

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF INDUSTRY

Margaret L. Andersen
North Dakota State University

Yongtao (David) Hong
North Dakota State University

Key Words: corporate social responsibility, ethics, industry effect

JEL Classification(s): D22, G21, G34, H83, J50, L29, L6, L7, L8, L9, Q1, Q5

Abstract

This paper addresses the following research question: In examining the strengths and concerns of the corporate social responsibility performance of firms, are there discernible industry effects? Using ANOVA, the results indicate that there are some generalizations which can be made relative to industry-wide corporate social responsibility actions. This finding suggests the need to consider the effects of industry in future corporate social responsibility research.

INTRODUCTION

This paper intends to make a modest contribution to our understanding of the corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance of organizations. The goal is to provide a description

of how firms' CSR strengths and concerns vary across industries. Researchers will be interested in the use of industry as a control variable in future research. This exploration of the impact of industry may also help us gain a more in-depth understanding of corporate social responsibility. CSR has received a great deal of attention after the wave of high-profile financial scandals since the beginning of the new millennium. An interesting, somewhat new, direction of CSR research has been to address the question of whether CSR can mitigate earnings manipulation. Chih, et al. (2008), Hong and Andersen (2011) and Kim et al. (2012) find that more socially responsible firms are less likely to engage in earnings management and thus to have higher quality financial reporting. However, Prior, et al. (2008) document a positive relationship between earnings management and CSR for regulated firms but no statistically significant relationship for unregulated firms. Obviously, in the Prior, et al. (2008) paper, whether an industry is regulated or not influences the results. In this paper, we wish to focus on the role of industry in CSR performance.

These conflicting results are not surprising given the number of unresolved issues remaining concerning the measurement of corporate social responsibility. The Kinder Lydenburg Domini (KLD) STATS database provides data for U.S. firms' CSR performance (*e.g.*, Barnea and Rubin 2010, Hillman and Keim 2001). The SiRi database and the FTSE4Good Index Series cover different CSR issue areas and are used in international, cross-country studies (*e.g.*, Chih, et al. 2008 and Prior, et al. 2008). In addition to different data sources, there is still a debate about the use of an aggregated measure of CSR versus separate measures of strengths and concerns. In this paper, we argue that industry is another factor to consider when researching corporate social responsibility performance. Firms in different industries face different economic environments. As a result, the political, social, regulatory and operating pressures on them vary tremendously. The goal of our paper is to provide a

description of how firms' CSR strengths and concerns vary across industries.

Using ANOVA, we examine U.S. firms' CSR performance during 1991-2008. For the sake of simplicity, we use the first digit of the SIC code to classify all firms into ten industries.¹ As expected, there are systematic differences across the industries in the seven issue areas reported in the KLD database. Our paper helps us gain a more in-depth understanding of CSR and has implications for future empirical research. Managers will be interested in what others, specifically their industry competitors, are doing in the area of social responsibility. Stakeholders – consumers, employees, suppliers, members of the community, shareholders and creditors – can also benefit from learning about the corporate social responsibility actions of the firms with which we interact.

In the next section, we discuss what we mean by corporate social responsibility. We then identify why industry is an important mediating factor in the choice of actions taken by firms. In the next section, we look at variable measurement and the database used in this study. This section concludes with a listing of the CSR strengths and concerns included in this study and the need to examine them separately. In the methodology section we identify the ANOVA analysis used and its appropriateness. We discuss the results in the next section from two perspectives. First, what industries score high or low on a particular CSR strength or concern? Second, we look at each industry and identify the CSR strengths and concerns associated with it. The paper ends with our conclusions.

CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR)

The definition of corporate social responsibility is still widely debated in the literature. A.B. Carroll, one of the first to

¹ Using a two-digit or three-digit SIC code would generate nearly a hundred or a thousand industries, which is impractical for ANOVA analysis.

address corporate social responsibility, has summarized the concept as follows: a CSR company is one which works to make a profit, obeys the law, behaves ethically, and is a good corporate citizen (Carroll 1979). Others state it somewhat more broadly. Corporate social responsibility reflects the fundamental fact that business and society are interdependent (Porter and Kramer 2006, Stewart 2006). Strike, et al. (2006) is one of the many papers which apply stakeholder theory to their definition of CSR. They refer to the effect of corporate actions on identifiable social stakeholders' interests. This closely resembles our approach. We look at the action of companies as either strengths (positively affecting a set of stakeholders) or concerns (negatively affection one or more stakeholder groups).

THE ROLE OF INDUSTRY

Our paper examines the role industry plays in the corporate social responsibility choices of firms. There is wide support in the literature for the assertion of the importance of industry. As others have noted "We begin with the unremarkable yet robust observation that industries differ along materially important dimensions, both economically (Porter 1980) and sociologically (Scott 1995)." (Godfrey, et al. 2010 p.322).

Miles (1987) discusses the differing social and political environments faced by different industries. Some authors emphasize industry differences from the perspective of different stakeholders (Godfrey, et al. 2010, Rowley and Berman 2000) and the different issues with which they are concerned. Industries also differ in their regulatory environments as well as their public visibility (Griffin and Mahon 1997, Holmes 1997 and Ingraham 1978). Smith and Ward (2007) argue, from a core competence-based CSR approach, that firms in different industries will have different competencies and will face different challenges.

In the empirical literature, industry has emerged as a critical variable to consider. Numerous researchers in the CSR area have identified industry as an important control variable (*e.g.*, Andersen

and Olsen 2011, Kotchen and Moon 2011, Waddock and Graves 1997). Others have simply found industry to be important in their results (Callan and Thomas 2009, McWilliams and Siegel 2001, Padgett and Galan 2010, Sethi and Sama 1998).

MEASURING THE VARIABLES

CSR

Corporate social responsibility is a difficult construct to define; it is even more difficult to measure. A.B. Carroll (2000) identifies the importance of providing “a comprehensive assessment of a firm’s social performance” (p.473) and recommends looking at a minimum of four or five stakeholder groups. We use measures from the following seven key issue areas reported in the Kinder Lydenburg Domini (KLD) STATS database: community relations, corporate governance, diversity, employee relations, the environment, human rights and the product.

The KLD database is highly recommended and the one used in this study. Speaking of the KLD database, Waddock (2003 p.371) states “... it is *still* true that the data are the best currently available ... KLD’s database has proven itself to be factual, reliable, broad-ranging, and maintained with consistency and transparency over the past decade.” A major contributing factor to the quality of the information relates to the wide variety of sources from which it is gathered. Companies provide public reports as well as financial statements from which the experts at KLD obtain information (Siegel and Vitaliano 2007, Strike et al. 2006, Waddock 2003). Some of the data is from court decisions (Waddock 2003) and law journals (Siegel and Vitaliano 2007). Investigative journalism (2003) and media reports (Kotchen and Moon 2011) are also information sources for KLD.

The KLD database provides information about two aspects of each of the seven issue areas; these are identified as strengths and concerns. Although some empirical research (*e.g.*, Waddock and Graves 1997) has combined the strengths and concerns to get a

single measure, recent studies have emphasized the need to keep them separate. Godfrey et al. (2010 p.318) state the following: “We highlight our contention that positive and negative CSRs must remain distinct ...” Mattingly and Berman (2006) find that positive and negative social actions did not converge in their factor analysis, emphasizing that they are independent constructs. Following this recent empirical research, we investigate the strengths and concerns separately. The CSR variables are listed in Table One.

