

Redefining Corporate Responsibility in a Global Economy

AN

AGENDA

FOR

ACTION



JOB
FOR
THE FUTURE

Jobs for the Future (JFF) is a national, non-profit organization that conducts research, provides technical assistance, and proposes policy innovation on the inter-related issues of work and learning. Founded in 1983, JFF's goal is to encourage policies and practices that prepare all citizens for effective transitions between learning and work. For the past five years, we have worked at the local, state, and national levels to develop a new system for linking employers with schools and for placing all youth on career paths.

THE
HITACHI
FOUNDATION

In November of 1985, Hitachi, Ltd. of Tokyo established The Hitachi Foundation in Washington, DC as a nonprofit, philanthropic organization with a mission to promote social responsibility through effective participation in a global society. The Foundation seeks to build the capacity of all Americans, particularly those under-served by traditional institutions, to address the multicultural, community, and global issues facing them. The Foundation also seeks to engage Hitachi companies with critical social issues. The Foundation program emphasizes issues of diversity, multiculturalism, youth service, collaboration, corporate responsibility, and effective participation in a global society.

Redefining Corporate Responsibility in a Global Economy



AN AGENDA FOR ACTION

Foreword	5
Toward a Global Community	9
The “Win-Win”: Strategic Social Investment	17
Models of Partnership:	
Confrontation to Collaboration	27
Corporate Leadership in a Global Economy	39
Bibliography	40
Advisory Council	43
Interviews	43

Support for this project has been provided by
The Hitachi Foundation.

**JOBS FOR
THE
FUTURE**

February 1996

FOREWORD

In 1992, **The Hitachi Foundation**, in conjunction with **Jobs for the Future**, discussed the need for and practicality of a critical review of the issue of *global corporate citizenship*—a frequently used, but ill-defined concept. The time for such an exploration seemed right: the private sector was in a phase of inexorable expansion worldwide; corporate profits were beginning to recover; and it was clear that the corporate role in community development was in flux. Furthermore, many governments seemed to be struggling with the consequences of declining public confidence in their capacities to cope with social and economic needs and a corresponding reduction in public coffers sufficient for the task. Workforce development issues increasingly were at the forefront of policy discussions, due to corporate downsizing and the increasing technological and skill requirements needed to remain competitive.

Both the Foundation and Jobs for the Future had an interest in formulating a project that could add substance to the debate on what corporate citizenship and responsibility needed to be in the 21st century. Each institution had its own reasons for wanting to address the matter: the Foundation because of its commitment to engagement issues of the future; and Jobs for the Future because it sought the opportunity to widen its focus to include the impact of global changes on the economy and workforce. In addition, the Foundation hoped to influence the thinking and actions of its benefactor, Hitachi, Ltd. and other corporations, in terms of how corporate-community involvement might need to be expanded and redirected, given global changes in the market and workforce development requirements.

WE HAD AN
INTEREST IN
FORMULATING
A PROJECT
THAT COULD
ADD
SUBSTANCE TO
THE DEBATE
ON WHAT
CORPORATE
CITIZENSHIP
AND
RESPONSIBILITY
NEEDED TO BE
IN THE
21ST CENTURY.

THE INTENT
WAS TO
DEVELOP AN
“ACTION
AGENDA” THAT
CORPORATIONS
AND
COMMUNITIES
COULD
UNDERTAKE
JOINTLY TO
ADDRESS
WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT
MORE
EFFECTIVELY.

Drawing upon Jobs for the Future’s expertise, it was decided that *workforce development* would be the initial focus of inquiry. The intent was to develop an “action agenda” that corporations and communities could undertake jointly to address workforce development more effectively. This approach made sense from a corporate perspective, since the literature is legion with observations on the shortage of skilled workers and commentaries on the best ways to foster the development of necessary skills. From the vantage of communities worldwide, this approach also made sense, since unemployment and underemployment seemed to be growing problems, particularly in those communities affected by corporate and government restructuring. For The Hitachi Foundation and Jobs for the Future, there was also the prospect of learning from this work together and advancing our individual agendas on global corporate citizenship and workforce development.

As we expected, the partnership between the Foundation and Jobs for the Future was a microcosm of some of the difficulties and rewards to be found in the *corporate-community relationship*. Each partner had to analyze some of its basic assumptions and hypotheses about what we could expect from corporations, what communities were responsible for, and who (or what) could bridge the gap between the two. This created a healthy atmosphere of creative tension—in the end of great value to both institutions and, we think, the project outcome itself.

This Action Agenda is designed to promote collaboration between corporations and communities. It is by no means a comprehensive cookbook, presenting new recipes for post-Cold War corporate-community relationships. It is, however, a first step in a journey that we believe is not only important, but necessary. Our work together has taught us a great deal

about the ingredients of collaboration and the challenges that corporations and communities face as they work together to confront the economic and social realities of the late 20th and early 21st century.

We sincerely hope that the work of this project and the issues that it raises will be carried on in a number of different directions. While the whole notion of corporate responsibility is a global issue and cannot be confined to practices within a single country, this Agenda focuses primarily on companies with operations in the United States. Clearly, we are in need of more and better case examples of the kinds of collaboration which are introduced here—from the United States and around the world.

In addition, the public sector's role in fostering corporate-community partnerships on workforce development must be explored further in order to make this Action Agenda comprehensive. We intentionally left the matter of government policy and involvement aside in the first phase of this work to keep the project manageable. However, government programs and policies—at the local, state, federal, and international levels—play an important role in creating incentives (or disincentives) for corporate-community collaboration.

We hope that this Action Agenda provokes thinking, discussion, and action that enhances the role that companies can play through involvement with critical social and community issues. For this document to be of value, we need to hear responses from the field—from those in companies and community organizations who are working to create new connections for their employees and residents.

We close by expressing our deepest appreciation to all who have cooperated in this enterprise. A special thanks to those who offered their frank opinions and insights during

several courses of interviews. In addition, we recognize and are grateful for the continuous involvement of the Advisory Council. Their comments and suggestions throughout have been of great value. Finally, our appreciation goes out to the external readers of the many drafts of this document. They have been unstinting in providing the authors with excellent ideas and editorial comment.



Delwin A. Roy
President and CEO
The Hitachi Foundation



Hilary C. Pennington
President
Jobs for the Future

TOWARD A GLOBAL COMMUNITY

This paper proposes an action agenda for strengthening corporate-community partnerships for workforce development in a global economy. It grows out of a collaboration between Jobs for the Future (JFF), a non-profit research and policy organization, and The Hitachi Foundation, a corporate foundation which has practiced global philanthropy since its inception ten years ago.¹

The report is intended primarily to challenge, inform, and assist leaders of American corporations² in directing their investments—production, workforce, and philanthropic—toward strengthening human resources and civic infrastructure in a rapidly changing, interdependent global economy. We hope it will also be useful to community and labor leaders as they work with corporations toward these ends.

