be a critical component to an organization’s success (Chong, 2009; Luring and Thomsen, 2009). In the marketing discipline

specifically, CSR disclosures trigger the corporate-image-building process and thus facilitate the overall attractiveness of a corporation's image and competitive advantage (i.e. Arendt & Brettel, 2010). Tropes of CSR can potentially contribute to the distinctive and enduring values of a corporation and its identity (for excellent examples see Collier & Esteban, 2007; Pérez & del Bosque, 2012) and thus enhance a stakeholder's sense of identification with a firm's identity (Bravo *et al.*, 2012).

Broadly, such studies provide for us the first glimpse into the ways that rhetoric of CSR can be strategically used to create and maintain positive conceptions of a firm's overall identity. Specifically, it gives us insight into the ways that a firm can use such conceptions to gain a competitive advantage through differentiation from their competitors. This insight was supported by authors Luring and Thomsen (2009) who recently claimed that, "CSR is often defined within the frame of the corporate identity and thereby considered well embedded in all organizational thought and action" (p. 38). With this growing awareness that CSR can be inherently persuasive and thus contribute towards an audience's specific perceptions of a firm's identity, a small but growing number of scholars have begun to explore the connections between rhetoric and corporate social responsibility more explicitly and how such discourses can strategically serve business interests on the global stage (i.e. Morsing, 2006; Banerjee, 2008c; Castelló & Lozano, 2011). In reflection of its inherently interdisciplinary nature, scholars from several academic disciplines subsequently explored the use of public discourses concerning social responsibility to express membership in civil society (Saila & Cyphert, 2003) such as the impact of CSR projects on communities (Epstein, 2007; Olawari & Fidelis, 2011). Others investigated in what ways discourses of social responsibility, financial soundness, and management quality can contribute towards a firm's reputation and the bottom line (Duhé, 2009) or overall firm value (Jo & Harjoto,

2012). Corporations increasingly use CSR measurements as a standard evaluation tool and explicit form of disclosing their environmental or financial performance (i.e. Liu *et al.*, 2012; Moser & Martin, 2012) and investing decisions (Cho *et al.*, 2012) more generally, with ideas of sustainability being used to strategically estimate average market valuations of public corporations specifically (Przychodzen & Przychodzen, 2013). While such studies provide an excellent guide as to how ideas surrounding CSR can enhance a corporation's identity, such research is remiss of discussion as to the rhetorical nature of such corporate claims, assuming instead that such deliberative, symbolic forms of language took a backstage role to the prominence of generating ethical public disclosures.

In the management and marketing disciplines, however, scholars profitably examine ideas concerning external CSR messages and their reception by internal stakeholders to reinforce corporate identity or stakeholder identification (Morsing, 2006) or manage a firm's interrelationships between CSR and notions of corporate governance or compliance, transparency and accountability (Jamali *et al.*, 2008). Other individuals in these disciplines investigate the use of CSR practices and discourses to express an organization's membership in civil society (Saila & Cyphert, 2003), the use of CSR to build a positive reputation with various stakeholder groups (Michelon, 2011) including consumers (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2004) by enhancing the legitimacy and overall positive reception of a corporation's image (Takano, 2013). Such studies gave us glimpses into how the concept of CSR can be strategically used to build stakeholder relationships and create positive conceptions of a firm with various stakeholders through specific ethical frameworks, but again do not make an explicit declaration of how such narratives are inherently persuasive in nature and ultimately and symbolically reflect the interests of the firms in question.

Strategic Ambiguity

The growing popularity of this corporate trend of embracing CSR to enhance positive conceptions of their identity is not to say that the very idea of CSR has gone unchallenged. In 1958 Theodore Levitt first warned managers of the dangers of CSR claiming that it was an oppressive and fanciful paradigm that could potentially harm business interests and profit making activities. Yet with this declaration, Levitt assumed that CSR was a fully defined and operative concept. Subsequent to this early critique authors have elaborated on how CSR remains an essentially contested subject (Votaw, 1972; May *et al.*, 2007; Okoye, 2009), particularly as the appraisal of good business practices are dependent on key moral imperatives that have various, and often, incompatible interpretations (Eabrasu, 2012). In the early 1990s definitions of CSR were understood to encompass different forms of business practices that included philanthropic charitable donations, community service, and attempts to enhance employee welfare (Banerjee, 2007). Charismatic terms such as “sustainability,” “corporate environmentalism,” or “corporate citizenship” continued to spark debates in academic circles over whether CSR is an oxymoron (Cloud, 2007), mythical concept (Doane, 2005; Devinney, 2009), or profitable enterprise (Barnett & Salomon, 2012) that encourages corporations to undertake voluntary actions beyond their legal expectations to reduce social ills (Margolis & Walsh, 2003).

A growing number of critics continue to problematize the very definition of CSR. Some scholars view the practice and philosophy of CSR to be a “fuzzy” concept (Lantos, 2003, p. 31) or social construction that is dependent on social, stakeholder, economic, environmental and voluntariness variables (Dahlsrud, 2008). This unease over the very definition of CSR led scholars Crane, McWilliams, Matten, Moon and Siegel in 2008 to lament that CSR has been

“quite frequently discredited, written off, marginalized, or simply overlooked in favor of new or supposedly better ways of conceptualizing the business and society interface” (Crane *et al.*, 2008a, p. 4). They elaborated that as a result of this disjuncture, CSR has become a broad label used to reflect competing ideas including “corporate citizenship, sustainable business, corporate responsibility, and corporate social performance” (p. 4). Rather than being something that held enormous promise, conceptions of CSR became a troubling catch all phrase that called into question exactly what the definition of ‘social responsibility’ can and should mean.

However, rather than viewing such obscurity as a negative, scholars fail to note that corporations can take advantage of this strategic ambiguity (Eisenberg, 2007) to legitimize their viewpoint on key social issues. Perhaps in response to this negative view of corporate image¹⁶ researchers have subsequently developed more nuanced arguments regarding CSR. For example Okoye (2009) urges us to realize that despite its ongoing lack of a single, precise definition, that the concept of CSR still requires some core or common reference point, “if only” Okoye states to “ensure that the contestants are dealing with an identical subject matter” (p. 613). In a similar vein, Rivoli and Waddock (2011) advocate that there is a “ratcheting quality” to CSR over time (p. 68). For the authors, shifting norms and business requirements naturally absorb what would certainly be the business case for CSR thus what would once considered to be “socially responsible” can subsequently be understood as “normal” business practices (p. 68). Others loosely define CSR as “some sort of commitment, through corporate policies and action” that can correspondingly be reflected in a firm’s social performance with minimal impact on society and the environment (Banerjee, 2007, p. 16; Utting & Clapp, 2008). While such studies are useful in bringing forward the limitations of CSR, they fail to address how such strategic forms

¹⁶ Conrad (2011) defined a corporation’s *image* as the “impressions people have of the organization in the *present*, given current issues and activities” (p. 168, my emphasis).

of ambiguity (Eisenberg, 2007) provide corporations with numerous opportunities to explain the incongruities of their actions while maintaining specific ideas of corporate citizenship (Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009). This insight was only recently discovered by Guthey and Morsing (2014) who view CSR as a mediated form of ambiguity that provides an advantage to CSR stakeholders by being “adaptable, resilient, and meaningful to diverse interests” (p. 555). Yet this study too was limited in its focus as it did not address how strategic ambiguity (Eisenberg, 2007) can be utilized by corporations to construct symbolic ideas of a corporation’s identity.

‘Good’ Corporate Citizens

Thus far we have learned that the concept of CSR can serve as a useful form of strategically ambiguous (Eisenberg, 2007) rhetoric for the communication of a firm’s value-laden strategies and corporate identity while paradoxically uniting various stakeholder audiences (Cheney, 1983). This strategic construction of arguments that may potentially silence competing ideas and voices returns us back to the fundamental philosophical question: “can such rhetoric actually do any good?” In this section I voice the concerns of scholars from several interrelated disciplines who have explored this question in more detail, finding that rather than promoting societal interests, the rhetoric of CSR might just indeed give us insights into how this form of strategic influence has dubious underpinnings, yet is still useful in promoting a certain character of corporate identity through claims of corporate citizenship (Waddock, 2001) and governance.

Corporate citizenship

I begin this discussion with research that addresses identified gaps between the rhetoric of CSR and the promised empirical benefits to society and firms of such corporate activities as a form of ‘good’ corporate citizenship (Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009). For several decades critics of CSR have questioned the erroneous and implied link between Corporate Social Performance

(CSP) (Wood, 1991) and a corporation's financial conduct (Barnett & Salomon, 2012). Such critics have found that the outcomes of numerous studies on the link between corporate social and financial performance fail to be consistent (i.e. van Beurden & Gössling, 2008) or are unclear (Weber *et al.*, 2008) and often view the relationship between the two as non-linear (Wang *et al.*, 2008). This incongruence between CSR activities and a corporation's financial performance has led scholars to criticize the use of empirical measurements within nonfinancial CSR reports that they argue are inherently subjective. Stuart Lawrence (2007) elaborates on this disjuncture between CSP and CFP when he discusses how a firm's application of universally applied measurement techniques and accounting practices to their CSR activities are ultimately damaging to sustainable practices. For Lawrence, such partial representations of reality do not recognize all of a firm's constituencies and thus represent an unending paradox of the objective measurement of subjective processes. Perrini *et al.*, (2011) extend such criticisms when they articulate the inconsistencies between the constructs of CSR activities and a firm's financial performance. The correlation between the two they remark, relies on "situational, company- and plant-specific elements that are difficult for most analytical approaches to detect" (p. 61). Despite these setbacks, corporate claims that a firm's performance and society in general are enhanced by engaging in the principles of CSR serve as advocacy of the organization's attempt to engage in socially responsible behaviors and policies.

Extending this critique on problematic empirical claims concerning the rhetoric of CSR more broadly, management scholars found that such corporate rhetoric does not recognize that some social initiatives (environment- or employee-related) are more important than others (Michelon *et al.*, 2013). Frynas (2008) argues that corporations and academia in general tout the benefits of CSR activities on the poor and marginalized communities without using any

systematic methodologies to generate accurate empirical evidence or consider what social and environmental impact CSR codes of conduct may have on such communities. It makes sense then, that critical management scholars have resultantly questioned if CSR development projects that are underpinned by capital can actually do any good (Banerjee, 2003a; Blowfield, 2004).

A rhetorical form of corporate governance

Building on the concept that empirical claims towards the rhetoric of CSR can construct particular, if problematic forms of corporate identities through their celebration of particular empirical measurements of their CSR activities, I now turn to a growing body of interdisciplinary research that has begun to reveal in what ways multinational corporations use CSR protocols to legitimize a firm's political role in democratic situations as a form of deliberative democracy or global form of governance¹⁷ (Scherer & Palazzo, 2011) to boost positive perceptions of their overall identity through 'good' corporate citizenship. Some management critics claim that corporations have begun to use the tenets of CSR assume state-like roles to fill regulatory vacuums that are traditionally associated with political bodies (Margolis & Walsh, 2003; Matten & Crane, 2005) as a fundamental way that a corporation can express its moral legitimation and role in society (Castelló & Lozano, 2011). Such claims they note, address company shareholder, and wider stakeholder concerns (Mason & Simmons, 2014) yet do not go very "deep" and are often "little more than a cosmetic treatment" (Crook, 2005, para. 12). Moreover that companies engage in the reporting of their CSR activities "to avoid negative impacts" of their actions rather than being "driven by a will" to make society a better place (Arvidsson, 2010, p. 339).

¹⁷ Scherer and Palazzo (2011) term these new forms of democratic processes of control and legitimacy a "deliberative model of democracy" that acknowledges the contributions of non-state actors to global forms of governance while ascribing political power to corporations (p. 918).

Concerns have also been raised concerning the veracity of the closely linked concept of sustainability and how corporations have used such rhetoric to offer idealized or artificial representations of a business' social and environmental impact (i.e. Bonevac, 2010; Banerjee, 2011; Boiral, 2012) in the global arena (Banerjee, 2003a). Such concerns have a particular importance when applied to multinational corporations. Scholars in the management discipline have critiqued efforts by multinational corporations towards CSR stating that it legitimizes the power of multinational corporations within the global market place (Rajak, 2011). Discourses of CSR lead to "ill-conceived and inappropriate development" programs particularly in economically developing countries that in turn generate "inequality, fragmentation, and social and economic insecurity" (Gilberthorpe & Banks, 2012, p. 185). Rhetoric plays an important role in both national and international CSR strategies and the subsequent persuasive constructions of global forms of corporate citizenship and organizational standards of efficiency. Bondy and Starkey (2012) argue for instance that multinational corporations that have embraced and implemented "integrated internationalization strategies" do not ultimately resolve the closely linked gap between global and local interests and the behaviors of the company and its employees (p. 4). Multinational corporations play an increasing 'governmental' or political role in the global economy by assisting with the formation of global standards, rules, and public goods (Crane *et al.*, 2008b; Scherer *et al.*, 2006; Whelan, 2012, p. 711). Thus Banerjee argues (2007) that we need to closely examine what he described as "the good, the bad and the ugly faces of corporate social responsibility" as such discourses present political aspects that impact the dynamics between actors (stakeholders) and institutions (pp. 2-3). According to Banerjee, we need to rethink our perceptions of the "purpose and legal personality" of corporations as enacted

in the current larger political economy as the current trend to maximize shareholder value does not always result in a win-win situation and can potentially marginalize millions (pp. 2-4).

Organizational communication scholar Stanley Deetz (2007) also took this form of myopia to task when he commented on CSR and corporate governance issues. Deetz suggests that corporate governance structures and processes are systemic in nature and thus promote what he termed “the exaggerated representation” of the values and interests of firms while omitting others (p. 267). Similarly, Rogers Orock (2013) notes that for transnational corporations, discourses of CSR have emerged as a new form of meta-narrative that projects values such as “responsibility,” “sustainability” and “development” that elides the way that their actions could be damaging and thus be held accountable (p. 27). Meanwhile in the marketing discipline, Prasad & Holzinger (2013) argue that the phenomenon of marketing CSR can be unethical or deceptive in describing CSR initiatives.

CSR as a Legitimation Strategy

Critics have subsequently found that discourses surrounding corporate CSR activities legitimize the power of multinational corporations within the global marketplace while overlooking the detrimental effects such business practices may have on local communities (Mitchell, 1989; Rajak, 2011) or the role of the nation-state (Sawyer & Gomez, 2008). Multinational corporations that operate in the extractive industries in developing countries for example often do not meet the stated expectations of their CSR promises and subsequently face criticisms of their performance (Hilson, 2012). Contributions of CSR and sustainable development to local communities by multinational corporations are thus viewed as “trifling or insignificant in relation to the overall activities” that result in “(irreparable) harm” to affected communities while profiting the multinational corporations (Ikejiaku, 2012, p. 16). Moreover,

limited benefits to local populations are offered in terms of human development, particularly in the case of oil corporations (Lompo & Trani, 2013). Yet despite these impressive lines of inquiry in the academic sector, considerations of the rhetoric of CSR to creation and maintain a corporation's identity exclusively as a form of strategic action are noticeably absent. This situation persists despite efforts by scholars to utilize the rhetoric of CSR as a way to legitimize corporate interventions into social activities.

Construction of 'ethos'

Rhetoricians have long recognized that the premise of rhetoric is to help us understand “how knowledge is generated and socially constructed through discourse” (Ihlen, 2011a, p. 147). Scholars often turn to one of the best-known and most commonly accepted definitions of rhetoric that is Aristotle's declaration: “Let rhetoric be [defined as] an ability, in each [particular] case, to see the available means of persuasion” (Aristotle, trans. 1991, 1.2.1; Ihlen, 2011, p. 148). As mentioned earlier, Aristotle (1991) considered ethos to be the “controlling factor in persuasion” (p. 1.2.4) possessing greater import than logos (reasoning) or pathos (emotional appeals). Ethos, or the character of a speaker, is constructed through language and presents a rhetor as trustworthy through three key strategies: practical wisdom (phronesis), virtue (arête), and goodwill (Euonia) towards an audience (Baumlin, 2001). Building on Aristotle's insights, contemporary scholars now place an emphasis on the epistemological roots of rhetoric (Scott, 1999) with an awareness that rhetoric constructs and influences the formation of social knowledge, social reality, and relationships causing some ideas to be accepted over others (Farrell, 1999) particularly as seen in its symbolic use (i.e. Burke, 1950) by the mass media. *Ethos* or a rhetor's “character as it emerges in language” (Baumlin, 2001, p. 263) is central to having a corporate message accepted, as it trumps logical arguments (logos) or emotional appeals (pathos). The creation of corporate

forms of ethos or corporate goodwill then is a particularly pertinent activity for today's businesses that must publically report to various stakeholders their CSR efforts while continuing to serve the 'bottom line' in response to market pressures.

Some organizational communication scholars have examined more generally how corporations engage in CSR rhetoric as a form of corporate advocacy or issues management (Crable & Vibbert, 1985). Livesey and Kearins' (2002) groundbreaking study on the nonfinancial reports of the Body Shop and Shell best illustrates this premise. According to the authors, corporate CSR reports often operate in a framework that embraces values such as an ethic of care and sustainable development. In the same year Livesey (2002) studied Exxon's use of CSR rhetoric finding that firms use such persuasive language to advocate and manage corporate values including Exxon's emphasis on the *market* as an all-encompassing god term (Burke, 1950). She solemnly notes that this overrode the focus on the consequences of global warming and the role of Exxon within to making scapegoats of government policy regulations and environmentalists. Arild Waeraas and Øyvind Ihlen (2009a) argue that the corporations Toyota, GE and Starbucks engage in claims concerning the environment that legitimate their everyday business practices through the creation of a particular environmental ethos through four broad claims: "we improve the world," "we clean up our own act," "we are like you," and "others approve of us." The authors elaborate that such claims serve to change stakeholder perceptions of the firms in question through a form of "green legitimation" or persuasion in which companies can gain acceptance of the belief that they "act in accordance with widely held social norms of environmental concern" (p. 96). Such positive rhetoric serves as a way of building each firm's ethos perhaps reinforcing why they are the most admired in the first place. Ihlen (2011a) later elaborates that companies on the Global Fortune 500 list center their CSR

strategies around five broad claims: we improve the world, we have cleaned up our own act, third parties give us praise, we have joined the CSR movement, and finally that we care about the audience. He comments that although such claims serve to help corporations come across as being trustworthy, discussions of the actual problems that such firms may face when implementing CSR strategies are missing. Moreover, that “there is no urgent practical need” for them to generate such socially responsible dialogues with their stakeholders (p. 157).

Removed from reality?

It is not surprising then to see studies that focus exclusively on the narratives of CSR to use the term “rhetoric” as a synonym for language forms that differs from “reality” (Ihlen, 2011a, p. 149). Research that explores the use of CSR reporting as a form of corporate advocacy and legitimation continues to expand as academics question if such self-revelations have become a mechanism for corporations to discharge their social and environmental forms of accountability (Bouten *et al.*, 2011). For instance in 2011, Olawari & Fidelis evaluated the rhetoric of CSR as expressed in the Statement of General Business Principles by The Royal Dutch/Shell Group of Companies in the Nigera Delta region. They conclude that claims of social responsibility are contested by a wide group of corporate stakeholders. As a rare exception, Frandsen & Johansen (2011) examined the impact of implicit CSR principles in the arena of corporate identity management, specifically climate change, questioning if organizations become in time, what they claim to be. Such concerns are conveniently overlooked in the use of CSR rhetoric by most corporations as such discourses enable them to escape critical censure. As Ihlen (2011a) notes CSR rhetoric can emphasize utopian corporate narratives that can be far removed from environmental and social realities, particularly when corporations discuss climate change. Social and environmental disclosures can be used as a tool of enhancing a firm’s legitimacy and to

communicate their superior performance to stakeholders (Mallin *et al.*, 2013). As an example of this, Ihlen (2011a) demonstrates how climate rhetoric of the world's largest 30 companies overlook fundamental systemic problems that stem from economic growth and the use of nonrenewable energy sources (Ihlen, 2009a).

Narrow view of stakeholder relationships

Researchers have subsequently offered important critiques that assist us in understanding how such forms of advocacy can be utilized by global firms to generate specific proactive forms of corporate identities. This is particularly important in the arena of stakeholder relationships. In 2006, legal scholar Amiram Gill found that corporate governance and CSR disclosures concerning ethics, accountability, transparency, and social and environmental concerns benefit not only a firm's shareholders but also the broader stakeholder community by transforming the transnational body of legal norms. Yet he notes that even this convergence and form of self-regulation can be improved upon. CSR practices represent "the viewpoints of only a subset of actors involved in the stakeholder consultation processes" (Archel *et al.*, 2011). Some researchers continue to question whether corporations are able to uphold the responsibility challenge (McMillan, 2007). Certainly, references to corporate ideals and morality abound in recent studies of CSR literature as more often than not corporations use CSR narratives to establish ethical and social values and to justify their existence within their firm statements and cultures and to distinguish them from their competitors (see Bravo *et al.*, 2012; Pérez & del Bosque, 2012 for excellent examples).

This argument is perhaps most salient in the idea that CSR rhetoric often follows what Castelló and Galang (2010) term "managerial logic" with the ultimate aim to increase shareholder value, paradoxically offered through the notion of "social contribution[s]" (p. 4). As

an illustration of such logic, companies that operate in developing countries utilize CSR narratives to justify their need for a “social license to operate” (Hilson, 2012, p. 134). Spanish financial institutions disclose their CSR actions in their websites as a way to communicate their corporate identity and to legitimate firm behaviors (Bravo *et al.*, 2012). Taiwanese corporations engage the rhetorical toposes of CSR to improve policyholder’s perceptions of their firms and to secure a reputation of being good (Hsu, 2012) while corporations in the high-tech industry in Taiwan use CSR narratives to boost a firm’s image through ethical business practices and norms of conduct in order to justify an increase in economic performance (Chang, 2009). CSR tropes are also used to improve corporate images in the closely related context of cause-related marketing (Vanhamme *et al.*, 2012) as a form of leverage to benefit both the corporate brand (Torelli *et al.*, 2012) and society at large (Vallaster *et al.*, 2012), or assess a firm’s reputation amongst multiple stakeholders (Mahon & Wartick, 2012). Corporations are urged for example, to integrate CSR messages such as sustainability into their mainstream communications in order to enhance stakeholder’s attitudes towards the firm (Peloza *et al.*, 2012).

Conclusion

In sum, construction of a positive corporate identity through the use of the rhetoric of CSR can be viewed as a form of strategic ambiguity (Eisenberg, 2007) to boost positive conceptions of a firm by stakeholder audiences. Corporations can use such ambiguity to generate conceptions of themselves as being “good” corporate citizens (Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009) that are legitimate (Waeraas & Ihlen, 2009) and that their actions are ethical and in the interests of the public. Yet such narratives are often removed from reality and offer a narrow view of stakeholder relationships. It is thus a situation that raises important moral and political questions, particularly as organizational decisions are “inevitably interested and value-laden” rather than

being simply economically rational (Kuhn & Deetz, 2008, p. 174). Advocacy of corporate decisions in the realm of social responsibility create distortions of social and economic developments in the public sphere that hinder the accomplishment of diverse goals and how corporations can embrace all stakeholder interests (Deetz, 2007). Given these insights, ideas of good governance expressed through CSR reports rather than demonstrating ‘good’ forms of corporate citizenship have perhaps become almost an institutionalized form of “unaccountability” that represent the views of a subset of actors within the stakeholder consultation process (Archel *et al.*, 2011, p. 327). This insight builds on the increasing number of scholars that have expressed concerns about the growing importance of the veracity of the closely linked concepts of CSR and sustainability and how global corporations have used such ideas to offer idealized or artificial representations of a firm’s local social and environmental impact (Bonevac, 2010; Boiral, 2012) or defend or enhance their reputation (Waller & Conaway, 2011).

Overall, the effect of the challenges and ongoing debates over the rhetoric of CSR and its increasing presence in the global business arena as an expression of corporate identity is thus profoundly important in paving the way for the positive reception of alternate forms of organizational rhetoric. A critical rhetorical approach to this issue causes us to rethink our current assumptions of what roles businesses and organizations can play in finding public-private/global-local resolutions to social ills (Margolis & Walsh, 2003) as corporate messages often have embedded and inhospitable forms of economic logic. Indeed, a sophisticated form of organizational identification is utilized within corporate messages (Cheney, 1983) that blurs the line between the organization and its stakeholders and the business-society relationship. In interrogating such moments of strategic ambiguity (Eisenberg, 2007), the question must not be *In*

what ways does this make the corporation look like a good citizen? but, rather, *Who benefits from such strategic forms of organizational language?* To assume that use of the rhetoric of social responsibility to maintain positive conceptions of a corporate identity is mutually beneficial for all involved is highly problematic. It is pertinent to examine the implications of what this may mean not only for contemporary forms of corporate identity management, but perhaps more importantly, our ever-evolving ideas of global democracy as even though they may appear on their surface to be mere ‘rhetoric,’ such corporate messages can have very material consequences indeed.

Chapter 2
Committed to Doing Some Good?
The Rhetoric of Corporate Social Responsibility

The secret of life is honesty and fair dealing. If you can fake that, you've got it made.

~ *Groucho Marx* (Ross, 2000, p. 2)

On April 20, 2010, *Deepwater Horizon*, an offshore deep-sea petroleum-drilling rig near Louisiana exploded causing 11 immediate deaths to individuals contracted to BP and unprecedented environmental and economic damage. Surprisingly, the various individuals and collectives¹⁸ that were involved in the *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill were largely overlooked in media treatments of the event (Coeckelbergh, 2012). Instead, public attention towards the disaster soon shifted to the U.S. Government and BP's former CEO Tony Hayward and his controversial denial of the presence of oil plumes within the Gulf's waters that ultimately resulted in his resignation in October of 2010 (BP PLC, 2010). Not surprisingly, however, BP engaged in an initial, albeit clumsy image-repair strategy regarding the ongoing and poorly managed subsequent oil spill into the Gulf region¹⁹ (Harlow *et al.*, 2011; Shogren, 2011). Specifically, they played the blame-shifting game by renaming the disaster from "Deepwater Horizon" to "the Gulf of Mexico oil spill" or "MC252 oil spill incident" (Soraghan, 2010) in order to extract their corporate reputation from the scuffle.

¹⁸ Including corporate and financial actors, regulators and politicians and consumers of the oil industry that support the current regulatory framework.

¹⁹ A total of more than 5 million barrels of oil, or a rate of 50,000 barrels a day for nearly 3 months (Robertson and Krauss, 2010).

Evaluating the rhetorical fallout of the incident, philosophy professor Mark Coeckelberg (2012) comments that the ascription of moral responsibility to BP reflected the common assumption that “responsibility is mainly or exclusively individual” (p. 36). Indeed it is common when the companies who control the oil pipelines and oil tankers experience major spills, to shoulder the burden of responsibility (Frynas, 2012). Such companies are subsequently called to task to change their behavior through government regulations or volunteer actions under the banner of ‘social responsibility.’ As one outcome of the “volunteer” types of reporting, some firms that operate in the controversial oil industry turn to tropes of sustainability and CSR as a means to obtain legitimacy (Du & Vieira, 2012), defer criticisms linked to their activities (Lompo & Trani, 2013), prescribe normative behaviors (Spangler & Pompper, 2011), or address issues related to social governance, or the various ways through which social life is coordinated (Frynas, 2012). Prior to the *Deepwater Horizon* disaster, BP (formerly known as BP Amoco) generated their inaugural sustainability report in response to the growing attention paid to the use of CSR as a competitive advantage. Released in 1998, the annual report titled “Environmental and Social Report 1998” articulated BP’s primary purpose of generating “a strong competitive return” for stockholders while playing a “progressive and constructive role in the world in which we operate” (BP Amoco, 1999, p. 2). Such efforts build on BP’s former *Beyond Petroleum* CSR campaign which attempted to rebrand BP as a “green” corporation and after operating for nearly more than a decade earned them the title of finalist for a federal award for firms that displayed “outstanding safety and pollution prevention” (Bush, 2010, para. 2).

As demonstrated by BP, ideas surrounding ‘social responsibility’ are often thought of as a much needed epiphany sorely needed in the oil industry as oil corporations realize that it is at the very least fashionable, if not advisable, to be publically seen as being committed to doing some

'good.' Certainly, the rhetoric of 'CSR,' 'sustainability' or 'sustainable living' is evoked frequently by a wide number of corporations as a standard tool in their repertoire of public relations and marketing efforts, pervading media, the academic arena, and now the everyday lives of the general public. The corporate use of CSR rhetoric to boost positive conceptions of a firm has become almost a philosophy that is not only commonplace and unremarkable, but is almost expected as way for corporations to escape censure. As evidence of the growing popularity of this trend, the global consulting company KPMG publishes an annual "survey of corporate responsibility reporting," a well-respected industry guideline that sets the benchmarks for corporations who wish to engage in CSR activities by detailing global trends amongst the world's largest companies (KPMG, 2013). According to KPMG (2013) in 2013 more than 4100 global corporations were surveyed that adhered to the corporate responsibility creed, factoring "environmental, social and governance information" into the assessment of their corporate performance (p. 4). KPMG (2011) comments that "CSR reporting has evolved into a mainstream business practice over the last two decades" (p. 4). Where such reporting was, "once merely considered an 'optional but nice' activity, it now seems to have become virtually mandatory for most multinational companies, almost regardless of where they operate" (p. 6).

Corporations utilize standard tropes of CSR or "sustainable business" to escape deeper examination of their daily business practices and to promote their overall public image in a climate that is increasingly suspicious of the role(s) of business leaders (Edelman, 2013). Yet we do not yet systematically and critically examine in what ways corporations use the rhetoric of CSR to strategically create positive affirmations of their overall corporate identity in the context of transcultural business, or to rhetorically mitigate conflicting interests of corporate stakeholder audiences. Instead, it is becoming commonplace to see firms 'institutionalize' their CSR reports

with such claims of transparency being used as evidence that corporations know the rules for disclosure on societal and environmental issues and are correspondingly following them (Carroll & Einwiller, 2014) without questioning what impacts such choices may have on various stakeholders.

My goal here is to take stock of the important role that the rhetoric of CSR plays in the creation and maintenance of specific forms of corporate identities. In today's global political economy, CSR narratives are largely taken for granted as wide public audiences engage in the self-evident belief that corporate social responsibility is about *volunteered* forms of *responsibility*. Such rhetoric has become a way of speaking corporate "truths" by organizations that generate specific purposes and affective political responses. Yet such practices gloss over the inherent issues with this all-encompassing and "feel good" rhetoric including in what ways corporations can use CSR discourses to implicitly embed specific capitalistic values amongst stakeholder audiences. Moreover, it fails to illustrate how such rhetoric creates and articulates *self-serving discursive constructions of responsible corporate citizenship*²⁰ (Waddock, 2001) or a particular form of corporate *ethos* (i.e. Waeraas & Ihlen, 2009) in order to strengthen a firm's long-term competitiveness and financial performance. Specifically, this chapter argues that we need to treat narratives of corporate 'social responsibility' as a specific form of audience-centered and proactive rhetoric: a persuasive strategy that corporations use to encourage audience identification (Burke, 1950) with specific conceptions of their enduring and endearing characteristics. Such a rhetoric is particularly important in today's flourishing media environment, where public relations efforts can use CSR rhetoric as a form of pre- and post-crisis management (Coombs, 2007). This chapter also explores in what ways the rhetoric of CSR as a

²⁰ Some researchers consider corporate citizenship to be synonymous with CSR (i.e. Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009). It is to this conception that I lean towards.

strategy is a form of prescriptive *transparency* of a firm's business practices (i.e., May *et al.*, 2007; Christen & Langer, 2009) while also being a persuasive norm that paradoxically *obscures* ways that organizations can secure ideas of legitimacy (Waeraas & Ihlen, 2009) as a strategic tool for improving troubled reputations as a competitive advantage.

To clarify, this critique is not meant to dismiss CSR or to deny its ability to actually do some good. Instead I wish to show how CSR narratives work to situate an organization's identity in superior relationship to its competitors as a strategic form of symbolic messaging that is far from benign or neutral. I cannot agree with KPMG that CSR is a fundamental and functional imperative for businesses to simply "report" on their involvement in key societal issues. The case study of BP in this chapter shows us the firm utilizes CSR rhetoric to construct a particular form of corporate ethos (Aristotle, 1991). In the *Deepwater Horizon* disaster, BP used CSR rhetoric to discursively re-center the firm from a troubled, corporate behemoth that causes unimaginable environmental disasters, to a legitimate one that can be trusted in the eyes of consumers and stakeholders. I illustrate how in this context how BP's reporting of their government mandated restoration efforts in the Mexico Gulf transform the company's identity to one with economic integrity and a 'sustainable' future. It thus argue that it is important to end our neglect of the ways in which CSR can be used as a form of proactive corporate identity management, as it is becoming increasingly apparent that such discourses and their failings have an explicit, profit-oriented effect that is potentially detrimental to various stakeholders.

BP & 'Ethos' as Ameliorating Rhetoric

Perhaps as one outcome of the ubiquitous, now global focus on forming narratives of social responsibility, the rhetoric of CSR as mentioned earlier is fast proving to be a useful tool for corporations to create and maintain positive ideas of their overall corporate image through the

effective management of their brand (Creel, 2012) or to gain and maintain legitimacy (Castelló & Galang, 2010). We do not need to go too far from our own backyard to see the use of CSR as this type of symbolic brand-building exercise in action. Consider for instance the American nation-wide chain Panera Bread Company and their launch of the *Live Consciously* advertising platform to express their “brand values, purpose and culture” (Parrish, 2013) or Shell Oil’s recent launch of their *Let’s go* campaign that describes Shell’s role in meeting the growing global population’s modern energy needs (www.shell.com). As is often the case in such accounts, CSR tropes are reportedly naturalized and deployed within a firm’s daily business practices to present the participating corporations as actively engaged and concerned corporate “citizens” that are committed to “doing well by doing good” with very little empirical evidence that such actions are actually helpful (Devinney, 2009, p. 45). Until now, tropes of CSR and sustainability have offered several benefits to corporations including improved revenues, branding and reputation or image (Jeffers *et al.*, 2014). Yet some emerging signs point to the idea that corporations are also aware that they can engage in the tropes of CSR to manage audience perceptions of their enduring characteristics or overall corporate identity. Disney (2013) for instance states that their new “citizenship identity” is to “Be Inspired” and that their “citizenship mission” is to “conduct our business and create our products in an ethical manner and promote the happiness and well-being of kids and families by inspiring them to join us in creating a brighter tomorrow” (p. 6).

BP attempts to reap the potential benefits that can be generated by the public reporting of such social scripts through the annual creation of their *Sustainability Review*. BP argues that such a report adheres to the reporting norms advocated by the GRI standards and the United Nation’s Global Compact and what BP terms as IPIECA guidance, or the voluntary reporting of sustainability activities in concert with the oil and gas industry associations (“Reporting

standards,” 2013). BP articulates its role as an active social citizen in their *BP Sustainability Review 2013* when the firm maintains, “We believe that the best way for BP to achieve sustainable success as a company is to act in the long-term interests of our shareholders, our partners, and society” (BP, 2014, p. 3). The corporation elaborates: “BP’s objective is to create value for shareholders and supplies of energy for the world in a safe and responsible way. We strive to be a world-class operator, a responsible corporate citizen and a good employer” (ibid., p. 3). This CSR rhetoric, of course, depicts BP as an involved and responsible world citizen that is focused on global political issues and restoration efforts of the Mexico Gulf. In this section I build on these claims by showing that BP strategically utilizes the rhetoric of CSR as a legitimation strategy to build a certain corporate *ethos* (Aristotle, 1991) or level of trust with their audiences through deliberately chosen narratives of social responsibility. Such an action, I argue, is undertaken as a strategic way to gloss over or mitigate the outfall of the *Deepwater Horizon* disaster in the short term while reinforcing a specific positive corporate identity for the firm as a sustainable energy provider in the long run.

Muddied Reputation

This use of CSR rhetoric by BP is particularly important when we consider the plagued history of the corporation. Formerly known as British Petroleum, the British oil and gas company BP represents the eleventh largest oil and gas company in the world as measured by its 2013 production (formerly sixth in 2012) (Helman, 2013), with operations in more than 80 countries around the world that employ more than 80,000 people (BP, 2013). But just like the troubled company Nestlé, the multinational firm also has a rather muddied reputation. In 2007 BP agreed to pay \$303 million in sanctions to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) to settle charges of manipulation in the propane market (CFTC, 2007). And in 1999 the firm pled

guilty to criminal charges stemming from the illegal dumping of hazardous wastes in Alaska's North Slope back in 1993 (EPA, 1999). According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the felony resulted in fines and penalties to the tune of more than \$22 million and the establishment of an agreement by BP that they will create the first environmental management system to safely oversee all of their exploration, drilling, and oil production facilities in the United States and Gulf of Mexico (ibid.). Such efforts by BP to regulate their daily operations seem to be futile as the firm has since experienced many ongoing environmental controversies. In 2003 for instance the California South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) sought \$319 in penalties against BP/Arco for charges that they violated thousands of air pollution standards over the previous eight year period (AQMD, 2003), an allegation that was repeated by AQMD in 2005 for the time period of 2002 and 2004 for BP's failure to properly run their refinery equipment according to AQMD regulations (AQMD, 2005). And in 2006 and again in 2009, Colombian farmers sued BP for environmental damage caused by the firm's *Ocensa* pipeline that reportedly caused damage to local soil and groundwater, water supplies, and caused landslides (Taylor, 2009).

These environmental damages and evidence of negligence extend to the deaths of individuals and the creation of major environmental disasters however. In 2005 BP's Texas oil refinery exploded, killing 15 employees and injuring more than 170 others leading to a fine of more than \$21 million by the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) department (OSHA, 2005). The following year, BP's *Exploration Alaska*, an oil transit pipeline in Alaska's North Slope mentioned previously, leaked for five days due to BP's cost-cutting measures in maintenance and failure to detect corrosion in its pipeline infrastructure leading to the largest oil spill in the region (Roach, 2006). Perhaps most disturbingly, evidence of this

negligence was also found to be a cause of the aforementioned *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill in April 2010. In what is now known to be one of the biggest man-made disasters, an estimated 4.9 million barrels of oil gushed into the water of the Mexico gulf, resulting in a strong detrimental impact on the Gulf Coast's economy sectors including fishing and tourism ("US to give BP evidence," 2012).

Narratives of Legitimacy

As shown in the last chapter, a small but growing number of studies have probed the link between narratives of CSR and rhetoric to explore how such discourses serve business interests. Such studies examined topics such as the use of CSR and its closely related term 'sustainability' as a form of strategic ambiguity (Eisenberg, 2007) or troubling catch all phrase that corporations can use to build rapport with stakeholders via good corporate citizenship or expressions of moral legitimation (i.e. Castelló & Lorzano, 2011). Although CSR can potentially do some good, the overwhelming consensus by critical scholars is that CSR rhetoric, particularly in the global arena, enables a firm to paradoxically escape responsibility for their actions (i.e. Devinney, 2009; Arvidsson, 2010), or avoid systematic methodologies and analysis of the ways in which such actions can marginalize millions in poor or marginalized communities (i.e., Banerjee, 2007; Frynas, 2008) while promoting inappropriate development programs (i.e., Gilberthorpe & Banks, 2012). CSR rhetoric can also function as a legitimizing strategy in which firms can construct particular discursive forms of 'ethos' or goodwill (i.e. Waeraas & Ihlen, 2009). This is a particularly important strategy for transnational corporations (Du & Vieira, 2012) that face increasing stakeholder expectations arising from their social misdeeds and crucial role in society. Corporations that engage in CSR disclosures in export-oriented industries for instance, use CSR rhetoric to allay concerns relating to family influence on a firm's corporate governance practices

(Khan *et al.*, 2013). In the oil and gas sector that BP operates within firms that champion CSR use the issue of revenue transparency to remain relevant as entities that can address the crucial issues relevant to the broader community (Frynas, 2010). Oil companies in particular address the issue of ethos through CSR communications that address cross-sector partnerships between stakeholders, two-sided messages and factual arguments via corporate web sites and social media platforms that are easily accessible (Du & Vieira, 2012).

BP adheres to such industry standards and the use of CSR rhetoric as a narrative of goodwill. As a way of managing the public relations fallout from the largest marine oil disaster in history (Robertson & Krauss, 2010), BP attempted to “reclaim” their corporate image using ethical/CSR positioning and rhetorical techniques such as brand exuberance (Balmer, 2010) and ethical corporate marketing (Balmer *et al.*, 2011) in general, to apologia (O’Connor, 2011) in particular. For example, clicking on the “Supporting Gulf tourism” link on BP’s website reveals BP’s heralding of their efforts to commit \$179 million through to the end of 2013 for regional and national tourism campaigns (“promoting tourism,” 2013). Such narratives of fiscal responsibility and accountability and cross-sector partnerships between BP and local communities are boosted by BP’s 2012 upbeat *Now is the perfect time to visit the Gulf* advertising campaign that encourages viewers to visit the Mexico Gulf region. In this instance the Gulf region is foregrounded as a unique, vibrant, and safe place to visit while the firm’s ongoing damage to the local environment are strategically omitted.²¹ Yet as I show below, two primary claims are made by BP within this context of CSR rhetoric as a form of proactive and

²¹ The fallout of the *Deepwater Horizon* event on the Gulf of Mexico environment and economic region is ongoing. For instance, as I will elaborate on later, there are ongoing debates over the chemical contamination of seafood within the region (Rotkin-Ellman *et al.*, 2011).

prescriptive transparency to build the firm's ethos: "we have economic integrity," and "we are creating a sustainable future."