Table One Corporate Social Responsibility Variables

Issue Area	Strengths	Concerns
Community Relations	Charitable giving Innovative giving Non-US charitable giving Support for housing Support for education Indigenous peoples relations Volunteer programs Other strengths	Investment controversies Negative economic impact Indigenous peoples relations Tax disputes Other concerns
Corporate Governance	Limited compensation Ownership Transparency Political accountability Other strengths	High compensation Ownership Accounting Transparency Political accountability Other concerns

Issue Area	Strengths	Concerns
Diversity	CEO Promotion Board of Directors Work/life benefits Women and minority contracting Employment of the disabled Gay and lesbian policies Other strengths	Controversies Non-representation Other concerns
Employee Relations	Union relations No-layoff policy Cash profit sharing Employee involvement Retirement benefits Health and safety Other strengths	Union relations Workforce reductions Retirement benefits Health and safety Other concerns
Environment	Beneficial products and services Pollution prevention Recycling Clean energy Communications	Hazardous waste Regulatory problems Ozone depleting chemicals Substantial emissions Agricultural chemicals

Issue Area	Strengths	Concerns
Environment	Management systems Property, plant and equipment Other strengths	Climate change Other concerns
Human Rights	Positive record in South Africa Labor rights Indigenous peoples human relations Other strengths	South Africa Northern Ireland Burma Mexico Labor rights Indigenous peoples relations Other concerns
Product	Quality R&D / innovation Benefits to economically disadvantaged Other strengths	Product safety Marketing / contracting Antitrust Other concerns

As discussed previously, the KLD database is one of the best available and is widely used in corporate social responsibility research. However, as evidenced in Table One, some of the issue areas and how they are defined are subject to debate. This is likely to be especially true with the diversity and human rights issues. There is substantial literature discussing the moral/ethical areas

reported in the KLD database. In this study, we use the data as supplied; more than that is beyond the scope of this paper.

Industry

In our study, we identify industry using the first digit of the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code. This choice involves an important trade-off. The advantage of using ten industry classifications is that the investigation is manageable. A major disadvantage is that valuable information is lost. Identifying only ten industries means that each sector is very broad; companies classified in the same industry may be quite different from each other. In spite of this drawback, we choose to use this more convenient method because our study is exploratory in nature. Future research could disaggregate the data further. The industry classifications used in this study are listed in Table Two.

Table Two Industries

0	Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing
1	Mining and Construction
2	Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and Chemical Manufacturing
3	Primary Materials, Machines, and Equipment Manufacturing
4	Transportation and Public Utilities
5	Trade, Wholesale and Retail
6	Financial Services
7	Hotel, Personal, Business, Auto and Amusement Services
8	Health, Legal, Education, Social and Engineering Services
9	Public Administration

METHODOLOGY

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to determine if there are differences in a variable of interest across groups. In this study, we are interested in determining if the average number of strengths (concerns) from an issue differs across industries. For

each issue area, our research questions are the following: (1) do the average number of strengths differ from industry to industry and (2) do the average number of concerns differ across industries? The null hypothesis for ANOVA is that there is no difference among the means.

$$H_0: \mu_0 = \mu_1 = \dots = \mu_8 = \mu_9$$

ANOVA is an appropriate method of analysis when the groups are created using a nominal level variable. In this study, the groups are industries and there are ten (10) of them.

RESULTS

We will present our results from two different perspectives. First, we focus on the issue areas and discuss how companies in the various industries have performed. Then we center our discussion on the industries and describe the issues which seem to be the most important for companies in that sector.

In the appendix, there are a series of tables showing the average number of strengths and concerns by industry for each issue area. The number of firms is also reported. These tables are essentially a rank ordering of the industries because each table is organized based on decreasing means.

Although it is possible to see which industry has a higher or lower average number of strengths or concerns than another industry from the tables in the appendix, we are not able to discern if the difference in the means is statistically significant. As a result, using the Tukey pair-wise comparisons reported in the ANOVA analysis, we next identify the industries with average strengths or concerns that are significantly different from the other industries.

Community Relations

For community relations, industries 2 (Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and Chemical Manufacturing), 4

(Transportation and Public Utilities) and 6 (Financial Services) are all very high in average strengths. Industry 9 (Public Administration) is significantly greater than all other industries in average community relations strengths. Interestingly, industries 4, 6 and 9 are also high in concerns; while industry 2 is low in concerns.