Our goal is to provoke a more considered debate about the relationship between corporations and communities in a global economy and, beyond that, to inform action by providing a framework against which both corporations and communities can focus and evaluate their activities.

THE NEED FOR AN ACTION AGENDA

The advent of a *global economy*, in which goods and services are traded throughout the world, is fundamentally restructuring basic economic institutions and corporations' relationships to their workers and the communities in which they do business. Unlike those of past generations, today's corporations produce goods and services through strategic partnerships with other companies all over the world, have varying employment structures ranging from permanent

¹ The analysis and recommendations presented here were developed over eighteen months of extensive discussion, literature reviews, and interviews with corporate and community leaders. They were further debated and refined through discussions with a multi-sector Advisory Council. See page 43 for Advisory Council members and people with whom interviews were conducted.

² This paper pertains more to U.S. firms than to all firms irrespective of national origin. Obviously, there are elements of the analysis and recommendations that do apply across the board given the increasingly generic character of corporate responses to international competition. However, there are also key differences, depending on the unique cultural, legal/regulatory, and social circumstances of each country.

THE PACE AND
NATURE OF
THESE CHANGES
...ARE FEEDING
A NEW SENSE OF
DISCONNECT-
EDNESS THAT
UNDERMINES
TRADITIONAL
CONCEPTS OF
COMMUNITY.

employees to temporary contract workers, and fulfill production needs through a variety of supplier networks and outsourcing. The increasing flexibility of corporate structures, employment relationships, and production networks raises basic questions about what will constitute a company in tomorrow's economy and what the nature of jobs or job security will be.

These questions are further complicated by *eight emerging economic trends* that are shaping the future.

These include:

- pressure toward more interdependent open markets;
- increasingly mobile factors of production;
- decreasing international wage differences and increasing intra-national wage differences;
- replacement of “job” security with a new notion of “career” or “employability” security;
- increasing use of non-wage alternatives to obtain, maintain, and retrain the most experienced workers;
- increasing access to knowledge, facilitated through the growth of electronic technologies;
- a need for new managerial skills and structures to accommodate the diverse workplace of the future; and
- continued strain on and change of traditional family structures and stability.

The pace and nature of these changes, as they affect workplaces and home life, are feeding a *new sense of disconnect-
edness* that undermines traditional concepts of community. The effects appear in many different forms, including increasing suicide, teen pregnancy, and divorce rates, and growing instances of ethnic and racial tension around the world. People rely less and less on close-knit home and work com-

munities for support, and employees are valued for the skills they can contribute to the workplace in the immediate-term, rather than for the experience they have built up over years of service to a corporation.

These changes provoke growing public anxiety about economic security and the traditional *social compact* between employers, workers, and communities. The public and the media alike are reacting negatively to what they perceive as a pattern of “lean and mean” corporate disinvestment: companies shopping the world for low-cost labor; underinvesting in worker skills, safety, and working conditions; outsourcing more work and relying on contingent workers without benefits; and increasing work hours and overtime, which further strains family structures. Corporate complacency in the face of such anxiety would be short-sighted and self-deceptive.

In this report, we suggest that corporations and communities working together have the responsibility and opportunity to redefine their relationships with each other and to mend the splintered fragments of traditional values and community. This task does not rest solely in the hands of one player or the other; working together through a variety of avenues, corporations and communities can become leaders in defining and creating a new kind of global community.

COMMITMENT, NOT COMMAND

Effective responses will not resemble old models of corporate largesse or government activism. Therefore, this call to action looks beyond external command and control and invites a new reciprocal commitment to shared responsibility. It defines corporate and community self-interest in the root sense: corporate—as in collective—responsibility.

THESE CHANGES
PROVOKE
GROWING
PUBLIC ANXIETY
ABOUT
ECONOMIC
SECURITY AND
THE
TRADITIONAL
SOCIAL
COMPACT
BETWEEN
EMPLOYERS,
WORKERS, AND
COMMUNITIES.

“STRATEGIC
SOCIAL
INVESTMENT”
ALLOWS
COMPANIES TO
LOOK BEYOND
IMMEDIATE
COST
CALCULATIONS
IN MAKING
DECISIONS
ABOUT
WORKFORCE,
COMMUNITY,
AND
PHILANTHROPIC
INVESTMENTS.

We advocate that corporations adopt a model of investment commonly called *strategic social investment*, which allows them to look beyond immediate cost calculations in making decisions about workforce, community, and philanthropic investments. This approach replaces traditional paths to competitiveness (such as cutting costs, minimizing labor costs through wage cuts, automation, and outsourcing), many of which impair a company’s ability to innovate and remain competitive in the long-run and contribute to a downward spiral in standards of living and workforce skills.

Instead, this model urges companies to achieve business goals by investing in employee skills and fostering an environment for innovation and high quality. Strategic social investment thus implies a fundamental change in corporate approaches to “social responsibility”—from a model in which philanthropic activities and business operations are weakly related to a model of investment that integrates philanthropy strategically with overall corporate strategy, combining workforce development, supplier and customer relations, public relations, and business goals into a coherent package, guided by the strategic and marketing priorities of the firm and executed consistently throughout the world.

In conjunction with redefining the corporate role, communities can also benefit from exploring ways to increase, expand, and pursue joint action on the common interests that they share with corporations. Communities can use different strategies to influence corporations toward a model of strategic social investment, working proactively to shape their own futures in the global economy.

In some ways, the best corporate-community partnerships today resemble many of the features that characterize corporate restructuring: an emphasis on building human capacity and empowering those on the frontline; a holistic, rather than

fragmented, approach to complex, inter-related problems; attention to assets rather than deficits; and a focus on systemic change rather than episodic programmatic “fixes.”

What is needed overall is not action in just one community or corporation, but in many—enough to change corporate and political culture broadly. If such efforts become common practice rather than isolated exceptions, they hold significant potential for addressing the major challenges communities and corporations face in the global economy and for building the kind of workforce and civic infrastructure that ultimately advances the commonwealth.

ACTION AGENDA

Building on the new relationship that is emerging between communities and corporations in the context of a dramatically changing economy, we ask corporations and communities to join together in action toward the following common goals:

1 Increase the productive capacities of people through corporate and community strategies that improve education and training and eliminate barriers to employment.