"We Have Economic Integrity"

The first rhetorical strategy that BP engages in to proactively generate goodwill and trustworthiness with their audiences is the claim *we have economic integrity* concerning the reparation efforts of the Gulf Oil spill. Several claims are made by the firm that they have financially invested in the Gulf region as a form of socially responsible behavior. BP advocates in their 2012 nationwide commercial *Committed to the Gulf. Committed to America* for instance that they have paid "\$23 billion in claims & cleanup," in order to "help people in businesses who were affected" by the oil spill ("Committed to the Gulf," 2012). On the same theme, BP reports in their 2012 nationwide commercial *BP Gulf Coast update: Our ongoing commitment* that they "have set aside \$20 billion dollars to fund economic and environmental recovery" and that they are "paying for all spill related costs" ("BP Gulf Coast update," 2013).²² As a declaration of "good" corporate citizenship through their direct economic involvement with employees, BP's website also reveals that they directly employ more than "2,300 people in the Gulf of Mexico" as well as providing "tens of thousands of additional jobs in the region" ("BP in America," 2014, p. 1). The main function of these financial declarations is to demonstrate BP's commitment to integrity as a 'good economic citizen' through the commitment and transfer of the proper economic resources to the Gulf region as part of their reparation efforts. Although BP admits that they have caused environmental damage, causing legal settlements to local business owners and individuals, through such reports and commercials they can point to the specific monetary

²² It should be noted that framing this discussion is the sheer economic presence and profitability of the BP corporation. For instance, at the time of writing BP's self-disclosed *first quarter profit* for 2013 amounted to more than US \$4.2 billion, an increase of US \$.3 billion from the last quarter of 2012²² (BPPress, 2013).

resources that they have utilized to rectify the outfall Gulf situation as an expression of good corporate citizenship (Waddock, 2009). Such explicit financial disclosures not only generate a link to a form of accountability and transparency to the firm's CSR efforts but give a sense of integrity and legitimacy to their testimony as claims of 'truth.'

Paying the Bills. BP can also claim that they are being "good" corporate citizens (Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009) by paying the bills of the restoration efforts in the Gulf. Broad empirical statements about BP's mandated and voluntary "progress of restoration efforts" include BP's expenditures of billions in restoration costs are made by the firm. Viewers can download the latest "Gulf progress fact sheet" that describes the establishment of fully funded trust funds for claims relating to the Mexico Gulf, BP's efforts to support state-led tourism campaigns, non-profit groups and government entities, and their environmental developments with the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) process ("Gulf progress fact," 2013). Evidence of such economic investments and social responsibility serve the purpose to reassure corporate audiences that the firm is reliable, honest, and effective and that confidence can thus be placed in their role as responsible citizens within the Gulf region by audience members.

Perhaps the most salient example of BP's claims towards economic integrity lies in the firm's 2013 sustainability review in which they provide an "Update on the Gulf of Mexico" (BP, 2014, p. 10). Here readers are given an estimate of BP's payments to December 31, 2013 for expenses related to the gulf disaster. Such expenses include: Response and cleanup \$14B+, Claims, advances and settlements, \$12.5B, Funding for the natural resource damage assessment process \$1B+, Early restoration projects \$698M, State-led tourism campaigns \$178M, State-led seafood marketing programs \$47M, and State-led seafood testing \$24M (ibid., p. 10). Such claims are backed up by BP's Group Chief Executive statement in the report, Bob Dudley who

writes “In the Gulf of Mexico, we are supporting environmental restoration efforts after the 2010 oil spill and paying all legitimate claims for compensation, while getting back to work on our 10 offshore rigs and production facilities” (p. 2). The benefits of such explicit financial investments are offered to corporate audiences to repair the firm’s image in the minds of such audiences due to their environmental damage in the Gulf region. In their statement concerning “Restoring the economy” for example on the same page of the 2013 sustainability report, BP (2014) acknowledges that commercial fishing is an important part of the Gulf but that “many experts believe Gulf of Mexico seafood has made a strong recovery. According to government testing results and commercial landings information, Gulf seafood is safe to consume and available in numbers comparable to pre-accident levels” (p. 10). It is inferred from such statements that BP’s payments concerning the seafood industry (\$47M for marketing and \$24M for seafood testing respectively) together with their reparation efforts have made strong progress in effectively restoring the natural resources of the Gulf of Mexico.

In such instances a corporate form of ethos (Aristotle, 1991) through absolution by fishing experts is prescribed in specific economic terms while directing audiences towards a consensus concerning what costs BP are absorbing in the aftermath of the oil spill. Such rhetoric helps to discursively construct BP as an invested partner in the environmental *and* economic restoration of the Gulf region while inferring that these investments reflect the generalizable interests of the local Gulf communities that subsequently approve of the firm’s actions. This rhetorical construction of ethos through the formation of economic relationships with community activities is strengthened through BP’s reporting of their establishment of trust funds, payments to members of the local Gulf communities for their cleanup efforts, agreement to plead guilty to

felony charges and pay \$4B in penalties in fines, and through the employment and economic support of local businesses and individuals.

But avoiding responsibility. What is left unsaid concerning these claims of economic integrity, however, is BP's active and ongoing attempt to *avoid* economic responsibility for the *Deepwater Horizon* disaster. Michael Hiltzik (2014) of *The Los Angeles Times* reports that for the class-action lawsuit against BP reached in 2012, that although the company initially "wanted to do the right thing" (para 3) in repairing the Gulf, it has since "mounted a frontal assault" (para 4) on the class-action settlement that remains uncapped. According to Hiltzik, BP placed full page advertisements in major newspapers that ridiculed "supposedly fraudulent claims" (para 4) asking the question of readers "*Would you pay these claims?*" Such resistance to being economically responsible for the class-action lawsuit was not restricted to the mass media. Hiltzik (2014) further reports that in the last few months of 2013, BP unsuccessfully "mounted an intensive legal attack" (para 6) against the Louisiana federal court to restrict payments of the claims arguing that the oil-spill agreement "should be scrapped if what it believed to be fraudulent payments continued" (Fowler, 2014). And although BP has paid more than \$1 billion for the government mandated *Natural Resource Damage Assessment* report, the corporation is reportedly refusing to pay for the government-led studies arguing that they "should not be forced to finance studies that it is not allowed to see" (Crooks, 2014, para 2).

Moreover, in strong contrast to the claims noted earlier in their annual sustainability report, a visit to BP North America's website www.thestateofthegulf.com that heralds the statement "The state of the gulf: BP sets the record straight," reveals BP's efforts to advocate for a different understanding of the Gulf spill ("the state of the Gulf," 2014). Here visitors to the website can click on the "advertisement" tab that includes including copies of the various

advertisements²³ that they continue to run in major newspapers such as *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* that question the integrity of claims made against the corporation (ibid.). For instance, in the section titled “answering our critics” BP question on the website if the corporation bears sole responsibility for the spill answering questions such as: “Does BP believe it was grossly negligent in its actions leading up to the spill?” and “When it comes to safety, is it true that BP just doesn’t get it?” BP informs readers that “BP was not grossly negligent” and that “safety is and has been of paramount importance to BP” respectively (ibid.). Such statements infer that BP is a responsible corporation that focuses on safety and that they were not solely responsible for the oil spill. The viewer of such messages is left wondering as to the effectiveness of this rhetorical counter-movement and if it serves as an effective portal for reliable information on the former claims made towards their economic integrity.

“We are building a sustainable future”

The second strategy utilized by BP to generate a positive conception of their corporate identity within the framework of CSR narratives is their claim *we are building a sustainable future*. BP engages in tropes of sustainability concerning the environment as a way to establish their leading role in responsible forms of self-regulation as a sustainable venture that can potentially legitimize their power in the global marketplace while overlooking the role of the involved communities and nation-states (Sawyer & Gomez, 2008). The company points to their efforts in this area in the *BP Sustainability Review 2013* in which they state that they are “working to avoid, minimize and mitigate environmental impacts wherever we do business” (BP, 2014, p. 34) as an example. In this report readers are informed that BP have shared the lessons learned concerning oil spill response with regulators in Azerbaijan, Brazil and Libya, that they

²³ To see an example of such an advertisement, visit BP’s website <https://www.thestateofthegulf.com/media/40704/BP-Ad-12-12-13.pdf>

have improved their energy efficiency at the Toledo refinery between 2010 and 2013 and understand better the associated risks of operating their business in water stressed regions (ibid.).

In the year immediately following the *Deepwater Horizon* explosion, BP articulated what actions the firm are undertaking to make the corporation a “safer, stronger, more valuable and more sustainable company.” (“Sustainability,” 2014) Such actions broadly include: improved safety and operation risk functions, a review of BP’s risk management systems, restructuring of BP’s upstream business divisions, greater emphasis on individual performance and rewards and contractor management, and an increased investment in technology (ibid.). Calling 2010 the year of the oil disaster the “year that called BP’s sustainability into question,” BP’s Chief Group Executive Bob Dudley, states in the firm’s 2010 sustainability review report that BP’s main task is to “earn back the trust that was lost and build a sustainable BP for the future” (BP PLC, 2011, p. 2). This task was to be achieved through the strengthening of responsible relationships by BP with governmental and regulatory bodies, the creation of investments in alternate energy businesses, paying greater attention to climate change and through “progressive” contributions to a lower-carbon economy (ibid.). Similar to problematic tropes of ‘sustainable development,’ (Banerjee, 2003a) such narratives valorize BP’s labors towards sustainability and the cleanup of the Gulf region in the immediate wake of the disaster while offering hope that the firm would continue to be responsible towards the environment in the future.

Today, in keeping with other oil industry leaders who talk about meeting the “Future of Energy” and “shaping the future of energy through innovation” (www.shell.com) as a form of social responsibility, BP demonstrates an almost dogmatic adherence to the belief that BP can be sustainable and discuss within their corporate documents and websites their new emphasis of meeting the needs of growing energy demands. Under the sustainability section on BP’s website

for instance, BP claims that “We believe we have a positive role to play in meeting growing energy demand around the world” and encourage viewers to read further about BP’s explanations of their sustainability initiatives including managing their environmental impact, working responsibility within areas in which they operate, and forecasts about the future (“sustainability,” 2014). A typical example is BP’s rhetoric concerning “the energy future” where “action is needed to limit greenhouse gases.” (ibid.) Website viewers are informed that BP has made progress in 2013 to meet the “challenge” of climate change including “extending forecasts for world energy markets in BP Energy Outlook 2035” as well as investing “\$8.3 billion” into alternative energy (ibid.). The website, in tandem with claims made in the *BP Sustainability Review 2013* make numerous references to the work that BP does within the areas of the energy future, safety, the environment, and society on the global stage. Such claims towards this responsible corporate identity do not of course suggest that the current trend towards maximizing shareholder value, in this instance through ‘sustainability initiatives’ may not reflect a ‘win-win’ situation or could even marginalize millions once enacted, a concern expressed by many scholars who study the impact of CSR activities within the global political economy (Banerjee, 2007).

A focus on safety. One impressionable example of how BP can achieve this sustainable future within their CSR rhetoric particularly in the wake of the *Deepwater Horizon* disaster is seen through their focus on the topic of “safety.” BP’s sustainability section on their website heralds the statement that “Everything BP aims to do as a company relies on the safety of our operations, workforce and the communities around us” (“Safety,” 2014). Viewers of the website are encouraged to read further on BP’s commitment to safety including their drive to provide leadership on safety through their Operating Managing System (OMS) (ibid). BP claims that

such a system “lays out the standards and processes required for environmentally and socially responsible actions” required by the firm to operate efficiently both now and into the future (BP, 2013, p. 51) and is applied to all aspects of their operations including process safety, health and personal safety, transportation and contractor safety and security and crisis management.

According to the corporation, such an empirical system also adheres to the “environmental management system standard ISO 14001” (ibid., p. 51) a standard that the ISO website explains provides practical guidelines and tools for organizations seeking to mitigate their environmental impact while improving their environmental performance (www.ISO.com). Note how such discourses closely align BP’s commitment towards CSR as a strategy to their predicted success (Lauring & Thomsen, 2009) while reinforcing the attractiveness of their corporate identity and competitive advantage.

For the general media consumer, however, BP’s conception of safety is not limited to corporate reports or their website exclusively but is also proclaimed in their 2013 nationwide commercial campaign *BP fuels America. America fuels BP*. In this campaign series that first aired in May 2013, BP, perhaps rather dubiously, declares that for more than 150 years they have fueled America with “Safely. Reliably. Responsibility.” and that in the past 5 years alone, BP has “invested \$55 billion more than any other energy company” to meet this goal (BP fuels America, 2013). Audiences are encouraged to “join in the conversation” or identify with this safety movement by viewing BP’s Facebook page²⁴. Here BP declares that, “We’re fueled by the people and communities of America, and our commitment has never been stronger” and that their adherence to “safe” forms of business, and investments in technology in the US serve as an extension to their sphere of influence to meet the short fall of actual state government agencies

²⁴ <http://facebook.com/BPAmerica>

(BP fuels America, 2013). Note how such tropes discursively transform BP's pragmatic legitimacy or ability to keep their license to operate from what would be considered to be an expected standard in their everyday business practices to an elevated form of moral corporate legitimacy (Palazzo & Scherer, 2006). Such tropes reinforce positive conceptions of the firm as a world leader in this realm that embodies a certain level of strategic ambiguity (Eisenberg, 2007) as to what "safety" and this commitment actually means. Moreover, as with other problematic claims of social responsibility, they focus an almost exclusive attendance to safety as a value of the firm, while obscuring other interests and values (Deetz, 2007).

Investments in environment restoration. To address their role in the *Deepwater Horizon* disaster explicitly, BP (BP PLC, 2014) also declare in their 2013 sustainability report that they are "funding early restoration projects designed to accelerate efforts to restore natural resources in the Gulf of Mexico that were injured as a result of the accident" including efforts to "restore and enhance wildlife, habitats and the services provided by those habitats, as well as to provide additional resources for fishing, boating and related recreational uses" (p. 10). According to the report, active cleanup operations have nearly ceased, tourism is now experiencing record numbers, and the seafood industry is almost back to normal. In BP's 2014 "Gulf of Mexico: Progress of restoration efforts" fact sheet the corporation conveys much of the same impression, informing readers that the "Gulf tourism industry has seen a strong rebound" and that "many of the tourism records that were broken in 2011 were surpassed again in 2012" ("Gulf progress fact," 2013, p. 2). Similarly, that commercial seafood landings reached their highest levels since 2002 and that the third and final phase of restoration projects designed to accelerate natural resources in the Gulf has begun (ibid., p. 3). Such CSR rhetoric gives us an understanding of why audiences would co-identify with BP and their proactive active efforts at maintaining an

ethical corporate identity. Specifically, such tropes embody the premise that BP is pro-environmental and thus “good” social citizen that can be trusted as they invest the implicitly appropriate amount of money and time into strengthening both the Gulf and the firm’s safety record so that both may become sustainable in the future. This message would be appealing not only to the impacted communities but also other corporate stakeholders who wish for big corporations to be responsible for the impact of their actions. Citizens who wish to have a ‘sustainable future’ of energy needs within both America and other countries would also find this message attractive and approachable as it uses the everyday language of civil society actors to convey that the firm is a legitimate and forward looking in its focus.

But the damage has already been done. Yet audience identification with this particular construction of ‘ethos’ or corporate character as it emerges within the framework of CSR narratives is a formidable goal for BP to achieve. Oil corporations in particular face highly controversial reputations stemming from their ability to have the greatest adverse impact on our environment and their persistent engagement in unscrupulous business practices (Du & Vieira, 2012). It appears that this perilous situation continues to apply to BP. Despite the firm’s claims that the seafood industry in the Gulf of Mexico has robustly recovered from the oil spill and that the region’s ecological environment is successfully being restored, critics assert that the Gulf Coast’s oyster populations have been in a constant state of decline since the disaster occurred (Visser, 2014). Experts in marine wildlife report that dolphins and sea turtles have died in unprecedented numbers (Viegas, 2013) and that the region’s Bluefin tuna are suffering from cardiac arrest due to the toxins released from the spill (Brette *et al.*, 2014) while fish embryo exposed to oil from the BP disaster continue to develop heart and other deformities that will either kill them or result in shortened lives (Wines, 2014). What was formerly known as the

“most product ocean ecosystems in the world” now reportedly experiences untold disaster such as fish that have cardiac arrests (Sahagun, 2014, para 4) and multiple complications arising from the use of the oil dispersant Corexit as it permeates the food chain through zooplankton (Ortmann *et al.*, 2012) that impacts regrowth capabilities in coral reefs (National Wildlife Federation, 2013). Given the gravity of the ecological impact on the Gulf region due to its widespread distribution and potential to continue to have “significant biological effects” that may be ongoing in their development, the National Wildlife Federation (2013) reports that “our understanding of the full scope of the Gulf oil disaster will be unfolding for years or decades” citing as evidence the decades long recovery of biomarine life in the Prince William Sound after the Exxon Valdez spill (p. 2). Meanwhile experts correspondingly predict that the oil spill will have long term negative impacts on both animals and humans (Johnson, 2013).

Despite these concerns, CSR rhetoric attempts to qualify the firm as an involved corporate citizen that not only has economic integrity but also invests their economic resources into a mutually shared sustainable future. This is a distinctive rhetorical move away from presenting the corporate identity of BP that is proud of its ‘green’ strategies. Specifically, the rhetorical tropes of CSR enable BP to transform from a troubled firm that generated one of the world’s biggest environmental disasters into a responsible, economically invested corporation that has ‘ethos’ (Aristotle, 1991) or wisdom, competence, and the ability to provide our energy needs of the future. Indeed, experts in the advertising industry note that since the initiation of the cleanup efforts in the Gulf, BP has begun to produce more corporate-oriented ads that focus on their efficiency and viability as a corporation in the oil and gas sector rather than highlighting

their environmental initiatives (Forbes, 2012).²⁵ This could be in response to pressures on firms in the energy sector that often face accusations of corporate greenwashing when attempting to look environmentally friendly, suspicions that can be reduced when such corporations explicitly acknowledge their economic motives (de Vries *et al.*, 2013). The rhetoric of CSR thus gives corporations an explicit opportunity to generate proactive, prescriptive, and ethical forms of transparency that not only can alleviate the outfall of major disasters such as the *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill, but also provide opportunities for audiences to identify with their corporate identity through promises of economic integrity and sustainability. In the next section I discuss the implications of this rhetorical move.

Language, Power, and Corporate Identity Management

Organizational communication scholar Charles Conrad (2011) reminds us that once events become crises, strategies of crisis management through the use of language must be deployed to deal with the “immediate rhetorical situation” (p. 184). He elaborates by giving the processes of crisis management that researchers and practitioners agree on: First, that organizations must respond *quickly* and *clearly* to the event for the primary purpose of framing it for key stakeholders, second, that the rhetoric of that response must be *consistent*, and finally, that organizations should be *open* and *honest* in their claims of credibility (p. 184). As is shown in this case study, BP used the rhetoric of CSR to legitimate the corporation as a responsible or “good” citizen through narratives of economic integrity and promises of a sustainable future. Such arguments work to affirm BP’s role as an engaged and economically invested partner in the restoration efforts in the Mexico Gulf region, that is, cooperative with the various state and

²⁵ Ironically, some researchers report that BP’s use of tropes of environmental stewardship both before and in the months immediately following the spill served to benefit the firm by mitigating the impact of the disaster on their retail margins (Barrage *et al.*, 2014)

national regulatory bodies and local civil society actors. In this case then, BP was not what Ihlen (2009b) would term a “passive victim” (p. 465) of the rhetorical situation. Rather, to temper the outfall of the disaster the rhetoric of CSR, specifically ideas of corporate ethos, became a critical component of BP’s attempts to become even more actively engaged in the ideas of responsibility for audiences to identify with the firm. Yet it is perhaps the disjuncture between BP’s claims to honesty and corporate citizenship and the material experience of the oil spill crisis by local communities that presents us a deeper understanding of the use of language by corporations to formulate particular notions of power and manage their identities. As with most criticisms of the use of CSR by multinational corporations within the global economy (see Banerjee, 2003a; Rajak, 2011, Gilberthorpe & Banks, 2012 for excellent examples), the question of *whose interests* are ultimately being represented in the aftermath of the disaster (and *whose are being marginalized*) is an important consideration that as of yet has no clear resolution. BP’s use of the rhetoric of CSR works in this case to make the Gulf region the purview of the corporation while glossing over the empirical truths that may be associated with the disaster. Moreover, their rhetoric of dominance subtly devalues the contributions that dialogue with various impacted stakeholders and social actors could make.

When considering questions of self-interest Edwards (2011) comments that this is not an immutable barrier to effective communication, but rather is an inherent factor that influences organizational rhetoric and is shaped through rhetorical engagement. Perhaps then tropes of economic integrity and sustainability within the context of CSR are not used by BP to be outwardly manipulative or controlling,²⁶ but rather as a form of persuasive language or tactic of appeal. Such an appeal rather transparently shows that their investment within local Gulf region

²⁶ An attitude that is often held by management scholars (see Hartelius & Browning, 2008).

communities is a strategic, and strictly rhetorical, activity. Expressed ideals by BP of what makes a corporation a “good” or in this case, “responsible” and “ethical” sustainable organization can be used as a reference point to not only articulate or shape this form of corporate self-interest, but also to highlight the differences between diverse and perhaps conflicting audiences of such rhetoric (including employees) that BP claims to serve the interests of the common good. This issue of evaluating a corporation’s self-interests in response to social issues within the context of the rhetoric of CSR and its subsequent influence on corporate identity management presents the kernel of this chapter. Arguably the *Deepwater Horizon* event gave rise to a whole new vocabulary of corporate citizenship (Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009) that helped BP to create and maintain positive conceptions of their overall corporate identity with which to court various stakeholders and encourage them to act together with the corporation.

Hidden Interests

Yet as with the strategic ambiguity of CSR such rhetoric contains several hidden interests (Boyd & Waymer, 2011) that are self-serving for the corporation. First, BP’s use of rhetoric concerning the issue of sustainability taps into broader public discourses that surround the acceptance and support of increased off-shore oil and gas drilling to pre-spill levels subsequent to the disaster (PewResearch, 2012). Thus, a large number of social actors exposed to such rhetoric are predisposed to participating in BP’s corporation as part of their own identity (Burke, 1950, Cheney, 1983). The firm recently committed almost \$4 million to The University of Texas for example as a strategic partnership formed to develop “next-generation” deepwater oil and gas resource extraction systems and tools (BPPress, 2014). Second, efforts towards public dialogue are impeded by BP’s strategic choice of words such as “sustainability” or “responsibility” in their nonfinancial reports concerning the oil spill. Such words may paradoxically prompt

discursive closure (Christensen & Langer, 2009) thus limiting the participation of stakeholders who actually have a voice and could argue that such efforts are actually ‘unsustainable’ or ‘irresponsible.’

A third hidden interest that BP benefits from with the use of CSR rhetoric is the way in which such rhetoric can be used as a form of self-advocacy for the firm to make an enlightened choice (Heath, 2011) concerning our oil and gas needs for the future. BP uses CSR rhetoric to position themselves as the expert authority on their efforts towards restoration and sustainability of the Mexican Gulf and their role in the energy needs. Fourth, BP’s use of CSR rhetoric is aimed at generating specific forms of ‘knowledge’ about their involvement in Gulf region for audiences as a product of financial integrity rather than as a form of corporate transparency. Although some explicit numbers were given on various projects, they were also arguably ambiguous. Here the firm’s vague claims of scientific investments into sustainable energy initiatives and reports of economic investments in the Gulf region become an effective tool for BP to discursively coopt or marginalize the rights of local citizens to independent studies or to mandate more formal means of governmental regulation.

Finally, BP’s corporate identity is enhanced by the firm acting in a state-like role (Matten & Crane, 2005) through reportable forms of self-regulation that appropriate environmental and energy sustainability and economic characteristics to take advantage of weak state, national, and global government enforcement mechanisms. Such rhetoric produces the vocabulary through which power, ecological restoration, and knowledge of the Gulf region and the energy needs of the future are defined and instantiated (Heath, 2011, p. 425). In this process BP is legitimated as a dominant economic, political, and social entity at the local, national, and global level. This orientation goes beyond economic and instrumental views of CSR that continue to rely on the

“containment power of the nation-state” (Scherer & Palazzo, 2011, p. 904) to firmly establishing BP as a powerful political actor that is engaged in self-regulation with no pre-established mandates of such an engagement to hold them accountable to.

As seen in BP’s claims of economic integrity or a sustainable future, firms can rhetorically create ethos (Aristotle, 1991) to suppress the inherent issues related to utopian CSR narratives. BP attempted to come across as a “good environmental citizen” or a constructive entity within the Gulf region that is cooperative, financially invested, responsible, and accountable for their actions concerning the environment while actively building a sustainable future for our energy needs. In this instance the rhetoric of CSR served to make cogent arguments on behalf of BP that the transnational firm willingly faces the demands of conflicting constituencies that hold them accountable for their actions. Yet as with the issues associated with the ambiguity of CSR more generally, several factors complicate claims by corporations that their CSR activities exhibit ethical or moralistic behavior and thus can justify this proactive move in their overall identity management. In the case of BP, narratives of sustainability and economic integrity discursively gloss over the long-term environmental damage that may occur to deep-water ecosystems due to BP’s decision to use chemical dispersants in the Gulf of Mexico (Schrope, 2013). Moreover, BP’s CSR discourses continue to attach little importance to the \$20 billion environmental penalties and criminal charges that the firm may soon face if found guilty of gross negligence in the disaster (Lavandera & Morris, 2013), claims by critics that the true impact of the oil spill is unknown (Schleifstein, 2013), or BP’s choices of cleanup remedies and the enforcement of new government regulations regarding overall safety issues (Broder, 2012).

Per Ihlen’s (2009b, 2011a) initial critiques of CSR narratives, key questions thus still hang over BP’s head: Have they *really* cleaned up the gulf oil spill? Did BP invite dissenting

voices in their cleanup efforts? And, are such efforts and community stakeholder dialogues being effectively regulated? With critics of CSR questioning if corporations are poised to take on such responsibility challenges, it remains to be seen whether BP's CSR narratives are characterized by what McMillan (2007) termed "instrumentality, exclusivity, attribution, monologue, and narcissism" (p. 22) rather than connection, reciprocity and trust. It may not come as a surprise that BP may be simply furthering their own self-interests while using CSR rhetoric to broaden public interest in their outcome (Ihlen, 2011a) and foster audience buy in to their corporate identity.

Conclusion

As has been illustrated by this case study of BP, CSR narratives are not only an integral strategy for the communication of positive conceptions of a firm's overall identity to their stakeholders (Bhattacharya *et al.*, 2009) but that rhetoric is an important component of this endeavor. While narratives of CSR have been found by marketing and organizational communication researchers to be essential to global corporate marketing strategies (Marin and Ruiz, 2007) and corporate identity policies, mission and vision statements (Cheney & Christensen, 2001; Pérez & del Bosque, 2012), rhetoric is one way that a corporation can strategically communicate to audiences their key and enduring characteristics (Conrad, 2011). Some management and marketing scholars consider the close alignment of CSR strategies and corporate personality to be a critical component to an organization's success (Chong, 2009; Lauring & Thomsen, 2009) that contributes to the distinctive and enduring values of a firm (Collier & Esteban, 2007). Authors Lauring and Thomsen (2009) elaborated on this when they noted that for a growing number of corporations, "CSR is often defined within the frame of the corporate identity and thereby considered well embedded in all organizational thought and

action” (p. 38). Yet as shown in the case study of BP, such embedded organizational thoughts and actions can be, and indeed are, inherently strategic and CSR rhetoric may be needed to overcome the material realities of a firm’s actions.

With this conception of what the rhetoric of CSR can actually do in terms encouraging audience forms of identification with a corporate identity, we can, and perhaps should, view the use of CSR rhetoric as a strategic business practice that not only triggers the corporate-image-building process (Arendt & Brettel, 2010) but facilitates a firm’s competitive advantage and overall attractiveness of a corporation’s identity to stakeholder audiences. Understandably, corporate stakeholders continue to remain guarded about corporate CSR statements and can be skeptical that proactive CSR communications equate to genuine or ethical actions (Pomeroy & Dolnicar, 2009). Some management and marketing researchers believe that companies engage in CSR behavior to avoid negative impacts rather than to be inherently “good” (Arvidsson, 2010)²⁷. Such concerns are supported by a wide-spread consensus that what is considered to be “good practice” often adheres to a moral pluralist perspective that involves controversial interpretations (Eabrasu, 2012). These studies built on prior studies in the CSR field in which some scholars argued that the universalization of the CSR rhetoric to boost a corporation’s overall business performance has produced the oxymoronic status of a “socially responsible corporation” that can use such discourses to deceive the public (Cloud, 2007; Devinney, 2009). Indeed in the oil and gas sector where BP operates, despite the rise in mandatory and voluntary reporting of sustainability and CSR initiatives, clear gaps exist between information and good performance or even performance improvements (Lindsey *et al.*, 2014). Critics of CSR rhetoric have subsequently argued that business disasters such as BP or the Goldman Sachs’ involvement in

²⁷ A situation that can lead to *corporate dissonance* or incongruity between a corporation’s behavior and their rhetoric (Bernstein, 2009).

the global business crisis are perhaps in response to CSR becoming a perverse target, mini-industry, or fetish “encouraged by the philanthropies that feed off on it and funded by the corporate executives who have found that it serves their bottom line” (Freeland, 2010, para. 2). Corporate stakeholders are increasingly overwhelmed by escalating CSR assertions by firms that make it hard to determine which ones are authentic (Parguel *et al.*, 2011).

To complicate this matter further, strategic management scholar Timothy Devinney (2009) astutely points out that corporations can actually do well by exploiting “being good.” He elaborates that corporations naturally gravitate towards CSR practices to solve “problems from which economic rents can be claimed” (p. 49). Devinney explains that this is because corporations exist to: generate profits not solve societal problems, often skew societal standards to “meet their own needs,” are not representatives of society at large, and are “naturally socially conservative” (pp. 49-50). Moreover, governments ironically use CSR practices to abdicate some of their “social responsibilities” (p. 51). It is perhaps not surprising then that contemporary investigations concerning the use of CSR rhetoric by corporations to manage or inform social issues or merge business goals with dialogic public communication efforts (Saiia & Cyphert, 2003) remains a growing field of research. Most recently, researchers have examined how CSR reports of Fortune 500 companies facilitate public conceptions of their “response, recovery, planning, and mitigation of disasters” in domestic and international situations (Johnson *et al.*, 2011, p. 352). Other scholars explore how managers of leading oil companies can manage CSR practices and reporting to fuel a longitudinal view of the best practices of their public relations efforts in order to earn back the trust of civil society actors and the media (Spangler & Pompper, 2011).

Yet as management scholars remind us an inherent gap continues to persist between CSR rhetoric and corporate practices such as corporate efforts towards philanthropy, prosocial activities, and adoption of particular codes of conduct concerning suppliers (Waddock & Googins, 2011). This form of “corporate hypocrisy” (Wagner *et al.*, 2009, p.77) negatively affects consumers and their attitudes towards corporations, a perception that is further induced by critics of businesses who claim that they are “doing good” more generally (Waddock & Googins, 2011, p. 26). Such a situation is amplified by key differences in country or even industry specific contexts (Olawari & Fidelis, 2011) and a lack of faith in traditional business leaders when communicating the prosocial activities of firms (Edelman, 2013). These criticisms highlight the unending paradox that corporations face in “trying not just to *look* like better corporate citizens, but actually to *become* better corporate citizens” (Waddock & Googins, 2011, p. 27). The rhetoric of ethos illustrates in what ways corporations can use such ideas, specifically the narratives of CSR to boost their overall identity while overlooking such concerns. Matejek and Gössling (2014) remark that ironically although BP’s own processes of branding, losing and repairing their environmental image after the *Deepwater Horizon* disaster set the bar by critics on the discrepancies between corporate claims concerning the environment and their substantive truth, this very act of corporate greenwashing was willingly accepted by public audiences and indeed boosted public perceptions of the firm. An investigation into the rhetorical function of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) the latest evolution of social responsibility that calls for corporations to avoid depleting natural resources, look after the ‘well-being’ of their customers and suppliers, and the “economic distress of the communities in which they produce and sell (p. 64) may provide us with a suitable alternative to this disturbing trend.

Chapter 3
Creating Shared 'Value'
Rhetorical Identification Consummated

If you want something new, you have to stop doing something old.

~ Peter F. Drucker, author of "The Effective Executive"

In a rather odd tribute to corporate branding, educators in Sri Lanka's public school system utilize Nestlé's "Creating Shared Value" (CSV) water education program materials to explain water conservation and its link to clean water, hygiene, health and wellness to young schoolgirls and boys (Nestlé, 2014). In keeping with the tenets of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011), such students are encouraged to become "water ambassadors" and to share their new found knowledge with their family and others in their community (Nestlé, 2014, p. 202). The corporation reports that they have installed several water foundations in Sri Lanka, providing more than 18,500 students with daily access to clean, safe drinking water (ibid., p. 198). Nestlé (2014) claims that they have also assisted various rural communities that are located near their factories and other countries with access to water, sanitation and hygiene projects. In the cocoa and coffee production areas of Côte d'Ivoire for instance, Nestlé partnered with the International Federation of Red Cross to construct public toilets in schools, local markets, and bus stations in order to prevent the spread of diseases. And as part of an effort towards sustainable reforestation in their *Nestlé Cocoa plan*, Nestlé Ecuador planted more than 13,000 native trees to "restore and protect areas within the watershed, which in term conserves water" (p. 201). Extolling a win-win

situation for all, Nestlé states that such CSV efforts not only “consolidate our [Nestlé’s] future” (p. 198) by “improving the quality of cocoa, improving the environment and the standard of living for local families” (p. 201) but that they promote responsible water management of water resources by all users.

Nestlé’s (2014) development of these sustainable water management practices or what they label as “long-term, locally relevant community initiatives” (p. 201) may seem like small steps in the conservation of our world’s water, but they are significant. According to UNICEF (2014), we face a growing water crisis. In 2011 36% of the world’s population (2.5 billion people) lacked what they termed adequate sanitation facilities while 768 million individuals continue to use unsafe sources of drinking water. UNICEF elaborates that such situations particularly impact remote rural populations and children and their right to education as they often generate serious repercussions in terms of hygiene. The World Health Organization confirms that such statistics are predicted to remain consistent in the short-term and that contributors to this issue include regional disparities of water coverage and service quality that cause intermittent supplies and increased contamination risks (WHO Press, 2013). This scenario is also arguably exacerbated by the private sector as it is out of the norm amongst large companies to attend to these needs. Less than one half of Global 500 companies lack techniques to reduce inefficient water use in their production supply chains or have not yet established cooperative measures with local and national governments regarding the efficient use of ecosystem resources (Holmgren *et al.*, 2013).

Armed with this information, Nestlé can perhaps ethically claim that the integration of CSV initiatives (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) into their daily business practices play a critical role in assisting urban and rural populations, governments, and community stakeholders to meet

our growing global water challenges. To that end, Nestlé's (2013) statement of their "corporate business principles" in their 2012 Creating Shared Value report specifically states: "We are committed to the sustainable use of water and continuous improvement in water management. We recognize that the world faces a growing water challenge and that responsible management of the world's resources by all water users is an absolute necessity." (p. 82) Such a commitment is backed up by Nestlé's efforts to actively work on reducing water use in their supply chain, factories, and other daily operations (Nestlé, 2012a). This focus on water conservation as a rhetorical strategy within the framework of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) to 'hail' various stakeholder audiences is no mere philosophical conversation. Nestlé has long been engaged in creating global water policies under the guise of CSV. Nestlé played a founding signatory role in the UN Global Compact CEO Water Mandate and the global Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS) (Nestlé, 2014). Similarly, the firm helped create the global 2030 Water Resources Group and is actively involved in the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI) as well as the creation of a new global ISO 14046: Water Footprint Standard (Nestlé, 2013, p. 86). Nestlé also continues to expand their partnerships with global stakeholder groups such as the Water Footprint Network to "facilitate the sharing of knowledge" and support the "development and implementation" of global sustainable agricultural and business practices (ibid., p. 88). Most recently the corporation became the first signatory of the global "Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Implementation at the Workplace" (WASH) pledge developed by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development in September of 2013 ("Nestlé helps," 2013), and was named as the leading food products company in the 2013 Dow Jones Sustainability Index for their efforts in water conservation ("industry group leaders," 2013).

In short, Nestlé's water education initiatives and global water policy efforts discursively locate the firm as an involved, 'caring' or even 'good' corporate citizen that values the wellbeing of the communities in which they operate. But their proactive involvement in the global water crisis through this specific form of corporate leadership does not mean that such activities of social responsibility are exclusively a form of philanthropy or expression of concern for the world's welfare. As discussed in Chapter 1, CSR rhetoric presents businesses with strategic opportunities to secure specific ideas of their corporate identity through ambiguous and debatable constructions of integrity that firms can exploit to be seen as doing something "good" (Devinney, 2009). Yet Nestlé's accountability for their role in the water crisis serves an explicitly different purpose. Created within the framework of sharing some form of 'value,' Nestlé actively engages in these water commitments with the premise that they will create social value for the involved communities as a form of social responsibility *as well as* economic value for the firm by raising their brand awareness and expanding their potential pool of loyal customers. Such mutually shared forms of 'value' are framed within the idea of "responsibilization" (Thompson, 2012) or form of corporate governance wherein Nestlé has become accountable for their own actions through voluntary and public forms of self-regulation while using a profitable and market-embedded form of morality (Shamir, 2008).

As a strategy then, Nestlé is able to use the rhetoric of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) as a way to differentiate themselves from their competitors while narrating for their stakeholders the expectations of how they will act in the future – this is what an "identity" does. Specifically, they can promise a simplistic 'win-win' formula that is based on mutually beneficial forms of social and economic 'value.' This is vastly different from the use of CSR by corporations that face ongoing accusations of using harmful business practices, or those that use

CSR rhetoric as a public relations exercise (May *et al.*, 2007) that leave it up to the corporations that engage in such practices to interpret how to even conduct such social forms of ‘responsibility.’ Instead, Nestlé can rhetorically generate a consistent and generative clean state of social responsibility, one that discursively frames them as being concerned and invested in social issues with an eye on the future. In short, CSV allows companies like Nestlé to create a *new*, and *legitimate* identity that is generative, rather than repair or defend an existing one.

In the following pages I hope to show how this rhetoric of CSV – first coined by Nestlé and then elaborated and made popular by Porter and Kramer (2006, 2011) – provides a particular rhetorical ‘toolkit’ of success that prompts corporations to repackage ideas of social responsibility from a reactive stance to a proactive, utopian and generative narrative of social and economic *value*, one created through innovation and economic growth as part of a corporation’s DNA. This organizational emphasis by the rhetoric of CSV on a mutually beneficial corporate identity is one reason why further examination of its claims is so important. Narratives of “shared value” are presented by Porter and Kramer (2006, 2011) as “opportunities” that encourage businesses to proactively express concern as involved corporate citizens for disfranchised populations or the environment – such as the global water crisis – through the instigation of innovative forms of products and environmental and government policy changes. Yet while the emphasis of CSV is on what could be deemed to be proactive forms of ‘social responsibility,’ such rhetoric also loudly endorses Friedman’s (1970) call that a firm’s responsibility is to make a profit. What is uniquely ironic in this situation is that despite this rather transparent economic agenda and expression of corporate self-interest, CSV narratives simultaneously invite a broad form of endorsement of participation in a firm’s identity by various, sometimes conflicting stakeholder audiences (Cheney, 1983).

The potential ability for these utopian claims of value to unite disparate or conflicting audiences while rhetorically transforming how businesses can be perceived in today's climate of suspicion towards corporations demands more intensive examination. As elaborated in this chapter, we should realize that the idea of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) offers a particular, for-profit oriented "toolkit" to corporations in a form of rhetoric that can be realized in its material application. Meanwhile corporations can use such rhetoric to further legitimize their intervention into strategically chosen social issues. Exactly how this rhetoric is presented to corporations and stakeholder audiences to get their 'buy in' is of paramount importance as it involves two generations of closely interrelated forms of identification. First an elimination of division (Burke, 1950) between corporations and the rhetoric CSV as advocated by Porter and Kramer and their consulting company Foundational Strategy Group (FSG). And second, the subsequent rhetorical "joining," or "consummation" if you will, of corporations with their stakeholder audiences to reduce conditions of estrangement (Cheney, 1983). What follows is a brief genealogy of the development of CSV as the latest form of management culture embraced by corporations to address the perceived public relations failings of CSR. Then, I will theoretically elaborate on how the very idea of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) functions as a corporate and rhetorically generative "toolkit" that instructs (most often global) corporations to provide strategic and measurable forms of economic performance under the utopian guise of providing social 'value.' Such an exploration contributes to our understanding of how this contemporary rhetoric of social responsibility can be strategically utilized by corporations to not only express their central character over time, but also to foster a symbolic and self-serving form of consensus by stakeholder audiences with their overall identity.

The Rhetorical Reinvention of Capitalism

The nascent rhetoric of CSV comes from what could be deemed as humble or puritanical beginnings. In 1999, world leading business strategist and Harvard University professor Michael Porter and his colleague Mark Kramer critiqued philanthropic efforts by charitable foundations in the area of social sector management stating that they lacked strategy, accountability, and focus in the provision of efficient services. For the authors, shared *social value* could only be achieved if such foundations strategically positioned themselves as solutions to social challenges, learned from previous experience, and tapped into their unique strengths. The expression of these early tenets of focused social initiatives soon paved the way for the presentation of more strategic forms of corporate philanthropy. Specifically, Porter and Kramer (2002) recognized that companies can move beyond the limited engagement of corporate philanthropy exclusively to the establishment of interdependent relationships between businesses and society for the creation of social *and* economic value. This “convergence of interests” they asserted is necessary as companies “do not function in isolation from the society around them” (p. 59). They elaborated that social and economic goals are not in inherent conflict but in the long run are integrally connected, an idea that foreshadows their contemporary ideas of how to embed a firm’s economic orientation in its relationship to society.

Porter and Kramer (2006) formally introduced the idea of CSV to the academic arena in their *Harvard Business Review (HBR)* article “Strategy and Society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility.” In this article the authors posit that proponents of CSR offer four prevailing justifications for its use: moral obligation, sustainability, license to operate, and company reputation (p. 81). Yet they bemoaned that such schools of thought are limited as they “focus on the tension between business and society rather than on

their interdependence” (p. 83). To resolve this, the authors suggested that organizations should engage in “strategic CSR” (p. 88) or a more broad understanding of their potential role within society. Such an approach would feasibly offer increased business opportunities, sources of innovation, and competitive advantage to firms that engage in such a practice.

This perspective offers a distinct turning point in the articulation of differences between CSR and CSV. Specifically, it deeply roots the strategy of corporate ‘social responsibility,’ traditionally seen as a PR invention (Frankental, 2001) in the core economic activities of companies. In this way a firm’s resources are leveraged to benefit society through the strategic implementation of specific forms of social intervention through market-based solutions. Such a philosophy goes beyond the duty-based common-sense morality often associated with CSR (Frederiksen, 2010). Specifically, it sponsors the idea that *economic solutions to perceived problems* are a viable and neutral way to resolve societal ills. As one outcome of this contemporary framework of ‘social responsibility,’ the ethical content of a firm’s activities are not only transparently sponsored by capitalism but contribute to an underlying market rationality of neoliberal governance (Harvey, 2005) in which it is up to the corporation to determine what is the appropriate vision of our civil society. Thus the premise of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) not only legitimizes the company, but also their capitalist practices and the culture that the company represents, an important insight in the age of globalization. Moreover, it prompts corporations to allocate resources to the social issues in which they wish to intervene, changing our perceptions of what is of value.