Table Three Significant differences among industries

Community Relations	Strengths	Concerns
High*	2, 4, 6 and 9	0, 1, 4, 6 and 9
Low**		2, 3, 5, 7 and 8

* significantly greater than five or more industries

**significantly less than five or more industries

Industry 4 (Transportation and Public Utilities) is high in average community relations strengths. Holmes (1977 p.436) finds that transportation and utility firms are “most involved with charities.” Charitable contributions are a component of the strengths in community relations in the KLD database and may account for the industry’s high average strengths. Industry 6 (Financial Services) is high in average strengths, too. Godfrey, et al. (2010) also find that firms with much direct contact with their customers and located in the customers’ community are high in community relations. This is often the case with banks.

Industry 9 is Public Administration. This sector includes governmental agencies which provide free or inexpensive public goods and services (Small Business Notes website). The industry is significantly higher than all other industries in community relations strengths and greater than all others (except industry 4) in concerns. It is likely that the higher strengths average reflects the provision of goods and services to the community. The high concerns average may indicate that the community is dissatisfied with the level or the nature of the support provided by the government. A note of caution is in order here. There are only 59

observations for industry 9. The results reported here may actually be due to the presence of outliers.

It may seem counter-intuitive that industries (*e.g.*, 4, 6 and 9) could have both high average strengths and high average concerns. However, Kotchen and Moon (2011) report a similar result. They find a strong relationship between what they call corporate social irresponsibility and corporate social responsibility in community relations. They assert that when companies do more “harm,” they also do more “good.” They posit that when companies engage in actions that are perceived as being socially irresponsible, they have an incentive to act more socially responsible to offset the negative. That pattern is also seen in these results.

Industry 2 (Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and Chemical Manufacturing) has the most desirable result; it is high in strengths and low in concerns. This industry would appear to have the best overall performance in community relations.

Corporate Governance

There are two industries with high average strengths in corporate governance: 0 (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing) and 6 (Financial Services). Industry 0’s high average could be the result of the small number of observations in the sample ($n=44$).

Table Four Significant differences among industries

Corporate Governance	Strengths	Concerns
High*	0 and 6	9
Low**		4 and 6

* significantly greater than five or more industries

**significantly less than five or more industries

Industry 6 (Financial Services) is high in strengths and low in concerns. Hoitash et al. (2009) document that audit committees with higher accounting and financial experience more effectively

oversee the internal control system. This results in fewer material weaknesses in financial reporting and more transparency. The financial services industry does not lack accounting and finance experts. Our results support the Hoitash et al. (2009) finding.

Diversity

Table Five Significant differences among industries

Diversity	Strengths	Concerns
High*		1 and 3
Low**	1, 3 and 8	2

* significantly greater than five or more industries

**significantly less than five or more industries

With diversity, not surprisingly, industries 1 (Mining and Construction) and 3 (Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment Manufacturing) are low in strengths and high in concerns. Traditionally, both industries employ men, primarily. Note that this is not necessarily bad. It is likely to be a reflection of the people who are interested in the work and who possess the physical strength necessary to perform the required tasks. Industry 8 (Health, Legal, Education, Social and Engineering Services) is low in diversity strengths while industry 2 (Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and Chemical Manufacturing) is low in concerns.

Employee Relations

Table Six Significant differences among industries

Employee Relations	Strengths	Concerns
High*	2	5 and 9
Low**		6, 7 and 8

* significantly greater than five or more industries

**significantly less than five or more industries

Industry 2 (Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and Chemical Manufacturing) is the only one that is high in average strengths. Industries 5 (Trade, Wholesale and Retail) and 9 (Public Administration) are high in employee relations concerns. A general observation may lend credence to these findings. Wal-Mart, a very large corporate member of industry 5, has had numerous employee law suits. One (*USA Today* 11/2/2005) alleged that Wal-Mart forced hourly employees to work off the clock, failed to pay overtime, and prevented employees from taking rest and lunch breaks.