Priorities include:

- Fostering “employability security,” if not job security;
- Understanding lifelong learning, education, and training as mutual obligations;
- Developing support mechanisms such as portable health care, pensions, and other benefits;
- Linking corporate leadership training with community development and outreach;
- Investing in family support programs for employees, such as flex-time, early childhood education, daycare, childcare, and eldercare alternatives;
- Establishing clear and comprehensive training goals for firms and workers;

IF SUCH
EFFORTS
BECOME
COMMON
PRACTICE
RATHER THAN
ISOLATED
EXCEPTIONS,
THEY HOLD
SIGNIFICANT
POTENTIAL FOR
ADDRESSING
THE MAJOR
CHALLENGES
COMMUNITIES
AND
CORPORATIONS
FACE IN THE
GLOBAL
ECONOMY.

- Developing uniform standards for skills and technological expertise; and
- Setting community service goals for corporate leadership.

2 Strengthen civic infrastructure by joining firms, intermediary organizations, and governments to build networks, norms, and levels of trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit.

Priorities include:

- Strengthening job-creation networks between companies and their suppliers to increase employment opportunities and broaden access to labor market information;
- Establishing a human resource information network within the community to exchange information relating to worker training and development;
- Promoting entrepreneurial activities within the community such as developing venture capital/“revolving loan” partnerships to provide seed capital for new enterprises in the community;
- Encouraging capital markets to be more responsive and accountable to changing workplace needs by adopting accounting practices and financial evaluations that place positive value on human resource investments; working to ensure long-term reform is appropriately supported by long-term investment;
- Developing institutions and networks (such as labor/management councils, labor unions, community organizations, school, churches, and others) that better support workers and family structures in an increasingly mobile and fragmented society;
- Strengthening community-based institutions and initiatives by providing corporate leadership, mentors, and volunteers; and
- Developing partnerships with secondary and postsecondary schools; promoting corporate involvement in school reform and school-to-career transition efforts.

A Global Social Investment Strategy

	INVEST IN YOUR EMPLOYEES	INVEST IN YOUR SUPPLIERS	INVEST IN YOUR COMMUNITIES
INCREASE PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY	<p>Focus on “employability” security if not job security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Offer training and learning opportunities that are not directly related to job tasks; ❑ Work with suppliers, unions, and other companies to maximize employment opportunities for displaced workers; ❑ Invest in spin-offs for entrepreneurial workers; ❑ Provide opportunities for education and training; ❑ Increase investment in front-line, lower-skilled workers. <p>Invest in your employees’ families:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Provide benefits, flextime, daycare. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Offer management assistance and training to help suppliers improve quality and worker skills; ❑ Open in-house training to employees in supplier firms. 	<p>Contribute the time and expertise of employees to civic and other community endeavors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Encourage volunteerism through release time (paid or otherwise); ❑ Contribute managerial, financial, and technical assistance to community efforts; ❑ Work with other companies to create more uniform skill standards. <p>Invest in your employees’ families:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Provide benefits, flextime, daycare.
BUILD CIVIC INFRA-STRUCTURE	<p>Use community service as a leadership training strategy for employees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Train junior managers for community service; ❑ Create employee committees to guide local philanthropy; ❑ Create labor buffers that minimize layoffs, such as arrangements that make it easier for employees to maintain benefits and seniority during downturns by being “loaned” to community projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Include suppliers in discussions about strategic social investment; ❑ Establish labor and environmental standards for suppliers and subcontractors; ❑ Ask suppliers to accept standards of social investment and to extend these standards to their own suppliers. 	<p>Participate in planning, delivering, and assessing community education and training opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Establish partnerships with local high schools, colleges, and community-based organizations to provide job-training opportunities; ❑ Participate in school-to-work, welfare-to-work, and adult retraining partnerships that ease the transition to or back into the labor market; ❑ Help strengthen community-based organizations that advance the local community’s interests.
ENCOURAGE DIVERSITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Provide jobs and access to diverse groups; ❑ Create a corporate culture that features diversity as an asset in global competition through internal hiring, training, and promotion practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Offer management assistance and training to help suppliers improve quality and worker skills; ❑ Open in-house training to employees in supplier firms; ❑ Ask suppliers to accept standards of social investment and to extend these standards to their own suppliers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Provide jobs and access to diverse groups in your community; ❑ Be known for a corporate culture that features diversity as an asset in global competition through internal hiring, training, and promotion practices.
INCREASE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY & REDUCE POVERTY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Maintain employment guarantees or job security, where possible. Use secure employment as a way to motivate high worker commitment, productivity, and willingness to take risks; ❑ Consider employee ownership as an alternative to shutdown; ❑ Offer profit-sharing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Ask suppliers to accept standards of social investment and to extend these standards to their own suppliers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Avoid “bidding wars” over location of new business facilities.

3 Value and encourage diversity as a strategic asset essential to business success.

Priorities include:

- Implementing hiring, promotion, and training practices that encompass diversity as an asset in global competition;
- Developing communication, negotiation, and facilitation skills across a variety of cultural boundaries;
- Collaborating with others to develop community activities which celebrate diversity as essential to strong community life and which expand a sense of shared community;
- Supporting civic activities that embrace diversity as essential to strong community life; and
- Supporting universities, museums, cultural centers, libraries, public forums, and all institutions that foster knowledge of and respect for diverse cultures.

4 Strengthen global efforts to reduce poverty, a force that limits the numbers of consumers and ferments economically destabilizing social unrest and illegal immigration.

Priorities include:

- Increasing support for micro-enterprise development;
- Loaning corporate staff for planning and managing public sector employment projects; and
- Providing assistance in capacity building and with strategic planning for labor-intensive, sustainable development strategies in low income areas.

In pursuing the four goals of this Action Agenda, *two governing principles* should be adopted: (1) we must build upon the successes and lessons learned from past change efforts; and (2) we must evaluate new initiatives rigorously, in order to measure progress, allow for mid-course corrections, and ensure initiatives' long-term viability.

THE “WIN-WIN”: STRATEGIC SOCIAL INVESTMENT

Strategic social investment is in the self-interest of global corporations for three important reasons. First, *it makes good business sense* given the continued restructuring of work required by today’s emphasis on customer satisfaction, lower prices, quality, and innovation. These trends will continue to erode old-style, “command and control” corporate structures in favor of those which give workers greater freedom, power, and discretion. Such commitment and discretionary effort are becoming essential to the performance of many transnational corporations. In light of this shift, strategic social investment through which corporations define, and fulfill, a new employment contract with their workers and establish strong relationships with the communities in which they do business is more important than ever.

Second, as the corporate leaders we interviewed suggest, *strategic social investment can be a more effective form of civic involvement* than a diffuse corporate charitable contributions program. Corporations that once undertook a broad variety of civic activities are finding that they need to apply the same discipline and strategic thinking to community affairs and corporate philanthropy as they have to their mainline business. Strategic social investment offers a framework for integrating these activities into a more coherent whole with greater potential impact.