Porter and Kramer refined this idea in a subsequent and widely popular 2011 *HBR* article “Creating Shared Value: How to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and

growth.”²⁸ In this article they reinforced the notion that corporations are more efficient at resolving social issues due to their often-high level of resources and marketing expertise. Claiming that, “the capitalist system is under siege” (p. 64) the authors argue in this treatise that capitalism itself could be reinvented to reflect profitable points of intersections between companies and society. They muse that corporations adhere to outdated approaches to value creation and that they can be more efficient at resolving social issues than government and non-profit entities due to their often-high level of resources and marketing expertise. For the authors, a “new conception of capitalism” is warranted (p. 64) in today’s business circles. That is, corporations could serve a new purpose of providing the “solution” to societal needs and challenges by the “blurring of the boundary” (p. 67) between for-profit and non-profit organizations while going beyond simple compliance with legal and ethical standards (pp. 67-77). Three distinct ways of creating “shared value” were offered by the authors in pursuit of this goal: the re-conception of products and markets to better meet societal needs, greater efficiency in the value chain, and localized clusters of suppliers. This initiative was presented by the authors within the pretense of a sophisticated form of what comprises of a social good while ironically using rhetorical ambiguity to determine what corporate *values* are being *shared* between organizations and stakeholders (Day, 2012).

As but one example of this form of social innovation, Porter and Kramer (2011) encourage businesses to actively provide “appropriate products to lower-income and disadvantaged consumers” particularly in developing countries as the social benefits of this “can be profound.” (p. 68) They cite the example of Vodafone’s provision of low priced cell phones and their M-PESA mobile banking service to rural farmers in Kenya in order to assist them in

²⁸ A cursory examination of the article under Google Scholar revealed a citation count of 1471 as of June 19, 2014.

producing and marketing their crops efficiently. Activities such as these Porter and Kramer (2011) argue are to be supported by the “right kind” of governmental regulations that set goals and stimulated innovation versus the “wrong kind” that would work against them (p. 74). This mantra is made explicit in the words of Michael Porter (2011) who notes, “we need to kind of think differently. *What’s good for society is actually good for business*” (p. 2, my emphasis), emphasizing CSV’s focus on reengineering the role of corporations within society.

Gaining Momentum

Since its formal introduction to academic and business circles in 2006 by Porter and Kramer and again in 2011, the language and conception of CSV and its supporters have proliferated. CSV is rapidly gaining traction in the academic and the non-profit sectors. Scholars include its ideas as a viable business rationale in leading business schools such as Stanford in their discussions on topics such as cross-sector social partnerships (Selsky & Parker, 2010), corporate cultures of sustainability (Eccles *et al.*, 2012; Schaltegger & Hansen, 2012), the role of CSR in corporate marketing perspectives (Hildebrand *et al.*, 2011), external stakeholder engagement (Henisz *et al.*, 2011), the health care system (Porter, 2009), strategic business practices (Karpen *et al.*, 2012), and the relationship between corporate social and financial performance (Perrini *et al.*, 2011). Enthusiasm for CSV as a holistic concept is best demonstrated in articles that contain titles such as “How to earn money by doing good! Shared value in the apparel industry” (Schmitt & Renken, 2012) that unquestionably apply the concept of CSV to carefully selected case studies to provide “insights” into the successful adoption of the innovative business strategy. Senior executives are encouraged by academia in this framework to cultivate shared value initiatives through a “three Cs approach” that includes: Capability of the enterprise to do so, Consistency in the creation of shareholder and social “value,” and Cultivation

of such social value beyond the enterprise that instigated the original initiative (Maltz & Schein, 2012). CSV is also affiliated with credible publications such as the *Stanford Social Innovation Review* and *HBR* (Bertini & Gourville, 2013) and appears in industry wide news reports (see Murray, 2011; “A higher capitalism,” 2011; Overall, 2012 for examples) including *Forbes* (Klein, 2011) as well as popular sustainability reporting blogs such as the *CorporateRegister.com* (Cohen, 2012).

The Foundation Strategy Group (FSG), a non-profit consulting firm cofounded in 1999 by Michael Porter and Mark Kramer that specializes in strategy, evaluation, and research supplements the author’s efforts at promoting the CSV agenda. This non-profit consulting enterprise is actively involved in global corporate consulting with for-profit and non-profit institutions, schools, and government bodies to create ‘effective forms of social change’ while documenting and pursuing what they term as “attractive markets” for CSV innovation (FSG, 2012a). FSG (2012a) remarks that such markets typically consist of developing countries such as South Africa where “some companies are beginning to build sustainability into their core business strategies” (p. 13). Similarly, FSG has targeted Brazil that the consulting company states “offers a ripe environment” for shared value innovation as well as India that “shows promise” (p. 13). FSG is also actively involved in *identifying promising points of leverage* for the implementation of CSV in core industries such as the food, beverages, and agriculture industry, health care, and housing and construction. As evidence of the CSV’s framework of success, they also provide an extensive list of “Shared Value Case Examples” that narrates various global firms that have embraced the CSV concept (FSG, 2014).

In 2008 the *Rockefeller Foundation* joined with FSG to “understand how large companies, through their business operations and practices, can make strong positive impacts on

underserved communities” within the CSV paradigm (FSG, 2012a, p. 1). Articles published by FSG and sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation also predict its success. For example in an article titled “Creating shared value in India: The future for inclusive growth” FSG (2011b) argue that India is uniquely positioned to use the principles of CSV to catalyze change. Such efforts are boosted by FSG’s significant presence at the 2012 Ethos Institute International Conference on Sustainability and their initiation of the *CSV Initiative* in 2012, a global partnership between the private and public sector formed to garner supporters of this approach (www.sharedvalue.org).

We saw in Chapters 1 and 2 that some researchers have argued that CSR foreclosed the potential for a corporation to address the interests of non-shareholder groups in any meaningful way. The adoption of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) by a corporation seemingly goes beyond these constraints. Corporate audience “buy-in” is promoted by CSV’s seemingly endless and profitable agenda that uses vague conceptions of shared ‘value’ to engage stakeholders in mutually profitable relationships. One way in which this is done is by promoting organizations to explore and discursively *broaden their stakeholder models* (Donaldson & Preston, 1995) and engage in activities beyond the limitations of social responsibility by introducing the *mutual* benefits of an exclusive economic focus. In sharp contrast to existing stakeholder management models this discursively shift the traditional focus of top management from stakeholders with high levels of influence (Mitchell *et al.*, 1997) to individuals and entities outside of these boundaries in order that they too can become, in a rhetorical sense, engaged and responsible societal (corporate) citizens.

In general, scholars have presented ideas of what comprises a ‘good’ corporate citizen for some time (i.e. Carroll, 1999; Hemphill, 2004; Matten & Crane, 2005; Moon *et al.*, 2005). Some

researchers consider corporate citizenship to be synonymous with CSR (Waddock, 2001, 2009). Other scholars have analyzed how corporate citizenship discourses express internal organizational values that subsequently influence corporate behavior (Wood & Longsdon, 2001; Banerjee, 2007, p. 41). The main tenets of CSV build on these ideas by encouraging the development of global organizational structures and procedures that can make corporate citizenship a local reality (Baumann-Pauly & Scherer, 2012). Specifically, corporations are encouraged to take advantage of the socio-political flux in today's business environment by demonstrating industry wide, local, and global forms of corporate citizenship (Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009) through self-regulation, economic collaboration, and the provision of public positive role models (Wood & Longsdon, 2008) while emphasizing mutually beneficial economic and social benefits. Examples of such forms of citizenship can be seen in Britannia, a popular British cookie manufacturer who recently launched iron-fortified cookies in India in support of government's efforts to improve nutrition. Similarly, The Coca-Cola company in partnership with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and TechnoServe, offered a unique small farming partnership with local farmers in Africa to produce locally-sourced forms of fruit juice. In these examples, CSV's rhetorical emphasis on interacting with (supposedly) *all* stakeholders is indispensable for advancing this global agenda.

As the organization that gave birth to the term, the global food giant Nestlé currently enjoys what would be considered to be the highest and most active CSV profile. Nestlé publishes an annual "Creating Shared Value" report that focuses on rotating special topics including rural development, nutritional needs, and water. Such reports supplement Nestlé's CSV website, their participation in global forums such as the World Economic Forum as well as the Nestlé annual CSV forum and their bi-annual global award: *Nestlé Prize in Creating Shared Value* ("Nestlé

prize,” 2014). With promises that organizations can unlock “shared value for companies and scalable solutions to social problems” (Porter *et al.*, 2012, p. 2), a growing number of other firms have joined Nestlé and embrace the tenets of CSV perhaps as a function to boost positive overall conceptions of their corporate identity. Such firms include a number of prominent national and transnational corporations including Intel, Revolution Foods, and GE. Porter and Kramer (2011) offer narratives of these corporations in their rhetoric as empirical proof that corporations that adhere to the CSV paradigm will enjoy large-scale social impact and improved competitive positioning while producing social benefits (p. 67). Other corporations that subscribe to the principles of CSV also include: Johnson & Johnson and their employee healthcare initiatives, Wal-Mart and their local cluster supplier model (Humes, 2011), and the Eli Lilly and Company that delivers sustainable programs through their insulin business. The transnational corporation Citi also engages in microfinance practices and financial literacy initiatives within this framework. CSV has also been embraced by a number of other transnational corporations including HP, and Alcoa (FSG, 2011a) as well as healthcare providers (Zusman, 2011).

Not all academics have supported this wave of success, however. Aakhus and Bzdak (2012) discuss how despite its recent appeal and update in corporate and philanthropic circles, the shared value ‘model’ merely “advances the conventional rhetoric that what is good for business is good for society” (p. 231). They point to its overlap with Stuart Hart’s (2005) book *Capitalism at the Crossroads* and C.K. Prahalad’s and Allen Hammond’s (2002) conceptualization of generating revenues from untapped markets at the bottom of the pyramid (BOP). Aakhus and Bzdak (2012) point out that one consequence of the CSV idea is that language can lead to “blindspots” for businesses for “what societies value” (p. 237). Moreover, that Porter and Kramer’s lack of potential contradictory examples to the rather positive cases that

they account for potentially produces a context in which businesses could engage in a form of “socially distorting decision-making” (p. 238). They argue that such a context is in itself fatally flawed as it assumes the logic that corporations “have the license to shape their environments as they see fit” rather than understanding the political and social nuances that such actions may have on a society and its ethical customs (p. 241).

Similar critiques of CSV as a seductive proposition were also made by Crane *et al.*, (2014) in the *California Management Review* journal. In a rare and provocative dialogue with Porter and Kramer, the authors assert that CSV suffers from serious shortcomings including: a reiteration of preexisting concepts of CSR, stakeholder management and social innovation, a failure to address adequately potential negative impacts on stakeholders as tradeoffs between economic and social value creation are made, naiveté about the state of compliance by multinational corporations particularly in a broad variety of geopolitical contexts, and a shallow conception of the corporation’s role in society. Porter and Kramer respond to this critique in the same article by stating that the premise of CSV does indeed rest on important contributions in the broad area of business environments and citizenship (including those mentioned by Aakhus and Bzdak), but that its primary function is to *create economic value* for corporations rather than simply “blending or balancing different types of value” (pp. 148-149). CSV’s “corporate-centric focus” they assert is popular not only because it addresses the “reality of competition and prevailing corporate practice” but it aligns “social progress with corporate self-interest in a concrete and highly tangible way” (p. 150).

This brief and evolving history has shown that the rhetoric of CSV can be understood as a rapidly growing management phenomenon that is widely embraced by the corporate sector and academic area. To date, few critics hold it accountable for its claims that it can rupture the “old,

narrow view of capitalism” (Porter & Kramer, 2011, p. 66). While academics have begun to debate how CSV be used to orient a firm’s behavior, no mention is made of how corporations can use such rhetoric to generate a specific form of corporate identity. The rhetoric of CSV demands that firms not only need to reengineer the way that they do business, but also argues that this contemporary approach is essential for them to remain competitive. In what follows I explore how this agenda is articulated to corporate audiences.

Rhetorical Toolkit

My goal in this section is to illustrate how creating shared value (CSV) (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) functions as a rhetorical “toolkit” that encourages corporations to treat local communities, corporate stakeholders, and the environment as entities to be absorbed into, and utilized by, a for-profit business model under the guise of sharing utopian social forms of ‘value’ in order to remain competitive. I argue that such a kit is the basis for a new form of relanguaging of corporate-community relations with a firm and their stakeholders in order to promote a symbolic form of consummation or consensus with their corporate identity. To illustrate in what ways the rhetoric of CSV functions as a toolkit for success is a partly ambitious agenda as while such rhetoric is explicit when promoted as a conceptual framework by Porter and Kramer and in the discourses of their consulting firm FSG, as will be illustrated in the following chapter, it rapidly becomes diffused when corporate practitioners engage in this rhetorical exercise to encourage identification with their stakeholder audiences. What follows should thus be seen as a critical stance towards understanding CSV as a corporate “grid of intelligibility,” sponsored by a particular “terministic screen” (Burke, 1966) – a logic of persuasion, and a corresponding rhetoric, through which firms make decisions concerning what discourses of social responsibility should be sponsored and what should be censored.

Burke (1966) defines terministic screens as “dramatistic” or symbolic action that is exercised by even the most unemotional utterances. When comparing such language to a scientific view of the nature of language he elaborates: “Even if any given terminology is a *reflection* of reality, by its very nature as a terminology it must be a *selection* of reality; and to this extent it must function also as a *deflection* of reality” (p. 45). Terministic screens function then to “direct the *attention*” (p. 45, author’s emphasis) from one topic to another, that what we select is but a wide range of “possibilities implicit in our particular choice of terms” (p. 46) that shapes our observations about reality. As evidence of how terministic screens work, Burke cites the example of viewing two different photographs of the same objects but with different color filters. He notes, “Here something so “factual” as a photograph revealed notable distinctions in texture, and even in form, depending upon which color filter was used for the documentary description of the event being recorded” (p. 45). Language choices contain definitions which in themselves represent a “symbolic act” and direct our attention to “quite different kinds of observation” (p. 44).

The language of CSV is a particularly productive example for understanding how terministic screens might work in today’s global corporate climate. Multinational corporations face growing risks and complexities concerning globalization and global political leadership. Together with academics they are in search for innovative solutions and effective policies as environmental issues such as climate change move to center stage on the international agenda (Falkner, 2013). But even multinational corporations are limited in the ‘problems’ that they can ‘fix.’ Reflecting these restrictions, a fundamental backbone of the approach of the rhetoric of CSV is to encourage corporations to identify and strategically choose social issues that will produce the most economic value. Porter and Kramer (2011) elaborate: “Shared value creation

focuses on identifying and expanding the connections between societal and economic progress” (p. 66). Such opportunities, they assert are “not static” but “change constantly as technology evolves, economies develop, and societal priorities shift” (p. 68). A firm’s attention is directed towards identifying with the rhetoric of CSV by focusing on social issues that provide the biggest competitive advantage. One example is the targeting of “underserved markets” that often exist in “disadvantaged communities and developing countries” or “nontraditional communities in advanced countries” (p. 68). Not only does the rhetoric of CSV serve to focus a corporation’s attention on strategic market incentives that are embedded in strategically chosen social issues as a mutually beneficial joining of interests, but it also discursively necessitates the immediate engagement of such initiatives by corporations in order to remain competitive.

Porter and Kramer (2006, 2011) together with their firm Foundation Strategy Group (FSG, 2011a) offer four initial major building blocks of success for corporations to follow to translate this contemporary approach towards social responsibility “into action” including *vision*, *strategy*, *delivery*, and *performance*. This foursome not only is the kind of memorable summary of which slogans, posters, powerpoints, conference, and boardroom pitches are made, but are themselves the key elements of a rhetoric act—any rhetorical act. That is, regardless of whether one is composing “I Have a Dream,” or “Let’s Sell more Vacuum Cleaners,” a solid technique of rhetoric would be to use these four elements: create a vision, form a strategy, deliver the message, sustain the performance (Campbell & Huxman, 2003). In the case of CSV, the goal of the rhetorical strategy here is to embed the orientation or vision of “shared value” in the corporate identity itself; for it to generate and reform business practices at a basic level, and to embody those principles in a company’s performance or “action.

The rhetorical “toolkit” of vision, strategy, delivery, and performance then constitutes in

this case a *transformative* rhetoric, one that transforms a company's identity for both internal and external constituents, and indeed, forms a new business model that transforms business practices in sustained *performance*. Certainly Porter and Kramer have in mind that a company doesn't just "talk the talk," but must "walk the walk." However, even walking is performance, and the reorientation of a company and its clients towards 'shared value' requires first that they engage the 'shared rhetoric' of this kind of talk, and embrace the faith that it will yield a transformation of the company and its relations to clients, and moralize capitalistic practices to a new ethical standard through generative types of rhetoric and activities. This rhetoric of transformation of a company's identity by fomenting *participation* in the shared actions of the company is the hallmark of rhetorical 'identification' (Burke, 1950, Cheney, 1983).

Vision

The first major building block within the CSV "toolkit" offers the potential for businesses to proactively identify an explicit *vision* of CSV as the underlying competitive strategy of the firm with the promise that will give them a competitive advantage. On its surface the articulation of this strategy as a way for corporations to identify with the overall goals of CSV is very clear. Corporations are told by FSG (2011a) that: "Companies that create shared value first adopt an explicit vision of doing so. To realize that vision, they develop a robust strategy, leverage internal and external assets, and manage their efforts for performance" (p. 9). As we will see below, this vision is communicated to corporate leaders in the inherently persuasive context of 'innovation.'

“Be Innovative”

Certainly, the concept of innovation is used in many ways throughout the rhetoric of the CSV vision to entice corporate leaders who wish to participate in the CSV ‘frontier.’²⁹ Porter and Kramer (2006) first address the competitive advantages that can be gained by engaging in CSV. Corporate social responsibility, according to the authors, can be utilized as a “source of opportunity, innovation, and competitive advantage” (p. 80). Yet in order to achieve this strategic vision, businesses should infuse social issues into their core business strategies and operations through the innovative concept of CSV and its emphasis on economic intervention. Porter and Kramer (2006) advise firms to create a strategic “corporate social agenda” (p. 85) by prioritizing what social issues to address and to integrate innovative ideas into their value chain activities. Discursively changing corporate involvement in society from “responsive CSR” to “strategic CSR” (p. 89), firms are told by the authors that they can serve a moral purpose by having a “greater impact on social good than any other institution or philanthropic organization” (p. 92).

Such a utopian vision is synonymous with a revolutionary transformation or metamorphosis of how businesses can participate within society as responsible citizens. This vision of transformation is explicitly to be undertaken through Porter and Kramer’s (2011) mantra of “reconceiving products and markets, redefining productivity in the value chain, and building supportive industry clusters at the company’s locations.” (p. 67) In some cases, firms are explicitly encouraged to identify with this form of socially innovative rhetoric by offering suggestions for how specific industries can obtain success. One example is shown in the list of

²⁹ FSG reports define this as the “area that borders market failures” wherein “companies facing uncertainty may turn away from profit-generating opportunities that can create social impact” (FSG 2012b, p. 11).

recommendations for companies that work in the global health sector. Here firms are urged to “shift from defensive to affirmative engagement with patients” and stakeholders particularly in low- and middle income countries, to “innovate and capture knowledge” on products and health care delivery, to “experiment with CSV measurements” for the purposes of learning and innovation, and to “invest early” to gain a “first-mover advantage” (FSG, 2012b, p. 6).

Tropes of *innovation* as part of the CSV vision as a form of competitive advantage are constantly reiterated throughout FSG’s creating shared value reports. Here corporate leaders are told that CSV is considered to start from “a different world view than corporate philanthropy” and that their vision should be to “create *new* economic and social benefit (rather than redistributing existing value)” (FSG 2012a, p. 10, original emphasis). In the forward to FSGs (2012b) report “Competing by saving lives: How pharmaceutical and medical device companies create CSV in global health” for instance, Michael Porter effortlessly blends innovation explicitly with the CSV vision. This report, he states, “seeks to inform and inspire companies in the pharmaceutical and medical device industries” to create CSV through new forms of “management thinking, innovations in business models, and cross-sector collaboration” (FSG, 2012b, p. 2). FSG employees’ Pfitzer, Brockstette and Stamp’s (2013) *HBR* article “Innovating for shared value: Companies that deliver both social benefit and business value rely on five mutually reinforcing elements” continues such rhetoric and its emphasis on innovation. Here *innovation* is offered as the counterpart to *stagnation* to readers as perhaps the only way that firms can remain strategic and thus gain or maintain their competitive advantage.

Ideas of innovation or utopian forms of transformation have considerable appeal to global corporations and their executives in today’s competitive global business climate that is still recovering from 2008’s worldwide recession. According to Insigniam’s 2013 Global Executive

Survey, 87 percent of global executives believe that innovation is important for the future success of their organizations while 36 percent believe that their organizational culture requires transformation “in order to meet future needs” (Insigniam, 2013, p. 4). Moreover, when combined with strategic planning, management experts believe that innovative corporations have the greatest potential to excel in dynamic global markets (Johnston & Bate, 2013). It is now not uncommon to see corporations move beyond merely simply producing goods, but rather to seek innovative ways to move towards a new kind of self-image as shown by Nike who transformed themselves from a shoe company to a global lifestyle brand (Klein, 1999). With this in mind, creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) supports the seemingly uncontested idea that would seem to be: If a corporation wishes to be competitive, then they must ascribe to this doctrine of innovation as the corporate vision within the parameters of CSV for to do so otherwise would surely (rhetorically) result in a uncertain market form of failure (stasis) or death. It is inferred from this argument that social and market value is gained from the identification with, and implementation of, innovative forms of value sharing and that such actions are necessary for a corporation to remain competitive. Indeed, with the tremendous uncertainty and risk that characterizes private enterprise today, particularly since 2008 and the collapse of the financial markets, such tropes of innovative value infer that they offer a sure-bet way for CEO’s to present a positive form of corporation’s vision.

“Win the hearts and minds of those at the top”

This vision of the company as an innovative one soon becomes the ‘engine’ for creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) to work and is the first strategic decision made by corporate leaders. Engagement of this vision by board and senior management groups is integral to CSV’s success. Corporate CEOs are specifically called to task. FSG (2011a) articulates, “The

voice and credibility of the CEO, in particular, can be an important tool to leverage other interested parties, and bring new ones to the table.” (p. 10). They elaborate, “without a commitment at the top, companies are unlikely to be able to marshal the resources, focus, and long-term thinking required to make a meaningful impact.” adding that “engaged senior managers set the tone, and they unleash the energy and creativity of the entire firm” (p. 10). For rhetorical purposes, the unequivocal call to senior business leaders to engage in the practice of CSV is needed for this new approach to make sense. FSG (2011c) elaborates this point in their webinar on making the case for CSV, “In any organization, corporate leadership sets the tone – [therefore] win the hearts and minds of those at the top first” (p. 6). Leaders are advised by FSG that “Although led from the top, shared value is typically created at the business unit level. Engaging managers from across the company in CSV is therefore essential” (p. 6). The CSV vision thus depends on senior managers and corporate leaders to identify with, and embed, the CSV orientation into the corporation.

This context offers a marked difference to CSR. Attention of the corporate CEO in the context of CSV is now directed towards how they are now necessary to make sense of the change in the *overall* competitive direction of the entire firm and its orientation towards social responsibility. Executives are explicitly called upon to herald this strategic change towards social responsibility that is no longer oriented towards self-regulation to ensure their firm’s compliance in ethical standards and international norms and laws. Instead, the focus is on developing a profitable and competitive business through efficient economic involvement with social issues. To that end the rhetorical instructions are clear: Companies are urged to “work from the inside out and from the top down” while engaging the use of “change managers more than program managers” that have a “strong link with and oversight from the board and sufficient managerial

authority to act” to instigate internal change and foster opportunities for corporate success (FSG, 2011c, p. 6). In this context the language of CSV enacted through the vision of corporate leaders becomes a *blueprint for action* that corporations should, and even must identify with, raising the stakes for those who wish to claim a competitive advantage in the marketplace through the generation of a specific form of corporate identity.

Strategy

The second major building block of the CSV toolkit espoused by Porter and Kramer and their consulting company FSG for corporations to identify with as a central characteristic of their enduring competitive advantage and societal goodwill concerns the notion of *strategy*. This notion involves prioritizing the “key issues” of local corporate communities and to correspondingly articulate “ambitious, measurable impact goals” that contribute towards “meaningful change” through the identification of business opportunities and their constraints (FSG, 2011a, p. 9). FSG (2011a) articulates: “developing a strategy gives shape and direction to a company’s engagement, ensuring that its efforts are mutually reinforcing and add up to meaningful change” (p. 12). As I show below, corporations are encouraged to set these goals while still acting (of course) in their own interests.

“Act in your own self-interest”

Once a firm and its leaders have engaged in the CSV vision, corporations are prompted to “identify a handful of genuine social challenges that also represent cost-reduction or growth opportunities and to prioritize the areas where it is best placed to act” (FSG, 2011a, p. 12). For instance, Porter and Kramer (2011) encourage corporations to find capitalistic opportunities that arise from serving disadvantaged communities and developing countries (such as India, China, and Brazil) that have pressing societal needs. According to Porter and Kramer, similar strategic

‘opportunities’ can be found in underserved markets in advanced countries including America’s poor urban areas. Participating businesses are cautioned, however, by FSG (2011a) to “shape this identification and prioritization process [of social issues] internally, rather than allow external stakeholders to be the driving force” of change (p. 12). That way, corporations can “retain control over their strategic agenda” and inform how shared forms of societal and business value can be produced (p. 12). In this light, the CSV toolkit encourages corporations to act in their own self-interest, that is to engage in discourses that strategically and proactively induce distinct relationships of power³⁰ that privilege the firm and their capitalistic ideals over their stakeholders. Such rhetoric encourages the use of corporate discursive resources to impose a specific form of corporate identity dependent upon a narrow vision of the world. Specifically, it prioritizes the resolutions of social issues to corporations as a mutually viable way to provide solutions to social ills while belying the idea that such “solutions” are exclusively focused on benefiting the firm’s shareholders or consumers. Corporate stakeholders not directly involved in the identification of social issues are framed as creating potential roadblocks to a company’s strategic positioning success. Those who threaten this seemingly objective and measured process are therefore rhetorically suppressed.

“Set ambitious Goals”

In addition to this explicit strategy of competitive advantage, corporations are told that a successful CSV strategy also infuses the setting and articulation of specific, ambitious goals.

FSG (2011a) elaborates that “well-crafted goals are ambitious” yet can spur the innovation

³⁰ I note here the problematic usage of the very term “power” and how it continues to be hotly debated in various disciplines. For the purposes of this study, I draw on the work of Discourse Analysts in particular Joanna Thornborrow (2002) who see power as a form of social meaning that is jointly produced through the activity of talk itself with particular discursive actions being seen as more powerful than others and that are responsive to the specific, local context in which it is produced.

needed to create and sustain momentum while providing for internal and external accountability (p. 12). Firms in the private sector are urged to find early successes such as “quick wins” from “legacy” programs to maintain the CSV momentum (FSG, 2011c, p. 6) as well as to identify promising points of leverage for the implementation of CSV activities. Such directives serve as a form of efficacy of this contemporary form of social responsibility that is illustrated through particular case studies by FSG to symbolically deepen trust in the CSV agenda. In the context of public health issues in India for instance, examples are given of corporations that successfully have increased access to poorer populations through the provision of medicine and the development of medical devices for hard-to-reach populations as well as access to clean water and improved sanitary conditions (FSG, 2011b). Meanwhile companies that work in food and beverage industries that address the needs of poor or vulnerable populations are urged to create competitive advantage by “fortifying their staple products with vitamins and minerals” in order to differentiate themselves from competitors (FSG, 2012a, p. 18).

By explicitly linking points of strategic business intervention and promises of economic success with particular social issues, a form of rhetorical logic or action program is constructed wherein corporations can enjoy community based forms of goodwill through responsible citizenship *and* enjoy the potential of profits from applying their marketing and business expertise to such unresolved and ongoing issues. In this context, efforts to find new markets for corporate forms of innovation and expansion into disenfranchised or poorer populations are sanctified. Meanwhile, such rhetoric invites the formation and reinforcement of a specific kind of corporate identity that is associated with reducing (oftentimes global) social ills through market based forms of interactions, products, and services that are already deeply embedded into a corporation’s DNA. In the context of global hunger for instance, Nestlé’s refinement of their

products to make them nutritionally fortified for undernourished populations rhetorically helps to alleviate the global hunger problem that the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates impacts more than 850 million people globally (FAO, WFP & IFAD, 2012).

More explicitly, while in the instances of the food and beverage industry or global health the rhetoric of CSV valorizes problems associated with undernourishment, infrastructure underdevelopment issues, and the nutritional and health needs of low-income populations, this valorization is ambivalent and focuses as its primary concern ideas of market as an all-encompassing god term (Livesey, 2002). The case is made that it perhaps precisely this particular vision of the world – ambitious forms of corporate economic intervention into social issues -- that is needed. Here ideas of “the market” promote a rational resolution to social issues by using capitalistic principles to absorb underserved populations into a for-profit business model. Yet corporations are assured that by engaging in this selection of ‘reality’ they can produce the greatest social good. This strategy becomes appealing through its rhetorical differentiation of corporations who supposedly “care” and thus become engaged in significantly reorienting their business units to spur the “leaps in innovation that are needed to make a serious impact” (FSG, 2011a, p. 12) on social issues as a form of competitive advantage, versus those who are ambivalent. It is also implied in such narratives of strategy, however, that corporations should also recognize this situation for “what it is” - a profitable business opportunity that takes advantage of underserved communities by enabling a corporation to differentiate their products from their competitors.

Delivery

Key to the success of this rhetorical toolkit and the interpretation of corporate identities as strategic and helpful to society by stakeholder audiences is effective *delivery* of the CSV

vision and strategy. FSG (2011a) explains that the CSV agenda is performed through the leveraging of corporate assets, the holistic management of CSV efforts, and the mobilization of external corporate partners and stakeholders.

“Leverage corporate assets”

Firms are urged by FSG (2011a) to “deploy” a range of their assets to address the implementation of a CSV method for strategically chosen social issues including the investment of their leveraging expertise, monetary assets and services (p. 13). As a rationale for this form of action, businesses are told that, “the most effective companies bring to bear an imaginative combination of assets in areas where they have an edge over other actors” (p. 13). The FSG consulting group uses HP as a “poster child” as a successful example for the engagement of this approach³¹ to encourage corporate buy-in. Referred to as “leveraging assets for social innovation” (p. 13) by FSG (2011a), these discourses of asset reallocation and leverage rhetorically construct *innovative* and *successfully competitive companies* as ones that not only become strategically invested in CSV but support such investments quantifiably through the deployment of material resources within their companies.

Yet surprisingly, little rhetorical attention is paid to the return on investment (ROI) of such assets into social issues. Instead, attention of the corporation is directed towards utopian narratives of visionary success as a way to encourage corporations to agree with the CSV philosophy. As but one example David Etzwiler, former vice president for Medtronic’s community affairs division observes, “Our vision calls upon us to leverage all our resources on alleviating pain, restoring health, and extending life. By focusing on areas where we have unique

³¹ In conjunction with an African social enterprise mPedigree, FSG (2011a) report that HP utilized their proprietary form of secure-printing technologies and the use of mobile technologies to tackle Africa’s problem of counterfeit drugs in remote rural areas while promoting their brand.

expertise as an organization, we are fulfilling our vision and increasing our impact on society.” (FSG, 2011a, p. 13). In this specific representation of ‘success’ phrases such as “fulfilling our vision” or “increasing our impact on society” are ambiguous and make no reference to the for-profit motivation of such activities or their cost effectiveness. Nor do they draw attention to how such discourses serve to construct corporations as invested and necessary members of society that are deserving of the benefits that they almost exclusively receive from the investment of such resources. Such rhetoric is appealing to corporate audiences that may have troubled reputations or face criticisms of their for-profit motivations.

“Engage in a holistic vision”

Corporations are urged by FSG (2011a), however, to engage in holistic management efforts to effectively oversee these asset investments and business forms of social engagement. In this instance, CSR and philanthropy personnel are rhetorically redefined as critical components of a firm’s CSV strategy via their potential ability to coordinate multifunctional projects rather than being limited to a grant administrator or report-writing role. To illustrate this point, FSG (2011a) call attention to Aloca’s recent creation of the position of a chief sustainability officer (CSO) to lead the firm’s CSV efforts. The consulting firm elaborates that in this instance the CSO was responsible for embedding Aloca’s sustainability goals within their relevant business units rather than having such objectives separately run. The rhetorical logic embedded in this discourse is that embracing the CSV vision by a company will enable them to replace operational silos that may be incongruous to a firm’s innovation or in competition for corporate resources with tropes of a corporate vision. Reference is made to the synergistic whole through an emphasis on the integration of the specialties of individual business units.

“Form strategic partnerships”

The third component of the effective delivery of a CSV strategy offered by the toolkit involves the formation of corporate coalitions with external partners such governmental policy makers or suppliers. Corporations are told by FSG (2011a) that firms that successfully create CSV should go beyond simply working with NGOs. Rather, that they should develop “consultation processes that inform action, but do not allow the loudest voices to dominate the agenda” (p. 14). Such processes of stakeholder engagement are to be delivered via coalitions that engage “complimentary capabilities” from other fields or industries in order to “tackle a common issue” (p. 14). Porter and Kramer’s (2011) article on CSV provides numerous examples of how this new form of hybrid enterprise should work. Such examples listed by the authors include WaterHealth International, an innovative water corporate backed by the World Bank that provides affordable water purification techniques to underserved communities as well as the Bangladesh firm Waste Concern, a hybrid for profit/non-profit enterprise that converts trash into organic fertilizer in conjunction with the United Nations Development Programme and capital provided by the Lions Club. The general argument contained in these directions concerning the formation of hybrid enterprises is the utopian idea that such coalitions can not only be financially sustainable or perhaps even earn a higher gross margin than traditional competitors, but also that such activities are a natural and innovative development of governments and NGOs should they wish to “think in value terms” (Porter & Kramer, 2011, p. 72). In this view, ideas of corporate innovation and corporate identities are rhetorically linked in a causal fashion to the synergistic and profitable engagement of social issues through hybrid forms of governmental intervention and social enterprise.

Indeed Porter and Kramer (2011) explicitly criticize traditional ways of business development and engagement by governments and NGOs stating that they “often assume that trade-offs between economic and social benefits are inevitable” (p. 72). Corporations are instructed to resolve this issue through the infusion of commercial activities into regulatory activities and governmental bodies with the conclusion that such narratives of innovation can become mutually beneficial and help them to be perceived as a productive competitive corporation in the long term. Underpinning these causal claims of success is the assumption that such hybrid entities and corporate activities will resolve what Porter and Kramer (2011) term “command-and control mandates and enforcement actions” that they assert are “designed to embarrass and punish companies” (p. 72). Such rhetoric effectively ends the bifurcation of governments, NGOs and corporations while suggesting that coalitions of this type are not only profitable, but inevitable, and that only competitive forms of corporate identities will embody such practices.

Performance

The three prior building blocks of CSV (vision, strategy, and delivery) culminate in *performance*, or the use of measurements to communicate scalable results by corporations to their audiences. Such narratives that are oriented towards delivering “high performance” within the toolkit discursively encourage corporations to strive for continuous improvement that FSG (2011a) describes as “an essential step if ambitious impact goals are to be met” (p. 16). As I show below, firms are encouraged to reflexively set measurable goals as part of this performance.

“Measure Progress”

Effective and careful measurement of progress on key indicators and reflexivity towards such indicators is presented as the first critical component of this approach. In their “Measuring Shared Value: How to unlock value by linking social and business results” report for example, Porter *et al.*, (2012) state that CSV measurement “assesses progress and results, generating actionable data and insights to refine CSV strategies” (p. 2). Firms are given four steps to measure these high performance standards: 1) the creation of itemized and prioritized lists of social issues that can be targeted by a CSV approach, 2) the development of a solid business case for CSV based on research and analysis that specifies activities and their involved costs, 3) careful tracking of progress including the calculation of its financial performance (in terms of revenues and costs), and 4) the use of these formal measurement results to justify pursuance of future CSV actions. This kind of message is overwhelmingly appealing to corporations who are often evaluated on their performance in the business world and utilizes familiar managerial language that articulates tangible results.

“Communicate wins and challenges”

Corporations are also urged to communicate the challenges that they may face when engaging in the principles of CSV to their various stakeholders through the enactment of “pragmatic approaches for measuring CSV” (Porter *et al.*, 2012, p. 15). For example corporations are urged to “measure immediate social outcomes” and to acknowledge that different social issues have “different time horizons” (p. 16). They are cautioned to use “proxy indicators to track business results” in response to market forces such as the overall volume of a sourced product or quality measurements (p. 16). Such discourses rarely identify or discuss

social initiatives that are not profitable but rather focus on successful case studies (such as GE's healthymagination social initiative) and stable narratives of sustainable, scalable solutions that are reflexive. Pragmatic measurements are thus conceived of as opportunities to build on a company's bottom line while providing objective measurements of "unlocking additional value creation" (Porter *et al.*, 2012, p. 18).

Such evaluative measures serve to make an explicit discursive link between the subjective rhetoric of CSV and the objective measurement of the cost effectiveness of strategic corporate interventions in social issues. It is implied that this data can then be utilized by the firms to subsequently scale CSV initiatives as well as generate a forum for the effective communication of tangible CSV actions with the investment community to reduce investor skepticism. In this way 'successful' corporate identities are ones that 'manage' their CSV performance as a form of financial reporting, strategically measuring the investment of their resources into carefully chosen and profitable social issues while consummating the merits of this view with their shareholders. Specifically, corporations are informed that the aim for such measurements is to "establish a direct linkage between social outcomes and actual financial results" (Porter *et al.*, 2012, p. 13). The underlying logic of this argument suggests that profits are inevitable if a financially sound and strategic business case is presented, implemented, and in this case, (re)evaluated and measured as evidenced by the presentation of numerous case studies that have profitably benefited from CSV activities by FSG (2011a).³²

The purposeful creation of these measurable results of CSV is clear: such measurements will communicate to shareholders and the broader stakeholder community the success of CSV initiatives and thus correspondingly influence decisions concerning capital across companies

³² Such case studies include Coca-Cola and their youth employment initiatives in Brazil or Novo Nordisk and their programs concerning diabetes care.

while boosting positive conceptions of the involved corporate identities. Indeed, Porter *et al.*, (2012) specifically state that such measurements will “reveal new and material data to investment analysts and leading investors” (p. 18). This rather narrow world view legitimates the economic focus of CSV in this instance through relevant, seemingly objective and practical results that will supposedly amplify the current performance of a corporation thus making its orientation inherently appealing to corporations.

“Be reflexive and learn”

A second component of structured efforts for corporate high performance within the CSV toolkit is that of reflexivity and learning. Firms are encouraged to be reflexive, that is to “learn from measurement to improve efforts” and to “optimize investments and rethink aspects that are not working as well as hoped” (FSG, 2011a, p. 17). Evidence of the effectiveness of this form of corporate reflexivity is illustrated by FSG (2011a) through the case study of McDonald’s use of their franchisee network. According to FSG, McDonald’s established a website www.bestpractices.mcdonalds.com that focused on encouraging their franchises to identify and share ideas for “greener operational practices” in order to reduce their environmental footprint (p. 17). Similarly, FSG comments that Nike identified the root causes of problems in their supply chain and addressed these issues in real time (p. 17). This type of business appeal that focuses on reflexivity and creative solutions to business problems reinforces the link between CSV and management while assuming that such forms of success are depoliticized, a message that would be appealing to corporations that face criticisms of being biased towards this particular stakeholder group.

“Address issues at scale”

For such robust progress measures and forms of reflexivity to work, corporations are urged to adhere to high-performing initiatives that address social issues at scale. FSG (2011a) warns that social issues are often large or complex and that to unlock solutions to such challenges, “it is essential to act at scale – otherwise, the impact on both social progress and corporate competitiveness will be negligible” (p. 17). FSG add that “efforts should be continuously adapted and improved, and promising social initiatives should be scaled up” while less successful social initiatives be scaled back so that a firm’s pool of assets can be devoted to strategically successful projects (p. 17). Underpinning this advice is an assumption, as before, that corporate competitiveness through an investment into social progress is dependent on the successful communication of a firm’s CSV initiatives to their internal and external stakeholders the fourth component of high performance. Rather than using CSR exclusively as a fallback response, corporations are told that, “effective companies go far beyond traditional CSR reporting” and thus should employ a wide range of communications to target specific groups (FSG, 2011a, p. 19).

FSG (2011a) are clear on the objectives why corporations should communicate the success of their scaled social initiatives to the broader community. FSG states, “communication should focus on informing key internal and external stakeholders and engaging them in efforts to create CSV, rather than on managing reputation” (p. 19). Pharmaceutical and medical device companies that work in global health for instance are urged to “shift from defensive to affirmative engagement with patients in low- and middle- income countries” to articulate the benefits of a scaled CSV engagement approach in the global health field (FSG, 2012b, p. 49). Corporate directives such as this diffuse the responsibility of social engagement initiatives from

a corporation's PR department exclusively to a dialogical relationship with other involved stakeholders such as employees, senior managers, investors, and local communities. This extends the range of individuals that can subsequently identify with the corporation's desired ends while inviting their consummation with this specific form of rhetoric.

