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Abstract
Consumers can be skeptical about corporate social responsibility (CSR), proving difficulties for companies in communicating about CSR. The influence of fit and how much information consumers receive about a company’s CSR were tested on skepticism and reputation. A corporate website was replicated to test the effects of CSR communication. The results of this research contribute to the literature by providing insight in the practical side of communicating about CSR and should assist communication professionals in determining what to communicate about CSR initiatives. A 2 by 2 design was used for an online experiment to test whether CSR communication of the Dutch company Philips would influence skepticism and its reputation. Fit showed to increase the level of skepticism. Skepticism was the lowest and reputation most positive in the condition where respondents were shown a CSR initiative with low fit and with a high level of information on the initiative. This research contributes by showing that there is not only a choice between fit and non-fit in developing a CSR initiative, but also how much is communicated about the initiative is of importance.

Introduction
Can companies benefit from engaging in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)? Many studies on CSR show positive effects on organizational performance (Margolis & Walsh, 2003; Rowley & Berman, 2000), employee attitude (Rupp, Ganapathi, Aguilera, & Williams, 2006), and consumer purchase intentions (Ellen, Webb, & Mohr, 2006; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Consumers are more positive about companies that engage in CSR (Nan & Heo, 2007; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Consumer support for conducting in a socially responsible manner is even considered to be well established and companies are expected to engage in CSR (Rundle-Thiele, Ball, & Gillespie, 2008).
The effects of corporate social responsibility have been examined throughout several studies (Barone, Miyazaki, & Taylor, 2000; Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Du, Bhattacharya, & Sen, 2010; Ellen et al., 2006). A lot of research on CSR so far has focused on the effects of engaging in CSR initiatives that fit the company. Positive effects have been found for fit and reputation (Elving, 2010; Forehand & Grier, 2003). Effects have been tested in combination with different kinds of products and on different kinds of fit (Becker-Olsen, Cudmore, & Hill, 2006; Elving, 2010; Forehand & Grier, 2003; Lafferty & Edmondson, 2009). These studies are in line with a recent shift in focus on CSR. Instead of asking the question if companies should invest in CSR, the question has shifted to how to invest in CSR (Smith, 2003).

The need for transparency and request for pro-active communication plays a part in this shift of focus (Chaudhri & Wang, 2007). If CSR is not communicated properly this can cause consumers to be skeptical towards the CSR and the company. However, there is still much unclear about what can be indicated as ‘good’ communication about CSR. Consumer responses to CSR depend on how CSR is conducted and communicated (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). Merely increasing the amount of money of CSR activities and communicating this to stakeholders does not increase the positive impact of CSR communication (Barone et al., 2000). It is important to have an understanding about how to communicate CSR initiatives in order to make them perceived as authentic (Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010; Podnar & Golob, 2007). More information on the effects of fit and how to communicate about CSR is needed in order to get a good sense of how CSR communication can effective. Also, more research is needed on the effects of fit on reputation and how this is influenced by skepticism (Elving, 2010).

This research addresses the practical side of communicating about CSR and will focus on how much information is communicated by the company, meaning how much specific information a consumer receives. In this research this concept will be described as ‘level of
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information’. By giving specific information on a CSR initiative a consumer can perceive the company as transparent, authentic in its CSR and will therefore be less skeptical towards CSR and rate the company’s reputation as positive (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). The main question that is posed for this research is:

*RQ: What are the effects of fit and level of information on skepticism and reputation of a company?*

This research aims to contribute to the literature by researching the level of information and providing more insight in the combined effects of fit, level of information on skepticism and reputation. More information is required on the effects of CSR on reputation, and the effects of consumer skepticism on reputation (Elving, 2010). So far no research has been done on the effects of how much information consumers receive, on the evaluation of CSR and the company. With an increasing number of companies investing in CSR, it is important to know how to communicate CSR. Consumers demand companies to engage in CSR and to be as transparent as possible (Podnar & Golob, 2007). Companies often communicate about what they think is important without taking into consideration what information the consumers actually want (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). This study aims to contribute to making what the consumers want in regards to CSR communication more clear for communication practitioners. This is achieved by providing insight into what level of information consumers prefer. Also, consumers want to be informed about the CSR initiatives companies engage in. Knowing what information consumers desire can make CSR more effective but can also contribute to meeting the information needs of the consumers.
Theoretical background