Finally, *strategic social investment may be an effective defense strategy*—since it is likely that someone else will define the standards of global citizenship if corporations do not do it for themselves.

MODELS FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: A FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION

Partly in response to these forces, a new concept of global citizenship is emerging that views workforce development, supplier relations, philanthropy, public relations, and volunteerism by employees as part of the same package, guided by the strategic and marketing priorities of the firm. These firms operate in terms of strategic social investment, not charity, and the activity is perceived to enhance the firm's competitiveness.

Moving toward a model of strategic social investment does not require starting from scratch. Many companies practice elements of it already. Yet, the framework for action we propose here goes significantly beyond common practice for two reasons: it advocates linking disparate efforts into a coherent strategy; and it suggests applying this strategy not just in domestic markets, but in all of a corporation's facilities worldwide.

Building on the guidelines for standards of excellence in community relations developed by the Center for Corporate-Community Relations at Boston College, we propose that transnational corporations:

1 Develop a formal commitment to a social vision.

A corporation should implement a strategic planning/visioning process that ties social responsibility to its worldwide business strategy. This definition of social responsibility should be corporate-wide with a coherent framework of values and consistent standards, no matter where the corporation operates globally.



Community expectations can influence how broadly—or narrowly—a corporation defines its involvement in community affairs. “Community Involvement in Foreign-Owned Companies,” a survey of 108 foreign-owned companies in the U.S. conducted by David Logan for the Conference Board, provides interesting evidence that corporate citizenship can be expanded as a result of the expectations countries and communities have for corporate practice. The majority see community involvement as an important aspect of doing business in the U.S. and include it in their business planning process, rather than leaving it to chance. Their giving levels (at one percent of pre-tax income) and giving patterns approximate those of domestic companies. Yet, Logan concludes, most companies are not nearly as innovative or proactive as they could be—either locally or as a force for a consistent standard for global citizenship.



2 Designate responsibility for managing strategic social investment. Within this central framework, local branches, sales offices, and production sites should be delegated substantial decision-making, discretion, and authority in how the corporation’s values are implemented.



At the U.S.-based corporate and manufacturing facilities of Hitachi, employees have come together to form Community Action Committees (CACs)—teams of employees who devise, support, and participate in projects which improve the quality of life and workforce in the facilities’ host communities.

Responding to the needs of each local community, CAC activities reflect Hitachi's commitment to its publicly articulated strategic social investment priorities: corporate citizenship, multicultural awareness, and global competitiveness—priorities reflected in their philanthropic contributions as in these local partnerships. Recent projects have included: cultural exchanges between teachers from Kentucky and Japan; support of a new public television series designed to attract grade-school students to careers in the sciences; mentoring and career preparation programs for local students; a playground-sized “world-view” map which helps students in Long Beach and Irvine, CA learn about and picture world events; and, in a period of corporate transition, an employee “loan” program between one of the facilities and the local public library. The local action of the CACs is complemented by matching grants, technical assistance, and other supports from the Washington, DC-based Hitachi Foundation.



3 Establish internal structures, policies, and practices to further strategic social investment. These include:

- a formal, visible process for strategic planning for social investment that involves headquarters and branch offices;
- brokering staff who work between the central corporate office and global business locations; and
- institutionalized responsibility for strategic social investment beyond the chief executive, as an explicit way to develop talent from all levels of the organization.



Some corporate leaders, such as Curt Weeden, VP for Corporate Contributions at Johnson & Johnson, call for increases in philanthropic contributions in line with the increases in corporate profit. Weeden argues that 1.5% of pre-tax net income in cash and an additional 0.5% in product should be the standard.



4 Plan community programs strategically, and manage and coordinate them to reflect concerns of both the community and the company. Corporate-community partnerships should be planned, implemented, and evaluated collaboratively. This means sharing information with community partners, involving a broad range of stakeholders in planning and implementing programs, and shifting from yesterday's model of paternalistic largesse to one which both uses and builds the problem-solving capacities of the community itself.

A KEY FACTOR
IN ANSWERING
WHETHER
CORPORATIONS
...WILL
IMPLEMENT A
NEW
STANDARD
WILL BE HOW
THEY BALANCE
THE ECONOMIC
IMPERATIVES
OF FLEXIBILITY
AND
COMMITMENT.

Specific applications of a global social investment strategy use a company's employment practices, supplier and purchasing relationships, and community relations in support of the priorities identified earlier in this Agenda:

- Increasing the productive capacities of people;
- Strengthening civic infrastructure;
- Encouraging and valuing diversity; and
- Reducing poverty.

While the growing number of examples of corporate strategic social investment is heartening, too often these models remain solely the singular responses of individual companies. A key factor in answering whether corporations on a broad scale will voluntarily define and implement a new standard for strategic social investment will be how they balance the economic imperatives of flexibility and commitment. These are critical considerations in defining corporate interests in a global economy: flexibility, because today's pace of innovation and competition requires highly flexible corporate structures; and commitment, because the levels of quality demanded in today's products and services cannot be guaranteed through old-style command and control management. They require a kind of discretionary effort and responsibility from workers that is best achieved through work organization that encourages high mutual commitment between employers and employees.

We believe that most corporations today fall into one of four categories. These four types are not mutually exclusive; indeed, often firms show elements of several different strategies within their own operations. The challenge is to convince large numbers of corporations—large and small—to move into what we call the “win-win” quadrant of high commitment and high flexibility.

Corporate Models of Work Organization and Community Involvement

COMMITMENT

		LOW	HIGH
FLEXIBILITY	HIGH	<p>LEAN AND MEAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Maximize flexibility at all costs ❑ Heavy use of downsizing, contingent workers, fluid employment structures ❑ Little corresponding investment in workers' employability and skills ❑ Bottom-line driven ❑ Limited and highly focused community-involvement activities 	<p>WIN-WIN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ New management and production techniques ❑ High performance work organization ❑ Commitment to "employability" security—skill development, flexible benefits, training ❑ Strong management/worker relationships ❑ Customer-supplier networks ❑ Strong partnerships with regional training institutions ❑ Consistent policies and practices across global operations
	LOW	<p>MINIMALIST</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Low wage, low-skill jobs ❑ Limited benefits ❑ Little flexibility or capacity to adapt to new market demand ❑ Limited attention to customer satisfaction ❑ Very little local involvement 	<p>TRADITIONAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Stable leadership and employment contracts ❑ Out of touch with markets and customers ❑ Participants in United Way campaign, school-business partnerships, etc. ❑ Somewhat inflexible structures and ways of doing business

BARRIERS TO ACTION

From a corporation's point of view, responding to the agenda proposed here is not simple. As the past decade has driven home, corporate social responsibility is ultimately constrained by market realities. Many large corporations, as their profits and market share collapsed, abandoned no-layoff policies and restructured benefits for workers and their families. When a firm's markets collapse, it is often left with few degrees of freedom for innovations that are "non-essential" to its survival.