An Ongoing Conversation

What is implied in the "toolkit" narrated in the last section is the premise that the discursive formation of the relationship between a firm's scaled shared value initiatives and their various stakeholders helps to articulate and explain the role and intention of a corporation's social contributions. Such an orientation enables a firm to justify why their overall identity can be viewed as being overly strategic. In this instance arguments made by creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) do not focus exclusively on ideas concerning what makes a "good" corporate citizen (Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009) as seen in the tropes of CSR. Rather the rhetoric of CSV narrates the benefits of instigating a distinctive and economically based proposition of a symbolic form of *value* that intersects with social needs as a *mutually beneficial* agenda. This particular world view and construction of corporate identities is coupled with the idea that such discourses will help to defer confusion or reluctance by stakeholders to accept help with social issues that may arise from the motivations of corporate capitalistic activities particularly those conducted in low- and middle-income countries. FSG (2012b) tell corporations of the benefits of this form of communication claiming that, "companies are not always clear as to what constitutes appropriate types of investments for fear of appearing to make a profit" (p. 49). FSG confirms that "affirmative CSV propositions can change the present dynamic of stakeholder engagement" (p. 49). Such candid dialogue and implicit instructions are conferred to corporations with hopes that it will accelerate the CSV trend by inducing corporations to identify

with the rhetoric of CSV as a tool that mitigates the outfall of their for-profit orientations or accusations that they are entities that simply extract resources from the involved communities

The reflexive nature of these tenets of CSV discourses and the merits of engaging in this approach by corporations are ongoing. Senior executives at FSG later extended these four steps of success into what they term “five mutually reinforcing elements” that corporations could engage in to ‘innovate’ for shared value that are context specific (Pitzer *et al.*, 2013). After studying the implementation of the shared value concept into multinational corporations, the executives found that such elements should include as before: embedding a social purpose into the corporate culture, defining the social need and understanding how best to change it, and measuring shared value so that progress can be monitored. However, they elaborated on the final two elements: creating the optimal innovation structure and co-creating with external stakeholders. Specifically, when advising corporations of what ‘options’ are available when engaging in structuring innovation initiatives, Pitzer *et al.* (2013) in conjunction with FSG instruct firms to “integrate with a legacy business,” to increase the likelihood that the social initiative will come close to normal ROI targets (105). Firms are also urged by the authors to “create a semiautonomous unit” to shield the innovative efforts from critique by the corporation’s normal financial requirements until it becomes profitable (p. 105). They also encourage businesses to “obtain philanthropic or government support” to help “test the waters” (p. 105) so that firms can take risks without necessarily jeopardizing the careers of their managers or other corporate projects. Such advice extends to encouraging firms to “finance external entrepreneurs” so that their learning curve and solutions can later be profitably assimilated (p. 106). Corporations are also instructed to co-create social interventions with external stakeholders through the enlisting of a wide range of individuals and entities including

universities, governmental bodies and other companies, and to “leverage others’ capabilities” such as their delivery networks or core competencies (p. 107).

As an interesting development, other academic scholars have also recently undertaken the burden of providing guidance for corporations who wish to engage in the tenets of CSV. Laura Micheleni’s (2012) book *Social Innovation and New Business Models: Creating shared value in low-income markets* provides but one example. Micheleni posits that she identifies the “critical success” factors for social product innovation including an exploration of how firms can generate income from the bottom of the pyramid through alternate business models and engage in what she terms “the social business model framework” (p. vii). According to Micheleni, CSV social business models emphasize the best places for the application of social innovation and prompt corporations to understand more deeply the new product development process particularly for social products for low-income markets. She ends with the presentation of four case studies of social product development including PUR water purification packets developed by Procter and Gamble that purifies household water and Shokti Doi, a micronutrient and vitamin fortified yoghurt developed by Grameen Danone. Such a treatise invites corporate audiences to identify with the tenets of CSV with the promise that such an action will be profitable. This orientation joins Biswas *et al.*’s (2014) case study on Nestlé and their implementation of CSV in Moga India in which the authors implicitly trace changes to the positive and profitable perceptions of Nestlé’s overall corporate identity in this region throughout the last couple of centuries. Such examples are supported by FSG’s ongoing efforts to promote the tenets of CSV through the *Shared Value Initiative* (www.sharedvalue.org), and FSG’s (2014) growing list of shared value case examples and promotion of CSV at their inaugural Shared Value Leadership Summit in New York in May of 2014.

Conclusion

In one sense creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) can be viewed as the latest ‘fad’ in management in which the disconcerting link between organizations and society’s problems can be supposedly ‘fixed’ by what Rolfsen (2004) might call a zealous promotion of a “concrete recipe for action” (p. 124). Situational examples are presented within the CSV toolkit to advocate for its success while offering a particular terministic screen or form of persuasive logic in which corporations can re-conceptualize their previous understandings of social responsibility. Such supplementary materials are applicable almost universally to all organizations and alternate selections of reality (such as exclusive adherence to the rhetoric of CSR) are presented in an explicitly unfavorable way. Within the toolkit organizations are urged to create corporate messages (Cheney & McMillian, 1990) that espouse the value of engaging in a shared symbolic form of “value” that not only support and justify the for-profit motivations of corporations and their inventions into social issues, but also provide a way for corporations to communicate the viability of such actions to their investor network and governmental and philanthropic stakeholders. This advice is oriented towards the creation of particular, profit-oriented formations of corporate identities that firms may find appealing as their emphasis on social ‘value’ not only justifies economic agendas but provides businesses a form of language to use that may mitigate the conflicts that may naturally arise from their daily capitalistic activities with social actors.

Broadly speaking, the rhetoric of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) when viewed as a terministic screen (Burke, 1966) encourages a form of rhetorical consummation with its agenda by corporate managerial audiences. It directs their attention to the potential to profit

from CSV as an innovative social endeavor rather than as yet another manifestation of a public relations exercise. This is a specific attempt by Porter and Kramer and FSG to revolutionize the limitations of the rhetoric of CSR. Here the logic of CSV is presented as an inherent business strategy that serves as a keystone of the ways in which such corporate identities can serve as a firm's competitive advantage. Indeed, firms are instructed to make decisions about how they can create societal 'value' through the re-conception of their business activities with promises that such forms of social intervention may support "both their communities and their business goals" (Porter & Kramer, 2006, p. 83).

A parasitic relationship

The troubles surrounding the rhetoric of CSR arguably provide a strong foothold for such a rhetorical toolkit to be a success. Distinctly noting that CSV "should supersede" CSR (p. 76), Porter and Kramer (2011) claim that CSV is focused on joint forms of company and community value creation that are integral to profit maximization efforts of firms relative to cost. As a departure from what they identify as the reactionary nature of CSR, Porter and Kramer focus on the economic benefits of pursuing social forms of responsibility claiming that ideas of innovation as "societal needs, not just conventional economic needs, define markets, and social harms can create internal costs for firms" (p. 65). In this way explicit links are made by the authors within the toolkit between pursuing strategic, innovative forms of social responsibility and a business' economic value as a natural evolution. The pro-active benefits of this approach are framed as being mutually beneficial to both corporations and involved communities. Conversely, CSR is discursively framed as being outdated and at risk of being able to adequately address the needs of communities and social issues. Whereas the broader realm of CSR encourages corporations to critically (re)examine their interrelationship between social forms of responsibility, the firm, and

notions of corporate governance, compliance, transparency, and accountability (Jamali, *et al.*, 2008), the rhetoric of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) continuously presents itself as a superior option to the dominant rhetoric of CSR by claiming an unending yet distinctly symbolic form of ‘value’ rather than simply social ‘responsibility’ that is appealing to a wide variety of corporate audiences. Whether or not this utopian form of value is achieved or sustainable or is indeed an improvement to CSR efforts becomes a moot point. The language of CSV is strategically ambiguous (Eisenberg, 2007) enough to effectively entice audiences to buy in its particular worldview that promotes a “particular kind of consensus” that organizational constituents can symbolically identify with rather than meeting the demands of having such forms of value “concretely shared” (Farrell, 1999, p. 144).

In one sense then it could be argued that the rhetoric of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) presents a rather pervasive, perhaps *utopian* and *transformative* paradigm that has an almost parasitic relationship to CSR through its reframing of claims of social ‘responsibility. Central to the success of such rhetoric is its habitual reliance on popular conceptions of CSR that perceive such a movement as necessary to counter accusations of corporations as being reckless, negligent, or unethical and ideas of ‘responsibility’ as something to be ‘earned’ or ‘proven’ to corporate stakeholders and the public at large. In strong contrast to this, the CSV toolkit presented here encourages firms to explicitly and proactively infuse social product innovations into their everyday business activities as essential to the well-being of both the corporation *and* their local communities. The rhetoric of CSV thus derives its validity at CSR’s expense by providing a more appealing, perhaps even misleading way in which corporations can engage with their publics. It is already assumed that ideas of responsibility are inherently present and thus do not need any further scrutiny or justification as they are proactively undertaken with the

communities “best interests” in mind. By doing so, corporations can undertake an almost euphemistic approach towards their dealings with local communities and their critics. In the next chapter I will attempt to illustrate one instance of how the success of this rhetoric, when espoused by corporations to various oftentimes conflicting stakeholder audiences, is partly reliant on these utopian forms of language in order to be effective.

Chapter 4
Conceding to the Heavenly Call
CSV as a Vocabulary of Motives

“Be a king? Think not, why be a king when you can be a God?”

~ *Eminem “Rap God” (2013)*

An overriding theme espoused by creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) is that companies can do some “good” in the communities in which they become involved. Indeed, to paraphrase Michael Porter (2012) the primary impetus of CSV is to mutually build strong companies and healthier societies through market-based activities, such as the reduction of a firm’s environmental footprint or serving the health needs of disenfranchised or underserved populations. As narrated in Chapter 3 and this toolkit of success, conceptions of social ‘value’ are transformed into observable realities of corporate citizenship. Meanwhile ideas of economic ‘value’ are elevated to sanctified heights, shored up by the referential properties of such value to its capitalistic underpinnings. With this rather transparent approach towards the benefits of capitalistic interventions into poorer and disenfranchised populations, how then can corporations successfully communicate that they are being “honest” or ethical with their CSV agenda to various, sometimes conflicting audiences? And in what ways can the recipients of such messages make sense of the social ‘value’ being presented to them? To answer such questions, Kenneth Burke’s (1945) concept of a “god term” or summarizing word that encompasses an entire ‘orientation’ or set of motives is helpful. Burke (1950) argues that the rhetorical uses of language

such as god terms (what he later also recognized as ultimate terms) perform an almost ideological function that sanctions “special interests in terms of universal validity” (p. 203). Such forward-looking (Utopian) images help to orient and collectivize people toward a shared discursive world, for the better and sometimes worse purposes of *social cooperation*. “In any term,” Burke (1945) elaborates, “we can posit a world, in the sense that we can see the world in terms of it, seeing all as emanations, near and far, of its light.” Such a vocabulary of motives or “reduction to simplicity” is what he names a god term, a “summarizing title” which subsumes complexities “beneath it” (p. 105) and participates in a larger “motivation order” of “competing ideologies” (Burke, 1950, p. 202). Thus god terms in rhetoric represent how an entire world-view can be summarized and condensed into one particular term that for some individuals can represent an entire orientation that compels them into action. God terms “sum up” the moral and emotional impetus of these orientations, and evolve their movement to action or works on its behalf. They are therefore “motivational” terms. Several god terms can be evidenced in today’s political economy to mitigate the effects of the fallouts of our growing populations and the role of corporations such as “globalization,” “innovation,” or “sustainability.” Each of these are dialectical terms that present arguments that the current trend towards expansion through ‘progress’ serves a higher purpose, providing forward-looking forms of ideologies or utopian images that sanction special interests while prompting us to identify with them and enact particular actions (Burke, 1950, p. 203).

Rhetorician Richard Weaver’s (1953) extrapolation of this concept is perhaps helpful in understanding the potential positive reception of the rhetoric of CSV by corporate stakeholder audiences. He articulates that a rhetor’s worldview can be understood in *ultimate terms* that can be divided into three major categories: god, devil, and charismatic terms. For Weaver a god term

is “that expression about which all other expressions are ranked as subordinate and serving dominations and powers. Its force imparts to the others their lesser degree of force” (p. 212). He elaborates that god terms are observable, and reflect the “nature” of our “conscious life to revolve around some concept of value,” to help to locate us in the “ideological universe,” and without such orienting and anchoring terms we would be “lost” (p. 213). Such is our tendency to keep such terms sacred, defend them from opposition, and to feel compelled to sacrifice on their behalf. At the time of Weaver’s insight, he considered several god terms to be present in American culture that are particularly appealing to corporate audiences including “fact,” “American,” and “technology.” Political ideology and political rhetoric are certainly rife with god terms, and with oppositional terms (devil terms) that evoke disgust and are reviled but help to locate and anchor us within a dramatic political universe. These kinds of summative and universalizing terms help to orient us and “subsume” complexities of everyday political life and the authority of our leaders without arguing basics and details. Burke (1950) analyzes “money” and “technology” as central god terms of our political economy. For Burke, such terms are automatic ‘goods,’ priorities that when invoked, go without question, their centrality and authority resolving any conflicts about what we should pursue. In that vein Weaver (1953) asserts that “progress” is “probably the only term that gives the average American or West European of today [1953] a concept of something bigger than himself, which he is socially compelled to accept and even sacrifice for”—this “capacity to demand sacrifice” being the “surest indicator of a god-term.” (p. 214) God terms thus tell us how things work and, perhaps more importantly, what our role(s) should be in the complexities of our socio-political worlds.

Any age might be characterized by the God and devil terms that summarize the political dramas central to its discourse. Cold war discourse, for instance, focused on the evils of

“communism” in contrast to the positive goods of capitalism and its sponsoring god term “freedom.” One recalls the evening of the 9/11 attack, George Bush pronounced that the attack had been on America’s “freedom,” revealing the deft substitution of our ubiquitous god term for the material devastation of the World Trade Center. The positive “goods” of “freedom” and an America’s “way of life” are countered by “evil-doers,” and “terrorism” has hence been the central devil term of political ideology since that date—coming to replace communism as the great devil-term of political discourse, and terrorists personifying ‘evil-doers’ in our popular culture, fantasy, and film. An interesting wrinkle in the summation of 9/11 as an attack on “freedom itself” occurs when one converts the symbolism downward from the lofty heights of the god term: the terrorists attacked a towering symbol of world financial domination by Americans—and how easily, when attacked, can our President substitute the ideal of freedom for their symbol of domination, cleansing or sanctifying it, as it were, of the political meanings the opposition had loaded into it. Americans might not be called to defend or sacrifice and rally about world financial domination, but our ‘freedom’ is synonymous, rhetorically, with the ‘good’ that holds us and locates us in the ideological universe. As with Bush’s deft manipulation of “freedom,” one can move up and down the ‘scale’ that is implied by our summarizing god terms, as Burke (1945) demonstrates with the easy movement between “freedom” and “free markets” that is so familiar to our political and corporate forms of rhetoric (p. 351).

There is little doubt that corporate and/or managerial rhetoric at times enjoins the larger political vocabulary, and that our economic interests and practices themselves are couched in vocabularies of not only politics, but culture, psychology, sociology, therapeutics and even, sometimes, metaphysics. Contemporary devil terms in our vocabulary now include “recession,” “bailout,” “bureaucracy” and “spam” (Foss *et al.*, 2014). Corporations can override disingenuous

portrayals of firms as acting exclusively in their own self-interests and instead discursively represent themselves as involved societal citizens that offer godly like substances through material interventions, themselves tested on their efficacy by the criteria of providing an adequate return on investment to corporate shareholders. The very term “political economy” itself suggests such linkages, as does business oriented god terms in our common everyday language such as “justice,” “capitalism,” “free markets,” “entrepreneurialism,” and the current buzz word “globalization.” It is in such terms that we find automatic and unarguable ‘goods’ that sponsor given trends and practices, imputing to them not only positive value, but ubiquity, legitimacy, and often, inevitability.

My ultimate purpose in introducing the idea of god terms (Burke, 1945) here is to examine the relationship between the recent doctrines of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) as a god term or rhetoric of corporate reform and how corporations can use subordinated terms within such a framework to shore up the ‘God like’ value of this rhetoric as a form of *utopian universality*. Specifically, I use the case study of Nestlé as a case study to illustrate how the CSV toolkit of success (elaborated on in the last chapter) is delivered through a new form of relanguaging of corporate-community relations that encourages the use of symbolic subordinated terms *nutrition* and *rural development* when describing particular conceptions of value. Values such as nutrition or rural development are something that most laymen share and invest in particularly in the Westernized world, but the potential for such values to be problematic can best be addressed only through illustrating how such terms can be utilized as a form of proactive social intervention for the explicit purpose of making a profit at the expense of the involved communities. In the context of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011), however, such terms become sanctified, cleansed as it were of their devil like understanding when engaged

in by Nestlé in order to fully consummate a stakeholder's sense of identification with the corporation. I then briefly discuss how such language of consensus can be used to proactively generate particular forms of corporate identities that discursively frame multinational corporations as "good" members of society as an attempt to mitigate growing concerns over their unchecked growth and political power (Soule, 2009). However, in the larger discussion of the "power of language" and corporate use of the idea of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011), it occurs to me that I might first identify a kind of genealogy of god terms (Burke, 1945) in corporate discourses in the last several decades that might help to provide a rhetorical context for this contemporary trend.

God and Devil Terms in Corporate Discourse

Focusing on corporate discourse more particularly reveals somewhat smaller or more discrete uses of such language. One might expect that the Great Depression of the 1930s would itself provide a host of god and devil terms (Burke, 1945, Weaver, 1953) as concerns monetary policy and economic reform, including the "New Deal" and the unspeakable devil-term "depression" itself, never to be directly applied to our cyclical "recessions" for the fear it would inspire. But it was perhaps not until the 1940s that god terms came into corporate discourses as identifiable terms in their own right. Banerjee (2007) observes that in this decade the word *development* gained traction by both corporations and policy makers alike. He elaborates that as part of his "desirable global agenda," US President Harry Truman urged Americans to link economics with scientific progress in his inaugural address in 1949 (p. 67). Economic growth thus soon became "interchangeable with development" (p. 70) sanctifying the material and social issues raised by the 'modernization' of disenfranchised and poorer populations into the 'assisted' (Escobar, 1995) as a way to hedge the devil terms of "poverty" and "welfare."

In reflection of mounting pressures by environmental groups in the 1960s, the term ‘development’ soon evolved into the premise of *sustainable development* defined in the 1980s by the Brundtland Commission as “a process of change in which the exploitation of resources, the direction of investments, the orientation of technological development, and institutional change are made consistent with future as well as present needs.” (WCED, 1987, p. 17) Rhetorically rising above exactly how growth or wealth can be created without resource depletion (Banerjee, 2003a), “sustainable development” soon became the buzzword of the 1990s and has since become synonymous with *sustainability* (Banerjee, 2007, p. 67). Such ubiquitous language has even found its way inside the corporate form itself as employees bow down to ubiquitous terms such as human ‘resources,’ or human ‘development,’ drawing on larger ideas surrounding the extraction of resources from one’s environment in the name of ‘progress.’

A multitude of other terms have also gained in popularity in the past few decades. The 1960s saw the rise of the term *innovation* embraced by corporations as a strategic way for firms to determine if their responses to conditions of stability or change are appropriate or dysfunctional (Burns & Stalker, 1961). Ideas of innovation have since become closely linked to the dexterous use of the god term *technology* or “science-based” industries that are often synonymous with the rise of corporate capitalism in America (Noble, 1977) and the creation of ties between industrial social scientists to management (Baritz, 1960). Believing that “quality-oriented firms in fact do better in market share and profits,” organizations also placed a value on pursuing the god term *quality* and its derivative, Total Quality Management (TQM). Firmly entrenched in today’s corporate practices, corporate personnel to this very day are asked to make laborious sacrifices for the twelve key themes of TQM including a focus on quality, continuous improvement, teamwork, and a customer-oriented focus (Marchese, 1991, p. 4).

In the 1990s, ideas of the god term *market* put forward in business communications have served to discursively override the impact of corporate activities on the environment (Livesay, 2002) and growing concerns over the analogous devil-term “climate change” while sponsoring subordinate terms such as “green marketing” (Coddington, 1993). And we are all familiar with the contemporary god term *globalization* (and its sponsoring devil-term “neoliberalism”). The term itself bespeaks a force, a historical epoch, an economic and political movement, a set of practices that include everything from labor, to diplomacy, to marketing, to communication media, to cultural production. During the early years of this century, popular authors such as Thomas Friedman (2005) declared that the “world is flat” calling for corporate practitioners and academics alike to ignore historical and geographical divisions in order to remain competitive. In this way the god term globalization labels or “stands in for” the multitude of complexities having to do with our contemporary geopolitical world, yet transcends the myriad details and politics of these transactions. The term has material consequences, invokes powers, and has the quality of unquestioned inevitability—while at the same time sponsoring, representing, legitimizing, and valorizing certain choices and strategies that are not inevitable or inherent.

As Payne (1989) observes, god terms are so-called because they impart these god-like qualities to the entities they are alleged to name. Specifically, they impart the character of *universality* as mentioned by Burke as though these trends and forces were widespread and self-sustaining as historical movements; they thereby attribute a kind of transformative *power* to the set of ideas and practices they name, even though they themselves are mystifications and transcend particular details. Payne elaborates that god terms assign a positive (or negative) *value* to all matters that come within their representational purview: what gets called “globalization” or “neoliberalism” for instance, partakes of the god-like or devil-like moral value (and often it is

ambiguously both) of the sponsoring term. Such terms reveal the rhetorical devices whereby we spiritualize material conditions and reify ideological schemes in social practices. Moreover they impute the sense that powers or forces or ideas for change transcend and organize our particular choices and activities. Using or conforming to these larger forces Payne asserts, gives transformative power to the choices and actions that we undertake in its name.

Corporate god terms (Burke, 1945) thus represent specific *motivational appeals* or *entire world views* that transcend the material, social, and political societal turmoil that is derived from corporate activities. They orient corporate and stakeholder audiences towards observable characteristics and values that can be supposedly apprehended yet remain obscure, ambiguous, or as shown in the case of ‘sustainable development,’ downright contradictory (Foss, Foss, & Trapp, 2002). Adhering to a hierarchical scheme of interpretation, god terms demands sacrifice(s) from corporations and their stakeholder audiences to avoid the deleterious effects of corporate stagnation and overall criticisms of a firm’s image as they navigate the perils of resource extraction from surrounding communities. Perhaps the most ubiquitous contemporary god term that has sustainable appeal to a wide variety of corporate audiences is *corporate social responsibility*. As shown in Chapter 2 this term is prolific in both academic and business circles despite its lack of a definitive definition (May *et al.*, 2007) and claims by critics that it is a reactive response to mounting pressures on corporations to be seen as being ethical and responsible societal citizens in order to repair their reputation or avoid further government regulation. Representing rhetorical paradigmatic values on how ‘ideal’ corporations can and should conduct business, CSR as a god term shores up its rhetorical force through the subsuming of many ancillary terms including “philanthropy,” “corporate social performance” (Wood, 1991) and “business ethics” (Donaldson & Dunfee, 1999). Reflective of the contradictory and often

obscure referents attached to god terms, debates remain over whether the term CSR is interchangeable with the terms “corporate citizenship” (Waddock, 2009), or “sustainability” a term that in 2012 Sullivan recognized is a god term in its own right.

CSV as a Vocabulary of Motives

The idea of a “god term” (Burke, 1945) thus reflects a view of rhetoric and how we organize socially through shared orientations to values and actions that language comes to represent. Burke’s (1950) theories of rhetoric as identification and how our rhetoric constitutes a basic “grammar of motivation” elaborate and have revolutionized the study of rhetoric, and are particularly central to the rhetorical studies of organizations. The core idea of this sociological view of rhetoric is that our shared communication and identification through rhetorically charged language puts us in a basically animated and motivationally charged symbolic world. We see this most readily at times of extreme conflict or crisis: pro this or anti that. At such times, we tend to cooperate toward shared goals, or unify against common enemies (Cheney, 1983). One clear example is the current trend for companies to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions, to become like BMW and be “climate change champions” with the shared goal of improving their environmental performance (FT, 2013). In such circumstances, it is easy to see how various concepts or entities can become charged with connotative meanings, as they align pro or con with whatever ‘gods’ or devils’ we are fighting at the moment. In other words, terms and concepts can become infused with the motivating vocabulary as they are seen to participate in the conflict or drama at hand. Burke’s (1945) insight is that this kind of motivational vocabulary occurs all of the time, as we relate systems of terms and concepts to particular key ideas or players in the larger dramatic context. These rhetorical processes of ‘identification’ (Burke, 1950) have not been overlooked by politicians or public relations firms or advertisers, and the

goal of promoting identification with a candidate, brand, or practice is the state of these rhetorical arts.

In the last chapter, it became apparent that this kind of motivational organization or energy is precisely what Porter and Kramer (2006, 2011) have tried to instill with the transformative language of CSV. That is, by promoting identification and participation in the basic concept and language of CSV, the entire business organization and its practices ideally would become infused with the motivation of *creating* ‘shared value.’ This “shared value” becomes the god term or motivational center for a ‘vocabulary of motives’ that infuses every level and every stakeholder relationship with their common action-oriented purpose. I noted above Burke’s (1945) idea that a god term is a “summarizing word,” (p. 3) capable of identifying or evoking all of the particulars that are subsumed under this motivational focus or orientation. CSV inflects and infuses ideas like ‘productivity,’ ‘efficiency,’ or ‘free-markets,’ with the standard of ‘shared value’ when used in the context of an organization devoted to that goal. Burke therefore helps to describe how an organizing keystone like “shared value” (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) can recruit other concepts and activities in its motivational army. We can identify clusters of ideas, concepts, or terms that work for and against our key terms as we participate in the drama of change. Using the case study of Nestlé, I focus on two subordinate terms that become motivational avatars in their performance of shared value, and as such, key parts of Nestlé’s reformed corporate identity: nutrition and rural development.

Nutrition

Broadly, as mentioned earlier, ideas of nutrition hold considerable appeal particularly in Westernized popular cultures as an observable trait of good health. This is demonstrated by the rapid rise in dietary and herbal supplements, the current trend of sourcing of local, whole or

organic low-fat foods in America, and mass media discussions concerning the detrimental effects of the global “Americanization” of diets due to the ongoing rise in popularity of fast-food restaurants and noncore foods (i.e. Wiley *et al.*, 2014). Demonstrating his concern with the rise in obesity in the U.S. for example, Jamie Oliver, BBC’s international celebrity chef recently started a “Food Revolution” to encourage more nutritious diets in American school cafeterias (www.jamieoliver.com). Individuals are often called on to make sacrifices in the name of nutrition: to engage in home cooking, pay higher prices for basic food ingredients, to take daily vitamin supplements, or to encourage food companies to produce better food products and labeling standards. Yet despite this perhaps obsessive attention to the promotion of healthy diets and nutrition in developed nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO, 2013) reports that more than 842 million individuals around the world in 2011-2013 suffered from chronic hunger, most often in developing countries. They argue that Sub-Saharan Africa remains the region most impacted by this crisis, closely followed by Western Asia that shows no progress in reducing undernourishment. Undernutrition is responsible for more than one-third of all deaths in children under the age of five globally (Black *et al.*, 2008). As with other poorer nations, in Bangladesh, risk factors for acute malnutrition amongst children include low socioeconomic status, underemployment, stopping breastfeeding before four months of age and single parent households (Fuchs *et al.*, 2014).

In direct recognition of this growing crisis, Nestlé engages ideas surrounding the subordinated term *nutrition* within their CSV reports as an expression of their proactive and ethical investment into the global social issues of food insecurity and hunger. Broadly, Nestlé (2014) argues that if corporations provide nutritional value for society (i.e. Nestlé’s consumers) through scientifically created and nutritionally fortified products and dietary staples then greater

shareholder and social value creation will ensue while reducing global forms of malnutrition.

Nestlé (2014) elaborates:

Our ambition remains to be recognized as the world's leading nutrition, health and wellness company. Our mission of 'Good Food, Good Life' is to provide consumers with the best tasting, most nutritious choices in a wide range of food and beverage categories and eating occasions, from morning to night. We must deliver against a backdrop of significant global nutritional challenges, which are both complex and far-reaching, but we believe that Nestlé can be a part of the solution by providing products that meet local nutritional needs and are tailored for different stages of our lives." (Nestlé, 2014, p. 51).

Nestlé (2014) further declares that nutrition forms "an integral part of our business strategy" a "key area of our work, where we believe we can make the biggest impact" (p. 61).

Such ethical forms of social "value" to get audience 'buy in' to this message is obtained through Nestlé's focused provision of vitamin fortified and nutritious products to poorer populations.

Adhering to a formula that they term "nutritional landscaping" Nestlé, together with international health authorities identify dietary gaps in developing nations such as iron deficiencies or lack of micronutrients in the diet, responding to such gaps by creating vitamin enriched existing products such as iron fortified milk ("nutritional landscaping," 2013). Such improvements are also made through the instigation of corporate forms of intervention into 'malnourished' communities including investments into R&D concerning nutrition, weight management initiatives, as well as the implementation of various forms of rural development (elaborated in the next section) (Nestlé, 2009). It is implicitly suggested that Nestlé's provision of such nutritional products are of course preferable to the alternative, in this case ignoring the global issue of malnutrition or inaction concerning the world hunger crisis.

As but one example of the performance of tropes of *nutrition* to boost positive conceptions of Nestlé's corporate identity, Nestlé published an inaugural "Nutritional needs and

quality diets: Creating Shared Value Report 2008” report that advocates for science-based solutions to what the firm deems to be the nutritional needs of at risk populations. Reporting in that year gross sales of more than 10.4 billion swiss francs of Nestlé’s nutritional products, Nestlé (2009) claims that social and economic ‘value’ in this instance is created through the distribution of Nestlé’s PPPs or Properly Positioned Products that represent “Products of high nutritional value and quality, with proven health and wellness benefits, for consumers” as well as the provision of corporate forms of knowledge concerning nutrition to rural populations (p. 14). Nestlé advocates that such products are created with the goal of improving market share for Nestlé and the provision of “greater financial returns for our shareholders” (p. 14). In such instances nutrition as a social ‘value’ is created through the upgrading of the quality of Nestlé’s commercial food products and correspondingly what they claim is an improvement to the diets of involved populations particularly in developing countries. Meanwhile economic forms of value are created through this market expansion. Nestlé (2009) elaborates on the genesis of this ‘win-win’ formula:

Consumers benefit from products with lower levels of public-health-sensitive components, fortified with vitamins, minerals, and other nutrients. Clinically demonstrated benefits developed by Nestlé Research and designed to improve health and wellbeing in turn bring higher sales and market expansion for Nestlé, and sustainable value for shareholders. (Nestlé, 2009, p. 22)

Note how such rhetoric makes an explicit link between Nestlé and their fortified products, the micronutrient needs of various populations, and the retail sector in order to generate a taken-for-granted assumption that Nestlé’s actions will benefit such sectors. Embedded within the discursive formation of this market nexus is also the suggestion that nutritional deficiencies are inevitable if targeted consumers do not make changes to their food consumption patterns particularly through the purchase of Nestlé’s products that are scientifically designed to improve

an individual's overall well-being. Addressing this 'win-win' situation from another vantage point, it is also suggested that Nestlé's shareholders will enjoy 'sustainable' revenue from this market form of intervention giving a sense of stability and predictability to their corporate identity.

As expected, this specific promotion of Nestlé's micronutrient fortified products to address micronutrient deficiencies in poorer populations are ongoing and take place on a global scale. In Africa for instance, Nestlé reengineered their *Maggi* bouillon cubes and seasoning tablets, a staple in many lower income consumer's diets, by adding a form of iron that had "good bioavailability" in Central and West Africa that was cost-neutral and prevented a color and taste changes from preexisting forms of the seasonings (Shared Value Initiative, 2013). When justifying the rationale for marketing this form of ultimate diet Maarten Geraets, Business Executive Manager for *Maggi* Central and West Africa remarks: "The fortification of commonly consumed food products such as bouillon cubes, flour, and milk has been shown to help prevent micronutrient deficiencies (Nestlé, 2012b, para. 9). Geraets continues, "If you look at the number of bouillon units Nestlé sells in this region every day, there is enormous potential for us to make a positive impact on local consumers' diets" (ibid., para. 8). Indeed, the African newspaper *Daily Trust* confirms that more than 50 million *Maggi* cubes are sold daily in Nigeria (Shosanya, 2012). Such sales are supplemented by "simple educational materials" on nutrition by Nestlé including "pocket cards and fact sheets" in various languages that raise awareness about the health implications of nutritional deficiencies (Nestlé, 2012b, para. 16) while potentially broadening the acceptance and understandings of this social intervention by consumers.

Meanwhile in India, Nestlé invented a new product "Maggi Masala-ae-Magic" a new mix of Indian spices for daily cooking fortified with iron and other micronutrients (Shared Value

Initiative, 2013). Specifically engineered towards low-income Indian households, Nestlé adhered to an inventive mass marketing campaign for Masala-ae-Magic in conjunction with the Indian government, media outlets, and street plays in remote villages where the benefits of consuming the spice mixture were embedded into the actors' scripts (ibid.). Nestlé (2014) further reports that they engage in several awareness campaigns and programs including their support in 2013 of the World Breastfeeding Week, the Nestlé Healthy Kids Global Programme that is oriented towards increasing young children's knowledge and awareness of the importance of good nutrition and regular exercise (reaching a total of 68 countries in 2013) (p. 77). They also claim that in 2013 they created the popular *Maggi* Taste Bhi Health Bhi Kitchen in India, a cooking education program aimed at mothers and children to promote home cooking of healthy recipes.

Sanctified Form of Social Intervention

True to Burke's (1950) doctrine of god terms explained earlier, Nestlé's evocation of the toolkit of success – in this case through the ideals surrounding 'nutrition' as a special interest – elevates this market-based form of business expansion into a sanctified form of social intervention exclusively oriented towards elevating the overall well-being of the involved communities. For general (particularly Westernized) audiences of such rhetoric, the term 'nutrition' functions as an "urgent social motive" (Burke, 1950, p. 201) with universal appeal that causes us to look forward towards the 'ultimate' or nourished state of being that the infusion of Nestlé's products into 'malnourished' products promise. Corporate stakeholder audiences exposed to the marketing of Nestlé's fortified products are able to understand the value of this appeal: Nestlé relieves individual consumers, particularly in rural communities, of their micronutrient deficiencies through consumerist practices while healthy financial returns are provided to Nestlé's shareholders from the expansion of their markets. Here Nestlé's marketing

and education efforts towards nutrition represents an ideal, the ultimate motivation or substance that is imputed onto stakeholder audiences, representing the greatest good, or goal towards which we as individuals should all move.

The suggestion that this approach also perpetuates the success of Nestlé both at an economic and reputational level is not minimized but rather is promoted as a necessary way to improve the overall visibility of the corporation and their goodwill in the global food and beverage industries. In their latest report “Nestlé in Society: Creating shared value and meeting our commitments 2013” for instance, Nestlé (2014) comments that “in line with our ambition to be recognized as the world’s leading nutrition, health and wellness Company, we are committed to improving the nutrition—and therefore the health and wellness—of people around the world” (p. 48). Such a claim of goodwill is backed up by Nestlé’s investments of \$1.503 billion in nutritional research and development (p. 49). Nestlé further remarks that an examination of nutrition as one of their “key performance indicators” reveals that 76% of their products meet or exceed their nutritional profile criteria, that they currently have 7789 renovated products, 4778 products that have increased nutritional ingredients or essential nutrients, 4221 products with reduced sodium, sugars, fats and artificial colorings, and 9562 PPP’s that amount to 11803 million swiss francs in sales (p. 17). Such results led the firm to proudly claim that in 2012 they were ranked as the highest food and beverage company in the annual *Global RepTrak*TM study, oriented towards understanding how global organizations build trust and support with their general stakeholders (“Nestlé named,” 2013). Kasper Ulf Nielsen, Executive Partner at Reputation Institute independently commented on this placement within the study stating that “Nestlé has a strong reputation with consumers around the world” noting that they are “a good example of the business benefit a strong reputation can give if managed well” (ibid, papa. 9).

(Mal)nutrition as a transcendent motive

Yet just like the narratives of ‘development,’ or ‘globalization’ explained earlier, Nestlé’s reasoning of what ways corporate interventions can take place in societal issues depict malnourished populations exclusively in economic terms—as communities from which resources can be extracted. Moreover, that Nestlé’s capitalistic interventions are to their benefit and represent the social ‘ideal.’ Specifically, such narratives privilege the firm’s Westernized conception of what nutrition can and should mean -- in this case a consumerist for-profit model that perpetuates capitalism in underserved or previously untapped markets such as remote rural communities -- while rhetorically overriding local food customs or the closely interrelated government standards of nutrition. As but one example of the problems concerning this prevailing use of (mal)nutrition as a transcendent motive, Nestlé came under criticism in 2012 by India’s premier health lobby group the Centre of Science and Environment (CSE). CSE claims that just like other major food companies that sell convenience foods such as PepsiCo, McDonalds or KFC, that Nestlé’s Maggi Noodles product, while it states on its packaging that it is vitamin fortified, contains negligible amounts of fiber and more than 70% of carbohydrates in its content (CSEIndia, 2012). According to their study, leading food manufacturers are guilty of “large scale misbranding and misinformation” (para. 1) in their claims that their products contain zero trans-fats, whereas the most popular “junk foods contain very high levels of trans-fats, salts and sugar – which inevitably lead to severe ill health and diseases like obesity and diabetes” (“big food brands hide,” 2012, para. 2).³³ Such complaints tap into ongoing accusations towards

³³ Nestlé responded to such allegations stating that “We respect the work being done by organizations like CSE to improve consumer’s understanding of healthy and balanced diets. Maggi is intended as a light meal and can safely be consumed as part of diversified balanced diet” (“big food brands hide,” 2012). It almost does not need to be pointed out that it is questionable in this response, what a “healthy” or “balanced” diet may mean if it includes food that primarily consists of rehydrated white flour-based products.

food producers of mislabeling the nutritional content in their food products while demonstrating yet again an implicit focus on the privileging of free-market fundamentalism through consumerism as a carrier of domestic and Westernized values to developing nations (Banerjee, 2008a).

Moreover, what is not said in such narratives is the potential for Nestlé to use ‘nutrition’ as an ideal to play rhetorical ‘cleanup’ of their sullied reputation. As mentioned earlier, in the 1970s Nestlé faced boycotts over the aggressive sale of their infant formula in developing nations as a preferable alternative to a mother’s breast milk, often to mothers who had inadequate access to clean water or monies needed for the formula (Moorhead, 2007). Moorhead (2007) argues that such an action caused the World Health assembly to adopt the “International Code of Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes,” in order to regulate the industry, but that the WHO code concerning infant formula marketing is still violated by Nestlé. Nestlé also faces long-standing boycotts and allegations of mislabeling and misleading claims concerning the nutritional content of their products. In 2008 Nestlé faced claims over nutritional mislabeling by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) body in the U.S. for overstating the nutritional value of their products and generating misleading claims of trans fats (Dorfman & Heavey, 2010) and again in 2009 for mislabeling their children’s juice boxes as “medical” foods (Khan, 2009). While still others argue that food giants like Nestlé should continue to bear the brunt for harming the health of entire nations by selling fat saturated and salt laden food products that can potentially harm “the health of whole nations, not just their babies” (Muller, 2013, para. 9). This brings to mind the overriding question: Exactly who is getting what kind of value when Nestlé makes the sanctified claim that their products are nutritionally beneficial to society? We may find an answer in their tropes of rural development.

Rural Development

Another form of social and economic value that is promoted by Nestlé under the umbrella of the god term shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) is *rural development*. Nestlé (2014) discursively constructs ideas of rural development as the investment of science and employee resources in rural farming communities as a way to foster responsible sourcing of goods for their global supply chain while boosting the economic and social well-being of local rural communities. In their report *Nestlé in Society: Creating shared value and meeting our commitments 2013*, Nestlé (2014) elaborates:

Our approach to Creating Shared Value is perhaps most evident in the field of rural development, where the wellbeing of our employees, farmers, small-scale entrepreneurs, suppliers and rural communities is intrinsic to securing global food supplies while delivering our own growth strategy.” (Nestlé, 2014, p. 101).

Nestlé (2014) remarks that such forms of rural development include the ongoing global expansion of Nestlé factories in 21 countries that “display such societal need” together with the instigation of specific scientific agricultural practices. Such agricultural practices include the introduction of improved planting materials (typically genetically modified disease-resistant plantlets), training programs, and technical and financial support to rural farming communities when needed (Nestlé, 2014, p. 101). Nestlé (2011) discursively frames their factories in such countries as “magnets for development” (p. 5) implicitly arguing that rural communities require particular (corporate) assistance.

One particular example of how Nestlé presents such narratives of rural development as a necessary but godly burden for local communities to undertake for audiences of such rhetoric is through their insistence that rural farming communities meet the growing global demands of food. Calling rural famers “agripreneurs” Nestlé (2014) calls for such individuals to “grow a

variety of agricultural crops, for their own consumption and to contribute to the nutritional security of their communities” but also that such farmers should be put center stage to obtain a secure supply of food to meet the world’s growing population (p. 106). Such demands are espoused as a means for motivating rural communities to push towards this ideal. In their inaugural 2010 rural development report Nestlé (2011) elaborates:

With the projected doubling of global food demand in the first half of the 21st century, the world needs low-income countries with a history of underperformance in their agricultural sectors to contribute more to their national and the global food supply (Nestlé, 2011, p. 15).

Here rural development is subordinated under the god term CSV as a viable driver of global development and as a positive solution to the perceived deficiencies of existing farming activities in rural communities. Following this reasoning, low-income countries with a history of “underperformance” (lack of progress) can become fertile grounds for producing what is needed to address the global social issues of hunger and malnutrition through Nestlé’s engagement with their local agricultural sectors. The means by which this higher level of rural performance can be made is through two principle ways: an increase in landmass for planting, or an increase in the production of crops per unit of land (Nestlé, 2011). Just as with the god term ‘technology’ (Burke, 1945) in this context rural farming activities gain value through their association with development often accessed through Nestlé’s technical *help* and financial support. Such ‘assistance’ of course, rhetorically boosts positive conceptions of Nestlé’s overall identity.

Also noteworthy within this vocabulary of motives is Nestlé’s discursive emphasis on embracing ‘higher-value’ crops that generally involve the implantation of genetically modified crops by farmers to increase productivity and market yield. Nestlé (2011) frames this genetic agricultural intervention in their inaugural rural development report under the guise of another

god term *progress* (Burke, 1945) as being a necessary action. Here the engagement of an individual's farming activities are discursively narrated as a resource to be consumed by the corporation. Successfully engaging such activities not only interpellates (Althusser, 2006) local communities as agents of change that can overcome their nation's "history" of underperformance and malnutrition but frame Nestlé in a positive light while promising to resolve pre-existing standards of living in involved communities. In this way local communities can be fully rhetorically consummated with Nestlé's world-view and corporate identity while helping to resolve the global hunger issue.