In this study the effects of fit and level of information on skepticism and reputation will be examined. First, information will be given on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), the domain in which this research is set. Following, the concept of fit will be discussed, continued by the constructs of reputation and skepticism will be addressed. Lastly the level of information will be addressed and its relation to fit, skepticism and reputation.

Introduction to CSR

There is no consensus on the definition of CSR (Silberhorn & Warren, 2007; Weber, 2008). What can be derived from the varied definitions is that a company’s CSR policy contains activities and processes in regards to societal or environmental obligations (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). The version of CSR that is known today can be traced back to the corporate marketing model designed by Gray and Balmer. Gray and Balmer (1998) stated that a shift in focus occurred in companies from a focus on solely obtaining profit, to contributing to society and operating in a responsible way. Operating in a socially responsible manner is increasing in importance as consumers expect companies to operate in a responsible way and at the same time demand transparency on how exactly the companies are involved. It has become a common conception that organizations must strive for profit in order to be successful. However, companies also have ethical responsibilities such as being a ‘good citizen’ (Pirsch, Gupta, & Grau, 2007). Consumers not only expect a company to be successful, but also to operate in a socially responsible way.

Consumers’ expectations towards a company’s responsibilities can be divided into four categories: economical-, legal-, ethical-, and discretionary responsibilities (Carroll, 1979). Economical responsibilities consist of the responsibilities a company has to make a profit. Legal responsibilities entail that consumers expect companies not to break any laws.
Ethical responsibilities are concerned with ethical codes and how a company should deal with situations or business that is considered immoral. Discretionary responsibilities can be considered to be the practical part of ethical responsibilities and includes expectations towards companies such as contributing to local charity. A study by Podnar and Golob (2007) revealed that combining ethical with discretionary responsibilities made a stronger construct. In this research the two responsibilities will be considered as one construct as well, so that CSR not only consists of doing ‘what is right’ but also how a company can achieve this.

By creating CSR initiatives a company can express the desire to uphold these responsibilities and show what is important and how the company envisions its contribution. By implementing CSR and communicating about it to its stakeholders, the company can achieve positive effects and create competitive advantages (Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, & Wright, 2013).

**Fit**

There are different types of CSR initiatives a company can engage in such as sponsoring and donating money to a charity. A CSR initiative that is closely related to the core-business of the company is considered an initiative with fit (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Fit can be defined as an evaluation by stakeholders of the observed relation between the company and its CSR (Nan & Heo, 2007). This evaluation is based on cognitive assumptions that rely on the similarities between a company and a CSR initiative. The opposite of fit is non-fit, which can be used to describe CSR initiatives that are not a logical choice for a company because they are not related to the company in any way. An example of fit is an initiative where a company that sells bottled water contributes to society by digging water wells in third world countries to help the community. An example
of non-fit is a bank that donates money to a cause that enables children from low-income families to play sports.

There is some debate on whether CSR initiatives should fit the company. A fit between a company and its CSR can be perceived as a technique that is only focused on maximizing profit (Yoon, Gürhan-Canli & Schwarz, 2006). Consumers could perceive the initiative as clearly beneficial to a company and could therefore reach the conclusion that it is no more than a means to more profit. Fit can also result in more skepticism about whether the motives of a company are sincere as opposed to non-fit that could be considered as more altruistic (Forehand & Grier, 2003; Yoon et al., 2006). However, in several studies positive effects of fit have been found on purchase intentions, consumer attributions and consumer skepticism (Ellen et al., 2006; Elving, 2010).