The pressures of operating in a global marketplace have forced many corporations to retreat from their commitments to domestic communities and their residents. Given this context, many companies feel that they should not be asked to solve a nation's social problems. Rather, as Chris Marsden of British Petroleum states, firms should follow a more limited and focused set of objectives, restricted to:

- running a firm's activities safely, legally and effectively;
- minimizing adverse impacts on community and society; and
- addressing (only) those social issues which:
 - have an impact on the firm's activity;
 - are within the firm's competence to influence; and
 - offer opportunities for mutual benefit.

These more limited objectives for corporate social responsibility are rapidly becoming a consensus view, with many corporate leaders asserting that the most responsible course of action for today's corporation is unwavering focus on its business success to the minimization of a broader "social" agenda.

Regardless of a corporation's philosophical stance on corporate social responsibility, corporations also face practical limitations in their ability to pursue more activist social investment strategies. Over the last decade, corporate philanthropy, like all corporate departments, has seen dramatic downsizing of staff and budgets.

Yet, as The Hitachi Foundation and others have documented, these very limitations can provide an impetus for using these diminishing resources more strategically—in spreading philanthropic dollars across the globe; emphasizing volunteerism and non-cash investments of time and expertise; and using philanthropy to improve corporate reputations. Indeed, recent research by the Walker Group indicates that companies will achieve an increasing competitive advantage through social responsibility, given the pressures toward growing parity in the price and quality of goods and services. This makes strategic social investment all the more important an opportunity for global corporations as they seek to establish a consistent image and market presence across the world.

COMPANIES
WILL ACHIEVE
AN INCREASING
COMPETITIVE
ADVANTAGE
THROUGH
SOCIAL
RESPONSIBILITY...

MODELS OF PARTNERSHIP: CONFRONTATION TO COLLABORATION

Community responses to the changes in the global economy have been nervous and scattershot, with communities often feeling powerless to affect the forces that are restructuring economic opportunity for their residents. Common responses include paralysis, as well as active hostility toward globalizing corporations. Yet, a new breed of corporate-community relationship is emerging as well—one in which corporations and communities work as partners in defining and realizing common interests. These partnerships have not received the attention they deserve, perhaps because the tendency in any period of rapid change is to focus on what is being lost, instead of the new structures and relationships that are being built.

At the same time as new models for corporate-community collaboration emerge, there is a countervailing trend toward confrontation in which communities organize to fight the flight of jobs and capital to other parts of the world. This trend is equally real and should be a cause for concern for corporations.

CONFRONTATION

Perhaps not surprisingly, communities are increasingly taking action to organize against corporate mobility and disinvestment. We focus first on these examples in order to place our discussion in context of the larger tensions and historical influences that more innovative and collaborative corporate-community relationships may encounter.

In some instances, communities organize from within, including efforts to adopt a “quid pro quo” strategy, in which communities offer subsidies or tax breaks only to

A NEW BREED
OF CORPORATE-
COMMUNITY
RELATIONSHIP IS
EMERGING...
ONE IN WHICH
CORPORATIONS
AND
COMMUNITIES
WORK AS
PARTNERS IN
DEFINING AND
REALIZING
COMMON
INTERESTS.

companies that sign an agreement to uphold certain standards and restrict “bad” corporate citizens that do not meet these standards.



Community Quid Pro Quo. In Louisiana, a large number of multinational companies receive significant tax reductions, yet wages remain low, unemployment high, and toxic emissions among the country’s worst. To counteract this pattern, citizen groups pressured the state to adopt a “scorecard” system that awards “points” for compliance with a variety of job and environmental standards (e.g., reducing the ratio of pounds-of-toxic-emission per job), whereas points are lost for fines received and felonies committed. A company with too few points at the end of the year could lose up to 50 percent of state tax abatements. This system has great potential for creating leverage points for changing business decision-making.

Other states and municipalities have developed a related set of procedures by which companies that receive subsidies make a written commitment to uphold their side of the initial agreement. These standards—widely referred to as “clawback laws”—are enforced in Ohio, Illinois, Connecticut, and Vermont, among other localities, and generally require actions such as a return of the subsidy—often with a penalty—if the company doesn’t deliver on the jobs promised, doesn’t use the site for the purpose intended, or moves out of the area within a certain amount of time.





Identifying Bad Corporate Citizens. In a number of cases, companies with a range of taxpayer-financed subsidies are often corporations with a long history of illegal and anti-labor activities. Establishing clear minimum standards for corporate citizenship, and banning those firms that do not live up to these standards from subsidized business in the community, is another way some areas have begun to level the playing field in attracting jobs to the area.

Palmer, Massachusetts is a town that has passed an ordinance prohibiting government contracts with companies with a history of bribery, collusion among bidders, and price fixing (for three years after the crime). Other towns have adopted similar policies and have started to expand on that list, to include restraint of trade, fraud, labor intimidation, or environmental crimes.



In other instances, confrontational strategies involve communities organizing to act together across community or even national boundaries, such as the move toward bi-national labor coordination, in which union organizers concentrate on raising work and pay standards in developing countries as a way of putting upward pressure on wages and standards in the U.S.



Bi-national Labor Coordination. The Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC) is working to make wages and work conditions more comparable across countries by developing parallel campaigns that place pressure on companies' suppliers in more than one country. In an effort to help U.S. workers who were unable to compete with the prices that rock-bottom wages allowed Mexican workers to offer large companies, FLOC coordinated a strategy that helped Mexican tomato pickers in their own struggles for higher wages. With extensive support from its U.S. allies, the Mexican workers won their best labor agreement ever—allowing U.S. workers to command higher wages as well. Rather than pitting workers here against workers abroad, FLOC's strategy has the appealing result of creating a tide on which all boats can rise.

FLOC has not succeeded in getting companies to voluntarily agree to bi-national labor standards, but corporate collaboration in bi-national agreements could enable this strategy to have great impact on changing job-related issues of economic globalization. Some major unions, notably the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers and the electric workers' union, have also moved in this direction, recognizing that in the long run, reversing the downward spiral in wages and work conditions requires raising the level of those at the bottom.



This confrontational trend is important for corporations to recognize and respond to proactively because it reflects an

anti-corporate sentiment that has the potential to coalesce into a problematic adversarial relationship. The experience of the Maytag Corporation in West Virginia shows just how costly such confrontation can be.



Corporate “Pay-Backs.” In West Virginia, Maytag Corporation recently settled the largest ever plant-closing dispute with workers in Ranson, a small city located in the eastern part of the state. The company agreed to pay \$11.5 million to 800 workers who were laid off after a vending-machine factory in Ranson was closed, and another, lower-wage plant was opened by Maytag in South Carolina.