Farmer Connect Program

One explicit example of rural development in action is seen within Nestlé's (2014) *Farmer Connect* program. Such a program is comprised of 60% dairy farmers, 35% coffee farmers, and 5% cocoa farmers that is "committed to the local sourcing of raw materials, by purchasing goods directly from farmers, co-operatives or selected, trusted leaders who are applying Nestlé good agricultural standards, offering technical assistance and ensuring cooperation to meet the highest sourcing standards" as part of their rural development framework (Nestlé, 2014, p. 106). One way in which this form of rural development is performed in this context is by Nestlé's creation of the "milk district model." Nestlé (2014) proudly reports that this model currently operates in 31 countries (including Brazil, Chile, China, India, Mexico, and Pakistan) in order to "secure" a regular supply of "high-quality fresh milk" from local farmers as milk and milk products have a "significant impact on nutritional levels in the country," and play an essential role in consumers' nutrition (p. 144). The corporation in turn provides "facilities and support" to further this agenda (p. 144). In this instance, rural development is something that local farming communities can apprehend and is destined to be the goal towards all should move.

When commenting on Nestlé specifically in the book *Creating Shared Value: Impacts of Nestlé in Moga, India*, Biswas *et al.*, (2014) also discuss the firm's milk production activities in this region over the past 50 years. They note that Nestlé has had a significant impact on the region's social and economic environ as the best example of this forward thinking development. Specifically, the instigation of Nestlé's milk rural development model resulted in steady increases in milk procurements for more than three decades, resulting in higher incomes for local rurally marginalized farmers and a better standard of living. They comment that the program increased the number of direct suppliers from 4,460 in 1962 to 62,183 in 2012 (p. 20). This resulted in an increase of milk purchased in 1962 from 2,054 tonnes to 236,472 in 2012 (p. 20). According to the authors, such an investment of Nestlé's corporate resources had further indirect benefits on the local communities including remunerated forms of employment for extended family members (mostly women), reliable farm earnings, as well as the facilitation of debt reductions and higher cattle numbers (p. 21).

Biswas *et al.*, (2014) elaborate that such rural developments have also resulted in long-term benefits to the Moga region. Such benefits include the modernization of "the traditional practices of the Punjabi farmers during the past three decades" (p. 23). Cumulative benefits were also recognized that stemmed from Nestlé's activities including long-term employment opportunities, and "lasting changes in livelihoods" (p. 24). They also estimate that Nestlé's milk factory and their suppliers have contributed up to 35% of the total income of the Moga Municipality in taxes in recent years (p. 44). It is evident in the author's consideration of the Moga district that the local communities have benefited from this infusion of the principles of CSV through rural development. They report that Nestlé is directly responsible for these multiple social supports including improved hygiene of the local communities, increased nutritional

benefits concerning the production of milk-related products, the provision of solutions to local financial gaps through microloans and extending credit to local farmers, the fostering of improved village water and sanitation facilities, and improvements to local environmental and water conservation. In turn Nestlé enjoys an innovative and sustainable supply chain relationship with the community that is profitable.

A final example of Nestlé's commitment to rural development as a way to boost positive conceptions of their overall identity concerns the instigation of their *Nestlé Cocoa Plan* that addresses issues concerning cocoa production on cocoa farms around the world including low productivity and child labor. According to Nestlé's 2013 creating shared value report, the plan adheres to three key aims: to encourage local farmers to choose cocoa farming via free will rather than by default, to encourage cocoa farmers to improve their standard of living both for themselves and their families, and to empower local communities so that they can thrive within the cocoa economy (Nestlé, 2014, p. 156). Nestlé (2014) report that in the last year alone that in support of these goals they have purchased 62 299 tonnes of cocoa within the cocoa plan, of which 75% was certified as fair trade (p. 156). Moreover that they have trained 154 liaison staff to operate within the child labor monitoring divisions of the firm, built or refurbished 13 schools in the cocoa region of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana, distributed more than one million cocoa plants to farmers and trained 33 855 cocoa farmers in 2013 (up from 27 000 in 2012) (p. 156). Such actions were undertaken by Nestlé (2014) to encourage farmers to be profitable, improve the social conditions of the involved communities, and to provide good quality, sustainable sources of cocoa for the firm.

The god like burden of 'development'

But as with the ideas surrounding the subordinated term nutrition, the concept of rural development, particularly within the context of cocoa farming is not without its problems. Some critics accuse Nestlé of covering only 15% of their global cocoa supply chain with the principles of cocoa plan and that the firm is gouging profits from the farming communities as the price per ton keeps dropping yet retail prices remain high (Korlina, 2014). Other note that despite promises by Nestlé that the cocoa plan and rural development framework instigated by the company will improve the lives of women, women cocoa farmers continue to face gender discrimination including unequal pay and lack of access to farming supplies (Nieburg, 2013). This reflects a broader pattern of women farmers being unfairly treated more generally despite making up 43% of the agricultural labor force in developing countries due to fewer opportunities than male-headed households to own land, access critical products and agricultural services needed for farming including fertilizer, livestock, mechanical equipment and seed varieties (United Nations, 2012).

The corporate watchdog *Behind the Brands* organization reports, however, that Nestlé has made some progress towards the treatment of women in the agricultural force in developing nations and indeed leads other global food companies such as Unilever and Coca Cola in the treatment of farmers, women, and workers (Behind the Brands, 2014). Yet critics still argue that the cocoa plan incorporates a number of foresighted drawbacks including lack of guaranteeing a living wage, unclear labeling standards on their products, a lack of including women explicitly in the cocoa plan itself, and a perhaps misplaced focused on building schools for children rather than directly addressing a community's "wish list" or more urgent needs (Hoffman, 2013). And

finally, the Fair Labor Association found that while the cocoa plan has “the makings of a well-rounded developmental program” in order to make cocoa supplies more sustainable, child labor continues to be a “reality” on cocoa farms located within the Ivory Coast, Africa cautioning that one company cannot solve this problem alone (Fair Labor, 2012, p. 3). Such concerns are raised in a framework of rural ‘development’ in which the very conception of development is itself an outward expression of colonial thought that reinforces Westernized forms of capitalism through specific managerial practices (Banerjee, 2003a).

Conclusion

Nestlé’s ideas surrounding *nutrition* and *rural development* as performances of the god term (Burke, 1945) shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) enable the firm to present themselves as being legitimately invested in the well-being of rural communities. Primarily, solutions to the problems of global hunger and rural poverty are driven by local agricultural and consumerist actions by civil society actors in developing countries under the authority of Nestlé. According to Nestlé’s CSV annual reports, such solutions principally involve rural to urban migration or corporate forms of intervention to pre-existing farming activities and the daily diets of the local communities. It is implied that without Nestlé’s intervention such communities would continue to under-perform in the farming sector and that the global food crisis and malnutrition of involved communities would continue.

Yet the problematic aspects of this forward looking and utopian commitment to social value quickly become evident. Banerjee (2003a) remarks that the notion of “progress” is based on an economic or capitalistic rationality and comes at an environmental price that is often paid for by Third World countries and their populations who predominately rely on the land to derive their sustenance. In line with other postcolonial scholars (i.e. Escobar, 1995) he explains that

such ideas discursively transform ‘nature’ into a ‘resource’ that serves Westernized managerial interests wherein modern scientific practices are pitted against indigenous agricultural practices without first seeking the validation of their merits, impact on local economies, and environmental degradation. Following Banerjee’s logic Nestlé’s use of the expression *rural development* as a subordinated term under the god term (Burke, 1945) “shared value” (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) demands sacrifices that impact indigenous measurements of quality of life, and pre-existing farming activities in favor of facilitating the dominating and Westernized economic principles of the free-market. Sustainable milk and cocoa supplies become dependent on economic growth and “proper” forms of farming management techniques proffered by Nestlé that are presented to the rural communities as something that is not only ‘ultimate,’ but unconditional and represent the highest ‘good.’ Yet such rhetorical tropes do not stop to consider what legitimizes acceptable growth, the corporatization of discourses of rural development, the autonomy of the local community, their history and position within their geographical region, and gendered forms of discrimination.

Similarly, transcendence above the current “issue” of global hunger and its associated problems through *nutrition* is reliant on audiences implicitly blaming the victim (local communities) for Nestlé’s discursive constructs of improper diets. Again, Nestlé’s is rhetorically constructed as a positive contributor that necessarily must intervene to assist. This capitalistic outlook attributes a sense of heroism to Nestlé’s activities while elevating their importance and use of the CSV rhetorical toolkit as a “solution.” Such rhetoric is appealing to corporate audiences that wish to mimic its approach as it discursively cultivates civic forms of virtue in corporations while rhetorically overcoming the exclusive profit-maximizing motives of corporations (Banerjee, 2007).

In sum, the language of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) when viewed as a vocabulary of motives serves to create a specific form of social knowledge that “establishes social precedents for future attributions of consensus” amongst corporations and their stakeholders (Farrell, 1999, p. 147). Such knowledge is based on a consensus of corporate forms of inclusionary and utopian forms of “value” or terms that purport to not only have universal validity but that they are morally, politically, and economically transformative. As seen in this case study, entire world-views and their inherent paradoxes are summarized in such terms that audiences can readily identify with and thus compel them to take action (Burke, 1950). Due to the very nature of their rhetorical properties such social values are thus often “attributed rather than fully realized” (Farrell, 1999, p. 145) yet ultimately serve as formative prospects for the corporate consumption of the resources of local rural communities. Despite its promise of utopia then, the premise of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) when view as a god term (Burke, 1945) may serve to be self-defeating in the long run as transcendence from material circumstances cannot be guaranteed. Perhaps the only thing that is ‘transcended’ here is Nestlé’s troubled reputation.

In light of this I draw attention to the merits of utilizing a rhetorical approach towards creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) in an attempt to show how this business practice encourages corporations to present themselves as being proactively invested in social and environmental issues in order to remain competitive while promoting the exclusive reliance on firms by stakeholder audiences as entities that can resolve them. Treating this business proposition as a rhetorical toolkit that engages in the use of god-terms (Burke, 1945) and rather compelling subordinate terms enables us to see how such knowledge is oriented towards minimizing controversies between conflicting audiences in order to proactively boost a

corporation's identity in the most positive sense. In the meantime, such a rhetorical strategy belies how such corporate social interventions subsume the local into the global while perpetuating (Western) capitalistic rationalities (Banerjee, 2003a).

Using Burke's (1945, 1950) recognition of god terms as representing entire vocabularies of motivation that can be used for the means of inducing cooperative action, it cannot be overlooked that the rhetoric of CSV and its growing popularity in the academic and private sector has enormous potential to symbolically shape the ways that corporations view disenfranchised populations and their subsequent prospects for social responsibility and societal engagement. When used effectively such discourses arguably add to debates on "caring capitalism" (Zinkhan & Carlson, 1995) by demonstrating in what ways corporations and their resources can strategically engage in social issues through the promise of win-win situations. In this context the ability of local communities or individuals to be "legitimate stakeholders" or to actively engage with corporations in a meaningful way is discursively promoted. Yet such discourses gloss over exactly what roles corporations and community members will actually undertake. It is to that end scholars should continue to critically examine the language of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) as a god term (Burke, 1945) to understand how such rhetoric can serve as the impetus or ultimate motivation of firms to perpetuate these inequalities. Such rhetoric ignores the physical, political, and material differences between organizations and the involved communities while lumping their for-profit activities under the umbrella of creating "social value." In the next chapter I examine this relationship more thoroughly at a global level by exploring in what ways the term *healthcare* (re)produces (neo-) imperial capitalistic relations by multinational corporations.

Chapter 5
Reaching Out to ‘Emerging Markets’
Globalization, Neo-imperialism, and the Rhetoric of CSV

It can take many years to create a sustainable business in these [developing] countries, but once the economy allows for proper diabetes care for the population, doctors and health authorities will remember that we were there for them when the going was tough. That’s our experience.

~ Novo Nordisk (2013)

As elaborated on in the previous chapters, what is unique about the concept of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) is that it encourages corporations to present themselves as being *proactively* invested in social and environmental issues, promoting the idea that cooperative action can resolve such issues. Engaging the premise of “shared value,” a corporation’s daily business practices are rhetorically *transformed* into “a higher form of capitalism,” one that promotes a new ethical and moralistic standard that will “enable society to advance more rapidly while allowing companies to grow even more” (Porter & Kramer, 2011, p. 75). In this utopian framework the idea of ‘value’ is not to be confused with sharing the economic value that a corporation may earn on its own, but rather as an appeal that promises sustained economic performance for a corporation while providing social benefits to the involved local communities through strategically chosen social interventions (ibid.). A rhetoric such as this changes how a firm’s identity can be viewed by both internal and external constituents while offering an implicit form of democracy – “value” being shared implies a kind of equality between a corporation and such clients. This rhetoric is distinctly different from narratives of

CSR that are focused on making a firm's image look 'good' with the aim to increase shareholder value (Castelló & Galang, 2010) or to justify their social license to operate (Hilson, 2012).

A growing number of multinational corporations use the rhetoric of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011). Inherent problems arise with this as such corporations are implicated both historically and currently in what some researchers term "the coercive elements of globalization" (Banerjee *et al.*, 2009, p. 3). When examining shared value in the context of multinational corporations and the practices of globalization, I thus question how this language of power and domination perpetuates a type of *neo-imperialism* or new form of imperial dominance by such businesses (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014). Some management scholars have begun to suggest that globalization is recreating colonizing relationships in a "supposedly post-colonial" world (i.e. Banerjee, 2003a; Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014, p.96). These scholars argue that multinational corporations perpetuate an "imperial dominance effect" wherein they reinforce a divide between their head office and their 'outlying' subsidiaries, continue to engage in resource extraction, and 'colonize' their constituents through their economic and political activities (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014, p. 96.). CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) is thus ripe for a postcolonial critique that explores such power dynamics. The question for critical scholars then is not *whether* values are being represented by the organizations that engage in this framework of social responsibility, but rather "*whose* and *what* values, are represented in business decisions" (Deetz, 2007, p. 269, original emphasis). "Shared value" may imply equality but what values are exchanged for what?

This chapter argues that the rhetoric of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) when engaged by multinational corporations, can perpetuate specific discourses of *political domination* by such firms especially over formerly colonized countries. As will be

shown in the case study of GlaxoSmithKline that follows, multinational pharmaceutical corporations can strategically engage in god like terms (Burke, 1945) such as *healthcare* to universalize standards of value-laden interventions in the global population. Such rhetoric frames these capitalistic social interventions in developing nations as not only necessary, but also offer the proper way for global corporations, consumer populations, and nations to behave. Meanwhile local cultural, material practices and social actors as agents of capitalism are institutionalized in a historical framework of colonization (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014). Here global corporations can make their involvement within local social and health issues to *not* be about acquisitioning new forms of political and economic power through imperialistic means. But rather, in the case of GlaxoSmithKline, as a unique form of partnership development with local and international organizations such as the UN and the nation-state to help build ‘sustainable’ and ‘healthy’ communities. Developing nations that are perceived to be weaker to developed ones become prime targets for the multinational corporation as they engage in local forms of branded ‘value’ or healthcare interventions that ultimately adhere to profitable and political global corporate agendas. Such nations are encouraged to participate in these new forms of ‘responsibility’ in partnership with multinational corporations in particular ways with the shared value agenda (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) signaling what is appropriate.

Such a situation generates important questions about the validity and long-term effects concerning creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) and its import on the stakeholder collaboration processes: “How much moral and political power could, or should we, assign to multinational corporations that utilize this rhetoric to validate particular forms of corporate identities in today’s global political economy?” “Whose objectives are ultimately being served?” This chapter first explores the merits of a “postcolonial” examination of creating

shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) that can assist us in analyzing forms of rhetorical and political inequality. Using the case study of GlaxoSmithKline I then argue that such rhetoric fosters a unique form of rhetorical dominance by the multinational corporation (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014) for a growing number of pharmaceutical markets in developing nations. Ultimately I hope to show that creating “shared value” as proffered by Porter and Kramer (2006, 2011) relies on a systemic recognition of the legacy of colonialism and the material and political ‘inequalities’ of global populations in order for it to be a success.

The Postcolonial Approach

In the Introduction I stated that an important part of my critique of CSV comes from the postcolonial perspective. This is an important critique to consider when we recognize that creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) has been readily adopted by companies such as Nestlé and Unilever who are multinational corporations, and whose markets and past transgressions are oftentimes in non-western cultures that were formerly colonized (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014). I observed in the last chapter that this idea sells not only one’s product, but it revises the principles of capitalistic engagement and sells that transformation to markets new and old as a more moral – and more profitable – set of business relationships. Postcolonialism is a useful interdisciplinary theoretical concept that enables me to explicitly critique historical and contemporary instances of the asymmetrical power relations between the West and non-West within the contexts of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011), multinational corporations, and globalization. Such a concept can help us to understand *why* the differences between multinational corporations and the cultures in which they operate in might be important when analyzing such rhetoric. In what follows I discuss the fundamental principles of a postcolonial

perspective that include specific representations of the ‘Other’ (i.e. Said, 1978) and the colonizing process through non-traditional means.

Discursive Formation of the ‘Other’

Postcolonial scholars in a variety of disciplines are united through their primary interest in how the ‘Other’ is represented in the juxtaposition between the West and non-West (i.e. Said, 1978; Spivak, 1987, 1996, 1999; Young, 2001; Prasad, 1997a, 2003; Jack *et al.*, 2011). One of the founding texts of postcolonialism is Edward Said’s (1978) book *Orientalism*. Said (1978) argues that discourses of domination exist between the West and non-West or ‘Orient’ countries that go beyond simply military, economic, or physical occupation and subjugation. Serving as a ‘European invention’ through language, ideas of the ‘Orient’ or the ‘other’ are necessary to understand the dynamics of colonialism and the power of the Empire (p.1). Said remarks that discourses of the ‘Orient’ inform our cultural consensus and stereotypes about the non-West that often include narratives of the Orient’s ‘eccentricity, backwardness, indifference, feminine penetrability, and supine malleability’ (p. 206). Such narratives he explains, set up a dichotomy between the West /non-West, that includes binary tensions ‘such as active/passive, center/periphery, civilized/savage, developed/underdeveloped, masculine/feminine, modern/archaic, scientific/superstitious, and so on’ (Prasad, 2003, p. 12). In this context, the West (Occident) is viewed as being superior to the non-West (Oriental), forming a hegemonic authority that continues through to today (ibid.). As we shall see later within corporate discourses of CSV, such binaries or rhetorical divides are perpetuated when GlaxoSmithKline discursively frames the corporation as being superior to the ‘developing countries’ that they offer to ‘help.’

Nandy (1983) later elaborated on Said’s ideas arguing that ‘colonialism is first of all a matter of consciousness’ (p. 63) or colonization through psychology. Although physical and

military occupation is important, “colonization of mind and imagination effected under the colonial situation” (Prasad, 2003, p. 15) is what we should pay attention to. In his review of Nandy’s work, Prasad (2003) elaborates that one example of such domination is “hyper-masculinity” wherein “highly aggressive and violent forms of masculinity came to represent the success of British imperial dominance (p. 16). Critical for Nandy’s (1983) expansion of Said’s work is the idea that colonialism is not a “one-way flow of benefits” (p. 30) between the colonizer and the colonized as traditionally believed, but rather as Prasad (2003) points out that “colonialism is a game without victors: both the colonizers and the colonized are merely *victims* of colonialism” that can mutually degrade the colonizer and colonized (p. 17). Moreover that the ‘colonized’ make an active psychological choice to be suppressed or resist attempts to be made vulnerable (Nandy, 1983). This awareness that colonialism is a ‘lose-lose’ situation and that colonized populations can choose to behavior in this manner is not to say that physical and ideological attempts at colonization are readily accepted by the involved populations. Rather as Bhabha (1994) discusses in his notion of *mimicry* (crude miming or imitation of the colonizer) or Spivak’s (1988, 1996) ideas about the *subaltern* (social groups who are at the margins of society and whom do not have a ‘voice’), nations and populations that are colonized can resist colonizer’s efforts. This results in a complicated arena of fissures, ambivalence, or hybridity as an act of active anticolonial resistance (Bhabha, 1994). Such insights open up a unique space to discuss in what ways the conception of social “value” through healthcare interventions in the case of GlaxoSmithKline can proactively counter potential forms of resistance.

The Colonizing Process Through Non-traditional Means

I cannot go too much further, however, without explaining the various ways in which such forms of ‘colonialism’ can take place through non-traditional means (i.e. Young, 2001;

Prasad, 2003). Building on historical ideas of physical colonialism and therefore domination of a populace by a Westernized country over a non-Westernized other, is the idea of *imperialism* or an ideology in which economic or political domination by one country or another takes place that does not necessarily require physical occupation (Young, 2001). Young (2001) notes that several forms of imperialism can take place dependent on its originating country giving rise to concepts such as French imperialism or British imperialism. American Imperialism, according to Young is a recent addition to such exercises of power in which imperialism can take place without a major colonial empire and that involves the powers of supranational organizations such as the UN or IMF. This recognition of colonialism or “direct rule” through nontraditional means gave rise to what Young terms *neocolonialism* that includes not only economic and political control but also *cultural* forms of domination (p. 44). Neocolonialism is most often seen in countries that formerly experienced physical occupation but are left with economic or political dependence on the colonizing country as their independence often has only “limited political value” (Prasad, 2003, p. 6).

It is important to realize here that the term “post” in the word postcolonialism is not to imply that colonization has completely ended that we are ‘post’ or past forms the ruling of distant territories by nation-states or corporations (Prasad, 2003, p. 27). Rather, as the concepts of neo-imperialism and neocolonialism demonstrate, scholars view the term ‘post’ to suggest a way of thinking about the consequences of colonialism – that is – what comes after physical occupation and direct rule (i.e. Young, 2001; Prasad, 2003). While imperial ways of ruling a country no longer take place at a raw physical level that involves direct military engagement by nation-states (but does indeed still take place by corporations, Banerjee (2008a)), we continue to see evidence of colonizing and oppressive power dynamics at work. Understanding how such

economic, political, and cultural forms of domination can be conceptualized is not only critical to this study, but the management and organizational studies disciplines in general. A postcolonial perspective gives us a way to critique the shared value practices of multinational corporations as discourses of power (and resistance to them by stakeholders) in order to understand the post- and current-influences of colonialism on such rhetoric. Such a critique enables us to “defamiliarize organizational practices” by revealing colonialist ways of thinking in such corporate discourses and the role played by management (Prasad, 2003, p. 32). Shome and Hegde (2002) validates the merits of this approach in their claim that, “The packaging of otherness promotes the interests of transnational corporatism” while also serving as a “politically correct gesture.” (p. 263). As we will see in the case study of GlaxoSmithKline that follows, when multinational corporations use discourses of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) they also can observe this theme.

Management and Organizational Contexts

Examples of postcolonial studies in management and organizational disciplines are steadily growing and discuss a wide range of topics including the issues involved with conceptions of progress and development (Escobar, 1995; McKenna, 2011), globalization and organizational communication (Ganesh et al., 2005), and intellectual imperialism (Misoczky, 2011). Chakrabarty (2000) argues that an almost mythical figure of Europe exists in the social sciences that the standards of developing nations are held up against, resultantly paving the way for their transition to capitalism. Nkomo (2011) critiques ‘African’ ideas of leadership and management and organization studies in particular, finding that tensions and contradictions existed between these two. Scholars are cautioned, however, to recognize that a form of hybridization exists between a metropole and its colonies when doing analysis work and that a

postcolonial perspective can and should include how such encounters are mutually informing (Frenkel & Shenhav, 2006).

Geopolitical Context

Most recently Boussebaa and Morgan (2014) defined the wider geopolitical context in which multinational corporations operate, arguing that multinational corporations (re)produce neo-imperial relations with their stakeholders in a “supposedly post-colonial world” (p. 96). That is, their international economic and political dominance shape the international business world to this day furthering practices of exploitation of the material resources of colonies and the importance of imperial domination by such firms. According to the authors, rather than adhering to the traditional viewpoint that national institutionalized contexts or corporations and their subsidiaries are separate and distinct from each other, today’s business scholars should realize that global corporations operate in a world economy that is deeply impacted by an “*imperial* nature of interdependence and hierarchy” (p. 98, author’s emphasis). Boussebaa and Morgan point out that such contexts are closely intertwined and shape the nature and realities of international businesses today. Many multinational corporations that are headquartered in former colonist countries (such as Britain, France and Germany or the new imperial nation USA) continue to control subsidiaries in developing nations that “provide their former imperial masters with labour, markets and materials” (p. 99). Thus, they argue, an imperial form of dominance is formed that functions through the material exploitation of the resources of ‘colonies’ or more recently, through ideological means. Such ideological dominance is evidenced in the rise of “professional services firms” such as accounting firms or management consultancies that have a powerful influence over knowledge production (p. 99).

Boussebaa and Morgan's (2014) insight builds on other work by postcolonial scholars who recognize that Western forms of capitalism performed in empirical sites in the Global South (re)produce significant neocolonial forms of encounters in the organizational setting. In a special issue dedicated to the postcolonial perspective in the *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, Mir *et al.* (2008) comment on the knowledge transfers between a US global corporation and an Indian subsidiary and their finding that what was considered to be neutral and beneficial transfer of knowledge by the multinational corporation at times displaced local knowledge in reflection of older colonial relationships. In the same edition, Cheung (2008) argues that meaningful dialogue between western expatriates and local managers in global corporations is short-circuited as not all of the managers had equal rights to a "voice." Meanwhile McKenna (2011) contends that although North American business leaders applaud the economic development of countries such as China and India in pursuit of a North American ideal, they also condemn them for exploitative practices and continue to use (neo)colonial discourses that represents such countries as the 'Other.' Thus, corporate discourses and practices can perpetuate imperial forms of geopolitical relations in which Western oriented businesses and their management practices are dominant entities in the construction of knowledge about the 'other.'

The Impact of Imperialistic Practices

The work of critical management scholar Subhabrata (Bobby) Banerjee and his application of a postcolonial critique gives us a good insight into how the impact of imperialistic practices can be identified within the rhetoric of CSV. Banerjee is primarily concerned with the politics of today's global economy and how the discursive practices of multinational corporations and the media can have troubling material consequences on the environment and

rural and indigenous populations. In keeping with the postcolonial focus, Banerjee's early work addresses issues of the discourses of representation of the 'Other.' His studies include the construction of silences that surrounded Aboriginal massacres in the Australian media (Banerjee & Osuri, 2000a) and colonial and anticolonial discourses and the struggles of the colonized in this country (2000) demonstrating that neocolonial practices occur in the everyday organizational context. This critique is strengthened by Banerjee's (2003b) subsequent evaluation of the concept of globalization in which he argues that such a critique of this prolific discourse is a useful way to understand how the emergence of our "'global culture' is simply a process that makes the transformation into a culture of consumption" possible while furthering colonialism (p. 683).

Banerjee's later works give us excellent insights into colonized forms of corporate stakeholder relationships and the role of communication within. Such ideas include the consideration of indigenous stakeholders in ideas surrounding corporate citizenship (2001) and stakeholder colonialism (2003b). In his widely cited work "Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature," Banerjee (2003a) argues that rather than being based on an ecological rationality, the discursive concept of *sustainable development* promotes modern economic thought by corporations that discursively transforms 'nature' into a 'resource' to be consumed, a move that has significant implications for corporate stakeholders and their environments in the Third World. Banerjee also explores the practices of (neo)colonialism in management through representations of such communities in anthropological journals (Banerjee & Linstead, 2004). He points to the importance of recognizing the material impact that neocolonial practices can present in his concept of *necrocapitalism* that involves the "dispossession" of a community's resources and the "subjugation of life to the power of death"

(Banerjee, 2008a, p. 1541). Such ideas help us to realize that organizations must navigate differential power relations between their stakeholders and the firm itself through language, and that representations are heavily laden with historical and geographical perspectives that contain colonial forms of political, economic, cultural, and even physical violence.

In the realms of CSR and corporate citizenship explicitly, Banerjee's ideas help us to understand how corporations can use language as a catch-all phrase that promotes moral responsibility. Banerjee (2007, 2008b) offers us useful critiques on the political economy of CSR, arguing that although they promise to be emancipatory, discourses of CSR, sustainability and corporate citizenship serve narrow business interests. He addresses this inequality in his theory of the *translocal*, examining how indigenous and rural communities can resist such forms of development by forming temporary coalitions with national and international groups to promote a form of participatory democracy (Banerjee, 2011). He notes, however, that indigenous and rural communities continue to often bear the "brunt of development" due to imperialistic and neoliberal forms of extraction that are characterized by three distinct modes of management: management by extraction, management by exclusion, and management by expulsion (ibid., p. 323). A global governance framework for CSR that is inclusive of marginalized voices and regulated by supranational organizations, however, may offer one solution to this problem (Banerjee, 2014).

In sum, a postcolonial perspective is a useful way to critically examine how differences between the West and non-West or corporations and their indigenous stakeholder communities can be articulated, managed, and used by organizations through rhetoric in pursuit of creating particular ideas of their corporate identities. Ideas surrounding the control of other populations no longer circulate around simple conceptions of neocolonialism, or Australians and New

Zealanders happily munching on meals of ‘fish and chips’ reminiscent of the heyday of the British Empire and its influence on their nations. Rather they involve complex geopolitical relations and struggles between corporations, supranatural organizations such as the UN, nation-states and society actors in which the ‘winners’ (corporations) gain environmental or societal resources while the ‘losers’ (developing nations, disenfranchised populations) face dispossession of such resources, their rights to democracy, or even death. The value of postcolonialism when analyzing corporate discourses of power via the rhetoric of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) lies in its ability to encourage us to question and theorize the politics of how this form of “shared value” may actually serve as a rhetoric of dominance that is constitutive of (re)producing neocolonial or imperial relations by corporations on disenfranchised populations that can indeed have material consequences. The case study of GlaxoSmithKline, the British pharmaceutical and biotech corporation in the next section may provide us with an illustrative example of such dynamics at work.

Your Health – Brought to You by...

According to Michael Porter, pharmaceutical and medical device companies can create ‘shared value’ when they meet the “health needs of billions of underserved patients” that offer “huge opportunities for innovation and growth” and social purpose in addressing the global burden of disease” (FSG, 2012, p. 2). In pursuit of that aim GlaxoSmithKline is becoming heavily involved with providing affordable healthcare to what they term “least-developed markets” that are located in sub-Saharan Africa and poorer nations. In 2010 for example, the corporation created a *Developing Countries and Market Access* (DCMA) business unit oriented towards bringing “a dedicated GSK focus to expanding access to medicines for around 800 million people in developing countries” including “the world’s poorest nations as defined by the

UN.” (“what we do,” 2014) Such efforts include increased access to vaccines, expansion of the firm’s portfolio of products to make them more amenable to local conditions, and investments in the healthcare infrastructures of developing nations and their people (ibid.). These efforts pay off as the corporation’s Emerging Markets and Asia Pacific business unit produced a turnover of £4.7 billion in 2013 alone (GSK, 2014a).

While such healthcare initiatives by the pharmaceutical corporation may benefit the populations in question, they also primarily take place in non-Westernized countries that gives us justification for a deeper examination of the embedded political and economic inequalities that may be associated with this practice. Efforts to align the firm’s product portfolios with the expansion of access to medicines for individuals in poorer and non-Westernized nations are not only timely, but significant. According to WHO (2013), approximately seven million children die in developing nations each year due to a lack of “simple and affordable” health interventions including better access to vaccines and medication, or clean water and sanitation facilities. Developing countries bear the brunt of major public health threats such as HIV/AIDS and noncommunicable diseases such as diabetes amongst others due largely in part, some believe, to the failings of their ‘weak’ healthcare infrastructures (Haregu *et al.*, 2013). In keeping with the postcolonial perspective, the following pages explore the notion of neo-imperial dominance by GlaxoSmithKline within the context of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011). I hope to show that such rhetoric also euphemizes corporate and stakeholder relationships through the rhetorical formation and colonization of the ‘Other’ created through the (re)production of neo-imperial forms of corporate management that include three specific rhetorical strategies: the construction of a rhetorical divide between GSK and the countries that they help, narratives of

political-economic dominance, and the rhetorical denationalization (Sassen, 2006) of the involved nation-states.

Neo-imperial Forms of Management

As noted earlier, postcolonial criticism argues that physical colonization and imperialism have been replaced by “neocolonialism,” which scholars argue can be found in indirect and hegemonic forms of political, cultural, and economic control through “non-traditional means” (Prasad, 2003, p.6). Emerging economies such as China and India have become key economic players in today’s globalized world economy (Chrysostome & Molz, 2014), yet multinational corporations must still continue to conduct business in a political space wherein “knowledge transfers” within such firms are shaped by first world-third world geopolitical relations in which old and new imperial powers continue to evolve (Frenkel, 2008). In this context large and very powerful multinational corporations continue to exist and amongst other things, can limit the ability of disempowered and marginalized groups to participate in any productive form of ‘stakeholder’ dialogue (Banerjee, 2007, p. 33). They thus possess “dominance effects” that are often neo-imperial by nature and contribute to their material supremacy in the world economy (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014, p. 98). In keeping with Boussebaa and Morgan’s (2014) ideas concerning neo-imperial nature of the multinational corporation, in the following pages I show how GlaxoSmithKline’s engagement with developing countries are overwhelmingly and deeply entwined with long histories of colonization and imperial relationships. In my review of the 51 countries that GSK reports where their “developing countries” business unit operates, I found that only six have not experienced direct and sustained periods of colonization. This situation has important implications for understanding the economic and political nuances of the corporation’s

actions when they engage in the rhetoric of CSV. I begin with the concept of a ‘rhetorical divide’ between the firm and local actors in ‘developing countries.’

Rhetorical Divide

GlaxoSmithKline perpetuates discourses of neo-imperialistic forms of management through a ‘rhetorical divide’ between the firm and local actors in “developing countries.” Molz *et al.* (2010) point out that international businesses today increasingly operate in global climate that recognizes a distinct binary between “developed” versus “developing” nations. Such a divide (re)produces Edward Said’s (1978) criticism of the discourses of domination between the West and the non-West that create a distinctive binary between geographical locations—binaries which further hegemonic relations of political and economic power based on problematic stereotypes and cultural narratives about the non-West. Tropes that embody this rhetorical divide between GlaxoSmithKline and “developing” nations are evident in their 2013 Corporate Social Responsibility report. According to GSK (2014a), “developing countries” present what they call “a major engine growth for our industry” (p. 26). In pursuit of this market expansion, the company has increased the volume of medicines supplied to what they term as “least-developed countries” by 60%, supplying 89 million packs of product in 2013 alone (p. 20). The corporation further claims that they make such efforts to correct the inequality of poor or developing nations to developed ones as they carry the greatest health care burden (24%) yet have access to only 1% of the global health budget (p. 20). Such “emerging markets” offer opportunities for the firm to focus their resources in these growth opportunities in what they recognize as “a challenging environment” that includes political forms of unrest and some economic uncertainty (p. 20).

Note that such discourses frame “developing countries” as being ‘poor,’ ‘under-developed,’ or in need of economic resources due partly to their meager allocation of the global

healthcare budget. The claim that such nations offer a “challenging environment” also suggests that they are politically and economically unstable as opposed to the financial stability and vast resources of GlaxoSmithKline. This form of rhetorical dominance subjugates the nations to the benefits of ‘help’ offered by the multinational corporation though its suggestion of stability that can be obtained from their social intervention.

These narratives of rhetorical dominance are continued throughout the firm’s website concerning their developing countries business unit. GSK reports that they have more than 650 invested employees across 49 of the world’s poorest nations that work on the unit that are “incentivised on volume targets rather than just profit targets” (“what we do,” 2014). This increase in GSK’s product volume is generated through four specific ‘interventions’ by the firm, including broadening their product portfolio to meet the specific medical needs of poorer populations, appropriately pricing such products, investing in education and awareness programs, and expanding the corporation’s supply chain capacity in underdeveloped nations. GSK (2012) surmises this approach in their social responsibility report stating, “In many developing countries the distribution network for medicines is weak and there is a lack of basic infrastructure, hospitals, clinics and healthcare professionals. These barriers are often compounded by a lack of political will for action, resulting in adequate funding across the healthcare system.” (p. 12). They elaborate, “These problems must not be an excuse for inaction; they indicate where action is most needed... We want to help improve health through our own business activities, skills and resources and by acting as a catalyst for wider change across the industry and society.” (p. 12) Adding that, “Our strategy focuses on where we can make the most difference and in particular improving affordability, availability, prevention and supporting vulnerable health systems.” (p. 12).

Such narratives afford a position of superiority to GlaxoSmithKline in which the multinational corporation is positioned to provide the ‘appropriate’ forms of ‘help’ to developing countries through the “appropriate products.” It is inferred that without such help, the “needs” of the poorer and uneducated nations would not be met but more so that they lack the resources and sophistication to come to a solution on their own. Once again we see the dichotomy between the West and the non-West as advocated by Said (1978) in which the (non-Westernized) developing countries are passive, uncivilized, underdeveloped and archaic while the Westernized multinational corporation is active, civilized, developed and modern. Not only does this binary between “developed” and “developing” preserve a divide then that presumes dominance and subordination, power and weakness, but it also asserts that the “developing” countries are in the process of becoming, like us, “developed.” That is, the trope itself implies that these countries are changing to become Westernized, to acquire our culture, knowledge, and perhaps power, and that this is not only a good thing to be sought, but is in a natural evolution that is inevitable. *In this context*, then, what our multinational corporations do to help these countries in their struggles to “develop” is a kind of “sharing” – a positive and moral contribution that is good without question. The postcolonial critique not only questions whether countries should accept our directions and practices, but interrogates the power and influence over *who decides* these questions. There is no doubt that huge infusions of money into the local governments and economies, as well as the demonstrable results of helpful products and projects, operate then as a form of imperial influence to sway those values and those decisions.

New way of doing business. GlaxoSmithKline seems forthright in their extolling supremacy over poorer countries. The firm reports that through their healthcare initiatives for “developing countries” they not only address “unmet healthcare needs in developing markets”

(para. 2) but that they “deliver higher volumes of lower priced high quality medicines and vaccines to improve the quality of human life” (para. 3) as “Our products do not help anyone if they sit on shelves” (“our innovative business model,” 2014, para 2). GSK elaborates, “Since 2009 we have capped the prices of our patented medicines in least developed countries at no more than 25% of prices charged in developed countries and we re-invest 20% of the profit we make back into those countries’ healthcare systems” (“who we are,” 2014, para. 4).³⁴ This is done in order to build “stronger healthcare systems, expanding markets for our products, and ultimately, ensuring healthier societies and economies over the long term” (ibid., para.5). Again, reminiscent of the practices of colonialism that viewed “natives” as inferior and therefore required civilization (i.e. Said, 1978), such discourses support the idea that the investment of GSK’s resources into the involved populations represents the most ‘efficient’ model and that societies that wish to ‘develop,’ become ‘healthier’ or economically ‘stronger’ by meeting their healthcare needs should adapt to its precepts.

GlaxoSmithKline explicitly justifies that the firm does not engage in these activities exclusively to ‘help’ such countries, but rather as a “new way of doing business” that is mutually beneficial for all involved. On their “developing countries” website the firm elaborates:

This is a new way of doing business: we enable people to do more, feel better and live longer... we strengthen health systems... we are growing our markets... together, this means we are building our business while building healthier societies over the long term. We believe these are firmly compatible aims. (“our innovative business model,” 2014, para. 5).

This rhetoric says, essentially, “we have power” and “we use this power for the good of those we make our clients and markets.” Postcolonial criticisms would have us focus on the first

³⁴ While also recognizing that such populations survive on less than \$1 a day. How such populations are supposed to afford such medications and vaccines in the face of this economic disparity is questionable.

part of the claim: “How does this picture of a powerful company in relation to a weaker ‘developing’ country replicate the conditions of colonialism, wherein the colonizing power felt itself to be bringing superior culture, military, and economic might to a lesser culture, while yet exploiting the people and resources of that culture for economic gain? What emerges is a consistent theme and picture that the multinational company is a superior organization, with superior technologies, superior knowledge, economic might, and bringing the effective science *and* business effectiveness (knowledge and power) to the lesser developed countries – of course, with all good intentions as well as profit motivation. Herein is the “rhetorical divide” perpetuated between “developed” and “developing.” This discourse of rhetorical supremacy reflects the corporation’s world-view in which Westernized forms of corporate intervention and scaled capitalistic activities “strengthen” the healthcare infrastructure systems in the involved nations. Moreover, that this form of intervention is not only necessary to “improve” the current quality of life and society in general of populations that exist in “undeveloped” countries versus “developed” ones but that such activities assist in expanding GSK’s market penetration. A win-win indeed.

These claims to the mutual benefits of implementing healthcare initiatives in receptive countries are also explicit examples of how the idea of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) advocates the sanctioning of special corporate interests. When reporting on their recent investments to the tune of £150 million into sub-Saharan Africa over the next five years for instance, GSK’s CEO Sir Andrew Witty reports that the investments are not only strategic but will assist the involved populations *and* the corporation in achieving sustainable employment and manufacturing growth (“GSK announces new,” 2014). When justifying this investment at the 5th EU-Africa Business Forum in Brussels, Sir Witty explains:

Today, we are setting out further steps to tackle Africa's dual health burden of infectious and emerging non-communicable diseases and help build crucial capacity to underpin the development of the healthcare sector of the region. We have a unique opportunity to deliver meaningful *social and economic value* to all of the communities we work in – using our scientific expertise and our global outreach to develop innovative medicines and deliver them to people who need them around the world. (“GSK announces new,” 2014, para. 3, my emphasis)

Sir Witty's comment mirrors conceptions of the “core-periphery” binary relations (elaborated on below) that were developed during colonial times between Westernized countries versus non-Westernized ones (Mourdoukoutas, 1999). Specifically, we see in such rhetoric a discursive divide or evidence of a corporate colonialism (ibid., p. 5) or unequal power relationship between the headquarters of the corporation and sub-Saharan Africa in which the firm and their neo-imperial forms of management (metropolis or core) become the centralized producer of the skills and knowledge needed for the involved communities (subsidiaries) to embody to overcome their ‘burdens’ of disease and poor health. The recipients of such communities have the resources ‘bestowed’ upon them. This is similar to the colonial powers that exported their “laws, their educational systems, their tax systems and their bureaucracies to civilize and exploit” (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014, p. 99) outlying communities. The assertion is made that this creation of “social value” by the corporation will indeed work justifies the corporation's intervention, impact, and ultimately rhetorical domination through ideological means onto local communities, their infrastructures and healthcare practices while positioning GlaxoSmithKline in a position of authority over such communities.