Findings of positive effects of fit are consistent with the associative network theory. According to this theory, a high level of perceived relatedness has a positive effect on the evaluation made by the consumer (Becker-Olsen et al., 2006). The relation between the company and CSR is congruent in case of fit and will therefore be easy to relate to. A consumer will be less critical towards the message when it is easy to relate to, unlike in the case of non-fit. A study by Forehand and Grier, using a fictitious company in testing fit, showed that when fit is considered negative or low (non-fit) it creates negative thoughts among consumers and increases how much the consumer elaborates on the message (Forehand & Grier, 2003).

The notion that fit has a positive influence on skepticism and reputation is supported by the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM). According to the ELM, people process information via two routes: the central route and the peripheral route (Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983). The route through which information is processed is determined by
motivation and opportunity. Information is processed through the central route when a person has the opportunity as well as the motivation to process a message. They will be motivated to elaborate on the message and consciously form an opinion. This route demands attention to evaluate both positive and negative aspects of the message. When someone does not have the opportunity or motivation to elaborate on the message as thoroughly as in the central route, the message will be processed through the peripheral route. This route requires less attention and is focused on forming opinions with the help of mental shortcuts that are based on previous experiences with similar situations. Little attention is paid to the content of the message and opinions are subconsciously formed.

Choosing a CSR initiative with fit allows consumers to process the message more easily because of the perceived congruity between the company and the CSR initiative. Consumers will not need a strong motivation or ample opportunity to process the information because the connection is logical and therefore mental shortcuts will be used. As a result, consumers will be more inclined to regard the initiative as positive, and also evaluate the company as more positive.

**Reputation**

Reputation is an attribute of a company and is an evaluation of how the company is perceived by its stakeholders (Roberts & Dowling, 2002). This evaluation is formed by the direct experiences of stakeholders with an organization (Gotsi & Wilson, 2001). Past behavior and performances influences the evaluation that is made by stakeholders. Aspects such as past images, past experiences and communication influence the forming of a reputation which eventually is established over time (Cornelissen, 2008). A positive reputation is an indication that a company is well regarded by its stakeholders (Weiss, Anderson, & Macinnis, 1999).
Having a strong, positive reputation is important because it is an evaluation of how consumers perceive the company when compared to its competitors (Rao, 1994). A good reputation can also attract qualified personnel and increase purchase intentions (Ellen et al., 2006; Herbig & Milewicz, 1995; Mahon, 2002). Engaging in CSR can positively influence the reputation of a company because it creates goodwill among the consumers (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2006). CSR can contribute to the reputation of a company when it is considered to be practiced without ulterior motives. According to the Attribute Theory (Jones et al., 1972) consumers make attributions about companies that they feel positive about. When a consumer perceives a company to be ‘good’, it will cause consumers to see other activities from the same company in a more positive way (Bae & Cameron, 2006; Brown & Dacin, 1997). Doing ‘good’ will thereby lead to a more positive evaluation of other activities and improve the reputation of the company. Companies can further strengthen the reputation by engaging in CSR initiative with fit. As mentioned before, fit will make consumers less critical by allowing consumers to process information via the peripheral route. This will make a company and the CSR communication more trustworthy and therefore can contribute to strengthening the reputation (Forehand & Grier, 2003). The following hypothesis is posed.