Warning signs of a plant closing were first apparent in October 1990, when the company began remodeling the Williston, South Carolina plant and laid off 150 workers in the Ranson plant. However, to ease employees’ worries, the company reassured workers through various means that the remaining jobs were secure. When the corporation released news that it would be closing its Ranson plant in July 1991, disgruntled workers started a class action suit alleging misrepresentation and breach of contract.

Although the company conceded to the settlement, it maintained that there was no wrongdoing in closing the Ranson factory. Spokespersons for Maytag emphasize that employees interpreted their words as guarantees for lifetime employment, a false interpretation and misconception that led to an expensive misunderstanding.



COLLABORATION

THE MOST
EFFECTIVE
COLLABORATIONS
BETWEEN
COMMUNITIES
AND
CORPORATIONS
TEND TO FOCUS
ON CLEAR
AREAS OF
MUTUAL
INTEREST, SUCH
AS WORKFORCE
DEVELOPMENT
AND
COMMUNITY
ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT.

The most promising kinds of collaboration between corporations and communities avoid both adversarial conflict and old models of “partnership” which emphasized what corporations could “do” for communities rather than using corporate resources to build communities’ capacities to do for themselves. In some ways, the best corporate-community partnerships today resemble many of the features that characterize corporate restructuring: an emphasis on building human capacity and empowering those on the frontline; a holistic, rather than fragmented, approach to complex, inter-related problems; attention to assets rather than deficits; and a focus on *systemic* change rather than episodic programmatic “fixes.”

The most effective collaborations between communities and corporations tend to focus on clear areas of mutual interest, such as workforce development and community economic development.

By their nature, promising models in workforce development require the cooperation of corporate and community interests. Familiar examples include job training programs, social supports (e.g., child care and transportation), and developing good work habits in current and future workers. In some communities, like San Antonio, Texas, community organizations are integrating these separate programmatic elements into comprehensive systems that can make a dramatic impact on the economic opportunity available to residents.



Project QUEST. San Antonio’s Project QUEST (Quality Employment through Skills Training) attempts to address directly what some have called “jobs mismatch,” whereby large numbers of people with little job training are unable to find decent

work, while positions in other sectors of the local economy remain vacant because employers have difficulty finding workers with the adequate skills. Project QUEST uses labor market research to identify jobs that are available in San Antonio, gets a commitment from employers to employ a certain number of graduates of the program, and interviews and selects unemployed potential employees—many of them low-income, many African-American and Latino, many on welfare—who show real commitment and initiative to be in the program. It arranges training opportunities at colleges and training centers, and provides personal and academic support to make sure that trainees get through the two-year program successfully. Since its inception in July 1992, over 500 program graduates have been placed in jobs in the San Antonio area. They were also able to leverage a financial contribution to the project of over \$1 million from state government.



Still other corporate-community collaborations concentrate on fixing the system that is supposed to pave a smooth path from school to the workforce. School-to-career transition programs in Boston, Louisville, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, and an increasing number of cities around the country are examples of the way internships, school curriculum based on awareness of the changing world of work, and employer willingness to reach out to its next generation of potential employees can bridge the gap between school and the workplace.



School-to-Career Transition. The Bank of America has worked with the state of California and other

PROMISING
COLLABORATIONS
IN COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
INCLUDE A
RANGE OF
PROJECTS FROM
THE CULTURAL
TO THE
ECONOMIC,
FROM
FINANCIAL AID
TO COMMUNITY
SERVICE.

banks to develop performance standards for career-entry jobs in banking. Together with other employers, it has organized several hundred internships in banking in Sacramento and now, through collaboration with a non-profit intermediary, LEED (Linking Education and Economic Development) Sacramento, is working to create similar programs in telecommunications and health. The partnership is structured to enhance the region's "civic infrastructure" through its use of a non-profit intermediary and the involvement of several school districts and community colleges. Bank of America is confident that this investment will pay off in terms of the quality and preparation of job applicants and reduced recruitment and turnover costs.



Community development is another common target for strategic social investments by corporations. Promising collaborations in community development include a range of projects from the cultural to the economic, from financial aid to community service. Here, too, the most effective corporate-community collaborations are working toward a broader vision of community-building.



The St. Paul Companies: Building More Than Housing³ When most corporate donation programs support community development, they fund identifiable projects such as rehabilitation of a specific

³ "Rebuilding Inner-City Communities: A New Approach to the Nation's Urban Crisis." 1995. A statement by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development.

building. In contrast, the St. Paul Companies, the 25th largest diversified financial company in the nation, targets a substantial share of its corporate giving to building community development institutions. In 1992, the company made grants of \$2.1 million to 56 community-based organizations in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. These unique efforts have four key characteristics:

- grants to community-based organizations for core operating support, not for projects but rather to “run the shop,” retain a core staff, and develop efficient operating systems;
- multi-year commitments, usually or two or three years, for both project support and core support;
- partnerships with a range of organizations in the community development system;
- support for human resource development in the community-based sector.



The emergent “community-building” paradigm emphasizes the importance of approaches that include community members at the table as equal partners. Thus, decisions, to an increasing extent, are made collaboratively by those who share an interest in their outcome. According to this model, business decisions—such as shutting down a plant—are not made unilaterally and then transmitted via a community-relations department to the public. Instead, community members are involved and informed in an ongoing way about business operations, and are able to consider a range of collaborative alternatives from underwriting loans to assisting in retraining and placing workers. Similarly, community decisions such as how to provide social services or build low-income housing are not made unilaterally by individual officials, but involve a

THE EMERGENT
“COMMUNITY-
BUILDING”
PARADIGM
EMPHASIZES
THE
IMPORTANCE
OF APPROACHES
THAT INCLUDE
COMMUNITY
MEMBERS AT
THE TABLE AS
EQUAL
PARTNERS.

collaborative effort that includes corporations, non-profit groups, and a variety of government agencies with a stake in the outcome.



Good Neighbor Agreements. One well-developed example of emerging “good neighbor agreements” is the agreement reached in Manchester, Texas, between the Rhone Poulenc chemical company, local community residents, and Texans United Education Fund, a statewide citizens’ group. According to the agreement—achieved after long negotiations and confrontations—the company employees would work directly with a community advisory committee, consisting of up to 25 residents of the surrounding area, to conduct an audit of company compliance with regulations, as well as employee training in safety procedures, emergency response plans, waste analysis, and other areas of mutual concern. The committee and company also work together to consider improvements in standards and compliance.