Political-economic dominance

Although the period of colonization ended in the twentieth century, GlaxoSmithKline is notably headquartered in Britain, a former imperial nation that historically was one of the most

powerful composite states of Europe (Armitage, 2000, p. 15). Thus the firm, like many other global corporations that operate in the global political economy and engage in the tenets of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011), can politically benefit from historical colonizing relations particularly as their home state was a former colonizing nation. This gives them a form of political and economic dominance over the countries that they are engaged in. An explicit material example of how such political and economic inequalities work can be realized through the firm's recent efforts to expand its ownership holdings in its Nigerian unit from 46.4 percent to 75 percent (BusinessDay, 2013). According to the media outlet BusinessDay (2013), although GSK complied with local laws with this shareholder arrangement, the transaction raised questions around governance issues as it was perceived to be a violation of the rights of minority shareholders. When commenting on the event Peter Townshend, a multibillion portfolio manager in Cape Town, told the media firm that "In most developed markets, regulation expressly prohibits related parties from voting their shares in a transaction such as this. So in its home market in the UK, GSK Plc, as the related party, would not be allowed to vote and the scheme would need 75 percent approval from shareholders other than GSK Plc for the scheme to pass." (BusinessDay, 2013, para. 10).

Such controversy speaks to the particularly powerful role that GlaxoSmithKline is able to undertake to perpetuate the realities of their political-economic dominance. Paradoxically, although the firm's efforts towards providing innovative medicines and medical brands to the developing countries feasibly adhere to "win-win" formula proffered by creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011), such efforts cannot escape historical patterns of colonization by the British Empire that perpetuated an historical framework of political and economic inequality. This legacy attributes a particularly powerful role towards the firm that is based in Britain in

shaping the rules and expectations of their healthcare interventions – and as shown in the above examples – how they can conduct their everyday business. In this political context the economic, social and political consequences of such interventions or their potential to ultimately represent a win-lose or lose-lose situation are obscured while the historical realities of the firm’s political dominance in the world economy are reinforced.

Core-periphery divide. As noted earlier, within this politically charged transnational sphere of governance GlaxoSmithKline is engaging in a familiar model of imperial political dominance that is similar to a core-periphery divide of colonial times. Global corporations traditionally represented independent entrepreneurs that enacted a firm’s competitive strategies from a distance and are liberated from the control of headquarters (Mourdoukoutas, 1999). Later forms of colonialism represent a form of non-physical occupation in which the headquarters of a corporation rules over its “subsidiaries” that remain in its periphery (ibid., p.5). Yet despite the rise of the global political power of some countries such as India and China (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014), some organization scholars still recognize that the activities of global organizations are influenced by old imperial relationships that structurally influence organizational thought (i.e. Prasad, 2003, 2012) in which “developing” nations become subsidiaries of the firms (Molz *et al.*, 2010).

GSK’s description of their managerial practices reflects this particular model of dominance. The firm discusses how it ‘exports’ its specialized pharmaceutical body of knowledge, skills, and resources from a central branded corporate identity through shared forms of value to formerly colonized “developing countries” in the firm’s periphery that become the recipients of such resources. One clear example of the rhetorical reinforcement of this core-periphery divide is evidenced through the firm’s reporting of their investments into new

manufacturing facilities in Africa. PharmaAfrica (2014) a leading pharmaceutical media source notes that the firm has pledged to invest up to £130 million into Africa within the next five years to extend the company's existing business base (para. 4). Core-periphery relationships are demonstrated through the corporations dedication by the head office in support of this effort. Specifically, Sir Witty the CEO has pledged to open a new R&D Open Lab for non-communicable diseases in Africa as well as the expansion of their manufacturing capacity and capability in various countries in the region to “*transfer* the technology, skills and knowledge needed to enable the local manufacture of more complex products over time” in order to “help reduce stock shortages.” (PharmaAfrica, 2014, para. 11, my emphasis)

Reflecting the principles of neo-colonialism that take place through “non-traditional” forms of economic or political control (Prasad, 2003), this discursive transfer of knowledge from GlaxoSmithKline's head office to their “subsidiaries” is not exclusively limited to manufacturing processes alone. Rather, it also extends to ideological forms of domination including academic forms of knowledge. In a press release in support of these investments GSK elaborates that they also hope to establish up to 25 academic Chairs within local African universities “in related areas such as pharmaceutical sciences, public health, engineering and logistics” to facilitate the global manufacturing capabilities of the region and attract further manufacturing investment (“GSK announces new,” 2014). This creates a situation in which the corporation is able to discursively reestablish the identity of the territories or “imagined communities” (Anderson, 1991) that they wish to penetrate. Similar to the status of such countries as being controlled by colonial Empires, such territories can then be exploited to the firm's benefit. Such an imperial form of rhetorical dominance reifies established linkages of international exploitation that take part on a daily basis as part of globalization and international business today (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014, p. 99).

Resource extraction. Another dimension to neo-colonial dominance concerns “resource extraction,” ensuring that the balance of gained economic resources by the firm flow back to their home country. GSK report that their aforementioned multi-million investment into sub-Saharan Africa will create shared forms of ‘value’ through the development of new medicines for Africa, the formation of new partnerships with other African countries to expand Africa’s existing manufacturing base, the creation of a tailored portfolio of medicines for the African population, and will play a part in strengthening the Africa’s healthcare system overall (“GSK announces new,” 2014). Their *Annual Report 2013* tells us of the explicit financial benefits that the head office of GSK will receive from this form of social intervention. GSK reports that in 2013 more than 80% of their vaccines were supplied to developing countries, generating a revenue flow back to the headquarters of the firm to the tune of more than £3.4 billion in turnover and £1.5 billion in operating profits from emerging markets alone (GSK PLC, 2014, pp. 6, 26). The report further states that the corporation’s sales to developing countries have predicted growth rates of more than 5% in 2015 (*ibid.*, p. 8). When addressing their financial data concerning the developing countries business unit explicitly in the report, GSK comments that they focus on “volume rather than growth” and have supplied 89 million units of medicines in 2013 alone (up from 55 million units in 2010) and reinvested £15 million of their profits into local healthcare building projects (*ibid.*, p. 27) (inferring an overall profitable return for the MNC’s headquarters of £75 million). Note how their reporting of the transferal of these economic assets is closely tied to the ‘social’ benefits that arise from the firm’s intervention into the “developing countries” that rhetorically need their assistance. The creation of such profits and their conditional return to the firm’s imperial home are rhetorically sanctioned as is a successful implementation of the shared value ‘vision.’

Denationalization

Sassen (2006) argues as part and parcel of the dynamics of globalization that localized, territory and institutionally bound domains that do not operate at the global scale are inherently still a part of this process. She elaborates, that with the influence and practices of global formations expressed through both private and public actors, transboundary networks, and the actions of institutions, nation-state logics can thus often undergo a process of “denationalization” that has “multiple and variable outcomes” (p. 2). This situation applies to GlaxoSmithKline. The firm’s actions are presented as being a positive force for social change that implicitly relies on the nation-state to support such social initiatives. This situation, that includes private investments in the very infrastructures of involved nations, rhetorically reshapes the institutional frameworks of the countries in which the corporation intervenes. When commenting on their 20% reinvestment initiative for instance, GSK reports that they “strengthen” the healthcare structures of underdeveloped countries primarily through investments into the training of frontline health workers in conjunction with three leading NGOs: African Medical and Research Foundation (MREF), CARE International, and Save the Children (“20% re-investment initiative,” 2014). In this example of institutional domination, the corporation rhetorically exercises their imperialistic power relations through financial investments into the very healthcare infrastructures of the nation-states that are perceived to be deficient. Such forms of dominance are also articulated through the corporation’s reporting on their training of such workers within their overarching institutional objectives and values. In that vein GSK claim that they have invested a total of £15 million into projects in 34 developing countries that are predicted to train more than 15,000 frontline health workers to generate a predicted outreach of five million people (“20% re-investment initiative,” 2014). Such investments include the training of over 1230 community

health workers and health professionals, doubling the capacity of a key health worker training institute in Zambia, and developing e-content for midwives and nurses who are located in remote areas (ibid.). These efforts are supplemented by the firm's partnership with the Frontline Health Workers Coalition (FHWC) that advocates for strategic investment into frontline healthcare workers in developing nations by the US government (ibid.).

In the case of GlaxoSmithKline their engagement of the rhetorical toolkit thus arguably furthers a process of *denationalization* (Sassen, 2006) in today's global business climate in which the role of the nation-state takes a back seat to privatized forms of community development under the guise of offering such nation states suitable forms of healthcare. Rather than working in concert with the nation-states in question, the multinational corporation takes it upon themselves to "strengthen" their healthcare infrastructures by training critical personnel or creating strategic partnerships with agencies that facilitate their for-profit agenda, actions that would be traditionally undertaken by the nation-state. GSK (2012) are explicit in articulating this agenda. They write, "[healthcare system] problems must not be an excuse for inaction; they indicate where action is most needed (p. 12). GSK elaborates, "We want to help improve health through our own business activities, skills and resources and by acting as a catalyst for wide change across the industry and society." (p. 12) Note how such an argument emasculates the power of the nation-state, discursively sacrificing their role of authority and expertise over healthcare to the power of the free-markets. Such a transfer of power is supported and reinforced by GSK's claim that the involved nation-states are passive about their healthcare issues and by the firm's formation of strategic partnerships to facilitate their particular agenda.

Conclusion

The above discussion illustrates that GlaxoSmithKline's use of *healthcare* reform serves as a narrative of 'help' wherein capitalistic and sophisticated forms of social interventions into poor or "developing" countries that need affordable healthcare and vaccinations are presented as not only legitimate, but necessary. Yet in this corporate form of social intervention such discourses (re)produce neo-imperial forms of management (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014) that emphasize the political power, sophistication, and resources of the multinational corporation versus the deficiencies, passivity, and primitiveness of involved nation-states that 'inadequately' provide for the healthcare needs of their populations. This inequality is generated and reinforced within the framework of a rhetorical divide between the sophistication of GlaxoSmithKline as a knowledgeable private-actor based in a 'developed' nation versus 'developing' countries that need their expertise and vast economic resources. Such tropes offer a uniquely productive space for GlaxoSmithKline to extend the positive outreach of their corporate identity and rhetorical dominance to a wide range of audiences as the resolution of global healthcare issues not only reflects the firm's special interests, but also universal understandings of what our well-being is supposed to look like.

Such an exercise has a rather destabilizing effect on the involved nation-states and is reinforced through historical patterns of imperialism that are (re)produced through a core-periphery divide in which any excess resources are extracted from the involved nations, only to return to the corporation as a form of justification for engaging and perpetuating in these market-based activities. Meanwhile local cultural and material healthcare practices are institutionalized through ideological forms of neocolonialism through education training programs and the

reconfiguration of the healthcare infrastructures of the involved nation-states. On examining what makes ‘globalization’ itself possible, Banerjee *et al.* (2009) remark that multinational corporations are implicated in what they termed “the coercive elements” of this process (p. 3). The authors elaborate that the reemergence of older patterns of imperialism are perpetuated by corporations that greatly influence the role of the involved nations. That is not to say that nation-states simply vanish they argue. Rather, they become a “fundamental building block of globalization” evidenced through their creation and maintenance of a global financial system, institution of public policies that interject labor mobility, and support of supranational organizations (p. 7). Such a situation is clearly evident within the context of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) that would not function without this critical source of support.

Perhaps in recognition of these socially ‘responsible’ initiatives, Corporate Knights a well-respected business magazine ranked GSK in 2013 within the magazine’s “top foreign corporate citizens rankings” (CorporateKnights, 2013). Yet favorable public recognition of the pharmaceutical corporation to provide sustainable forms of capitalism is uniquely ironic. The pharmaceutical industry has long faced accusations of corporate corruption stemming from issues such as bribery, unsafe manufacturing processes and testing of drugs, and political interventions in developing nations (Braithwaite, 1984). Such issues are ongoing. Pharmaceutical companies continue to maintain barriers to access to drugs in low- and middle-income countries with the privatization of the healthcare industry. These barriers include high drug prices (Hoen, 2014), continued monopolies on blockbuster drugs through patent law (Shalden *et al.*, 2011; Bouchard, 2012), or purchasing strategies that make it difficult for countries to create drug policies that lower or remove attendant risks (Nguyen *et al.*, 2014).

GlaxoSmithKline do not acknowledge the effect of such barriers in preventing such countries from regulating their pharmaceutical markets. Instead the corporation offers “poverty” as the “single biggest barrier to improving healthcare in the developing world” (“what we do,” 2014) and blames nations for not having adequate investments into their healthcare infrastructures. GSK’s biggest competitor Novo Nordisk sings a similar tune. Placing the blame on “distribution channels,” Novo Nordisk (2014) remarks that, “mark-ups and other barriers throughout the distribution chain may significantly distort the general picture of affordability” (p. 5), a situation they argue that is magnified by a lack of public funding for patients requiring diabetic care. Corporate statements such as this are not meant to imply that the firms are unwilling to invest their resources in solving the global health problem. Rather, as with the case for most multinational corporations, emerging and developing countries present “unprecedented business opportunities” including cheap worker labor, flexible regulations, lenient environmental protection policies, and a steady improvement of the relevant business climates (Chrysostome & Molz, 2014), enabling them to expand and secure their penetration into local markets. Pointing out the deficiencies of the involved nation-states sets the tone for subsequent corporate forms of social intervention.

Trouble in Paradise

While such infrastructure investments and rhetorical forms of dominance are overwhelmingly seen as a positive course of development by many of the countries involved (i.e. Mwai, 2014), GlaxoSmithKline’s attempts to fruitfully intervene in their healthcare systems also strategically serves to override the material realities of their more serious, objectionable activities and reputation. Mukherjee (2014) recently reported in the *Times of India* for example, that the corporation’s exorbitantly high pricing and redevelopment of *Crocin Advance*, the most widely-

used fever and pain-relief pill by that nation generated a market shortage of the medicine and the rejection by the drug pricing regulator National Pharmaceuticals Pricing Authority (NPPA) of the firm's application to see an exemption from price control. GSK also face allegations of bribery of doctors in the form of funding for 'education' for patients of their drugs in a growing number of countries to persuade them to prescribe the firm's medicines (Nagarajan, 2014). Growing concerns have also arisen concerning the corporation's partnership with the international charity Save the Children in which the firm's flagship program in DR Congo and Kenya will pay for the training of healthcare workers while 'innovating' the firm's product portfolio in developing countries. Critics claim that while such a partnership will offer much needed and cost-effective products that can save babies lives including vaccines, the deal cannot overlook GSK's long history of undermining the access to medicines by the developing world including keeping the prices overly high for Aids drugs, the material realities of it being unsustainable, or that the biggest problem healthcare workers face is not training but a lack of salary (BBC, 2013; Boseley, 2013).³⁵

Such activities resulted in RepRisk, one of the leading global reporting consulting firms on environmental, social and governance risks associated with companies to list GlaxoSmithKline in 2013 as the seventh most controversial company (RepRisk, 2014). According to RepRisk's 2014 report, the firm also engaged in several controversial activities in developing countries. Such activities included: unauthorized cervical cancer vaccine trials on girls from disadvantaged groups in India, a failure to provide adequate medical interventions during multiple sclerosis drug testing in Shanghai, overstating the benefits or understanding the

³⁵ Although not performed in a developing nation, it is also worth mentioning that within the U.S., GlaxoSmithKline recently paid an historic and unprecedented \$3 billion resolution with The Justice Department for violations of the marketing of their drugs for unapproved uses including the promotion of Paxil for children (Tremonti, 2013).

side effects of several of their drugs, bribery and fraud in China including that of foreign government officials, and punitive actions against union workers in India (p. 9). Troubling examples such as this speak to the corporation's ability to successfully engage in Porter and Kramer's (2006, 2011) premise of creating "shared value" to best manage their corporate identity within the global political economy; rhetorical emphasis is placed on the benefits of engaging in healthcare interventions to rectify the socio-economic differences and disparities in global health populations as a socially beneficial exercise rather than on the firm's blemished reputation or how their social forms of interventions may indeed be neo-imperialistic. Tropes of 'healthcare' shore up the rhetorical force of such language rather than focusing explicitly on how it actually can function as a devil term (Weaver, 1953) and reveal the corporation's oftentimes objectionable activities.

Global (kool)Aid

In conclusion, I argue that studies of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) would benefit from the application of a postcolonial perspective to make them more "critical" of the global, inter-cultural context of this rhetoric. Examples abound of how this perspective would be helpful when multinational corporations drink global forms of "(kool)aid" to advocate for the legitimacy of these types of social interventions. One illustration can be seen in CSV's philosophical repackaging of philanthropy into a strategic endeavor (Porter & Kramer, 1999; 2002, 2006). Corporate forms of philanthropy were traditionally viewed by scholars and firms to be outside of the relationship to a firm's core business, causing them to focus instead on image or reputation improvement (Halme & Laurila, 2009) or protective strategy in communities where corporations face demands from stakeholders (i.e. Miller, 2008). Certainly, firms use philanthropy in controversial ways including to offset attention to their fraudulent activities

(Koehn & Ueung, 2009), poor performance on environment issues or product safety records (Chen *et al.*, 2008), or as a way for managers to strategically increase their personal income tax deductions (Yermack, 2009). Yet the tenets of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) move philanthropy philosophy beyond the traditional outlook of donating corporate monies or time to support a charitable cause, but rather as seen in the case study of GlaxoSmithKline to provide a complex way for corporations to actively engage in, and strategically legitimize, conditions of profitable corporate social interventions that often involve consumerist activities under the guise of “community development.” Again, as such practices often take place between Westernized multinational corporations and non-Western or disenfranchised populations in need of ‘help,’ inherent generalizations can be drawn about the possibilities for such rhetoric to further discourses of neo-imperialistic forms of management (Boussebaa & Morgan, 2014).

One example of such imperialist logic in action is Unilever’s (2013) *Lifebuoy* campaign that provided millions of bars of Lifebuoy soap and branded messages during the 2013 Kumbh Mela, a mass Hindu pilgrimage in India that asked individuals “Lifebuoy se haath dhoye kya?” or, “did you wash your hands with Lifebuoy?” throughout the event. Sudhir Sitapati, General Manager of Skin Cleansing at Hindustan Unilever Limited elaborates on the strategic benefits of this mutually beneficial corporate message:

The ‘Roti Reminder’ gets a consumer’s attention at the exact time when handwashing is critical to help stop the spread of germs carrying preventable diseases. That is, right when consumers sit down to eat roti with their hands... The Kumbh Mela provides a unique opportunity to communicate this message to a large, predominately small-town and rural population. In effect, this simple, clutter-breaking idea will help us reach out to a massive audience, at a fraction of the cost. (Unilever, 2013).

While improving the personal sanitation habits of individuals in India by encouraging them to use (preferably Lifebuoy) soap is an admirable goal, this social, and rather opaque philanthropic intervention of a Westernized, multinational corporation into local, non-Westernized populations as a mutually beneficial arrangement also presents us with a form of neo-imperialism in which Unilever's Lifebuoy brand is promoted to millions of potential customers through public messages and Lifebuoy product donations while 'Westernized' and uniform ways of conducting sanitation practices are reinforced. Going back to Said's (1978) claims concerning discourses of the 'Orient' and the distinctive binaries that such approaches create, Unilever is making implicit claims in the above examples that the involved local communities are unsanitary, backwards, and primitive, inferior to Unilever as a corporation that must 'educate' them in order for them to be more 'developed' and improve their health.

Such forms of neo-imperialism are not limited exclusively to non-Westernized countries. In the complexities of today's global political economy, poor and disenfranchised populations face inequalities within Westernized countries as well. Pertinent examples of "community development" initiatives that are tied to consumerism within the context of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) can be found in companies that have a relationship with poor economic sectors in the U.S. One example is Starbucks' *Create Jobs for U.S.A.* and their intervention into the social issue of unemployment. Middle and upper income Starbucks customers in the U.S. are encouraged to buy a \$5 red, white and blue wristband that depicts the word "indivisible" in support of the fund (Starbucks, 2013) or 'like' the campaign on their Facebook page so that they too can claim that they had "had a part in fixing our country" (createjobsforusa.org). Proceeds from the campaign are forwarded to local community development financial institutions within the U.S. that in turn provide financing to "underserved

community businesses” through small business loans and poor individuals via projects of microfinance (www.ofn.org). Similarly, Citi[®] and Standard Chartered Bank offer “microloan” initiatives to the poorest populations within the U.S. to promote financial stability to individuals through entrepreneurship³⁶ (while also encouraging them to become Citi customers once they reach financial stability of course).

Such examples are in support of the argument that “a better society produces a better environment for business” (Davis, 1973, p. 313), yet, keeping in the mind the critique of democracy and power differentials offered by the postcolonial perspective, it might be pertinent to remain skeptical about what these claims of “community development” might actually mean and to question if they offer their own specific form of imperialism through psychological means in which the multinational corporations colonize the minds of the involved populations through branding while devaluing their own possibilities for economic liberation (Nandy, 1983). There may be a sense in which the rhetorical and ideological success of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) in the global, intercultural context is so successful, that these strategies – and the relationships they perpetuate – are brought “home” to the U.S. and used to “colonize” poorer economic sectors who, like less developed countries, are struggling in this new economy. This speaks to the ability of such rhetoric to act as a form of structure of government, in which even Westernized populations form dependencies and relationships with a corporation instead of the government forms that may have traditionally played this role. Such success, or “kool(aid)” is notably also being shared with non-profit organizations and supranatural organizations around the world that are increasingly forming partnerships with multinational corporations such as GlaxoSmithKline and Nestlé under the premise of sharing “value” while ignoring how such

³⁶ Coopting the microloan business model first offered by Grameen Bank (Grameen, 2012).

partnerships may perpetuate the inherent inequalities of our global economy. In the conclusion that follows, I address some of the implications of these colonizing economic relationships for democratic governance.

Conclusion
Companies Doing Some Good
Being Socially ‘Responsible’

Ethics in business is extremely important; your reputation is all you have in life.

~ Sir Freddie Laker, bankrupt British airline entrepreneur

It's about creating shared value and making sure that what we do as a business doesn't just benefit our shareholders, but can also have a much wider, positive impact for society.

~ British American Tobacco Sustainability Summary 2013, p. 2

As the above quotations suggest, businesses are becoming increasingly sensitive to the importance of creating and maintaining positive perceptions of their corporate identity. No longer do corporations use organizational forms of “talk” to simply manage their day-to-day activities (Boden, 1995), reputations, or to generate press releases that no one even reads. In our overly mediated and globalized world, a company’s actions and messages for the outside world matter. Stock market economies are also an important factor. The popularity of the concept of social responsibility in the last few decades, together with a growing awareness of the importance of communication as a strategic way to unite stakeholder audiences, provides businesses with motivation to express and manage their corporate identity, vision, and values. A small but promising body of research currently examines closely related topics, exploring in what ways the open-ended definition of CSR can serve as a form of aspirational talk to stimulate positive social change for corporations (Christensen *et al.*, 2013) or to construct particular forms of ethos or environmental legitimacy (i.e. Waeraas & Ihlen, 2009; Ihlen, 2009a, 2011; Castelló &

Lozano, 2011). Indeed, instrumental views that consider CSR actions to be foundational to a firm's reputation or financial performance, or political-normative views that highlight the roles of corporations in constructing social norms, are being challenged as some claim that CSR is, at its most fundamental level, dynamically created through interactions in today's networked societies as a constitutive form of communication (Schultz *et al.*, 2013). Rhetoric is an important component of understanding corporate forms of social responsibility as organizations use rhetoric to manage issues and deflect criticism of their practices while strengthening their legitimacy and sidestepping systemic issues (Ihlen, 2011a, p. 158). This dissertation adds to this growing body of research by examining specifically what role rhetoric can play in the formation of the very idea of a corporate identity within the primary contexts of social responsibility and globalization.

Through my use of rhetorical criticism and a postcolonial approach, the material, social, ethical, philosophical, historical, and stakeholder complexities that are involved in the formation of corporate identities through the rhetoric of social responsibility become clear. Similar to globalization, such discourses address a “multileveled and relational phenomenon (Jameson, 1999, p. xi) in which corporations must negotiate their (often dominant) relationship with multiple stakeholders, in multiple converging physical and spatial contexts. Using this ideological agenda the contribution of my study towards creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) as a contemporary evolution of management and marketing practices concerning corporate social responsibility is in pointing to the importance of how these activities are executed in and through ways of talking about the identity of the corporation, ways of making claims about its moral character and moral purposes, ways of defining relationships with clients, stakeholders, sought-after markets, and “developing” countries – as well as some economic

sectors here in the United States. For example, what I view as CSV's rhetorical "toolkit" provides instructions to corporate managers that advises them to engage in complex and symbolic relationships of power that are deeply embedded and encoded into such rhetoric.

Certainly, there is no doubt that the energizing and moralizing *talk* of "social responsibility" and Porter and Kramer's (2006, 2011) "shared value" is a rhetoric, one that claims to transform public relations, in the case of social responsibility, and in the case of shared value, the very meaning and morality of capitalist practices. My work to analyze the documents produced under the aegis of this rhetoric, from BP's use of CSR rhetoric to claim 'ethos' or corporate legitimacy, Porter and Kramer's (2006, 2011) CSV manifesto, to the CSV reports of Nestlé and GlaxoSmithKline, should argue to all observers of these phenomena that they are stylized, crafted messages that have a goal to influence (Burke, 1941) through the constitution of a transformative rhetoric of corporate identity in the global, media marketplace that can be utilized by all (multinational) corporations.

My critique builds upon the important work of other scholars who have taken rhetorical approaches to the rhetoric of organizations (i.e. Cheney, 1983, Cheney & McMillan, 1990; Cheney *et al.*, 2004; Ihlen, 2009a) and the rhetoric of corporate social responsibility in particular. With these scholars of rhetoric I affirm that the traditional concepts of rhetorical identification apply and are helpful to describing how this language of corporate identity works. My use of the work of postcolonial critics, I hope, helps to integrate that larger, global and cross-cultural assessment of communication and its consequences into these rhetorical studies. In both the study of communication and the postcolonial critique, the focus is on how language accomplishes the persuasive and ideological work of our human relationships, and by focusing on language with critical methods and insight we can observe language doing this work (Shome

& Hedge, 2002). As with any rhetoric, organizing people can accomplish positive change – we cannot make change without such rhetoric – yet the language we use can also mask advantage-seeking purposes, and hide from us power relations and modes of dominance that warrant critical assessment. In that vein I believe I contribute to a large interdisciplinary body of work by suggesting that the time-worn concepts of identification (Burke, 1950) or god terms (Burke, 1945) are both accessible and relevant to researchers outside of rhetorical studies and even the communication discipline as such concepts can be applied to the nuanced and strategic language of our most powerful corporations, particularly within today’s global political context.

While it is true that some companies such as Google, Microsoft, or BMW try to adhere to the tenets of CSR to the best of their ability and are heralded as leaders in this vision (Forbes, 2014), it is also true that some corporate expressions of social responsibility can serve as “mere rhetoric” in its most “pejorative sense of the term” (Conrad, 2011, p. 201). Such rhetoric is designed to mislead stakeholders into believing that the claims made on sustainability reports or corporate websites will substantially materialize while obscuring objectionable events. In either case, corporate claims of social responsibility should be viewed as a symbolic form of action, or “symbolically mediated, communicative event” (Schultz, 2013, p. 362) in which firms can seek reparations for their reputation, help fulfill society’s most basic needs, resolve our social ills, or conversely, create dysfunctional effects. In this work divergent examples were shown of the wide uses and import of such socially responsible forms of rhetoric in this case to promote the identification by various, sometimes conflicting audiences with positive conceptions of a corporate identity (Burke, 1950; Cheney, 1983). In Chapter 2 for example I discussed how BP in the wake of the *Deepwater Horizon* oil disaster, engaged in the rhetoric of CSR to boost public perceptions of their overall ethos through their claims of “economic integrity” and by building

for us “a sustainable energy future,” using such impressions to obscure the ongoing damage and outfall of this tragic event.

Consideration of how rhetoric of social responsibility can be utilized to strategically construct positive conceptions of a firm’s identity is perhaps most pertinent in creating “shared value” (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) that promises a transformation of social issues relevant to the corporation into profitable and sustainable business opportunities. The goal of this idea is not to engage in the messy politics of capitalism and the limitations of the free-market or even the power inequalities that may exist between transnational corporations and local communities in the context of globalization. Rather, as shown in Chapter 3 the rhetoric of CSV provides a ‘toolkit’ of success for firms to follow that helps them to successfully navigate the conflicts and disparities between stakeholder groups as a rhetorical performance that is transformative in its ability to morally sanction their capitalistic practices. In Chapter 4 I then elaborated on how sharing “value” serves as a “vocabulary of motives” or god term (Burke, 1945) that infuses every stakeholder relationship with a common action-oriented purpose, the very words creating “shared value” representing a summarizing term that serves as a firm’s motivational purpose or orientation while evoking other concepts and activities into its motivational army to encourage corporate audience buy in.

Discourses of social responsibility can also serve as a form of domination over disenfranchised local and global populations that, similar to tropes of globalization, perform a form of symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2001). Writers have long noted the adverse effects of globalization such as its effects on the power relationships that exist between nation states, their populations, and the role that multinational corporations play within such dynamics (i.e. Sassen, 2006; Banerjee *et al.*, 2009; Black & Rodriguez, 2010). Representations of the

'Other' not only promote the interests of transnational corporatism but serve as a "politically correct gesture" (Shome & Hegde, 2002, p. 263). Thus in Chapter 5 I expanded my focus to the broader intellectual engagement of postcolonialism and CSV and its use by the multinational corporation GlaxoSmithKline as a form of neo-imperialistic management. I believe that this ideological critique of the concept of shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) is not without some merit for as Shome and Hegde (2002) eloquently remind us "The politics of communication are of central importance in the understanding of the contradictions and ambivalence in our deeply divided world." (p. 261). As they point out, to "overlook this is to be not only reductive in our research endeavors but also intellectually misleading" (p. 261).

Permanent Positive Change?

Implicit throughout this dissertation is the question: "Can the rhetoric of 'corporate social responsibility' and creating 'shared value' encourage firms to provide a basis for permanent positive change for society and resolve our social ills?" (Margolis & Walsh, 2003). Or, "should we confine such discourses to the realm of 'mere rhetoric' that enables them to evade responsibility and/or shift blame?" (Conrad, 2011) There is no doubt that in the case studies presented here that efforts are being made by the corporations towards being "good." BP claims that they are actively addressing the pressing issue of climate change through various activities including being more efficient in their daily operating practices, developing technologies to lower their carbon risk and energy use, and increasing the overall efficiency of their fuels and engine oils (www.bp.com). Similarly, GlaxoSmithKline claim that they are being increasingly transparent in reporting their interactions with healthcare and non-profit communities, that they will continue to pursue the goals of the Millennium Declaration, and that they are oriented towards improving the standards of living and healthcare of millions around the world

(www.gsk.com). Meanwhile Nestlé is providing ‘nutrition’ and food to some of the world’s poorest populations. But as shown here such efforts towards improving our planet’s resources and the well-being of our global population are obscured by the unwillingness of such firms to paradoxically accept ‘responsibility’ for the sometimes unwanted consequences of their actions. I thus bring forward two topics for philosophical consideration towards the limitations of such rhetoric: unsustainable forms of sustainability and the context of global governance.

Unsustainable Forms of Sustainability

Without doubt, the rhetoric of CSR and creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) are both highly seductive in their outlook. When used by corporations both forms of rhetoric are aspirational in the goals that they can achieve and both provide a means for such firms to (re)state their roles in society as a form of corporate citizenship (Waddock, 2001, 2007, 2009). Certainly, there appears to be a profound prediction that corporations *can actually* deliver social forms of “responsibility” or create “value for society” using such rhetoric be it in their role of the caretaker of social and environmental issues or in promoting sustainable forms of economic growth. Yet when scholars in the management and organization disciplines analyze such initiatives by corporations (particularly multinational corporations), with the exception of critical scholars, they are remiss of further discussion on how the corporation in its “current form” might be incompatible with positive social change. Without question such rhetoric thus remains firmly embedded in a corporation’s for-profit orientation (Friedman, 1970) while glossing over how corporations can use claims of social responsibility to encroach their mission on free society. Clear examples of this abound in topics such as “sustainable development” that adheres to an environmental form of “managerialism” (Escobar, 1995) in which an economic

rationality rather than an ecological one persists (Banerjee, 2003), emasculating the interests and rights of local communities when developmental projects are implemented (Smyth, 2011).

There is no doubt in my mind that a large and growing number of companies outside of what was mentioned in this study utilize the rhetoric of social responsibility more broadly to claim that they directly benefit society to (re)produce positive conceptions of their overall identity. Umicore for example recently adhered to the tenets of creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) and radically changed their business model from one that engages in highly-polluting smelting to “urban-mining” or the recycling of old mobile phones and laptops with reduced metal emissions as a source of competitive advantage (Balch, 2013). But there is no escaping the fact that such rhetoric also produces troubling dilemmas and unwanted social consequences. The use of such rhetoric by the British based global company British American Tobacco (BAT, 2014) provides an excellent example. According to their 2013 annual sustainability summary *Value Shared: A tobacco company for the 21st century*, the firm is applying CSV’s strategic “win-win” management approach to the tobacco industry including the creation of a new range of “safer” nicotine products that can have “a major, positive impact on public health” (p. 4). One questions what such “positive impact” might be. Other forms of such ‘responsible’ social engagement by the corporation include their initiation of ‘sustainable’ farming practices, ‘responsible’ forms of marketing, and ‘active efforts’ to fight tobacco trafficking that “rob governments of around £30 billion annually in legitimate taxes” (BAT, 2014, p. 17). Such examples illustrate the importance of ongoing debates over the opposing perspectives concerning the rhetoric of social responsibility that question if such discourses lead to real improvements by corporations to be better citizens or simply help them to refine specific constructions of their corporate identity and image of being “good” corporate citizens (i.e.

Waddock, 2007, 2009) while lining their pockets and glossing over the material consequences of their actions.

(non)Democratic Forms of Global Governance

Crucial for this philosophical discussion is also Banerjee's (2014) insights on the use of CSR as a form of global governance. According to Banerjee, in today's global political climate a new global governance regime is needed if we wish to continue to pursue democracy, one that treats the corporation itself as a stakeholder rather than one that simply reacts with others and is inclusive of marginalized voices. This is particularly pertinent he remarks in the context of CSR that has a problematic preoccupation with "win-win" situations that may not necessary "serve societal interests" as they are inherently constrained by the corporate form that "remains firmly focused on profit generation" (pp. 84, 85). Banerjee then provides for readers an extensive discussion of the ways in which this governance framework for CSR can provide more deliberative forms of democracy and decision-making in today's political economy in which marginalized groups can seek redress or veto rights towards developmental projects. Specifically, he suggests strategic and regulatory features of CSR governance at both the political-economic level as well as the level of the firm. For example he proposes that a "variety of legal mechanisms" can be incorporated to encourage the voluntary aspects of CSR (p. 91).

Banerjee also calls for some form of meta-regulation (Parker & Braithwaite, 2003) performed through a "kind of supranatural agency with enforcement powers" that is also necessary for this form of accountability of both governments and the resocialization of transnational corporations to work (Banerjee, 2014, p. 92). For the firm Banerjee (2014) elaborates that such regulatory features include mandatory environmental and social impact disclosures, stakeholder voting rights and corporate sanctions. Such regulatory features at the

political economy level of CSR extend to institutional sanctions, veto rights over development projects and rights of redress for affected communities. Meanwhile strategic features at the level of the firm include an expanded role of directors and stakeholder integration into a firm's business. Such actions he predicts should incorporate stakeholders within the political economy of CSR at the level of democratic governance and transnational political regimes. He surmises that CSR *can* "produce social outcomes that are not necessarily constrained by corporate rationality" (p. 85). For this to take place he advocates that "there needs to be a change in the normative framework of public decision making at the institutional level" (p. 85) and that differences between the capabilities and authority of corporations versus government bodies, NGOs, and private actors to influence decision-making and participate in global governance must be acknowledged and accounted for.

Taking Banerjee's suggestion into consideration, it is encouraging to see a growing awareness in the academic and private sector that the (global) activities of a firm not only impact a number of stakeholders but that such stakeholders in turn could have a degree of influence over these activities (Aras & Crowther, 2009). Researchers in the management and organization studies disciplines subsequently have begun to explore the synergistic relationship between CSR and corporate governance in the interdisciplinary area of ethics and power differentials. Topics include examinations of the impact of corporate governance on the regulation and standardization of CSR principles (Rahim, 2014), or correlations between a firm's CSR strategy and the value propositions that they make (Devinney *et al.*, 2013). Young and Thyil (2014) claim for instance that at the global level that the relationship between CSR and corporate governance is fluid and responsive to the national, institutional, industry context. Others find that while companies that operate in strong economies can develop a socially responsible form of

“corporate self-regulation” this convergence of CSR with corporate governance is more difficult in companies that operate in weak economies (Rahim & Alam, 2013) and that different countries embody different legal and institutional characteristics (Filatotchev & Nakajima, 2014; Honke & Thauer, 2014, Sierns & Alvarez-Macotela, 2014). There is thus a movement towards more ethical forms of corporate self-regulation and an awareness that corporations can be ‘resocialized’ by protecting weaker social groups (Muchlinski, 2011) and embrace more “polyphonic” forms of organization (Hazen, 1993, as cited in Banerjee, 2014) or intellectual pluralism (Utting, 2013).

While it is perhaps possible to apply this governance framework to CSR as Banerjee (2014) argues, it fails miserably in its application to the rhetoric of CSV primarily because of two reasons: a) a lack of accountability fostered by the for-profit orientation of CSV rather than the voluntary nature CSR and, b) the ability for CSV rhetoric to foster a privatized system of governance through strategic (non)profit partnerships. As noted earlier, MNCs often become embroiled or implicated in imperialist processes due to their involvement with resource extraction from developing nations or the utilization of poorer nations as sources of cheap labor for labor-intensive manufacture (Banerjee *et al.*, 2009) while profiting from the spaces of exception that exist outside of international and national laws (Banerjee, 2009). This is particularly true within the context of CSV (Porter & Kramer, 2006, 2011) in which an emphasis is placed on the energies of the free-markets as a chosen corporate *strategy* to expand a firm’s client base at all costs versus the voluntary nature of CSR that morally implies government and policy forms of interventions (Banerjee, 2014, p. 92). Such a market strategy is optimized through CSV’s claim that corporations should form privatized system of governance or strategic partnerships with NGOs, supranational organizations (such as the UN or WHO) to support their

goals in the service of the free-market (Porter & Kramer, 2011). This removes their burden of accountability to such organizations from one that ‘reports’ on their social duties to one of mutual goal creation. To overcome this limitation may require an appreciation that what we need to move forward towards not a “common future” in which we share corporate forms of values, but rather a consideration of the “future as commons” (Banerjee, 2003a, p. 174) in which we actively deconstruct the power relations contained within the discourses of corporations, particularly transnational ones (Ganesh *et al.*, 2005). This requires that we treat organizations as inter-subjective acts that perform as both a “means for the praxis of liberation” as well as a “learning space” for exploring the possibilities of liberation projects (Misoczky, 2011, p. 359) and the inclusion of marginalized voices.

Communication as a Framework for Responsibility

In sum, the study of rhetoric is an important component of today’s global world as it is through ‘rhetoric’ that corporations can not only further their own interests (Palenchar, 2011) such as selling products or influencing the political sphere, but also help a troubled reputation (Conrad, 2011), or argue for specific organizational values such an environmental ‘ethos’ (Waeraas & Ihlen, 2009). In this work I used Burke’s (1950) traditional approach towards rhetoric to illustrate that communication is not a discrete phenomenon that takes place within organizations (Smith, 1993), but rather that the language of ‘social responsibility’ can indeed be persuasive and promote a dynamic sense of stakeholder ‘identification’ (p. 21) with a corporation to induce cooperative action, in which such audiences act together with such firms as if they have common ideals. Corporations use communication as a framework to effectively coordinate internal and external constituents by establishing and maintaining favorable impressions by such constituents of their actions on which they are dependent (Cornelissen, 2011, p. 5). Such

messages are strategic, at times even inherently ambiguous (Eisenberg, 2007), to hide the complexities of their character and the corporate goals that they serve. This concern was illustrated in my application of a postcolonial approach to such messages that illustrated that tensions continue to exist between multinational organizations and often disenfranchised populations while perpetuating inequalities and power differences.

While this work adds to the disciplines of organizational communication, management, and marketing in particular, it is limited by the small number of firms who actively engage in the tenets of CSV that can be used as data sources. Moreover it is reliant on rhetorical criticism as its primary methodology and practical approach for analysis. Scholars who conduct their research within the quantitative realm may find this to be limiting as such an approach does not explore empirical results of the effects of these verbal claims. Despite these limitations, however, this study powerfully reminds us that not only do audience perceptions of corporate identities “differ in terms of time” (Conrad, 2011, p. 169) but that such perceptions of a firm’s social responsibility efforts are tightly interwoven with the nuances and material inequalities of today’s global media and political economy, democracy, and corporate colonialism (i.e. Deetz, 1992). Such an insight points us to the importance of this type of work as we seek to understand further the intricacies involved in using rhetoric to promote particular forms of identity formation. This is particularly important in the context of CSV as introduced by Porter and Kramer (2006, 2011) as when put under close scrutiny it becomes rather apparent that in “emphasizing shared value, values disappear” (Aakhus & Bzdak, 2012, p. 243). Foucault (1988) once said, “The thought that there could be a state of communication which would be such that the games of truth could circulate freely, without obstacles, without constraint and without coercive efforts, seems to me to be Utopia” (p. 18). While we may not reach this state of paradise anytime soon, pursuing the

ways in which rhetoric helps to (re)produce inequalities or obscure questionable corporate activities points us in the right direction.