Industries 6 (Financial Services), 7 (Hotel, Personal, Business, Auto and Amusement Services) and 8 (Health, Legal, Education, Social and Engineering Services) are low in employee relations concerns. Employee relations are well-regulated in the U.S. In addition, most companies realize employees are their most valuable assets and strive to develop good relations with them. For example, during our test period, employees in financial services earned relatively higher salaries than those in other industries.

Environment

The results in the environmental issue are particularly interesting. Three industries (2, 4 and 9) are high in strengths and high in concerns; they may be demonstrating the corporate social responsibility/irresponsibility finding discussed by Kotchen and Moon (2011). The small sample size for industry 9 (Public Administration) makes it difficult to interpret the finding of high environmental strengths and concerns. The results could be influenced by the presence of outliers.

Table Seven Significant differences among industries

Environment	Strengths	Concerns
High*	2, 3, 4 and 9	1, 2, 4 and 9
Low**	5, 6, 7 and 8	3, 5, 6, 7 and 8

* significantly greater than five or more industries

**significantly less than five or more industries

Industry 2 (Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and Chemical Manufacturing) and industry 4 (Transportation and Public Utilities) each have been in the headlines in the past (*e.g.*, many still recall the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Prince William Sound or the Three Mile Island nuclear accident). Widespread public concerns about firms in these industries may have prompted them to engage in positive, socially responsible environmental actions.

These results support what a number of earlier studies have reported. Holmes (1977) finds that oil, gas and mining companies are concerned with pollution reduction and conservation. Rowley and Berman (2000) find that firms in high impact industries, such as natural resource exploitation and heavy industry may engage in socially responsible behaviors as a way to “insulate” themselves from possible negative public relations events. Prior, et al. (2008) find that metal mining, oil and gas field exploration services had the highest CSR rating. They postulate that regulated sectors are more politically sensitive with high stakeholder power. This supports the very environment strengths. Godfrey, et al. (2010 p.335) report that public utilities “invest heavily in environmental CSR.”

Industries 5 (Trade, Wholesale and Retail), 6 (Financial Services), 7 (Hotel, Personal, Business, Auto and Amusement Services) and 8 (Health, Legal, Education, Social and Engineering Services) are low in both environmental strengths and concerns. It appears the environment is not a critical issue area for these industries. Industry 3 (Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment Manufacturing), with high average strengths and low average concerns, appears to have the best overall environmental performance record.

Human Rights

In the human rights issue area, industry 1 (Mining and Construction) stands out with high strengths and high concerns.

[As mentioned previously, results from both industries 0 (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing) and 9 (Public Administration) are difficult to interpret because of the small number of observations.] Recall that two major aspects of the human rights issue area are labor rights and the countries in which the companies do business.

Table Eight Significant differences among industries

Human Rights	Strengths	Concerns
High*	0 and 1	0, 1 and 9
Low**		4, 6, 7 and 8

* significantly greater than five or more industries

**significantly less than five or more industries

Product

Industry 2 (Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and Chemical Manufacturing) is one of the industries with high average product strengths; it is also high in average product concerns. One of the concerns in the product issue area is product safety. That said, it is easy to think of food safety issues (*e.g.*, salmonella and E. coli poisoning) and the safety issues of tobacco have long been in the headlines.

Table Nine Significant differences among industries

Product	Strengths	Concerns
High*	2 and 3	0, 2, 4, 8 and 9
Low**		1, 3, 5, 6 and 7

* significantly greater than five or more industries

**significantly less than five or more industries

Industry 3 (Primary Materials, Machines, and Equipment Manufacturing) is high in product strengths and low in concerns. From society's point of view, this reflects the best performance in the product issue area. Another interesting aspect of the results in

this area is that the industries appear to be evenly “split” relative to the concerns. Five industries have means which are significantly greater than the means of the other five industries.

RESULTS BY INDUSTRY

It can be informative to organize the results by industry. In this section, we will very briefly discuss the issue areas which are relevant in each industry, based on our findings.