Advisory groups of this kind do not actually make corporate, government, or community decisions, but have access to information, can commission expert studies or reviews, and can initiate solutions to problems that arise. Important on their own terms, the gradual expansion of agreements of this kind hold real potential for a substantially different corporate-community relationship that reflects new economic realities. To date, these campaigns have been largely initiated by activists in the environmental justice movement, but they also have clear implications for decisions regarding jobs.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF EFFECTIVE COLLABORATION

For companies that choose to pursue effective, reciprocal collaboration with the communities in which they do business, our interviews and case study research indicate some common factors for success. Important characteristics for successful corporate-community partnership include:

- strong independent organizations that act as credible brokers and can organize and sustain pressure on all sides when necessary;
- sophisticated analysis and understanding of the local labor market and how it fits into the regional and global contexts;
- support for capacity development—building the confidence, efficacy, and leadership ability of people in the community;
- information-sharing which allows collaboration to operate from a common knowledge base;
- holistic approaches to problems and their solutions;
- an assumption of assets, not deficits; and
- an expanded sense of partnership and inclusion of a broad group of stakeholders.

CORPORATE LEADERSHIP IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY

In emphasizing joint action toward common interests, we do not mean to disguise the real differences and conflicts that exist between corporations and communities in the global economy. The forces that challenge any prior social contract between corporations and their communities remain quite strong; they have not yet run their course. It is our belief that while there is more room for partnerships and joint gains at the community level than is often assumed, any sustainable social contract will require significant policy changes at a level beyond any individual community and its employers—at the national and international policy levels.

Clearly, any period of intense change requires active exploration of new structures and ideas, as well as open discussion and debate. More forums are needed for candid discussion of where corporate and community interests overlap, where they don't, and what can—and should—be done about it. The need for redefining corporate-community relations in the rapidly changing economy will only increase in importance and urgency over the next decade.

As corporate interests in and influence on the world economy grow, corporations are uniquely positioned to use their global presence as a way to promote a new standard for strategic investment in human resources, economic opportunity, and social capital.

Global corporations, especially, have a unique opportunity to address common problems in the many communities in which they produce and market goods and services. In this way, global companies, often accused of fragmenting the traditional values and security of communities, can become leaders in defining and creating a new kind of global community.

CORPORATIONS
ARE UNIQUELY
POSITIONED TO
USE THEIR
GLOBAL
PRESENCE AS A
WAY TO
PROMOTE A
NEW
STANDARD FOR
STRATEGIC
INVESTMENT IN
HUMAN
RESOURCES,
ECONOMIC
OPPORTUNITY,
AND SOCIAL
CAPITAL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ady, Robert M. July 6, 1992. "Why BMW Cruised Into Spartanburg," The Wall Street Journal.
- Avishai, Bernard. July/August 1991. "A European Platform for Global Competition: An Interview with VW's Carl Hahn." Harvard Business Review, vol. 69, no. 4: 102-113.
- Berryman, Sue and Thomas R. Bailey. 1992. "The Double Helix of Education and the Economy." New York, NY: The Institute on Education and the Economy, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Bluestone, Barry. 1982. The Deindustrialization of America. New York: BasicBooks, Inc.
- Castro, Janice. March 29, 1993. "Disposable Workers." Time: 43-7.
- Colburn, Bruce. Spring 1994. "'Sustainable Milwaukee' Launches Bold Metro Planning Initiative: New Coalition Plans for 50,000 Jobs." FIRR News, vol. 6, no. 1: 10-11.
- Committee for Economic Development. 1995. "Rebuilding Inner-City Communities: A New Approach to the Nation's Urban Crisis." A statement by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development.
- Corditz, Dan. May 29, 1990. "Corporate Citizenship, No More Soft Touches." Financial World: 30-36.
- Drucker, Peter. 1989. The New Realities. New York: Harper & Row.
- . September-October 1992. "The New Society of Organizations." Harvard Business Review: 95-104.
- Erdman, Andrew. March 8, 1993. "The Unemployed." Fortune: 40-9.
- "Families on a Treadmill: Work and Income in the 1980s." 1992. A Staff Study Prepared for the Use of Members of the Joint Economic Committee. Washington, DC: United States Congress.
- Gilpin, Robert. 1987. The Political Economy of International Relations. Princeton, NJ: University Press.
- Harrison, Bennett. July 1994. "Strategic Networking for the People." Technology Review.
- Huntington, Samuel P. Summer 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations?" Foreign Affairs: 22-49.
- "Japanese Industry: Losing its Way." September 18, 1993. The Economist: 78-9.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. May 1994. "Greater Boston's Challenge in the Global Economy: Strengthening the Infrastructure for Collaboration." Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, the George F. Baker Foundation, in collaboration with The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce and Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

- Kilborn, Peter T. August 16, 1995. "Appliance Maker Agrees to Pay for Moving Away." New York Times: A20.
- . March 15, 1993. "New Jobs Lack the Old Security In a Time of 'Disposable Workers.'" New York Times: A1.
- Kirsch, Sandra L. August 24, 1992. "The Job Drought." Fortune: 62-74.
- Kuttner, Robert. October 18, 1993. "Talking Marriage and Thinking One-Night Stand." Business Week: 16.
- Levering, Robert and Milton Moskowitz. 1993. The 100 Best Companies to Work for In America. New York: Doubleday.
- Logan, David. September 23, 1994. "Community Involvement in Foreign Owned Companies." The Conference Board.
- Marsden, Chris. April 6, 1994. "Towards a Responsible Free Market System." Presidential lecture to The Economics and Business Education Association.
- Marshall, Ray. 1991. Employee Rights in a Changing Economy: The Issue of Replacement Workers. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- . 1992. "Work Organization, Unions, and Economic Performance." Unions and Economic Competitiveness. Eds. Lawrence Mishel and Paula B. Voos. Armonk, NY: W.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Marshall, Ray and Marc Tucker. 1992. Thinking for a Living. New York, NY: BasicBooks, Inc.
- Miller, Frederick A. and Judith H. Katz. 1993. "Cultural Diversity as a Developmental Process: The Path from Monocultural Club to Inclusive Organization." Cincinnati, OH: The Kaleel Jamison Consulting Group, Inc.
- Morrow, Lance. March 29, 1993. "The Tempering of America." Time: 40-7.
- Noble, Barbara Presley. February 28, 1993. "Straddling the Law on Layoffs." The New York Times.
- O'Reilly, Brian. June 13, 1994. "The New Deal: What Companies and Employees Owe One Another." Fortune: 44-52.
- Osterman, Paul. 1993. "How Common is Workplace Transformation and How Can We Explain Who Adopts It? Results from a National Survey." Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Sloan School of Management.
- Packer, Arnold H. 1991. "The Demographic and Economic Imperatives," in An Economic Strategy for the 90s: Human Capital and America's Future. Eds. David Horn Beck and Lester Salamon.
- Putnam, Robert D. Spring 1993. "The Prosperous Community, Social Capital and Public Life." The American Prospect: 35-42.
- Reich, Robert B. January 1987. "Enterprise and Double Cross." The Washington Monthly: 13-19.