Bibliography

- 20% re-investment initiative. (2014) *GlaxoSmithKline*. Retrieved May 31, 2014 from <http://www.developingcountriesunit.gsk.com/20-re-investment-initiative>
- A Higher Capitalism. (2011, Spring). *Wilson Quarterly*, 35.
- Aakhus, M., & Bzdak, M. (2012). Revisiting the role of “shared value” in the business-society relationship. *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, 31(2), 231-246.
- Abrams, F. (1951). Management’s responsibilities in a complex world. *Harvard Business Review*, 29(3), 29-34.
- Abratt, R. (1989). A new approach to the corporate image management process. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 21(1), 63-73.
- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). “Organizational identity,” in L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (Eds.). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 263-295. Greenwich, CT: JAO Press.
- Althusser, L. (2006). Chapter, 3, “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an investigation), in A. Sharma and A. Gupta (Eds.), *The Anthropology of the State: A reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities*. London, UK: Verso.
- Anderson, S. (2008, December 1). Nestlé water ads misleading: Canada green groups. *Reuters*. Retrieved February 27, 2013 from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/12/01/us-water-protest-idUSTRE4B06UJ20081201>
- AQMD. (2003, March, 13). AQMD seeks \$319 million fine from BP for air pollution violations. *AQMD*. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from http://www.aqmd.gov/news1/2003/bp_lawsuitpr.html
- AQMD. (2005, March 17). AQMD and BP settle refinery emission violations for \$25 million in civil penalties, \$6 million in past fees, and \$50 million for community and clean air projects. *AQMD*. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from <http://www.aqmd.gov/news1/2005/bpsettlementpr.html>

- Aras, G., & Crowther, D. (2013). Chapter 1, "Corporate governance and social responsibility in context," in G. Aras and D. Crowther (Eds.), *Global Perspectives on Corporate Governance and CSR*. Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Archel, P., Jusillos, J., & Spence, C. (2011). The institutionalization of unaccountability: Loading the dice of corporate social responsibility discourse. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 36, 327-343.
- Arendt, S., & Brettel, M. (2010). Understanding the influence of corporate social responsibility on corporate identity, image, and firm performance. *Management Decision*, 48(10), 1469-1492.
- Aristotle, N. (1991). *On Rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse*, translated by G. A. Kennedy. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Armitage, D. (2000). *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Arvidsson, S. (2010). Communication of corporate social responsibility: A study of the views of management teams in large companies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96, 339-354.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H., (Eds.). (2006). *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20-39.
- Balch, O. (2013, August 19). The smelting company that became an urban mining pioneer. *The Guardian*. Retrieved June 6, 2014 from <http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/blog/umicore-smelting-company-clean-tech>
- Balmer, J. M. T. (1991). Corporate branding and connoisseurship. *Journal of General Management*, 21(1), 24-46.
- Balmer, J. M. T. (1995). Corporate branding and connoisseurship. *Journal of General Management*, 21, 24-46.
- Balmer, J. M. T. (2001). Corporate identity, corporate branding, and corporate marketing: Seeing through the fog. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35 (3/4), 248-291.
- Balmer, J. M. T. (2010). The BP Deepwater Horizon debacle and corporate brand exuberance. *Brand Management*, 18(2), 97-104.
- Balmer, J. M. T., & Gray, E. R. (1999). Corporate identity and corporate communications: creating competitive advantage. *Corporate Communications: An international journal*, 4(4), 171-177.

- Balmer, J. M. T., & Greyser, S. A. (2002). Managing the multiple identities of the organization. *California Management Review*, 44, 72-86.
- Balmer, J. M. T., & Greyser, S. A. (2006). Corporate marketing: Integrating corporate identity, corporate branding, corporate communications, corporate image, and corporate reputation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(7/8), 730-741.
- Balmer, J. M. T., & Soenen, G. B. (1999). The acid test of corporate identity management. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15, 69-92.
- Balmer, J. M. T., & Wilkinson, A. (1991, Winter). Building societies: Change, strategy and corporate identity. *Journal of General Management*, 2, 20-33.
- Balmer, J. M. T., Powell, S. M., & Greyser, S. A. (2011). Explicating ethical corporate marketing. Insights from the BP Deepwater Horizon catastrophe: The ethical brand that exploded then imploded. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102, 1-14.
- Balmer, J. M. T., Stuart, H., & Greyser, S. A. (2009). Aligning identity and strategy: Corporate branding at British Airways in the late 20th century. *California Management Review*, 51(3), 6-23.
- Banerjee, S.B. (2000). Whose land is it anyway? National interest, indigenous stakeholders, and colonial discourses. *Organization Environment*, 13(1), 3-38.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2001). Corporate citizenship and indigenous stakeholders: Exploring a new dynamic of organizational stakeholder relationships. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 1, 39-55.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2003a). Who Sustains Whose Development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature. *Organization*, 24(1), 143-180.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2003b). "The practice of stakeholder colonialism: National interest and colonial discourses in the management of indigenous stakeholders," in Prasad, A. (Ed.), *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2007). *Corporate Social Responsibility: The good, the bad, and the ugly*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2008a). Necrocapitalism. *Organization*, 29, 1541-1563.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2008b). Corporate Social Responsibility: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Critical Sociology*, 34(1), 51-79.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2008c). "The political economy of corporate social responsibility," in A. Scherer & G. Palazzo (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Corporate Citizenship*. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.

- Banerjee, S. B. (2011). Voices of the Governed: towards a theory of the translocal. *Organization*, 18, 323-344.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2014). A critical perspective on corporate social responsibility: Towards a global governance framework. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 10(1/2), 84-95.
- Banerjee, S. B., & Linstead, S. (2004). Masking subversion: Neocolonial embeddedness in anthropological accounts of indigenous management. *Human Relations*, 57(2), 221-247.
- Banerjee, S. B., & Osuri, G. (2000a). Silences of the media: Whiting out Aboriginality in making news and making history. *Media Culture Society*, 22(3), 263-284.
- Banerjee, S. B., & Prasad, A. (2008). Introduction to the Special Issue on “Critical Reflections on Management and Organizations: A postcolonial perspective.” *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 4 (2/3), 90-98.
- Banerjee, B. S., Chio, V. C. M., & Mir, R. (2009). Chapter 1, “The imperial foundations of globalization,” in S. B. Banerjee, V. C. M. Chio, and R. Mir (Eds.), *Organizations, Markets and Imperial Formations: Towards an anthropology of globalization*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Baritz, L. (1960). *The Servants of Power*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Barnett, M. L. & Salomon, R. M. (2012). Does it pay to be *really* good? Addressing the shape of the relationship between social and financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(11), 1304-1320.
- Barrage, L., Chyn, E., & Hastings, J. (2014). Advertising, reputation, and environment stewardship: Evidence from the BP oil spill. *NBER Working paper, No. 19838*.
- Basu, A. (2011). HIV/AIDS and Subaltern Autonomous Rationality: A call to recenter health communication in marginalized sex worker spaces. *Communication Monographs*, 78(3), 391-408.
- Basu, A. (2010). Communicating health as an impossibility: Sex work, HIV/AIDS, and the dance of hope and hopelessness. *Southern Communication Journal*, 75(4), 413-432.
- BAT. (2014). *Value Shared: A tobacco company for the 21st century: Sustainability Summary 2013*. UK: Pureprint.
- Baumann-Pauly, D., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). The Organizational Implementation of Corporate citizenship: An assessment tool and its application at UN Global Compact participants. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1502-4.
- Baumlin, J. S. (2001). Ethos. In T. O. Sloane (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, 263-277. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- BBC. (2013, May 10). GlaxoSmithKline launches Africa charity partnership. *BBC*. Retrieved June 1 2014 from <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-22476556>
- Behind the Brands. (2014). Company scorecard. *Behind the Brands.com*. Retrieved May 16 2014 from <http://www.behindthebrands.org/en/company-scorecard>
- Benoit, W. (1996). A note on Burke on 'Motive.' *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 26(2), 67-79.
- Bernstein, D. (1984). *Company Image and Reality*. Eastbourne, Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Bernstein, D. (2009). Rhetoric and reputation: Some thoughts on corporate dissonance. *Management Decision*, 47(4), 603-615.
- Berrone, P., Surroca, J., Tribo, J. A. (2007). Corporate ethical identity as a determinant of firm performance: A test of the mediating role of stakeholder satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 76(1), 35-53.
- Bertini, M., & Gourville, J. T. (2012, June). Pricing to create shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 90(6), 96-104.
- Beverly, J. (2004). Writing in Reverse: The subaltern and the limits of academic knowledge. In *Subalternity and Representation*, 25-40. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhattacharya, C. B., Krschun, D., & Sen, S. (2009). Strengthening stakeholder-company relationships through mutually beneficial corporate social responsibility initiatives. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(Suppl 2), 257-272.
- Big food brands hide harmful effects, claims Delhi-based NGO Centre for Science and Environment. (2012, March 31). *Times of India*. Retrieved May 4, 2014 from <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Big-food-brands-hide-harmful-effects-claims-Delhi-based-NGO-Centre-for-Science-and-Environment/articleshow/12474800.cms>
- Biswas, A. K., Tortajada, C., Biswas-Tortajada, A., Joshi, Y. K., & Gupta, A. (2014). *Creating Shared Value: Impacts of Nestlé in Moga, India*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Bitzer, L. (1971). Chapter 25, "The rhetorical situation" in R. J. Johanneson (Ed.), *Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric: Selected Readings*. New York, NY: Harpers Row.
- Black, R. E., Allen, L. H., & Butta, Z. A. (2008). Maternal and child undernutrition: global and regional exposures and health consequences. *The Lancet*, 371(9608), 243-260.
- Black, T. & Rodriguez, C. M. (2010, September 12, D4). Mexico is taking back manufacturing work. *Houston Chronicle*. Retrieved October 24, 2013 from <http://www.chron.com/business/article/Mexico-is-taking-back-manufacturing-work-1703790.php>.

- Blowfield, M. (2004). CSR and development: Is business appropriating global justice? *Development*, 47, 61-69.
- Boden, D. (1995). *The Business of Talk: Organizations in action*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Boiral, O. (2012). Sustainability Reporting and Transparency: A counter-argument of GRI reports. Unpublished submission # 12066 accepted for the 2012 Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Boston, MA.
- Bondy, K., Starkey, K. (2012). The dilemmas of internationalization: Corporate Social Responsibility in the multinational corporation. *British Journal of Management*, 25(1), 4-22.
- Bonevac, D. (2010). Is Sustainability Sustainable?. *Academic Quest*, 23, 84-101.
- Boseley, S. (2013, May 9). Save the Children teams up with GlaxoSmithKline. *The Guardian*. Retrieved June 1, 2014 from <http://www.theguardian.com/business/2013/may/09/save-the-children-teams-up-glaxosmithkline>
- Bouchard, R. A. (2012). *Patently Innovative: How pharmaceutical firms use emerging patent law to extend monopolies on blockbuster drugs*. Oxford, UK: Biohealthcare Publishing.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (2001, January). Neoliberal newspeak. *Radical Philosophy*, 105, 2-5.
- Boussebaa, M., & Morgan, G. (2014). Pushing the frontiers of critical international business studies. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 10(1/2), 96-106.
- Bouten, L., Everaert, P., van Liedekerke, L., & de Moor, L. (2011). Corporate social responsibility reporting: A comprehensive picture? *Accounting Forum*, 35, 187-204.
- Bowen, H. (1953). *The Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Boyd, J. (2000). Actional legitimation: No crisis necessary. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 12(4), 341-353.
- Boyd, J. (2009). Chapter 8, "756*: The legitimacy of a baseball number," in R. Heath, E. Toth, and D. Waymer (Eds.), *Rhetorical and Critical Approaches to Public Relation*. Hoboken: Routledge.
- Boyd, J., & Waymer, D. (2011). Organizational rhetoric: A subject of interest(s). *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 474-493.
- BP. (2013). *Annual Report and Form 20-F 2012*. London, UK: Pureprint Group Limited, UK.

- BP. (2014). Gulf of Mexico: Progress of restoration efforts. *BP*. Retrieved April 27, 2014 from http://www.bp.com/content/dam/bp/pdf/gulf-of-mexico/Gulf_Progress_Fact_Sheet_v12.pdf
- BP Amoco. (1999). *Environmental and Social Report 1998*. Dorset, UK. The Beacon Press.
- BP Fuels America. (2013). BP fuels America. America fuels BP. [video] Retrieved June 5 2013 from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1FXxJlcbS6A>
- BP Gulf Coast Update. (2013). BP Gulf Coast update: Our ongoing commitment. *BP*. Retrieved June 1 2013 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hoOfIR4Vk1o&feature=kp>
- BP in America. (2014). BP in America: Our commitment to the deepwater Gulf of Mexico. [fact sheet]. *BP*. Retrieved June 14 2014 from http://www.bp.com/content/dam/bp/pdf/bp-worldwide/FS_US_Deepwate_%20GoM.pdf
- BP PLC. (2010, July 27). BP CEO Tony Hayward to step down and be succeeded by Robert Dudley [press release]. Retrieved May 24, 2013 from <http://www.bp.com/genericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7063976>
- BP PLC. (2014). *BP Sustainability Review 2013*. London, UK: BP PLC.
- BPPress. (2013). BP First Quarter Results. *www.BP.com*. Retrieved May 21, 2013 from <http://www.bp.com/extendedgenericarticle.do?categoryId=2012968&contentId=7085477>
- BPPress. (2014). BP partners with The University of Texas on leading-edge energy research. *www.bp.com*. Retrieved June 17 2014, from <http://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/press/press-releases/bp-partners-university-texas-research.html>
- Braithwaite, J. (1984). *Corporate Crime in the Pharmaceutical Industry*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bravo, R., Matte, J., & Pina, J. M. (2012). Corporate Social Responsibility as a vehicle to reveal the corporate identity: A study focused on the websites of Spanish financial entities. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 129-146.
- Brette, F., Machado, B., Cros, C., Incardona, J. P., Scholz, N. L., & Block, B. A. (2014). Crude oil impairs cardiac excitation-contraction coupling in fish. *Science*, February, 14.
- Broder, J. M. (2012, April 17). Panel faults Congress for inaction on drilling. *The New York Times*. Retrieved June 2, 2013 from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/18/science/earth/bp-oil-spill-panel-faults-congress-for-inaction.html?_r=0

- Brown, K. S., & White, C. L. (2011). Organization-Public Relationships and Crisis Response Strategies: Impact on attribution of responsibility. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 23(1), 75-92.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock.
- Burke, K. (1941). *The Philosophy of Literary Form*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1950). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1966). *Language as Symbolic Action*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1973). *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in symbolic action*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bush, M. (2010, May 3). BP Struggles to hit right note in response to oil spill: Successful environmental marketing efforts cause major disconnect. *Advertising Age*. Retrieved May 21, 2013 from <http://adage.com/article/news/bp-struggles-hit-note-response-oil-spill/143663/>
- BusinessDay. (2013, July 15). GSK embarks on charm offensive to sell controversial equity stake raise deal. *BusinessDay*. Retrieved June 1, 2014 from <http://businessdayonline.com/2013/07/gsk-embarks-on-charm-offensive-to-sell-controversial-equity-stake-raise-deal/#.U4tIJPmwLYg>
- Campbell, K. K. (1972). Chapter 2, "The Process of Rhetorical Criticism", in *Critiques of Contemporary Rhetoric*, K. K. Campbell & T. A. Burkholder (Eds.). Belmont, CT: Wadsworth.
- Campbell, K. K., & Huxman, S. S. (2003). *The Rhetorical Act: Thinking, speaking, and writing critically*, 3rd Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Carroll, A. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4, 497-505.
- Carroll, A. R. (1999). The Four Faces of Corporate citizenship. *Business and Society Review*, 100(1), 1-7.
- Carroll, C. E., & Einwiller, S. A. (2014). Chapter 15, "Disclosure alignment and transparency signaling in CSR reports," in P. Hart (ed.), *Communication and Language Analysis in the Corporate World*. ICI Global.

- Castelló, I., & Galang, R. (2010, August). The rhetoric of corporate social responsibility: Strategies of legitimization among Asian firms. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, meeting abstract supplement, 1-6.
- Castelló, I., & Lozano, J. M. (2011). Searching for new forms of legitimacy through corporate responsibility rhetoric. *Journal of Business Ethics*, published online February 10, 2011. Doi 10.1007/s10551-011-0770-8
- Castle, S. (2013, February 19). Nestlé removes 2 products in horse meat scandal. *The New York Times*. Retrieved June 2 2014 from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/20/world/europe/nestle-pulls-2-products-in-horse-meat-scandal.html?_r=0
- CFTC. (2007, October 25). BP agrees to pay a total of \$303 million in sanctions to settle charges of manipulation and attempted manipulation in the propane market. *U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission*. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from <http://www.cftc.gov/PressRoom/PressReleases/pr5405-07>
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thoughts and historical difference*. Oxfordshire, UK: Princeton University Press.
- Chang, C. (2009). The relationships between corporate social responsibility, corporate image and economic performance of high-tech industries in Taiwan. *Quality & Quantity*, 43, 417-429.
- Chen, J.C., Patten, D. M., & Roberts, R. W. (2008). Corporate charitable contributions: A corporate social performance or legitimacy strategy? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(1), 131-144.
- Cheney, G. (1983). The Rhetoric of Identification and the Study of Organizational Communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 69, 143-158.
- Cheney, G. (1991). *Rhetoric in an Organizational Society: Managing multiple identities*. Columbia, University of South Carolina Press.
- Cheney, G., & Christensen, L. T. (2001). Organizational Identity: Linkages between internal and external communication. In F. M. Jablin & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in theory, research and methods*. London, UK: SAGE.
- Cheney, G., & McMillan, J. J. (1990). Organizational Rhetoric and the Practice of Criticism. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 18, 93-114.
- Cheney, G., Christensen, L. T., Conrad, C., & Lar, D. J. (2004). "Corporate Rhetoric in Organizational Discourse," in D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Oswick, & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Discourse*. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

- Cheney, G., May, S., & Munshi, D. (2011). *The Handbook of Communication Ethics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cheung, L. L. (2008). Let the “other” speak for itself: Understanding Chinese employees from their own perspectives. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 4(2/3), 277-306.
- Cho, S., Lee, C., & Park, C. K. (2012, June). Measuring Corporate Social Responsibility: A survey of recent research. *The CPA Journal*, 54-61.
- Chong, M. (2009). Employee participation in CSR and corporate identity: Insights from a disaster-response program in the Asia-Pacific. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 12(2), 106-119.
- Christensen, L. T., & Cornelissen, J. (2010) Bridging Corporate and Organizational Communication: Review, Development and a look to the future. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 383-414.
- Christensen, L. T., & Langer, R. (2009). Chapter 7, “Public Relations and the Strategic use of Transparency,” in R. L. Heath, E. Toth, and D. Waymer (Eds.), *Rhetorical and Critical Approaches to Public Relations*, 129-153. Routledge.
- Christensen, L. T., Morsing, M., & Thyse, O. (2013). CSR as aspirational talk. *Organization*, 20(3), 372-393.
- Chrysostome, E. V., & Molz, R. (2014). *Building Businesses in Emerging and Developing Countries: Challenges and opportunities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cloud, D. L. (2007). Chapter 15, “Corporate social responsibility as oxymoron: Univeralization and exploitation at Boeing,” in S. May, G. Cheney, & J. Roper (eds.), *The Debate Over Corporate Social Responsibility*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Coddington, W. (1993). *Environmental Marketing: Positive strategies for reaching the green consumer*. New York: McGraw-hill.
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2012). Moral responsibility, technology, and experiences of the tragic: From Kierkegaard to offshore engineering. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 18, 35-48.
- Cohen, E. (2012, September 4). Condoms, ice-cream and creating shared value. *CorporateRegister.com*. Retrieved September 13, 2012 from <http://csr-reporting.blogspot.com/2012/09/condoms-ice-cream-and-creating-shared.html>.
- Collier, J., & Esteban, R. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and employee commitment. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 16(1), 19-33.

- Committed to the Gulf. (2012). Committed to the gulf. Committed to America. [video] BP. Retrieved June 1, 2013 from <http://www.bp.com/sectiongenericarticle800.do?categoryId=9048902&contentId=7082577>
- Conrad, C. (1988). Work songs, hegemony, and illusions of self. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 5(3), 179-201.
- Conrad, C. (2011). *Organizational Rhetoric: Strategies of resistance and domination*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Cooke, B. (2010). "Managerialism and knowing and making in Latin America: International Development Management and the World Bank Interventions" in A. Guedes and A. Faria (Eds.), *International Management and International Relations: A critical perspective from Latin America*, 161-184. London: Routledge.
- Coombs, T. W. (2007). *Ongoing Crisis Communication: Planning, Managing, and responding*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Coombs, W. T. (2009). Chapter 12, "Crisis, crisis communication, reputation, and rhetoric," in R. L. Heath, E. Toth, and D. Waymer (Eds.), *Rhetorical and Critical Approaches to Public Relations*, 237-252. Routledge.
- Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2011). Self-regulatory Discourse: Corrective or quiescent? *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 494-510.
- Cooren, F., & Fairhurst, G. T. (2009). Dislocation and Stabilization: How to scale up from interactions to organization. In L. L. Putnam & A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *The communicative constitution of organization: Centering organizational communication* pp. 117-152). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2002). On the 'organizational identity' metaphor. *British Journal of Management*, 13, 259-268.
- Cornelissen, J. P. (2011). *Corporate Communication: A guide to theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Cornelissen, J. P., Haslam, S. A., & Balmer, J. M. T. (2007). Social identity, organizational identity and corporate identity: Towards an integrated understanding of processes, patternings and products. *British Journal of Management*, 18, S1-S16.
- Corporate Knights. (2013). 2013 Top foreign corporate citizens. www.corporateknights.com. Retrieved June 21, 2014 from <http://www.corporateknights.com/report/2013-best-corporate-citizens-canada/2013-top-foreign-corporate-citizens>

- Crable, R. E. (1990). "Organizational Rhetoric" as the Fourth Great System: Theoretical, critical, and pragmatic implications. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 18(2), 115-128.
- Crable, R. E., & Vibbert, S. L. (1983). Mobile's Epidemic Advocacy: Observer Prometheus bound. *Communication Monographs*, 50(38).
- Crable, R. E., & Vibbert, S. L. (1985). Managing Issues and Influencing Public Policy, *Public Relations Review*, 3-16.
- Crane, A., Matten, D., & Moon, J. (2008b). *Corporations and Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crane, A., McWilliams, A., Matten, D., Moon, J., & Siegel, D. (2008a). Chapter 1, "The corporate social responsibility agenda." In A. Crane, A., McWilliams, D. Matten, J. Moon, and D. Siegel (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crane, A., Palazzo, G., Spence, L. J., & Matten, D. (2014). Contesting the value of "creating shared value." *California Management Review*, 56(2), 130-153.
- Creel, T. (2012, Summer). *Management Accounting Quarterly*, 13(4), 20-23.
- Crook, C. (2005, January 22). The Good Company. *The Economist*. Retrieved June 26, 2014 from <http://bi.galegroup.com.ezproxy.lib.usf.edu/essentials/article/GALE%7CA127880166/3937efb3c411fb33d7968a91427364ba?u=tamp44898>
- Crooks, E. (2014, April 20). BP refuses to fund Gulf oil spill studies. *The Financial Times*. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/cdf8ba8c-c8a3-11e3-8976-00144feabdc0.html#axzz301ac7NEv>
- CSEIndia. (2013). Watch out for what you eat. It could be killing you slowly and sweetly: says new CSE junk food and nutrition study. *CSE India*. Retrieved May 4, 2014 from <http://www.cseindia.org/content/watch-out-what-you-eat-it-could-be-killing-you-slowly-and-sweetly-says-new-cse-junk-food-and>
- Cushman, D. P. & Tompkins, P. K. (1980). A Theory of Rhetoric for Contemporary Society. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 13(1), 43-67.
- Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: An analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15, 1-13.
- Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 16(2), 312-322.

- Day, C. (2012). Like water for chocolate: Nestlé the modern day idiom. Individual competitive paper presented at 98th NCA Convention, Orlando, Florida, November 2012.
- de Vries, G., Terwel, B. W., Ellemers, N., & Daamen, D. D. L. (2013). Sustainability or profitability? How communicated motives for environmental policy affect public perceptions of corporate greenwashing. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, doi:10.1002/csr.1327
- Deetz, S. (1982). Critical Interpretive Research in Organizational Communication. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 46, 131-149.
- Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany: State University Press of New York.
- Deetz, S. (2006). Critical Theory, in S. May, & D. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging Organizational Communication Theory & Research* (pp. 85-111). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Deetz, S. (2007). Chapter 18, "Corporate governance, corporate social responsibility, and communication," in S. May, G. Cheney, and J. Roper (Eds.), *The Debate Over Corporate Social Responsibility*, 267-278. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Devinney, T. M. (2009). Is the Socially Responsible Corporation a Myth? The good, the bad, and the ugly of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 44-56.
- Devinney, T. M., Schwabach, J., & Williams, C. A. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and corporate governance: Comparative perspectives. *Corporate Governance: An international review*, 21(5), 413-419.
- Disney. (2013). *Disney citizenship: 2013 performance summary*. Retrieved May 15, 2014 from <http://thewaltdisneycompany.com/sites/default/files/reports/FY13PerfSummary.pdf>
- Doane, D. (2005). The myth of CSR: On philanthropy. *Global Policy Forum*. Retrieved May 21, 2013 from <http://www.globalpolicy.org/social-and-economic-policy/social-and-economic-policy-at-the-un/un-and-business/46977.html>
- Donaldson, T. (2012). The epistemic fault line in corporate governance. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(2), 256-271.
- Donaldson, T., & Dunfee, T. W. (1999). *Ties that Bind: A social contract approach to business ethics*. Harvard Business Press.
- Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, evidence and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 65-91.

- Dorfman, B., & Heavey, S. (2010, March 3). FDA warns Nestlé, others for misleading food claims. *Reuters*. Retrieved May 4, 2014 from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/03/03/us-fda-foodlabels-idUSTRE6224GW20100303>
- Du, S., & Vieira, E. T. Jr. (2012). Striving for legitimacy through corporate social responsibility: Insights from oil companies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110, 413-427.
- Duhé, S. C. (2009). Good management, sound finances, and social responsibility: Two decades of U.S. corporate insider perspectives on reputation and the bottom line. *Public Relations Review*, 35, 77-78.
- Dussel, E. (2006). Globalization, Organization and the Ethics of Liberation. *Organization*, 13(4), 489-508.
- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 239-263.
- Eabrasu, M. (2012). A moral pluralist perspective on corporate social responsibility: From good to controversial practices. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110, 429-439.
- Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., Serafeim, G. (2012). The Impact of a Corporate Culture of Sustainability on Corporate Behavior and Performance. *National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER)*, working paper no. 17950. Retrieved December 22, 2012 from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17950>.
- Edelman. (2013). *Trust: 2013 Edelman Trust Barometer*. Retrieved on July 7 2013 from http://www.scribd.com/fullscreen/121501475?access_key=key-1ao9w09me9qq9h66m0d2&allow_share=true
- Edwards, L. (2011). Questions of Self-interest, Agency, and the Rhetor. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 531-540.
- Ehninger, D. (1994). "On systems of rhetoric" in T. Enos & S. C. Brown (Eds.), *Professing the New Rhetorics: A source book*. Boston: Blair Press.
- Einstein, M. (2012). *Compassion, inc.: How corporate America blurs the line between what we buy, who we are, and those we help*. University of California Press.
- Eisenberg, E. (2007). *Strategic Ambiguities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Eminem. (2013). Rap God. On *The Marshall Mathers LP 2*. Aftermath (Santa Monica, CA), Shady (New York, NY), and Interscope (Santa Monica, CA).

- EPA. (1999). *BP exploration (Alaska) pleads guilty to hazardous substance crime will pay \$22 million, establish nationwide environmental management system*. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from <http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/016bcfb1deb9fec85256aca005d74df/5d61856989631e20852567f6004bbbf?OpenDocument>
- Epstein, E. M. (2007). The good company: rhetoric or reality? Corporate social responsibility and business ethics redux. *American Business Law Journal*, 44(2), 207-222.
- Escobar, A. (1995). Power and Visibility: Tales of peasants, women, and the environment. In *Encountering Development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*, 154-211. Princeton University Press.
- Fair Labor. (2012). Sustainable Management of Nestlé's Cocoa Supply Chain in the Ivory Coast – Focus on Labor Standards. *Fairlabor.org*. Retrieved May 16, 2014 from http://www.fairlabor.org/sites/default/files/documents/reports/cocoa-report-final_0.pdf
- Fairclough, N. (1980). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Falkner, R. (2013). *The Handbook of Global Climate and Environment Policy*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- FAO, WFP & IFAD. (2012). *The state of food insecurity in the world 2012: economic growth is necessary but not sufficient to accelerate reduction of hunger and malnutrition*. Rome: FAO.
- FAO, WFP & IFAD. (2013). *The state of food insecurity in the world: The multiple dimensions of food security*. Rome: FAO.
- Farrell, T. B. (1999). Knowledge, consensus, and rhetorical theory. In J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, and S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A reader*, 140-152. New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Fassin, Y. (2009). The stakeholder model refined. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84, 113-135.
- Filatotchew, I., & Nakahima, C. (2014, May 13). Corporate governance, responsible managerial behavior, and CSR: Organizational efficiency versus organizational legitimacy? *Academy of Management Perspectives*. Doi 10.5465/amp.2014.0014
- Forbes. (2012, February). BP goes for public relations makeover to get beyond Gulf spill. *Forbes*. Retrieved May 15, 2014 from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/greatspeculations/2012/02/07/bp-goes-for-public-relations-makeover-to-get-beyond-gulf-spill/>

- Forbes. (2013, November 6). Apple dominates list of the world's most valuable brands, [blog by K. Badenhausen.]. Retrieved June 17, 2014 from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kurtbadenhausen/2013/11/06/apple-dominates-list-of-the-worlds-most-valuable-brands/>
- Forbes. (2014). The 10 companies with the best CSR reputations. *Forbes.com LLC*. Retrieved June 6 2014 from <http://www.forbes.com/pictures/efkk45mmlm/the-10-companies-with-the-best-csr-reputations/>
- Foss, S. K., Foss, K. A., & Trapp, R. (2002). *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Foss, S. K., Foss, K. A., & Trapp, R. (2014). *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric: 30th anniversary edition*. Chicago, IL: Waveland Press.
- Foucault, M. (1988). "The ethic of care for the self as an ethic of freedom," in J. Bernauer and D. Rasmussen (Eds.), *The Final Foucault*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Fowler, T. (2014, January 12). BP payments may continue to flow. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved April 26, 2014 from <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303819704579316823758089560>
- Frandsen, F., & Johansen, W. (2011). Rhetoric, climate change, and corporate identity management. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 511-530.
- Frankental, P. (2001). Corporate social responsibility – a PR invention? *Corporate Communications*, 6(1), 18-23.
- Frederiksen, C. S. (2010). The relation between policies concerning corporate social responsibility (CSR) and philosophical moral theories – an empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(3), 357-371.
- Freeland, C. (2010, July 18). What's BP's social responsibility? *The Washington Post*. Retrieved June 1, 2013 from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/16/AR2010071604070.html>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman.
- Frenkel, M. (2008). The multinational corporation as a third space: Rethinking international management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhabha. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 924-942.
- Frenkel, M., & Shenhav, Y. (2006). From binarism back to hybridity: A postcolonial reading of management and organization studies. *Organization Studies*, 27(6), 855-876.
- Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its profits. *New York Times Magazine*, 32-33, 122-126.

- Friedman, T. (2005). *The World is Flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Picador/Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Frynas, J. G. (2008). Corporate social responsibility and international development: Critical assessment. *Corporate Governance*, 16(4), 274-281.
- Frynas, J. G. (2010). Corporate social responsibility and societal governance: Lessons from transparency in the oil and gas sector. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93, 163-179.
- Frynas, J. G. (2012). Corporate social responsibility or government regulation? Evidence on oil spill prevention. *Ecology and Society*, 17(4), 4.
- FSG. (2011a). *Creating Shared Value: A how-to guide for the new corporate (r)evolution*. Boston: Bockstette, V., & Stamp M.
- FSG. (2011b). *Creating shared value in India: How Indian corporations are contributing to inclusive growth while strengthening their competitive advantage*. Boston: V. Borgonovi, S. Meier, M. Sharda, & L. Vaidyanathan.
- FSG. (2011c, September 28). *Creating Shared Value: Making the case in your company* [webinar presentation PDF document]. Retrieved August 1 2012 from http://www.fsg.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/PDF/HP_CSV_webinar_presentation.pdf
- FSG. (2012a). *Shared Value in Emerging Markets: How multinational corporations are redefining business strategies to reach poor or vulnerable populations*. Boston: G. Hills, P. Russell, V. Borgonovi, A. Doty & L. Iyer.
- FSG. (2012b, March 8). *Competing by saving lives: How pharmaceutical and medical device companies create CSV in global health*. FSG.
- FSG. (2014). Shared Value Case Examples. www.fsg.org. Retrieved June 12, 2014 from <http://sharedvalue.org/example-listing>
- FT. (2013, September 12). BMW recognized as climate change champion. www.ft.com. Retrieved June 20, 2014 from <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/fbcaf4c4-1aed-11e3-87da-00144feab7de.html#axzz355tQpgNc>
- Fuchs, C., Sultana, T., Ahmed, T., & Hossain, M. I. (2014). Factors associated with acute malnutrition among children admitted to a diarrhea treatment facility in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Pediatrics*, article ID 267806., 1-5.
- Ganesh, S., Zoller, H., & Cheney, G. (2005). Transforming Resistance, Broadening Our Boundaries: Critical organizational communication meets globalization from below. *Communication Monographs*, 72(2), 169-191.

- Gatewood, R. D., Gowan, M. A., & Lautenschlager, G. J. (1993). Corporate image, recruitment image, and initial job choice decisions. *Academy of Management*, 36(2), 414-427.
- Gilberthorpe, E., & Banks, G. (2012). Development on whose terms? CSR discourse and social realities in Papua New Guinea's extractive industries sector. From Corporate Social Responsibility in the Extractive Industries: Experiences from developing countries, *Resources Policy*, 37(2), 185-193.
- Gill, A. (2008). Corporate governance as social responsibility: A research agenda. *Berkeley Journal of International Law*, 26(2), 452-478.
- Global Reporting Initiative. (2014). www.globalreporting.org. Retrieved June 26, 2014 from <https://www.globalreporting.org/Information/about-gri/Pages/default.aspx>
- Grameen. (2012). *Grameen Bank at a Glance: October 2011*. Retrieved October 12, 2012 from http://www.grameen-info.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=26&Itemid=175.
- Gray, E. R., & Balmer, J. M. T. (1998). Managing corporate image and corporate reputation. *Long Range Planning*, 31, 695-702.
- Gray, J. (2012, December 5). Former Nestlé Canada CEO may face chocolate price-fixing charge 'shortly.' *The Global and Mail*. Retrieved April 22, 2014 from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/the-law-page/former-nestl-canada-ceo-may-face-chocolate-price-fixing-charge-shortly/article6013249/>
- Groups challenge Nestlé's bottled water greenwashing. *Polaris Institute.org*. Retrieved February 27, 2013 from http://www.polarisinstitute.org/groups_challenge_nestlé's_bottled_water_greenwashing
- GSK announces new strategic investments in Africa to increase access to medicines, build capacity and deliver sustainable growth. (2014). *GlaxoSmithKline*. Retrieved May 30, 2014 from http://www.developingcountriesunit.gsk.com/News/News/GSK-announces-new-strategic-investments-in-Africa-to-increase-access-to-medicines-build-capacity-and-deliver-sustainable_
- GSK PLC. (2012). *Corporate Responsibility Report 2011*. Middlesex, UK: GSK PLC.
- GSK. (2014a). *Corporate Responsibility Report 2013*. Retrieved May 27, 2014 from <http://www.gsk.com/content/dam/gsk/globals/documents/pdf/corporateresponsibility/2013/cr-report-2013.pdf>
- GSK PLC. (2014b). *Annual Report 2013*. Middlesex, UK: GSK PLC.

- Gulf Progress Fact. (2013, May 24). Gulf of Mexico: Progress of restoration efforts. *www.bp.com*. Retrieved June 1, 2013 from http://www.bp.com/liveassets/bp_internet/globalbp/globalbp_uk_english/gom_2012/STAGING/local_assets/downloads_pdfs/Gulf_Progress_Fact_Sheet_v3.pdf
- Guthey, E., & Morsing, M. (2014). CSR and the mediated emergence of strategic ambiguity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(4), 555-569.
- Hall, S. (1996). "Ethnicity: identity and difference," in G. Eley and R. Suny (Ed.), *Becoming National: A reader*. New York, NY: Oxford.
- Halme, M., & Laurila, J. (2009). Philanthropy, integration or innovation? Exploring the financial and societal outcomes of different types of corporate responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(3), 325-339.
- Haregu, T. N., Elliott, J., Setswe, G., & Oldenburg, B. (2013). Epidemiological patterns of HIV/AIDS and diabetes in developing countries: A cluster analysis. *International Journal of Tropical Disease*, 3(1), 1-12.
- Harlow, W. F., Brantley, B. C., & Harlow, R. M. (2011). BP initial image repair strategies after the *Deepwater Horizon* spill. *Public Relations Review*, 37, 80-83.
- Hart, S. (2005). *Capitalism at the crossroads: Aligning business, earth, and humanity*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School Publishing.
- Hartelius, E. J., & Browning, L. D. (2008). The application of rhetorical theory in managerial research: A literature review. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 22, 13-39.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haslam, S. A., Postmes, T., & Ellemers, N. (2003). More than a metaphor: Organizational identity makes organizational life possible. *British Journal of Management*, 14, 357-369.
- Hayes, D. C., Hendrix, J. A., & Kumar, P. D. (2013). *Public Relations Cases, 9th Ed.* Cengage Learning.
- Hazen, M. A. (1993). Towards polyphonic organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 6(5), 15-26.
- HBR. (2012, April). The 53rd annual McKinsey awards. *www.hbr.org*. Retrieved June 2 2014 from <http://hbr.org/2012/04/the-53rd-annual-mckinsey-awards/ar/1>
- Heath, R. L. (2001). A rhetorical enactment rationale for public relations: The good organization communicating well. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of Public Relations*, 31-50. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Heath, R. L. (2011) External organizational rhetoric: Bridging management and sociopolitical discourse. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 415-435.
- Helman, C. (2013, November 17). The world's biggest oil companies, 2013. *Forbes*. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/christopherhelman/2013/11/17/the-worlds-biggest-oil-companies-2013/>
- Hemphill, T. (2004). Corporate citizenship: The case for a new corporate governance model. *Business and Society Review*, 109(3), 339-361.
- Henisz, W. J., Dorobantu, S., & Narthey, L. (2011, June). Spinning gold: The financial returns to external stakeholder engagement. In *11th Annual Strategy and the Business Environment (SBE) Conference, Wharton, PA*, 9-10.
- Hewes, D. E., (2009). The Influence of Communication Processes on Group Outcomes: Antithesis and thesis. *Human Communication Research*, 35, 249-271.
- Hildebrand, D., Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2011). Corporate Social Responsibility: A corporate marketing perspective. *Emerald*, 45(9/10), 1353-1364.
- Hill, C. W. (1990). Cooperation, opportunism, and the invisible hand: Implications for transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(3), 500-513.
- Hillenbrand, C., Money, K., & Ghobadian, A. (2013). Unpacking the mechanism by which corporate responsibility impacts stakeholder relationships. *British Journal of Management*, 24, 127-146.
- Hilson, G. (2012). Corporate social responsibility in the extractive industries: Experiences from developing countries. *Resources Policy*, 37, 131-137.
- Hiltzik, M. (2014, February 23). BP gets slick in trying to undermine gulf oil spill settlement. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved April 26, 2014 from, <http://articles.latimes.com/2014/feb/23/business/la-fi-hiltzik-20140221>
- Hoen, E. T. (2014). European Parliament Committee on International Trade Hearing on TRIPS and Access to Medicines. *Medecins Sans Frontieres (MSF) Access to Essential medicines Campaign*. Retrieved from <http://cdrwww.who.int/intellectualproperty/topics/ip/tHoen.pdf>. 01/24/2014.
- Hoffman, B. (2013, February 22). Love chocolate? 4 reasons why Nestlé's Cocoa Plan is not enough. Retrieved May 16 2014 from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/bethhoffman/2013/05/22/4-reasons-why-nestles-cocoa-plan-is-not-enough/>

- Holmgren, T., Jäferskog, A., Berggren, J., & Joyce, J. (2013, August 30). The global water crisis – why water politics matter for business security. *The Guardian*. Retrieved September 14, 2013 from <http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/global-water-crisis-politics-business-security>.
- Honke, J., & Thauer, C. R. (2014). Multinational corporations and service provision in Sub-Saharan Africa: Legitimacy and institutionalization matter. *Governance*, online. DOI 10.1111/grove.12072.
- Hooghiemstra, R. (2000). Corporate communication and impression management – new perspectives why companies engage in corporate social reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27(1-2), 55-68.
- Hsu, K. (2012). The advertising effects of corporate social responsibility on corporate reputation and brand equity: Evidence from the life insurance industry in Taiwan. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109, 189-201.
- Humes, E. (2011). *Force of Nature: The unlikely story of Wal-Mart's green revolution*. Harper Business.
- Ihlen, O. (2009a). Chapter 19, “Good Environmental citizens?: The green rhetoric of Corporate Social Responsibility.” In R. L. Heath, E. Toth, and D. Waymer (Eds.), *Rhetorical and Critical Approaches to Public Relations*, (pp. 360-374). Routledge.
- Ihlen, O. (2009b). The oxymoron of “sustainable oil production”: The case of the Norwegian oil industry. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 18, 53-63.
- Ihlen, O. (2011a). Chapter 8, “Rhetoric and corporate social responsibility,” In O. Ihlen, J. Bartlett, and S. May (Eds.), *The Handbook of Communication and Corporate Social Responsibility*, 147-166. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ihlen, O. (2011b). On Barnyard Scrambles: Towards a rhetoric of Public Relations. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 455-473.
- Ikejiaku, B. (2012). Consideration of ethical and legal aspects of corporate social responsibility: The issue of multi-national corporations and sustainable development. *Nordic Journal of Commercial Law*, 1, 1-32.
- Industry group leaders 2013. (2013, September). *Dow Jones Sustainability Indices*. Retrieved June 27, 2014 from <http://www.sustainability-indices.com/review/industry-group-leaders-2013.jsp>
- Insigniam Performance. (2013). *2013 Insigniam executive sentiment survey*. Retrieved August 12, 2013 from <http://insigniamquarterly.com/2013/03/13/the-2013-insigniam-executive-sentiment-survey-draft/>.