**HI: Fit between the company and its CSR has a positive effect on reputation.**

**Skepticism**

Next to fit, there are other factors that influence whether CSR can positively influence a company’s reputation. Studies reveal that how consumers perceive the company’s motives can influence how the CSR initiative is regarded (Ellen et al., 2006; Forehand & Grier, 2003; Yoon et al., 2006). When consumers perceive the motives to be untrustworthy, they become
skeptical towards the company and the company’s CSR initiative. Skepticism is an important reaction because it can protect people from harmful situations. This happens, for instance, as a result from engaging with people or organizations that have wrong intentions. However, some consumers are more skeptical in general than others. Skepticism is defined as a tendency towards disbelief (Obermiller & Spangenberg, 1998; Pirsch et al., 2007). There are two kinds of consumer skepticism: predispositional skepticism and situational skepticism. Predispositional skepticism increases when a consumer develops more knowledge about marketing tactics, also known as persuasion knowledge. Situational skepticism is a temporary form of skepticism which can be a result from a salesperson or a specific message that the consumer does not trust. Both predispositional and situational skepticism are likely to influence the level of skepticism. However, this study will focus on situational skepticism because it can be manipulated by making sure the source and the message comes across as trustworthy. Predispositional skepticism is more difficult to influence as it is an integral part of a personality and forms over time.

One way to reduce skepticism is by engaging in a CSR initiative that has a good fit with the company. In a study on the effects of fit on purchase intentions and the influence of skepticism, it was found that fit reduced skepticism towards the company and increased purchase intentions (Ellen et al., 2006; Elving, 2010). The Associative Network Theory can be used to explain the effect of fit on skepticism. Fit causes a sense of congruence among consumers. When consumers feel that their expectations, knowledge and associations are in line with what a company is communicating, consumers will feel that a company is legitimate in its communication about CSR (Becker-Olsen et al., 2006). This will reduce the level of skepticism consumers might experience as a reaction to the communication about CSR.

*H2: Fit between a company and a CSR initiative lowers the level of skepticism.*
The study on the effects of fit, skepticism and reputation revealed moderating effects of fit and prior reputation on skepticism (Elving, 2010). Fit and a positive reputation would decrease the level of skepticism and positively influence the overall evaluation of the company. Non-fit would create a higher level of skepticism which would influence the evaluation of the company in a negative way. This study measured the effect of reputation on the level of skepticism. Skepticism has not been researched as much as an independent variable (Vanhamme & Grobben, 2009). However, it can be posed that skepticism could also influence reputation. If a company's CSR policy is regarded in a negative aspect, this could be attributed to the entire company and therefore have a negative influence on the company’s reputation. If consumers believe the company is not doing ‘good’, it will cause consumers to regard other corporate activities in the same way (Bae & Cameron, 2006; Brown & Dacin, 1997).

**H3: Skepticism towards CSR has a negative effect on the reputation of the company.**

The relations between fit and skepticism have been researched and therefore a positive relation is expected. The relation between fit and reputation has also been proven to be positive. In studies on fit, a moderating effect of reputation and fit on skepticism has been found (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Elving, 2010). The Legitimacy Theory was used to describe the effect of reputation on skepticism. According to this theory, the lower the legitimacy and therefore the reputation is considered, the more skeptical consumers will be (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990). This is due to the fact that when the legitimacy of a company is considered low, the company can try to restore legitimacy by communicating about CSR (Vanhamme & Grobben, 2009). In this research a mediating influence is expected between fit,
skepticism and reputation, indicating the effect of fit on reputation will be mediated by (a low level of) skepticism.

**H4: Consumer skepticism mediates the effect of fit on reputation; high fit has a positive effect on reputation when skepticism is low**

Communicating about CSR will increase skepticism when consumers view the company’s legitimacy as low. To avoid consumers to become skeptical of the company and its CSR, it is important to communicate enough information and communicate in a neutral way (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990).

**Level of information**

Organizations need to communicate their CSR in order to reap possible benefits from it (Lee & Holladay, 2011). However, communicating too much about CSR can cause consumers to question a company’s motives and create skepticism towards the initiative and the company itself (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990). When a company communicates about CSR it can be seen as a way to promote the company’s legitimacy (Vanhamme & Grobben, 2009). The more a company is perceived as legitimate, the more positive the evaluation of the company will be (Herbig & Milewicz, 1995). However, if a company has a negative reputation the company’s CSR will be considered as illegitimate and communicating about CSR will cause skepticism. This can be prevented by communicating about CSR in an authentic way.