- . March/April 1991a. “Who is Them?” Harvard Business Review, vol. 69, no. 2: 77-88.
- . 1991b. The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Rosen, Robert H. 1991. The Healthy Company. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc.
- Rothstein, Richard. 1993. “Setting the Standard: International Labor Rights and US Trade Policy.” Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Sabel, Charles F. 1993a. “Can the End of the Social Democratic Trade Unions be the Beginning of a New Kind of Social Democratic Politics?” in Economic Restructuring and Emerging Patterns of Industrial Relations, ed. Stephen R. Sleigh. Kalamazoo, Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- . 1993b. “Large Firms and Small: Where They Are in Europe Viewed from Where They WERE,” Speech given in Lisbon, Portugal at the October 8th “Cooperation and Competitiveness” conference.
- Sheridan, Elissa. March 29, 1994. “CSR and the Bottom Line—Financial Performance and Consumer Purchase Decisions.” Levi Strauss & Co. Inter-Office Correspondence.
- Sleigh, Stephen R. 1993. “Introduction,” in Economic Restructuring and Emerging Patterns of Industrial Relations, Stephen R. Sleigh, ed. Kalamazoo, Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Spivey, W. Allen and Lawrason D. Thomas. Spring 1990. “Global Management: Concepts, Themes, Problems and Research Issues.” Human Resource Management, vol. 29, no. 1: 85-97.
- Streeck, Wolfgang. 1993. “Training and the New Industrial Relations: A Strategic Role for Unions.” Economic Restructuring and Emerging Patterns of Industrial Relations, Stephen R. Sleigh, ed. Kalamazoo, Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Swasy, Alecia. October 3, 1993. “Don’t Sell Thick Diapers in Tokyo.” The New York Times.
- Sweeney, Paul. May 15, 1994. “Corporate Giving Goes Creative.” The New York Times, Sunday.
- “Thinking Ahead: Radically Redefined Global Competition in the 1990s.” Price Waterhouse Review, vol. 34, no. 1: 6-25.
- Thurow, Lester. 1992. Head to Head. New York, NY: Morrow.
- Vernon, Raymond. August 1992. “Transnational Corporations: Where Are They Coming From, Where Are They Headed?” Transnational Corporations, vol. 1, no. 2: 7-35.
- Zachary, G. Pascal and Bob Ortega. March 10, 1993. “Workplace Revolution Boosts Productivity at Cost of Job Security.” The Wall Street Journal: A1.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Darryl Banks
World Resources Institute

Jim Benn
Federation for Industrial
Retention & Renewal

Stephen A. Greyser
Harvard Business School

Pam Koprowski
Champion International

Robert Kuttner
The American Prospect

Frank Levy
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology

Lisa Lynch
Fletcher School of Law &
Diplomacy

Rosemary Mans
Bank of America

John McKnight
Center for Urban Affairs
Northwestern University

Katherine Newman
Department of Anthropology
Columbia University

Terry Quinn
Hitachi Data Systems

Tony Sarmiento
AFL-CIO

Arthur White
Yankelovich Partners, Inc.

INTERVIEWS

Gar Alperovitz
National Center for Economic
Alternatives

Judy Belk
Community Affairs
Levi Strauss & Company

Jim Benn
Federation for Industrial
Retention and Renewal

John Foster Bey
John and Catherine MacArthur
Foundation

Bill Dempsey
Organizer
Sustainable Milwaukee

Frank Doyle
Executive Vice President
General Electric Company

Mark Eliot
Ford Foundation
Urban Poverty Division

Richard Ferlato
Center for Policy Alternatives

Hector Figueroa
ACTWU Research Department

Ann Filloramo
Northeast Citizen Action
Resource Center (NECARC)

Jim Gibson
Urban Institute

Peter Goldberg
President
Family Service America, Inc.

Bruce Hanson
Center for Community Change

Richard Healey
Grassroots Policy Project

Robert C. Holland
Committee on Economic
Development

Jackie Kendall
Midwest Academy

Judith Kidd
City Year

Ann Kubisch
Roundtable on Comprehensive
Community Initiatives of
Children and Families and
Aspen Institute

Robert Kuttner
The American Prospect

Jose LaLuz
formerly international strategy
for ACTWU

Frances Moore Lappé
Center for Living Democracy

Frank Levy, Ph.D.
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology
Department of Urban Studies &
Planning

Sanford Lewis
Good Neighbor Project

David Logan
Corporate-Community Relations
International

Jane MacAlevay
Veatch Foundation

Eric Mann
Labor/Community Strategy Center

Geri Mannion
Carnegie Corporation of New York

Chris Mathis
Labor/Community Strategy Center

Tony Mazzocchi
Oil Chemical and Atomic
Workers Union

Lisa McCloud
Community Organizer
Save Our Cumberland Mountains

John McKnight
Director of Community Studies
Center for Urban Affairs and
Policy Research
Northwestern University

Karen Muller
Director of Community Affairs
HB Fuller

Neal Peirce
Contributing Editor
The National Journal

Steuart Pittman
ACORN Jobs Campaign

Peggy Powell
Cooperative Home Care Associates

Terry Quinn
Vice President, Public Affairs
Hitachi Data Systems

Delwin A. Roy
President
The Hitachi Foundation

Andrew C. Sigler
CEO
Champion International

Craig Smith
Editor & Publisher
Corporate Philanthropy Report

Rebecca Stone
University of Chicago
Chapin Hall Center for Children

Michael Useem, Ph.D.
University of Pennsylvania
Department of Sociology

Alis Valencia
Editor
*World Business Academy Perspectives
and At Work: Stories of Tomorrow's
Workplace*

Beldemar Velasquez
Farm Labor Organizing Committee

Susan Wade
Managing Editor
Corporate Philanthropy Report

Cynthia Ward
Commonwealth Institute

Curtis Weeden
Vice President, Corporate
Contributions
Johnson & Johnson

Robert Wehling
Senior Vice President, Public Affairs
Procter & Gamble

Susan Williams
Coordinator
Economy Program at Highlander
Center

ADDITIONAL COPIES

Additional copies of this document are available for \$10.00 prepaid from Jobs for the Future, One Bowdoin Square, Boston, MA 02114. Any or all portions of this document may be freely reproduced and circulated without prior permission, provided the source is cited as Jobs for the Future. 1996. Redefining Corporate-Community Responsibility in a Global Economy: An Agenda for Action. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.



**One Bowdoin Square
Boston, MA 02114
(617) 742-5995
fax (617) 742-5767**

ISBN 1-887410-82-1
Union Bug