- ILRF. (2014). US companies sued over forced child labor. *International Labor Rights Forum*. Retrieved April 22, 2014 from <http://www.laborrights.org/stop-child-labor/news/11073>
- Intuit. (2012). *2011 Corporate Sustainability Report*. Retrieved April 24, 2014, from http://http-download.intuit.com/http.intuit/CMO/intuit/philanthropy/intuit_2011_sustainability_report.pdf
- IUF. (2014). Nestlé Pakistan: Unions rolls back ‘de-unionization’ drive, double membership. Retrieved April 21, 2014 from http://www.iuf.org/cgi-bin/dbman/db.cgi?db=default&ww=1&uid=default&ID=3591&view_records=1&en=1
- Jack, G., & Lorbiecki, A. (2007). National identity, globalization and the discursive construction of organizational identity. *British Journal of Management*, 18, S79-S94.
- Jack, G., Westwood, R., Srinivas, N., & Sardar, Z. (2011). Deepening, Broadening and Re-asserting a Postcolonial Interrogative Space in Organization Studies. *Organization*, 18(3), 275-302.
- Jamali, D., Safieddine, A. M., Rabbath, M. (2008). Corporate governance and corporate social responsibility synergies and interrelationships. *Corporate Governance*, 16, 443-459.
- Jameson, F. (1999). Preface, in F. Jameson and M. Miyoshi (Eds.), *The cultures of globalization*, xi-xvii. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Jeffers, A. E., Lin, B., Romera, S., DeGaetano, L. A. (2014, March). Is it time for companies to capitalize on sustainability? *CPA Journal*, 6-10.
- Jo, H., & Harjoto, M. A. (2012). The causal effect of corporate governance on corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 106, 53-72.
- Johnson, B. (2013, January 29). Study:”dirty bathtub” buried oil from BP spill. *CBS News*. Retrieved April 25 2014 from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/study-dirty-bathtub-buried-oil-from-bp-spill/>
- Johnson, B. R., Connolly, E., & Carter, T. S. (2011). Corporate social responsibility: The role of Fortune 100 companies in domestic and international natural disasters. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 18, 352-369.
- Johnston, R. E., & Bate, J. D. (2013). *The power of strategy innovation: A new way of linking creativity and strategic planning to discover great business opportunities*. American Management Association.
- Jones, T. M. (1980, Spring). Corporate social responsibility revisited, redefined. *California Management Review*, 59-67.
- Junior, R., Best, P., & Cotter, J. (2014). Sustainability reporting and assurance: A historical analysis on a world-wide phenomenon. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(1), 1-11.

- Kanter, R. M. (1999). From spare change to real change: The social sector as a beta site for innovation. *Harvard Business Review*, 77, 122-133.
- Karner, C. (2011). *Negotiating National Identities: Between globalization, the past and the 'other.'* Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Karpen, I. O., Bove, L. L., & Lukas, B. A. (2012). Linking Service-Dominant Logic and Strategic Business Practice A Conceptual Model of a Service-Dominant Orientation. *Journal of Service Research*, 15(1), 21-38.
- Kent, M. L. (2011). Public Relations Rhetoric: Criticism, dialogue, and the Long Now. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 550-559.
- Khan, A. (2009). Nestlé rebuked by the FDA for misleading nutritional labeling [blog]. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved May 4, 2014 from http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/booster_shots/2009/12/nestle-fda-juicy-juice-boost-nutrition-label.html
- Khan, A., Muttakin, M. B., & Siddiqui, J. (2013). Corporate governance and corporate social responsibility disclosures: Evidence from an emerging economy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114, 207-223.
- Klein, N. (1999). *No Logo*: New York, NY: Picador.
- Klein, P. (2011). Three Great Examples of shared value in Action. *Forbes*. Retrieved September 13, 2013 from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/csr/2011/06/14/three-great-examples-of-shared-value-in-action/>.
- Kleyn, N., Abratt, R., Chipp, K., & Goldman, M. (2012). Building a strong corporate ethical identity: Key findings from suppliers. *California Management Review*, 54(3), 61-76.
- Kock, C. (2004). Rhetoric in media studies: The voice of constructive criticism. *NORDICOM Review*, 25(1/2), 103-110.
- Koehn, D., & Ueung, J. (2009). Is philanthropy being used by corporate wrongdoers to buy good will? *Journal of Management and Governance*, 14(1), 1-16.
- Korlina, A. (February 14). Bitter truths about sweet chocolate [blog]. Retrieved May 16, 2014 from <http://www.thetoc.gr/eng/economy/article/bitter-truths-about-sweet-chocolate>
- KPMG. (2011, November). KPMG International Survey of Corporate Responsibility Reporting 2011. Retrieved May 18, 2013 from <http://www.kpmg.com/Global/en/IssuesAndInsights/ArticlesPublications/corporate-responsibility/Documents/2011-survey.pdf>
- KPMG. (2013, December). The KPMG survey of corporate responsibility reporting 2013. *KPMG International*. Netherlands.

- Kuhn, T., & Deetz, S. (2008). Chapter 8, "Critical theory and corporate social responsibility: Can/should we get beyond cynical reasoning?" In A. Crane, A. McWilliams, D. Matten and D. S. Siegel (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lantos, G. P. (2003). Corporate socialism unethically masquerades as CSR. *Strategic Direction*, 19, 31-35.
- Laufer, W. S. (2003). Social Accountability and Corporate Greenwashing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 43(3), 253-261.
- Lauring, J., & Thomsen, C. (2009). Collective ideals and practices in sustainable development: Managing corporate identity. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 16, 38-47.
- Lavandera, E., & Morris, J. (2013, February 25). BP's billions at stake as courtroom showdown starts. *www.cnn.com*. Retrieved June 1 from <http://www.cnn.com/2013/02/25/us/bp-civil-trial>
- Lawrence, S. (2007). Chapter 16, "Toward an accounting for sustainability." In S. May, G. Cheney, & J. Roper (Eds), *The Debate Over Corporate Social Responsibility*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Levitt, T. (1958). The dangers of corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 36(3), 41-50.
- Lievens, F., Van Hove, G., & Anseel, F. (2007). Organizational identity and employer image: Towards a unifying framework. *British Journal of Management*, 18, S45-S59.
- Lindsey, C. O., Janus, B., & Murphy, H. (2014). Growing expectations: The rising tide of sustainability reporting initiatives and their challenges for the oil and gas industry. *SPE International Conference on Health, Safety, and Environment (conference paper)*. Presented 17-19 March 2014 Long Beach, California.
- Liu, B., Yu, Q., Bi, J., Zhang, B., Ge, J., & Bu, M. (2012). A study on the short-term and long-term corporate responses to the GreenWatch Program: Evidence from Jiangsu, China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 24, 132-140.
- Livesey, S. M. (2002). Global warming wars: Rhetoric and discourse analytic approaches to ExxonMobil's corporate public discourse. *Journal of Business Communication*, 39(1), 117-148.
- Livesey, S. M., & Kearins, K. (2002). Transparent and caring corporations? A study of sustainability reports by the Body Shop and Royal Dutch/Shell. *Organization and Environment*, 15(3), 233-258.

- Lompo, K., & Trani, J. (2013). Does corporate social responsibility contribute to human development in developing countries? Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 14(2), 241-265.
- Lucaites, J. L., & C. M. (1999). Introduction in J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A reader*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Lynch, N. C., Lynch, M. E., & Casten, D. B. (2014, March). The expanding use of sustainability reporting. *CPA Journal*, 18-24.
- Mahon, J., & Wartick, S. L. (2012). Corporate social performance profiling: using multiple stakeholders perceptions to assess a corporate reputation. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 12(1), 12-28.
- Mallin, C., Michelon, G., & Raggi, D. (2013). Monitoring intensity and stakeholders' orientation: How does governance affect social and environmental disclosure? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(1), 29-43.
- Maltz, E., & Schein, S. (2012). Cultivating shared value initiatives: A three Cs approach. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 47, 55-75.
- Marchese, T. (1991, November). TQM reaches the academy. *AAHE Bulletin*, 44, 3-9.
- Margolis, J. D., & Walsh, J. P. (2003). Misery Loves Companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 268-305.
- Marin, L., & Ruiz, S. (2007). "I need you too!" Corporate identity attractiveness for consumers and the role of social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 71(3), 245-260.
- Markwick, N., & Fill, C. (1997). Towards a framework for managing corporate identity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(5/6), 396-409.
- Mason, C., & Simmons, J. (2014). Embedding corporate social responsibility in corporate governance: A stakeholder systems approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119(1), 77-86.
- Matejek, S., & Gössling, T. (2014). Beyond legitimacy: A case study in BP's "green lashing." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120, 571-584.
- Matten, D., & Crane, A. (2005). Corporate citizenship: Toward an extended theoretical conceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 166-179.
- Mattera, P. (2014). Nestlé: Corporate rap sheet. Retrieved April 22, 2014, from <http://www.corp-research.org/Nestlé>
- May, S., Cheney, G. & Roper, J., (Eds). (2007). *The Debate Over Corporate Social Responsibility*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- McGee, M. C. (1999). "Text, context, and the fragmentation of contemporary culture," in J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, and S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*, 65-78. New York, NY: Guilford Publications, Inc.
- McKenna, S. (2011). A Critical Analysis of North American Business Leaders' Neocolonial Discourse: Global fears and local consequences. *Organization*, 18(3), 387-406.
- McKerrow, R. E. (1989). Critical Rhetoric: Theory and praxis. *Communication Monographs*, 56, 91-111.
- McMillan, J. J. (1990). Symbolic Emancipation in the Organization: A case of shifting power. In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook*, 13 (pp. 203-214). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- McMillan, J. J. (2007). Why corporate social responsibility: Why now? How? In S. K. May, G. Cheney, and J. Roper (Eds.), *The Debate Over Corporate Social Responsibility*, 15-29. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Meisenbach, R. J., & Feldner, S. B. (2011). Adopting an Attitude of Wisdom in Organizational Rhetorical Theory and Practice: Contemplating the ideal and the real. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), p. 560-568.
- Meisenbach, R. J., & McMillan, J. J. (2006). *Communication Yearbook*, 30. C. S. Beck (Ed.). Routledge.
- Michellini, L. (2012). *Social Innovation and New Business Models: Creating shared value in low-income markets*. New York, NY: Springer Heidelberg.
- Michelon, G. (2011). Sustainability disclosure and reputation: A comparative study. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 14, 79-96.
- Michelon, G., Boesso, G., & Kumar, K. (2013). Examining the link between strategic corporate social responsibility and company performance: An analysis of the best corporate citizens. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 20, 81-94.
- Miller, J. (2008). The ongoing legitimacy project: corporate philanthropy as protective strategy. *European Management Review*, 5(3), 151-164.
- Milne, M. J. & Gray, R. (2013). W(h)ither Ecology? The triple bottom line, the global reporting initiative, and corporate sustainability reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118, 13-29.
- Mir, R., Banerjee, S. B., Mir, A. (2008). Hegemony and its discontents: A critical analysis of organizational knowledge transfer. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 4(2/3), 203-207.
- Misoczky, C. M. (2011). World Visions in Dispute in Contemporary Latin America: Development x harmonic life. *Organization*, 18, 345-363.

- Mistrati, M., & Romano, R. (2010). *The Dark Side of Chocolate* [Film]. Bastard Film.
- Mitchell, N. J. (1989). *The Generous Corporation: A political analysis of economic power*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mitchell, R., Agle, B., and Wood, D. (1997). Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 853-886.
- Modaff, D. P., de Wine, S., & Butler, J. A. (2008). *Organizational Communication: Foundations, Challenges, and Misunderstandings*. Boston, NY: Pearson.
- Molz, R., Ratiu, C., & Taleb, A. (2010). *Local Versus Global Logic: The multinational enterprise and developing countries*. London: Routledge.
- Moon, J., Crane, A., & Matten, D. (2005). Can Corporations be citizens? Corporate citizenship as a metaphor for business participation in society. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 15(3), 429-453.
- Moorhead, J. (2007, May 14). Milking it. *The Guardian*. Retrieved March 13 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2007/may/15/medicineandhealth.lifeandhealth>
- Morsing, M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility as strategic auto-communication: on the role of external stakeholders for member identification. *Business Ethics*, 15(2), 171-182.
- Moser, D. V., & Martin, P. R. (2012). A broader perspective on Corporate Social Responsibility research in accounting. *The Accounting Review*, 87(3), 797-806.
- Mourdoukoutas, P. (1999). *The Global Corporation: The decolonization of international businesses*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- Muchlinski, P. (2011). The changing face of transnational business governance: Private corporate liability and accountability of transnational groups in a post-financial crisis world. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 18, 705.
- Mukherjee, R. (2014, April 22). Glaxo to cut price of Crocin by 50%. *The Times of India*. Retrieved June 1, 2014 from <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/Glaxo-to-cut-price-of-Crocin-by-50/articleshow/34067537.cms>
- Muller, M. (2013, February 13). "Nestlé baby milk scandal has grown up but not gone away." *The Guardian*. Retrieved March 6, 2014 from <http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/nestle-baby-milk-scandal-food-industry-standards>.

- Mumby, D. K. (2011). *Reframing Difference in Organizational Communication Studies: Research, pedagogy, practice*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Mumby, D. K. (2013). *Organizational Communication: A critical approach*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Mumby, D. K. & Stohl, C. (1996). Disciplining organizational communication studies. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10(1), 50-72.
- Murray, S. (2011). Benefits Flow as Top People Join the Battle. *FT.com*.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/873354987?accountid=14745>. Retrieved 09/13/12.
- Mwait, C. (2014, April 1). UK drug firm to set up plant in Rwanda. *The New Times*. Retrieved June 1, 2014 from <http://www.newtimes.co.rw/news/index.php?i=15679&a=75736>
- Nadesan, M. H. (2011). Chapter 13, "Transparency and neoliberal logics of corporate economic and social responsibility." In O. Ihlen, J. Bartlett, and S. May (Eds.), *The Handbook of Communication and Corporate Social Responsibility*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nagarajan, R. (2014, May 30). GSK's weak defense over corruption charges. *The Times of India*. Retrieved June 1, 2014 from <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/GSKs-weak-defence-over-corruption-charges/articleshow/35777320.cms>
- Nandy, A. (1983). *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- National Wildlife Federation. (2013, April). Restoring a Degraded Gulf of Mexico: Wildlife and wetlands three years into the Gulf oil disaster. *National Wildlife Federation*. Retrieved April 25 2014 from http://www.nwf.org/pdf/Wildlife/2013_NWF_Restoring_Gulf_Report_FINAL.pdf
- Nestlé. (2008, March). The Nestlé Creating Shared Value Report. Nestlé S. A., Public Affairs.
- Nestlé. (2009). *Nutritional needs and quality diets: Creating Shared Value Report 2008*. Vevey: Switzerland: Nestlé S.A., Public Affairs.
- Nestlé. (2011). *Creating Shared Value and Rural Development Report 2010*. Vevey: Switzerland: Nestlé S.A., Public Affairs.
- Nestlé. (2012a). *Creating Shared Value Summary Report 2011: Meeting the global water challenge*. Vevey: Switzerland: Nestlé S.A., Public Affairs.
- Nestlé. (2012b). Nestlé helps address micronutrient deficiency in Africa with new Maggi cube. Retrieved May 3, 2014 from <http://www.nestle.com/media/newsandfeatures/iron-fortified-maggi>

- Nestlé. (2013). *Nestlé in Society: Creating shared value and meeting our commitments 2012* (full report). Vevey: Switzerland: Nestlé S.A., Public Affairs.
- Nestlé. (2014). *Nestlé in Society: Creating shared value and meeting our commitments 2013* (full report). Vevey: Switzerland: Nestlé S.A., Public Affairs.
- Nestlé named one of the world's top ten most reputable companies. (2013, April 10). *Nestlé*. Retrieved June 27, 2014 from <http://www.nestle.com/Media/NewsAndFeatures/RepTrak-study-2013>
- Nestlé prize in creating shared value. (2014). *Nestlé*. Retrieved June 27, 2014 from <http://www.nestle.com/csv/what-is-csv/nestleprize>
- Nguyen, T. A., Knight, R., Roughead, E. E., Brooke, G., & Mant, A. (2014). Policy options for pharmaceutical pricing and purchasing: issues for low- and middle-income countries. *Health Polity Plan*, 29.
- Nieburg, O. (2013, March 8). Nestlé promises action to improve women's lives on cocoa farms. Retrieved May 16, 2014 from <http://www.confectionerynews.com/Manufacturers/Nestle-promises-action-to-improve-women-s-lives-on-cocoa-farms>
- Nkomo, S. M. (2011). A postcolonial *and* anti-colonial reading of 'African' leadership and management in organization studies: tensions, contradictions and possibilities. *Organization*, 18(3), 365-386.
- Noble, D. F. (1977). *America by Design: Science, technology, and the rise of corporate capitalism*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Nokomo, S. M. (2011). A Postcolonial *and* Anti-colonial Reading of 'African' Leadership and Management in Organization Studies: Tensions, contradictions and possibilities. *Organization*, 18(3), 365-386.
- Novo Nordisk. (2014). *Novo Nordisk Annual Report 2013*. Bagsvaerd, Denmark. Novo Nordisk A/S.
- Now is the perfect time. (2013). Now is the perfect time to visit the Gulf. *BP*. Message posted to <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0FidIIQO6ZY>
- Nutritional landscaping for effective fortification. (2013b). *Nestlé*. Retrieved May 3, 2014 from http://www.nestle.com/Media/NewsAndFeatures/nutritional-landscaping?WT.mc_id=micronutrient_alert_nf_16102013
- O'Connor, E, OH. (2011, November 29). Organizational Apologies: BP as a case study. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 64(6), 1959-1990.
- Okoye, A. (2009). Theorizing Corporate Social Responsibility as an essentially contested concept: Is a definition necessary? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89, 613-627.

- Olawari, D. J., & Fidelis, A. E. (2011). The rhetoric of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the Niger Delta. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 1(3), 123-133.
- Olins, W. (1978). *The Corporate Personality: An inquiry into the nature of corporate identity*. Mayflower Books.
- Olins, W. (1990). *Corporate Identity: Making business strategy visible through design*. London, UK: Thames & Hudson.
- Ono, K. A., & Sloop, J. M. (2002). *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, immigration, and California's proposition 187*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Orock, R. T. E. (2013). Less-told stories about corporate globalization: Transnational corporations and CSR as the politics of (ir)responsibility in Africa. *Dialectical Anthropology*, 37(1), 27-50.
- Ortmann, A. C., Anders, J., Shelton, N., Gong, L., Moss, A. G., Condon, R. J. (2012). Dispersed oil disrupts microbial pathways in pelagic food webs. *PLOS ONE*, 7(7), 1-9.
- OSHA. (2005, September 22). OSHA fines BP products North America more than \$21 million following Texas city explosion: Company agrees to make extensive plant-wide improvements. *OSHA*. Retrieved April 24, 2014, from https://www.osha.gov/pls/oshaweb/owadisp.show_document?p_table=NEWS_RELEASES&p_id=11589
- Otubanjo, O. (2011). Practitioner conceptualisations of Corporate Identity 1950-2010: Review and analysis. *The Marketing Review*, 11(3), 263-279.
- Otubanjo, O., & Amujo, O. C. (2012). A holistic corporate identity communications process. *The Marketing Review*, 12(4), 403-417.
- Otubanjo, O., Amujo, O. C., & Cornelius, N. (2010). The informal corporate identity communication process. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 13(3), 157-171.
- Our innovative business model. (2014). *GlaxoSmithKline*. Retrieved May 29, 2014 from <http://www.developingcountriesunit.gsk.com/Our-innovative-business-model>
- Overall, M. (2012, May 21). GSK Medicine Bank: creating shared value in Thailand. *The Guardian*. Retrieved January 24, 2014 from <http://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/blog/gsk-thailand-medicine-bank-creating-shared-value>.
- Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983). Organizational Communication as Cultural Performance. *Communication Monographs*, 50(2), 126-147.
- Palazzo, G., & Scherer, A. G. (2006). Corporate legitimacy as deliberation: A communicative framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66, 71-88.

- Palenchar, M. J. (2011). Concluding Thoughts and Challenges. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 569-575.
- Parguel, B., Benoît-Moreau, F., & Larceneux, F. (2011). How sustainability ratings might deter “greenwashing”: A closer look at ethical corporate communication. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102, 15-28.
- Parker, C., & Braithwaite, J. (2003). “Regulation,” in P. Cane, and M. Tushnet (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Legal Studies*, 119-145. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Payne, D. (1989). *Coping with Failure: The therapeutic uses of rhetoric*. University of South Carolina Press.
- Peloza, J., Loock, M., Cerruti, J., & Muyot, M. (2012). Sustainability: How stakeholder perceptions differ from corporate reality. *California Management Review*, 55(1), 74-97.
- Pérez, A., & del Bosque, I. R. (2012). The role of CSR in the corporate identity of banking service providers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108, 145-166.
- Perrini, F., Russo, A., Tencati, A., & Vurro, C. (2011). Deconstructing the Relationship Between Corporate Social and Financial Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102, 59-76.
- Parrish, L. (2013, February 13). Panera bread introduces new platform to express brand values, purpose and culture: “Live consciously” [press release]. *Market Wired*. Retrieved June 26, 2014 from <http://www.marketwired.com/press-release/panera-bread-introduces-new-platform-express-brand-values-purpose-culture-live-consciously-nasdaq-pnra-1757860.htm>
- PewResearch. (2012). As gas prices pinch, support for oil and gas production grows: Those aware of fracking favor its use. *PewResearch*. Retrieved June 13, 2013 from <http://www.people-press.org/2012/03/19/as-gas-prices-pinch-support-for-oil-and-gas-production-grows/>
- Pfizer, M., Bockstette, V., & Stamp, M. (2013, September). Innovating for shared value: Companies that deliver both social benefit and business value rely on five mutually reinforcing elements. *Harvard Business Review*, 100-107.
- PharmaAfrica. (2014, February 4). GSK announces plans to set up five new manufacturing facilities in Africa. www.pharmaafrica.com. Retrieved June 1, 2014 from <http://www.pharmaafrica.com/gsk-announces-plans-to-set-up-five-new-manufacturing-facilities-in-africa/>
- Pomering, A., & Dolnicar, S. (2009). Assessing the prerequisite of successful CSR implementation: Are consumers aware of CSR initiatives? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(Suppl 2), 285-301.

- Porter, M. (2012, December 3). What's wrong with maximizing shareholder value? [blog]
Retrieved from
<http://www.fsg.org/KnowledgeExchange/Blogs/CreatingSharedValue/PostID/387.aspx>
- Porter, M. E. (2009). A Strategy for Health Care Reform – Toward a value-based system. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 361, 109-112.
- Porter, M. E. (2011, January 6). How to fix capitalism. *HBR Blog Network. Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved December 9, 2013 from <http://blogs.hbr.org/2011/01/how-to-fix-capitalism/>.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (1999, November/December). Philanthropy's new agenda: Creating value. *Harvard Business Review*, 121-130.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2002, December). The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*, 56-68.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006, December). Strategy & Society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 78-92.
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011, January-February). CSV: How to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and growth. *Harvard Business Review*, 62-77.
- Porter, M.E., Hills, G., Pfitzer, M., Patscheke, S., & Hawkins, E. (2012). *Measuring CSV: How to unlock value by linking social and business results*. FSG.
- Powell, S., Elving, W. J. L., Dodd, C., & Sloan, J. (2009, October). Explicating ethical corporate identity in the financial sector. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 14(4), 440-455.
- Poynder, J. (1844). *Literary Extracts From English and Other Works; collected during half a century: together with some original matter, (Vol 1)*. London, UK: John Hatchard & Son.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Hammond, A. (2002). Servicing the World's Poor, Profitably. *Harvard Business Review*, 80, 4-11.
- Prasad, A. (1997a). Provincializing Europe: Towards a post-colonial reconstruction: a critique of baconian science as the last stand of imperialism. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, 3(1), 91-117.
- Prasad, A. (1997b). "The Colonizing Consciousness and Representation of the Other: A postcolonial critique of the discourse of oil," in A. Prasad, A. Mills, M. Elmes and A. Prasad (Eds.), *Managing the Organizational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of workplace diversity*, 285-311. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Prasad, A. (2003). Chapter 1, "The gaze of the other: Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis," in A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A critical engagement*, 2-43. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad, A. (2012). *Against the Grain: Advances in postcolonial organization studies*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Prasad, A., & Holzinger, I. (2013). Seeing through smoke and mirrors: A critical analysis of marketing CSR. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 1915-1921.
- Promoting Tourism. (2013). Promoting tourism along the Gulf Coast. *www.bp.com*. Retrieved <http://www.bp.com/sectiongenericarticle800.do?categoryId=9048908&contentId=7082588>
- Przycodzen, J., & Przychodzen, W. (2013). Corporate sustainability and shareholder wealth. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 56(4), 474-493.
- Putnam, L. L. (1983). Chapter 2, "The Interpretive Perspective: An alternative to functionalism, in L. L. Putnam & M. E. Paconowsky (Eds.), *Communication and Organizations*, 31-54. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Putnam, L. L., & Nicotera, A. M. (2009). *Building Theories of Organization: The constitutive role of communication*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Rahim, M. M. (2014). *The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Corporate Governance: The rise of standardization of CSR principles*. Berlin: Springer.
- Rahim, M. M., & Alam, S. (2013). Convergence of social responsibility and corporate governance in weak economies: The case of Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Doi 10.1007/s10551-013-1699-x
- Rajak, D. (2011). *In Good Company: An anatomy of corporate social responsibility*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Redding, W. C. (2006). Chapter 1, "Stumbling Toward Identity: L. L. Putnam and K. J. Krone (Eds.) *Organizational Communication (five volume set)*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Reporting Standards. (2013). *www.bp.com* Retrieved June 4, 2013 from <http://www.bp.com/sectiongenericarticle800.do?categoryId=9048978&contentId=7083840>
- RepRisk AG. (2014). *The Most Controversial Companies of 2013*. Retrieved June 1, 2014 from <http://www.reprisk.com/marketing/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/140416-RepRisk-MCC-Report.pdf>
- Rink, F., & Ellemers, N. (2007). Diversity as a basis for shared organizational identity: The norm congruity principle. *British Journal of Management*, 18, S17-S27.

- Rivoli, P., & Waddock, S. (2011). "First they ignore you...": The time-context dynamic and corporate responsibility. *California Management Review*, 53 (Winter), 67-102.
- Roach, J. (2006). Alaska oil spill fuels concerns over arctic wildlife, future drilling. *National Geographic*. Retrieved April 24, 2014, from http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2006/03/0320_060320_alaska_oil.html
- Robertson, C., & Krauss, C. (2010, August 2). Gulf spill is the largest of its kind, scientists say. *The New York Times*. Retrieved May 26, 2013 from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/03/us/03spill.html?_r=0
- Rolfesen, M. (2004). The Tyranny of Trends? Towards an alternative perspective on fads in management. In D. Tourish & O. Hargie (Eds.), *Key Issues in Organizational Communication*, 112-129. London: Routledge.
- Rotkin-Ellman, M., Wong, K. K., & Solomon, G. M. (2011). Seafood contamination after the BP gulf oil spill and risks to vulnerable populations: A critique of the FDA risk assessment. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 120, 157-161.
- Safety. (2014). www.bp.com. Retrieved June 2 2014 from <http://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/sustainability/safety.html>
- Sahagun, L. (2014, February 13). Toxins released by oil spills send fish hearts into cardiac arrest. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved April 27, 2014 from <http://www.latimes.com/science/sciencenow/la-sci-sn-tuna-hearts-oil-spill-toxins-20140213,0,5212912.story#ixzz2tbQVLgxI>
- Saia, D. J., & Cyphert, D. (2003). The public discourse of the corporate citizen. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6(1), 47-57.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Saila, D. H., & Cyphert, D. (2003). The public discourse of the corporate citizen. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6(1), 47-57.
- Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory Authority Rights: From medieval to global assemblages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sawyer, S., & Gomez, E. T. (2008). *Transnational Governmentality and Resource Extraction: Indigenous peoples, multinational corporations, multilateral institutions, and the state*. Identities, conflict and cohesion programme paper No. 13. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

- Schaltegger, S., & Hansen, E. G. (2012). Business Cases for Sustainability: The role of business model innovation for corporate sustainability. *International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 6(2), 95-119.
- Scherer, A. G., & Palazzo, G. (2011). The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(4), 899-931.
- Scherer, A. G., Palazzo, G., & Baumann, D. (2006). Global rules and private actors: Toward a new role of the transnational corporation in global governance. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 16, 505-532.
- Schleifstein, M. (2013, April 2). National Wildlife Federation says environmental effects of BP spill far from over. *The Greater New Orleans*. Retrieved June 1, 2013 from http://www.nola.com/news/gulf-oil-spill/index.ssf/2013/04/national_wildlife_federation_s_1.html
- Schmitt, J., & Renken, U. (2012). How to earn money by doing good! Shared value in the apparel industry. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 45, 79-103.
- Schrope, M. (2013, January 24). Researchers debate oil-spill remedy. *Nature*, 493(461). Retrieved June 2, 2013 from <http://www.nature.com/news/researchers-debate-oil-spill-remedy-1.12267>
- Schultz, F. (2013). Chapter 30, "Corporate social responsibility, reputation, and moral communication: A constructivist view," in C. Carroll (Ed.), *The Handbook of Communication and Corporate Reputation*, 362-375. Wiley Blackwell.
- Schultz, F., Castelló, I., & Morsing, M. (2013). The construction of corporate social responsibility in network societies: A communication view. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115(4), 681-692.
- Scott, R. L. (1999). On viewing rhetoric as epistemic. In J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, and S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A reader*, 131-139. New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and Organizations*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- Selsky, J. W., & Parker, B. (2010). Platforms for Cross-Sector Social Partnerships: Prospective sensemaking devices for social benefit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, 21-37.
- Shalden, K. C., Guenniff, S., Guzman, A., & Lalitha, N. (2011). *Intellectual Property, Pharmaceuticals and Public Health: access to drugs in developing countries*. North Hampton, MA: Edward Elgare Publishing Limited.

- Shamir, R. (2008). The age of responsabilization: on market-embedded morality. *Economy and Society*, 37(1), 1-19.
- Shared Value Initiative. (2013). Built to create shared value: How Nestlé tackles malnutrition in developing regions. Retrieved from http://sharedvalue.org/sites/default/files/resource-files/FSG_SVI_casestudy_r4_051713.pdf
- Shogren, E. (2011, April 11). BP: A textbook example of how not to handle PR. *NPR*. Retrieved May 21, 2013 from <http://www.npr.org/2011/04/21/135575238/bp-a-textbook-example-of-how-not-to-handle-pr>
- Shome, R., & Hegde, R. S. (2002). Postcolonial approaches to communication: Charting the terrain, engaging the intersections. *Communication Theory*, 12(3), 249-270.
- Shosanya, M. (2012, May 7). Nigeria: 50 million Maggi cubes sold daily – Nestlé. *Daily Trust*. Retrieved May 3, 2014 from <http://allafrica.com/stories/201205070979.html>
- Sierns, M. M., & Alvarez-Macotela, O. *The OECD Principles of Corporate Governance in Emerging Markets: A successful example of networked governance?* Berlin: Springer.
- Smith, R. C. (1993). Organizational Communication Theorizing: Root-metaphor of the organization-communication relation. Paper presented at the 1993 ICA conference, Washington D. C., Purdue University at West Lafayette.
- Smyth, L. (2011). “Anthropological critiques of sustainable development,” in *Cross-Sections*, II, 77-86. Canberra, ACT: ANU E View.
- Soraghan, M. (2010, September 9). Companies involved in Gulf oil spill play ‘name that disaster’ with eye on posterity. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 2, 104 from <http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2010/09/09/09greenwire-companies-involved-in-gulf-oil-spill-play-name-79834.html?pagewanted=all>
- Soule, S. A. (2009). *Contention and Corporate Social Responsibility*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spangler, I. S., & Pompper, D. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and the oil industry: Theory and perspective fuel a longitudinal view. *Public Relations Review*, 37, 217-225.
- Spivak, G. C. (1987). *In Other Worlds: Essays in cultural politics*. New York, NY: Methuen.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). “Can the subaltern speak?” in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1996). *The Spivak Reader*, D. Landry & G. MacLean (Eds.). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A Critical of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sproule, J. M. (1988). The New Managerial Rhetoric and the Old Criticism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 74, 468-486.
- Starbucks. (2013). *Create jobs for USA*. Retrieved October 17, 2013 from <http://www.starbucks.com/responsibility/community/create-jobs-for-usa-program>.
- Sullivan, D. L. (2012, June). Sustainability as a rhetorical god term. In XVII European LSP Symposium [online]. Retrieved on June 12 2014 (vol. 22).
- Sustainability. (2014). *www.bp.com*. Retrieved June 24, 2014 from <http://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/sustainability.html>
- Sweet Success for Kit Kat campaign: you asked, Nestlé has answered. (2010). *Greenpeace International*. Retrieved February 27, 2013 from <http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/news/features/Sweet-success-for-Kit-Kat-campaign/>
- Takano, K. (2013). McDonald's Japan: A case study of effective public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 39, 60-62.
- Taylor, D. (2009, November 11). BP faces damages claim over pipeline through Colombian farmland. *The Guardian*. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/nov/11/colombia-farmers-sue-bp-pipeline>
- Taylor, J. R. (1993). *Rethinking the Theory of Organizational Communication: How to read an organization*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Taylor, M. (2009). Civil Society as a Rhetorical Public Relations Process. In R. Heath, E. L. Toth, and D. Waymer (Eds.), *Rhetorical and Critical Approaches to Public Relations II* (pp. 76-91). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Taylor, M. (2011). Building Social Capital Through Rhetoric and Public Relations. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 436-454.
- The state of the gulf. (2014). The state of the Gulf: BP sets the record straight. *BP*. Retrieved June 26, 2014 from <https://www.thestateofthegulf.com/>
- Thompson, G. F. (2012). "The politics of the 'citizenly company' and global corporate governance reform," in G. F. Thompson (Ed.), *The constitutionalization of the Global Corporate Sphere?* Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Thornborrow, J. (2002) *Power Talk: Language and interaction in institutional discourse*. London.

- Tompkins, P. K. (1984) Chapter 10, "The Functions of Human Communication in Organization" in, A. C. Carroll & J. W. Bowers (Eds.), *Handbook of Rhetorical and Communication Theory*, 659-719. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tompkins, P. K., Fisher, J. Y., Infante, D. A., & Tompkins, E. L. (1975). Kenneth Burke and the Inherent Characteristics of Formal Organizations: A field study. *Speech Monographs*, 42, 135-142.
- Torelli, C. J., Monga, A. B., & Kaikati, A. M. (2012, February). Doing poorly by doing good: Corporate Social Responsibility and brand concepts. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 38, 948-963.
- Townley, B. (2002). Managing with Modernity. *Organization*, 9(4), 549-573.
- Tremonti, A. (2013, December 19). Pharmaceutical giant GlaxoSmithKline will stop giving doctors a paycheque. *CBC Radio*. Retrieved June 1, 2014 from <http://www.cbc.ca/thecurrent/episode/2013/12/19/pharmaceutical-giant-glaxosmithkline-will-stop-giving-doctors-a-paycheque/>
- Tuskej, U., & Podnar, K. (2013). Chapter 6, "Consumer's identification with a brand," in K. Podnar & J. M. T. Balmer (Eds.), *Contemplating Corporate Marketing, Identity and Communication*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- UNICEF. (2014). *Water, sanitation, and hygiene*. Retrieved March 20, 2014 from <http://www.unicef.org/wash/>
- Unilever. (2013). *Lifebuoy creates innovative roti reminder*. Retrieved October 5, 2013 from <http://www.unilever.com/brands-in-action/detail/Lifebuoy-creates-innovative-roti-reminder/346332/>.
- US to give BP evidence. (2012, April 11). US to give BP evidence on size of Gulf oil spill. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved April 24, 2014 from http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-04-11/news/sns-rt-bpoilspill12e8fblta-20120411_1_deepwater-horizon-bp-plc-oil-spill
- Utting, P. (2013). "Multistakeholder Regulation of Business: Assessing the pros and cons" in R. Van Tulder, A. Verbeke, R. Strange (ed.), *International Business and Sustainable Development (Progress in international business research, volume 8)*. Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- Utting, P., & Clapp, J. (2008). *Corporate Accountability and Sustainable Development: Ecological economics and human well-being*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Vallaster, C., Lindgreen, A., & Maon, F. (2012). Strategically leveraging Corporate Social Responsibility: A corporate branding perspective. *California Management Review*, 54(3), 34-60.

- van Beurden, P., & Gössling, T. (2008). The worth of values – A literature review on the relation between corporate social and financial performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 407-424.
- van Knippenberg, D., & Sleebos, E. (2006). Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: Self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(5), 571-584.
- van Rekom, J. (1997). Deriving an operational measure of corporate identity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(5/6), 410-422.
- van Riel, C. B. M. (1992). *Principles of corporate communication*. Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- van Riel, C. B. M., & Fombrun, C. J. (2007). *Essentials of Corporate Communication: Implementing practices for effective reputation management*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Vanhamme, J., Lindgreen, A., Reast, J., & van Popering, N. (2012). To do well by doing good: Improving corporate image through cause-related marketing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109, 259-274.
- Viegas, J. (2013). Record dolphin, sea turtle deaths since gulf spill. *Discovery*. Retrieved April 27, 2014 from <http://news.discovery.com/animals/whales-dolphins/record-dolphin-sea-turtle-deaths-since-gulf-spill-130402.htm>
- Visser, N. (2014, April 20). Four years later, BP oil spill still taking a toll on gulf fisherman: ‘we haven’t started to recover.’ *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved April 25 2014 from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/04/20/bp-oil-spill-still-taking-a-toll_n_5182552.html
- Votaw, D. (1972). Genius becomes rare: A comment on the doctrine of social responsibility Pt 1. *California Management Review*, 15(2), 25-31.
- Waddock, S. (2001). Integrity and Mindfulness: Foundations of corporate citizenship. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 1, 25-37.
- Waddock, S. (2007). Chapter 5, “Corporate citizenship: The dark-side paradoxes of success.” In S. May, G. Cheney and J. Roper (Eds.), *The Debate Over Corporate Social Responsibility*, 74-86. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Waddock, S. (2009). *Leading Corporate citizens: Vision, values, value added* (3ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Waddock, S., & Googins, B. K. (2011). Chapter 2, “The paradoxes of communicating corporate social responsibility.” In O. Ihlen, J. L. Bartlett, and S. May (Eds.), *The Handbook of Communication and Corporate Social Responsibility*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Waeraas, A. & Ihlen, O. (2009). Green legitimation: The construction of an environmental ethos. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 17, 84-102.
- Wagner, T., Lutz, R. J., & Weitz, B. A. (2009). Corporate hypocrisy: Overcoming the threat of inconsistent corporate social responsibility perceptions. *Journal of Marketing*, November, 73, 77-91.
- Wahba, P. (2013, February 12). Avon shares climb as long-awaited improvements start kicking in. *Reuters*. Retrieved June 7, 2014 from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/12/us-avon-results-idUSBRE91B0NX20130212>
- Waller, R. L., & Conaway, R. N. (2011). Framing and counterframing the issue of corporate social responsibility: The communication strategies of Nikebiz.com. *Journal of Business Communication*, 48(1), 83-106.
- Wang, H., Choi, J., & Li, J. (2008). Too little or too much? Untangling the relationship between corporate philanthropy and firm financial performance. *Organizational Science*, 19, 142-159.
- WCED. (1987). Report of the world commission on environment and development: our common future. *United Nations*. Retrieved June 27, 2014 from <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>
- Weaver, R. (1953). *The Ethics of Rhetoric*. South Bend, IL: Regnery/Gateway.
- Weber, O., Koellner, T., Habegger, D., Steffensen, H., & Ohnemus, P. (2008). The relation between sustainability performance and financial performance of firms. *Progress in Industrial Ecology*, 5, 236-254.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*, (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- What we do. (2014). What we do. *GlaxoSmithKline*. Retrieved May 27, 2014 from <http://www.developingcountriesunit.gsk.com/What-we-do>
- Whelan, G. (2012). The political perspective of corporate social responsibility: A critical research agenda. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22(4), 709-737.
- Who we are. (2014). *GlaxoSmithKline*. Retrieved May 30, 2014 from <http://www.developingcountriesunit.gsk.com/Who-we-are>
- WHO. (2013). 10 facts on the state of global health. *World Health Organization*. Retrieved June 5 2014 from http://www.who.int/features/factfiles/global_burden/facts/en/index1.html
- WHO Press. (2013). *Progress on sanitation and drinking-water: 2013 update*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

- Wiley, J. F., Cloutier, M. M., Wakefield, D. B., Hernandez, D. B., Grant, A., Beaulieu, A., & Gorin, A. A. (2014). Acculturation determines BMI percentile and noncore food intake in hispanic children. *Journal of Nutrition*, 144(3), 305-310.
- Wines, M. (2014, March 24). Fish embryos exposed to oil from BP spill develop deformities, a study find. *The New York Times*. Retrieved April 25, 2014 from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/25/us/fish-embryos-exposed-to-oil-from-bp-spill-develop-deformities-a-study-finds.html?_r=0
- Wood, D. J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 691-718.
- Wood, D. J., & Longsdon, J. M. (2001). "Theorizing Business Citizenship," in J. Andriof and M. McIntosh (Eds.), *Perspectives on Corporate citizenship*. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Wood, D., & Longsdon, J. M. (2008). Business citizenship as Metaphor and Reality. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 18(1), 51-59.
- Worcester, R. M. (2009). Reflections on corporate reputations. *Management Decision*, 47(4), 573-589.
- Yermack, D. (2009). Deductio' ad absurdum: CEOs donating their own stock to their own family foundations. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 94(1), 107-123.
- Young, R. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Young, S., & Thyil, V. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and corporate governance: Role of context in international settings. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Doi 10.1007/s10551-013-1745-8
- Zinkhan, G. M., & Carlson, L. (1995). Green advertising and the reluctant consumer. *Journal of Advertising*, 24.
- Zorn, T. E., & Collins, E. (2007). Chapter 18, "Is Sustainability Sustainable? Corporate social responsibility, sustainable business, and management fashion." In S. May, G. Cheney and J. Roper (Eds.), *The Debate Over Corporate Social Responsibility*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Zusman, E. E., (2011). Creating shared health care value. *Neurosurgery*, 68(4), N21-N22.