Communicating about CSR should be done via very minimal forms of communication to avoid the self-promoters paradox which causes skepticism (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990). The
self-promoters paradox of CSR entails that communicating about CSR to secure legitimacy can cause skepticism when consumers feel that a company communicates too much about it. An example of the self-promoters paradox is when a company spends a lot of money on creating advertisement in order to communicate its CSR. This will cause protest among consumers when a company has a bad reputation or when the communication about the CSR is considered inappropriate (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990). Research on communication on CSR shows that communication that is indirect and subtle will be considered as more legitimate and cause less skepticism. An example of indirect and subtle communication is the presentation of tangible and objective information on, for instance, a corporate website (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). Examples of tangible information are: how much money a company spends, the time and expertise that is spent by employees and additional resources a company invests.

Expressing tangible resources could aid in convincing consumers and thereby create a more positive evaluation of the company. Expressing resources could also be experienced as a marketing tactic itself. Instead of decreasing distrust by proving legitimacy, it could increase distrust. This could be prevented by being transparent and setting long term goals could prove legitimacy and prevent claims of ‘greenwashing’, a term used to describe companies that mislead consumers by linking the company with sustainability when the company is not involved in CSR at all (Elving, 2010).

It is important to communicate enough information on the CSR initiatives so the information is credible, but not too much or otherwise it will be perceived as persuasive and cause skepticism (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990). Also, by communicating information that is tangible, skepticism, that arises as a result from communicating about CSR in a way that consumers can considered to be ‘sensegiving’, can be prevented. Sensegiving is a concept that describes how companies communicate in a way that is often not objective but entails
information on how the message should be viewed. The company ‘makes sense’ of the message hoping the consumers will view the message in the way the company presents it (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). When consumers feel that a company uses sensegiving to convince them of the legitimacy of the company’s CSR, they will become skeptical. To avoid this, enough information should be available but it has to be tangible and objective to avoid consumers to become skeptical.

**H5: Providing a high level of tangible information lowers the level of skepticism**

Consumers can become more distrustful when a company’s motives are unclear or contradicting (Fein, 1996). When consumers are distrustful they will process information through the peripheral route, as indicated by the ELM (Petty et al., 1983). Providing consumers with information might take away the distrust that arises from communicating about a CSR initiative, even with an initiative with non-fit. It could also make the initiative seem more sincere. Consumers can become skeptical when they perceive a company’s motives to be self-serving instead of altruistic. Motives for a company to develop CSR initiatives can be self-serving, as long as the consumers consider the company to be sincere (Bae & Cameron, 2006; Becker-Olsen et al., 2006; Forehand & Grier, 2003; Yoon et al., 2006). By communicating about tangible resources, consumers could consider the CSR initiative as sincere which will reduce skepticism. Researching if the level of communication strengthens the effect of fit could help to understand the limitations of fit and determine whether non-fit or fit has the most positive effect on the reputation of a company.
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No study has researched whether the level of information would affect skepticism towards CSR among consumers or whether information could moderate the effect of fit on skepticism. Therefore the following research question is posed:

*RQ2: What is the effect of information on the relation between fit and skepticism?*

An overview of all hypotheses can be found in the conceptual model in figure 1.

![Conceptual Model](image)

*Figure 1: The conceptual model including hypotheses*

**Method**

**Research design**

A 2x2 between-subjects online experiment was conducted to research the effects of fit and level of information of CSR activities on skepticism and reputation. An experiment was conducted to analyze the influence of level of information as well as test the causality between the variables. The conditions consisted of fit and non-fit, and high information and low information. The online survey tool where the experiment was hosted, randomly assigned the respondents to one of the four conditions. A convenience sample of respondents eighteen years and up were asked to partake in the online experiment via social media, e-mail,
and face-to-face contact. The snowball sampling method was also used in this experiment; all respondents were asked to share the link directing to the online experiment through social media.