Industry 0 (Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing)

The description of our findings for this industry must be tempered with the acknowledgement that the number of observations is low and the results could be unduly influenced by a few outliers. Industry 0 is high in community relations concerns, high in corporate governance strengths, high in environment concerns, high in both human rights strengths and concerns and high in product concerns.

Industry 1 (Mining and Construction)

Industry 1 has high community relations concerns, low diversity strengths and high concerns, high environment concerns, high human rights strengths and concerns and low product concerns.

Industry 2 (Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and Chemical Manufacturing)

This industry shows good performance in community relations; it is high in strengths and low in concerns. In addition, industry 2 is low in diversity concerns, high in employee relations strengths, high in environment strengths and concerns and high in product strengths and concerns.

Industry 3 (Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment Manufacturing)

Industry 3 is low in community relations concerns, low in diversity strengths and high in concerns. In the environment and product issue areas, this industry performs well. Industry 3 is high in strengths and low in concerns for both issues.

Industry 4 (Transportation and Public Utilities)

This industry is high in community relations strengths and concerns, low in corporate governance concerns, high in environment strengths and concerns, low in human rights concerns and high in product concerns.

Industry 5 (Trade, Wholesale and Retail)

Industry 5 has low community relations concerns, high employee relations concerns, low environment strengths and concerns, and low product concerns.

Industry 6 (Financial Services)

This industry is high in community relations strengths and concerns, low in employee relations concerns, low in environment strengths and concerns, low in human rights concerns and low in product concerns. The financial services industry appears to have the best corporate governance performance of all the industries; it has high strengths and low concerns.

Industry 7 (Hotel, Personal, Business, Auto and Amusement Services)

Industry 7 has low community relations concerns, low employee relations concerns, low environment strengths and concerns, low human rights concerns and low product concerns.

Industry 8 (Health, Legal, Education, Social and Engineering Services)

This industry is low in community relations concerns, low in diversity strengths, low in employee relations concerns, low in environment strengths and concerns, low in human rights concerns and high in product concerns.

Industry 9 (Public Administration)

As with industry 0, the description of the findings for industry 9 must begin with a word of caution. The small sample size for this industry means the results could be influenced by the presence of a few outliers. Industry 9 is high in community relations strengths and concerns, is high in corporate governance concerns, high in employee relations concerns, high in environment strengths and concerns, high in human rights concerns and high in product concerns.

CONCLUSION

Using ANOVA and KLD data, we examine strengths and weaknesses separately and gained insights into how CSR, a complex, multi-dimensional construct, varies across industries. Consistent with our argument that industry is an important factor in examining CSR performance, we find systematic differences in strengths and concerns in all CSR issue areas across one-digit SIC code industries.

Based on this finding, we suggest that future research consider the impact of industry on the corporate social responsibility performance of firms. Our paper initiates the study of the industry impact on CSR performance. Further studies in this area may help us better understand this complex construct.

REFERENCES

- Amato, C. H. and L.H. Amato. 2011. Corporate commitment to global quality of life issues: Do slack resources, industry affiliations, and multinational headquarters matter? *Business and Society* 50(2): 388 – 416.
- Andersen, M.L. and L. Olsen. 2011. Corporate social and financial performance: A canonical correlation analysis. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal* 15(2):17-37.
- Barnea, A. and A. Rubin. 2010. Corporate social responsibility as a conflict between shareholders. *Journal of Business Ethics* 97(1):71-86.
- Callan, S.J. and J.M. Thomas. 2009. Corporate financial performance and corporate social performance: An update and reinvestigation. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 16(2):61-78.
- Carroll, A.B. 1979. A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review* 4(4):497-505.
- Carroll, Archie B. 2000. A commentary and an overview of key questions on corporate social performance measurement. *Business & Society* 39(4): 466-478.
- Chih, H.L., C.H. Shen and F.C. Kang. 2008. Corporate social responsibility, investor protection, and earnings management: Some international evidence. *Journal of Business Ethics* 79(1-2):179-198.
- Godfrey, P.C., N. W. Hatch and J. M. Hansen. 2010. Toward a general theory of CSRs: The roles of beneficence,

profitability, insurance and industry heterogeneity. *Business & Society* 49(2): 316-344.

