

Figure 4.3: Summary of Findings on RQ1:

What CSR stakeholder engagement practices do pharmaceutical companies undertake?

Source/Code	Terminology	Stakeholders	Communication/ Dialogue	Organisation/ Governance	Projects	Expectations
Documentary Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diverse range • Multiple usage • Most frequent: CR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity • Limited usage of term often confined to older reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High visibility of CSR activities • Many themes • Low level of dialogue enabled on websites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diverse Approach • Ethics Committee • Compliance Function 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patchwork of diverse activities • Themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Society ○ Environment ○ Patients ○ Own Projects ○ Guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited data
Telephone Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diverse range • Multiple usage • Most frequent: CSR • Individualisation/ unique labelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited usage of term • Incongruity between claimed and actual prioritisation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Customers and employees ranked highest overall ○ Directors consulted most ○ NGOs: low rank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expenditure on CSR activities not published • Reported intention to improve transparency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific CSR department rare • Network of responsible departments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patchwork of diverse activities • Themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Donations ○ Re-cycling ○ Health/Safety ○ Energy usage ○ Practices to improve work-life balance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reputation/Image and employee motivation ranked highest • CSR viewed as a cost to the business
Participant Observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on stakeholder dialogue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact generally unproblematic • Responses primarily friendly and helpful • Speed and intensity of response good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge often lacking between affiliates to allow effective internal communication • Policies sometimes block dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific CSR department rare • PR usually first responder • Other responders: Marketing & CEO • Multi-functional involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited data indirectly confirms diversity and range of themes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited data suggests desire to improve image/reputation
In-depth Interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diverse range • Multiple usage • Individualisation • Evolvement • Confusion • Label stated as less key than actual behaviour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deemed pivotal to CSR • Terms used to manage but not always to communicate CSR • Evolvement • Dynamic and activity-based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder scepticism • Label relevant • Challenge of balancing expectations • Improvement required on transparency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central direction from HQ • Some local decentralisation at project level • Network approach • PR pivotal role • Dynamic, diverse, and activity-based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diverse projects • Two categories of approach • Evolvement • Improvement required to translate values into practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves reputation and possibly motivates some employees • Differentiating factor • Measurement challenges

Figure 5.4: Summary of Findings on RQ2: What similarities and differences exist in stakeholder engagement practices in the UK and Germany?

Source/Code	Terminology	Stakeholders	Communication/ Dialogue	Organisation/ Governance	Projects	Expectations
Documentary Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity • More terms in German language used on German sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited data • Some evidence of different approach between countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences • Strong lack of standardisation • Diversity in message conveyed • Language barrier on D websites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited data • Some evidence of diverse approach between countries • Some evidence to support decentralisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity on themes addressed and in codes of conduct guidelines followed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited data • Expected benefits of CSR not clearly communicated
Telephone Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The terms ‘CSR’ & ‘sustainability’ are used more often in D • Higher standardisation of terms in the UK • Higher diversity of terms in D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General similarity • Prioritisation purpose driven in UK & D • Some diversity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Term “stakeholder dialogue” used less in the UK than D ○ Stronger business focus in the UK ○ Stronger emphasis on society in D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity • German affiliates publish official CSR expenditure figure less often 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity • Centralised approach • Higher tendency to have a dedicated CSR department in D • CEO responds more often in D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong similarity • Claimed dialogue on projects is high in both countries • Some evidence that dialogue on activities is not linked with its claimed importance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity • Improved reputation and employee motivation • Some evidence that affiliates in D rate expected outcomes with stronger conviction
Participant Observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See stakeholder data on dialogue/communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity • Some evidence to suggest higher responsiveness in D than in UK • But D employs ‘blocking’ policies more often 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity • Centralised approach • Higher tendency for dedicated CSR department in D • Marketing responds more often in UK 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited data indirectly supports similar levels of diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited data
In-depth Interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity due to centralised /global approach • Documentary and survey findings confirmed on diversity in D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General underlying similarity based on common intent • Some differences in attitude/approach to CSR (which effects <i>how</i> CSR is practiced) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity • Some differences due to stakeholder perceptions, requirement for local sensitivity, & culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General similarity • Complex/evolving • Some evidence of local diversity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Supports previous findings ○ D more formal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall similarity • Some diversity • Standardised CSR in UK • Higher business & environmental regulation in D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarity on outcome and measurement • Possible difference in perceptions on value & company

Figure 6.1: Summary of Findings on RQ3: What factors influence the practices and what factors explain the differences in the CSR stakeholder engagement practices of pharmaceutical companies targeting stakeholders in the UK and Germany?

Source/Code	Terminology	Stakeholders	Communication/ Dialogue	Organisation/ Governance	Projects	Expectations
In-depth Interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evolution in expectations on company's role in society • External cultural factors such as history, politics & language may influence perceptions • Internal business objectives & activity including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Differentiation ○ Internal & External Communication • These factors may explain some of the diversity identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evolution in societal roles and expectations regarding stakeholder rights and obligations • Prioritisation and engagement influenced by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ External cultural contextual factors e.g. PEST ○ Internal company stage of evolutionary development ○ Business activity, task at hand ○ Perceived outcome expectations (i.e. CSR as motivator/ image factor) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External cultural aspects i.e. (local) PEST factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Affect roles/ expectations/ (mis)perceptions ○ Are evolving ○ Offer new opportunities • Internal business profile & activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Differentiate/ individualise CSR approach ○ Language/ labelling ○ Policies block dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal culture driven by values and personal (moral) interest • Decision-makers' understanding of stakeholders' evolving perceptions • Business profile: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Size, resources, evolution stage • Diverse approaches • External PEST factors affecting roles/expectations • Uncertainty, complexity, involvement, room for improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External PEST factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regulations ○ Tax law ○ Societal need • Internal factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CSR organisation/ governance approach • These factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May affect roles and expectations ○ May determine the philanthropic or integrative nature of the projects adopted • Salience of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evolution ○ CSR Training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal leadership mindset • Assumed stakeholder perceptions on what determines value • Uncertainty • Measurement (i.e. outcome) & education challenges related to the intangible nature of CSR • External PEST factors affecting roles and expectations • Business profile and activity
Documentary Analysis / Participant Observation	☒	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal management approach to stakeholder engagement is evolving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural aspects i.e. PEST affects roles/expectations • Decision-makers' wish to portray ethical intent • Business objectives e.g. individualisation • Communication practices may block dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sometimes organisational approach blocks CSR stakeholder dialogue • Decisions regarding size and allocated resources influence stakeholder engagement 	☒	☒