The company that was chosen for this experiment is a Dutch company named Philips that develops software and electrical appliances for domestic (coffeemakers) and industrial use (equipment for hospitals). Philips, well-known throughout The Netherlands, is most commonly known for developing energy-saving lighting, developing technology that can be used in healthcare and innovative design for technology aimed for consumers. Information on Philips’ vision on CSR can be found on the corporate website. Philips only communicates about CSR and the initiatives the company engages in on the corporate website.

Participants

Respondents aged eighteen years and up where asked to partake in the online experiment. A total of 189 respondents filled in the questionnaire. In total 34 of the questionnaires were removed because they were incomplete (N=155). The sample constituted of respondents between 21 and 75 years old with an average age of 34 years old (SD= 8.59). More than 50 percent of the respondents were between the age of 20 and 30 years old. Almost 60 percent of the respondents were female. The majority was highly educated; 54 percent had a Bachelor or a Masters degree. In table 1 an overview of the number of respondents per condition can be found.
Table 1.

Experiment design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fit / Non-fit</th>
<th>Level evidence</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition 1</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Low level of information</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 2</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>High level of information</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 3</td>
<td>Non-fit</td>
<td>Low level of information</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 4</td>
<td>Non-fit</td>
<td>High level of information</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

Over a period of four weeks respondents were asked to participate in an online experiment. The first part of the experiment contained questions to measure the reputation of the company and level of skepticism towards CSR in general. After completing the first part of the questionnaire the respondents were shown a page with a text that stated they were going to look at a webpage and that they should take their time to view the page and read the text. When the respondents were done reading the page they were asked to type in what they had read before they could continue to the rest of the questions. This in order to make sure the respondents properly viewed the material to ensure internal validity. The remaining questions were the same questions they had answered before seeing the webpage concerning skepticism towards CSR and the reputation of Philips.

At the end of the questionnaire the respondents were asked to answer questions about how they thought there was fit or non-fit between the company and the CSR initiative and how they rated the level of information they had received on the initiative. Lastly the respondents were asked to fill in questions regarding their age, gender and level of education they had achieved. After completing the questionnaire the respondents were offered the chance to provide feedback on the experiment. Almost all of the respondents took around ten minutes to complete the online experiment. In appendix 1 the questionnaire can be found.
Stimulus material

The current webpage of Philips devoted to CSR was manipulated in order for the material to be as authentic as possible. It was possible that one of the participants had seen the original website prior to this study. By replicating the website any doubt about the authenticity could be reduced or even eliminated. This would limit the level of skepticism the participant would express as result from possible doubts whether or not the message actually originates from Philips (instead of skepticism as a result from the message). The webpage had the same measurements as a regular webpage and the text and images respondents were shown were constructed specifically for this research. The set-up of the web pages was consistent throughout all the conditions. None of the links on the web pages worked to prevent distraction from the message.

Both CSR initiatives portrayed on the web pages were fictional to prevent participants from having predispositions that may have developed through prior experience with the initiative. All the web pages included a picture with text alongside. In the conditions where fit was portrayed the web page provided information on a CSR initiative where Philips explained that durable energy as well as developing appliances that are low in energy cost are important.

In the non-fit condition information was provided on a CSR initiative for a food program in Ethiopia. In the conditions that portrayed a low level of information the picture that was shown was not related to the text or Philips but was a generic depiction of a CSR activity that somewhat fitted the description of the CSR initiative. Also, the text was relatively short and only mentioned that CSR was important for the company without elaborating on why this was or how Philips was involved in CSR specifically.
In the conditions with a high level of information on the CSR initiatives, a (non-playable) video was shown. The still of the video showed Philips employees contributing to the initiative. The text entailed information about what CSR initiatives Philips was involved in, Philips’ vision on the initiatives, what the goal of the initiatives was and what resources (money, time or employee expertise) they used in order to reach the goal. The text was written in Dutch due to the fact that only Dutch people were likely to partake in this experiment. A pre-test was conducted but only had four respondents and was therefore excluded from the research. In appendix 2 the manipulations of all four conditions can be found.

