

# An Investigation of Global Corporate Social Responsibility Implementation

Janna Rich, Master of Arts Candidate  
Human Dimensions of Organizations, The University of Texas at Austin

### Introduction



**hypothesis**  
CSR policies are difficult to disseminate globally. Companies struggle to gain regional employee engagement for HQ CSR projects

### Methods

1. Literature Review
2. Qualitative Research
  - a. Company Investigations
  - b. Interviews (HQ/field-based)

### Results & Conclusions

- HQ and field-based employees both struggle to gain executive buy-in and staff participation.
- Field staff directly observe CSR impacts on employees and community.
- Field-based staff interpret the CSR message creatively.
- HQ and field CSR priorities sometimes conflict.
- Industry differences are insignificant.

TABLE 1  
Comparison of HQ & field-based employee statements

Topic		Employees	
		Headquarters	Field/Non-CSR
Motivations for company's CSR program	Company A	Encourage employee giving, community engagement	Strong community outreach
	Company B	Embody corporate values	Same as HQ
	Company C	Response to community needs (with approval)	Same as HQ
Core Values & Requirements	Company A	Focus Areas (educ. & literacy, environ. & sustainability, community safety & preparedness)	Focus areas loosely acknowledged
	Company B	Not well defined	Sustainability
	Company C	Education (55%), Basic Needs (25%), Arts & Culture (10%), Environment (10%)	Same as HQ
Biggest Challenges	Company A	Empl. engagement; telling people 'no', staying on message (Focus Areas)	Budgeting limited funds; potential for int'l corruption; hesitant environmentalists
	Company B	Executive engagement	Employee engagement
	Company C	Executive engagement; cultural differences; NGO qualification	Centralization of CSR funding; nonprofit qualification

Company A Oil & Gas  
Company B Software Development  
Company C Semiconductor Manuf. Products

### For Further Investigation

How can a global company implement CSR policies in a way that:

- applies at both regional and corporate levels?
- avoids diluting the brand?
- adapts to different political climates?
- encourages employee engagement at every level?
- invites input from field-based locations?
- helps communities without making them dependent?

"We have to clean up our own backyard... we don't think the planet can wait."  
- Company B Field



### Literature Cited

Freeman, I. and Hasnaoui, A. (2011). The meaning of corporate social responsibility: The vision of four nations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100, 419-443.  
Garriga, E .M. and Melé, D. (2004). Corporate social responsibility theories: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53, 51-71.  
Jamali, D. (2008). A stakeholder approach to corporate social responsibility: A

fresh perspective into theory and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 213-231.  
Matten, D. and Moon, J. (2008). "Implicit" and "explicit" CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *The Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 404-424.

### Acknowledgments

Thanks and love to Jason and my family for their unwavering encouragement and optimism. Special thanks to my advisor, Dan Bonevac and my second reader, Catherine Crago, and to the faculty and staff of HDO.  
Heartfelt gratitude to the HDO class of 2015, my tribe.

### Further Information

✉ jannarich@utexas.edu  
✎ *Good Business: Leadership, flow and the making of meaning*, by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi  
✎ *The High-Purpose Company: The truly responsible (and highly profitable) firms that are changing business now*, by Christine Arena