Griffin J. J. and J. F. Mahon. 1997. The corporate social performance and corporate financial performance debate: Twenty-five years of incomparable research. *Business and Society* 36(1):5-31.

Hillman, A. and G. Keim. 2001. Shareholder value, stakeholder management and social issues: What's the bottom line? *Strategic Management Journal* 22(2):125-139.

Hoitash, U., R. Hoitash and J. Bedard. 2009. Corporate governance and internal control over financial reporting: A comparison of regulatory regimes. *The Accounting Review* 84(3):839-867.

Holmes, S.L. 1977. Corporate social performance: Past and present areas of commitment. *Academy of Management Journal* 20(3): 433-438.

Hong, Y. and M.L. Andersen. 2011. The relationship between corporate social responsibility and earnings management: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Ethics* 104(4):461-471.

Ingraham, R.W. 1978. An investigation of the information content of (certain) social responsibility disclosures. *Journal of Accounting Research* 16(2): 270 – 285.

Kim, I. and M. Venkatachalam. 2011. Are sin stocks paying the price for accounting sins? *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance* 26(2):415-442.

- Kim, Y., M.S. Park and B. Wier. 2012. Is earnings quality associated with corporate social responsibility? *The Accounting Review*. Forthcoming.
- Kotchen, M. J. and J. J. Moon. 2011. Corporate social responsibility for irresponsibility. National Bureau of Economic Research WP 17254. July 2011.
- Mattingly and Berman. 2006. Measurement of Corporate Social Action: Discovering Taxonomy in the Kinder Lydenburg Domini Ratings Data. *Business & Society* 45(1): 20-46.
- McWilliams, A. and D. Siegel. 2001. Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 26:117-127.
- Miles, R.H. 1987. *Managing the corporate social environment: A grounded theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood cliffs, N.J.
- Padgett, R. C. and J. I. Galan. 2010. The effect of R&D intensity on corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics* 93(3):407-418.
- Porter, M. E. 1980. *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. The Free Press. New York, NY.
- Porter, M.E. and M.R. Kramer. 2006. The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review* 84(12):78-92.
- Prior, D., J. Surroca and J. A. Tribo. 2008. Are socially responsible managers really ethical? Exploring the relationship between earnings management and corporate

social responsibility. *Corporate Governance* 16(3): 160-177.

Rowley, T. and S. Berman. 2000. A brand new brand of corporate social performance. *Business & Society* 39(4): 397-418.

Scott, W. R. 2001. *Institutions and Organizations Second Edition*. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Sethi, S. P. and L. M Sama. 1998. Ethical Behavior as a strategic choice by large corporations: The interactive effect of market-place competition, industry structure and firm resources. *Business Ethics Quarterly*. 8(1): 85-104.

Sharman, M. 1996. The construct validity of the Kinder, Lydenberg & Domini Social performance ratings data. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 15(3):287-296.

Siegel, D. S. and D. F. Vitaliano. 2007. An empirical analysis of the strategic use of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*. 16(3):773-792.

Small Business Notes. Public Administration Industry. Online. June 30, 2012.
<http://www.smallbusinessnotes.com/Starting-a-business/public-administration-industry.html>

Smith, N.C. and H. Ward. 2007. Corporate social responsibility at a crossroads? *Business Strategy Review*. 18(1):16-21.

Stewart, T.A. 2006. Corporate social responsibility: Getting the logic right. *Harvard Business Review*. 84(12):14.

Strike, V.M., J. Gao and P. Bansal. 2006. Being good while being bad: Social responsibility and the international

diversification of US firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*. 37(6): 850-862.