**Manipulation**

Independent variable: fit. In this experiment fit was portrayed by a CSR initiative that was directly related to the core business of Philips (saving energy) and one that was not (food program in Ethiopia). Fit was measured using three items from the scale developed by Lafferty, Goldsmith and Hult (2004) and was measured by ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answers. The items were: “Do you think Philips and the CSR initiative are similar?”, “Do you think there is a good fit between the company and the CSR initiative?”, and “Do you think this initiative is a logical choice for Philips?”. This scale was checked for skewness and reliability and showed to have a normal distribution and the scale proved to be reliable (α = .92).

Independent variable: level of information. The level of information was manipulated by providing a low level of information that was also generic in relation to the CSR initiative in the ‘low information’ condition, and providing a high level of detailed information on the initiative in the ‘high information’ condition. The level of information was measured by asking the respondents three questions that could be answered with ‘yes’ or ‘no’. The items were: “Do you feel you received enough information on the CSR initiative?”, “Did you
receive too much information on the initiative?”, and “Did you feel that Philips provided you with too little information on the CSR initiative?”. The scale was checked for skewness and showed to have a normal distribution. A reliability analysis was conducted and the scale proved to be reliable ($\alpha = .79$).

**Measurements**

*Dependent variable: reputation.* To measure reputation an adaptation of the scales of Yoon et al. (2006) and Bae and Cameron (2006) was used in this study. The new scale was suitable for this experiment because it does not measure a specific aspect or a specific product of the company, but rather the overall reputation of the company. The scale consists of seven items and will be measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The scale includes items such as: “I think Philips is reliable”, “I think Philips is an expert”, and “I think Philips is sincere”. The scale was checked for skewness and had a normal distribution. A reliability analysis showed that the scale before showing the web pages was reliable ($\alpha = .86$). The scale from the second measuring proved to be slightly more reliable ($\alpha = .89$). The items for the variable were averaged and in the first measuring the reputation of Philips proved to be positive ($M = 3.80, SD = .50$). The items in the second measuring were also averaged and proved to be positive, although slightly less ($M = 3.70, SD = .50$).

*Dependent variable: skepticism.* Skepticism was measured using an adaptation of the scales of Yoon et al. (2006) and the scale of Becker-Olsen et al. (2006). This scale consists of twelve items and was measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The scale included items such as: “Companies that engage in CSR only do this to make profit”, “Companies that engage in CSR are genuinely interested in contributing to society”, and “I think that companies should engage in CSR”. The scale showed to have a
normal distribution and was reliable in both the first measuring ($\alpha = .79$) as well as the second measuring ($\alpha = .80$). The first measuring showed a level of skepticism with an average mean of $M = 3.58$ ($SD = .46$, min = 1, max = 5) indicating that respondents generally were not skeptical towards CSR but had a neutral to positive attitude towards it. In the second measuring skepticism had an average mean of $M = 3.51$ ($SD = .42$, min = 1, max = 5) which is slightly lower than the score in the first measuring, but still indicates that respondents had a neutral to positive attitude towards CSR and were generally not skeptical about it.

**Results**

**Manipulation check**

Before testing the hypotheses a manipulation check is conducted. Both manipulations of fit and level of information are tested with three items. The difference between the two groups in the fit condition is significant ($t = 7.80$, $df = 123.36$, $p < 0.001$).

Respondents in the fit condition rate the fit between Philips and the initiative as ‘high’ ($M_{\text{difference}} = .90$, $SD = .61$, min = 0, max = 1) and in the non-fit conditions the respondents rate the fit as ‘low’ ($M_{\text{difference}} = .23$, $SD = .23$, min = 0, max = 1) proving the manipulation successful. The analysis also shows a significant difference between the two groups in the information condition ($t = 3.16$, $df = 144.13$, $p = 0.002$).