USA Today. 2005.

http://www.usatoday.com/money/companies/management/2005-11-02-walmart-employees_x.htm

Waddock, Sandra. 2003. Myths and realities of social investing. *Organization and Environment*. 16(3):369-380.

Waddock, S.A. and S.B. Graves. 1997. The corporate social performance – financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal* 18(4):303-319.

APPENDIX

Table One Ranking of Industries: COMMUNITY RELATIONS STRENGTHS

Industry	N	Strengths
9 Public Administration	59	0.56
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.27
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.25
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.21
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.15
3 Primary Materials, Machines and	5,188	0.15
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.09
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.08
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.05
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.02

Table Two Ranking of Industries: COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONCERNS

Industry	N	Concerns
9 Public Administration	59	0.31
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.27
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.19
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.14
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.11
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.09
3 Primary Materials, Machines and	5,188	0.05
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.03
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.03
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.02

Table Three Ranking of Industries: CORPORATE GOVERNANCE STRENGTHS

Industry	N	Strengths
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.43
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.25
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.18
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.16
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.15
9 Public Administration	59	0.15
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.14
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.14
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.13
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.13

Table Four Ranking of Industries: CORPORATE GOVERNANCE CONCERNS

Industry	N	Concerns
9 Public Administration	59	0.86
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.61
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.41
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.41
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.38
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.38
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.37
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.35
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.32
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.27

Table Five Ranking of Industries: DIVERSITY STRENGTHS

Industry	N	Strengths
9 Public Administration	59	0.90
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.77
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.73
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.72
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.70
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.57
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.50
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.43
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.42
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.13

Table Six Ranking of Industries: DIVERSITY CONCERNS

Industry	N	Concerns
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.47
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.41
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.39
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.36
9 Public Administration	59	0.36
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.33
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.33
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.32
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.31
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.24

Table Seven Ranking of Industries: EMPLOYEE STRENGTHS

Industry	N	Strengths
9 Public Administration	59	0.44
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.43
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.38
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.37
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.34
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.32
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.24
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.20
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.20
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.09

Table Eight Ranking of Industries: EMPLOYEE CONCERNS

Industry	N	Concerns
9 Public Administration	59	0.75
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.68
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.56
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.49
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.49
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.48
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.44
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.40
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.35
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.21

Table Nine Ranking of Industries: ENVIRONMENT STRENGTHS

Industry	N	Strengths
9 Public Administration	59	0.36
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.25
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.24
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.22
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.20
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.14
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.08
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.03
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.02
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.01

Table Ten Ranking of Industries: ENVIRONMENT CONCERNS

Industry	N	Concerns
9 Public Administration	59	1.34
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.61
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.58
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.58
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.46
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.25
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.10
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.02
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.01
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.01

Table Eleven Ranking of Industries: HUMAN RIGHTS STRENGTHS

Industry	N	Strengths
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.14
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.01
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.01
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.01
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.00
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.00
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.00
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.00
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.00
9 Public Administration	59	0.00

Table Twelve Ranking of Industries: HUMAN RIGHTS CONCERNS

Industry	N	Concerns
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.48
9 Public Administration	59	0.31
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.15
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.10
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.10
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.08
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.06
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.03
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.02
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.02

Table Thirteen Ranking of Industries: PRODUCT STRENGTHS

Industry	N	Strengths
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.13
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.11
9 Public Administration	59	0.07
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.07
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.06
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.05
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.05
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.03
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.02
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.00

Table Fourteen Ranking of Industries: PRODUCT CONCERNS

Industry	N	Concerns
9 Public Administration	59	0.93
0 Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	44	0.50
4 Transportation and Public Utilities	2,216	0.37
2 Food, Tobacco, Apparel, Petroleum and	3,574	0.36
8 Health, Legal, Education, Social and	674	0.30
6 Financial Services	4,188	0.23
5 Trade, Wholesale and Retail	2,081	0.19
3 Primary Materials, Machines and Equipment	5,188	0.16
1 Mining and Construction	1,106	0.15
7 Hotel, Personal Business, Auto and	2,221	0.13