Respondents in the condition where a low level of information is presented, the respondents rate the level of information as ‘low’ ($M_{\text{difference}} = .34$, $SD = .82$, min = 0, max = 1). Congruently the respondents in the ‘high information’ conditions rate the information as ‘high’ ($M_{\text{difference}} = .76$, $SD = .36$, min = 0, max = 1) proving the manipulation successful.

Next to testing the manipulation, a bivariate correlation was performed using the dependent variables and the demographic variables to determine a possible relation between the
variables. The analysis showed no significant results and therefore the demographic variables are excluded from further analysis.

**Hypothesis 1**

To test the effect of fit on reputation a moderate linear regression was conducted. Respondents in the fit condition rated the reputation of Philips higher ($M = 3.88$) than respondents in the non-fit condition ($M = 3.66$). This indicates that the respondents rated the reputation of Philips as positive in both conditions, but slightly more positive in the fit condition. However, the regression analysis of the effect of fit on reputation revealed no significant difference in results $F(1,153) = 1.32, p = .252, CI 95\% [-.80, .30]$ and therefore hypothesis 1 is rejected.

**Hypothesis 2**

In order to analyse whether fit lowers the level of skepticism a linear regression analysis was performed. The analysis revealed a significant effect of fit on level of skepticism $F(1, 154) = 4.15, p = 0.043, CI 95\% [-.27, .01]$. In case of fit, the respondent becomes more skeptical towards CSR ($M = 3.35$) than in case of non-fit ($M = 3.54$). However, this effect was small ($b^* = -.16, t = -2.04$). Fit can be used to explain 1.5 percent of the variation in skepticism ($R^2 = 0.015$). It was expected that fit would decrease the level of skepticism. In this study the opposite was found. As a consequence of these findings hypothesis 2 is rejected.

**Hypothesis 3**

To test whether the level of skepticism influences reputation a linear regression analysis was conducted. This relationship proved not to be significant $F(1,153) = 1.32, p = .252, CI 95\% [-.80, .30]$. As a consequence of this outcome the hypothesis is rejected.
Hypothesis 4

A mediating effect between fit, skepticism and reputation was assumed. Due to the fact that only the relation between fit and skepticism was significant, the requirements for this analysis were not met and therefore the mediation could not be tested (Baron & Kenny, 1986). This hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 5

To test the assumption that more information about a CSR initiative would lead to less skepticism, a linear regression was conducted. The analysis revealed a significant effect of level of information on skepticism $F(1, 54) = 1.82, p = 0.029, CI 95\% [0.16, 0.29]$. The more information about a CSR initiative is provided, the less skeptical the respondent becomes ($b^* = 0.25, t = 2.20$). This hypothesis is therefore accepted.

Research question 2

In this research question what effect the level of information would have on the relation between fit and skepticism was examined. The multiple regression analysis that was used to test this relation showed no significant effects $F(1, 153) = 1.82, p = 0.078, CI 95\% [-0.15, 0.27]$. The value of the $R^2_{\text{adjusted}}$ indicates that the predictors fit and level of information only explain 1.6 percent of the variances in the model ($R^2_{\text{adjusted}} = 0.016$). In table 2 an overview of the results from the regression analysis is shown.
Table 2

Results from moderation analysis of fit, level of information and skepticism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y (M)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>b*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit*Information</td>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Y = independent, X = dependent, M = moderation

* p<0.05, *** p < 0.001, ns = not significant on 95% reliability, $R^2_{\text{adjusted}} = .016$

A paired samples t-test was conducted to determine the effects throughout the conditions. Condition 4 revealed to differ significantly from the other conditions ($M_{\text{difference}} = .14, p = <0.000$) indicating that a high level of information combined with non-fit decreases the level of skepticism. However, the multiple regression analysis revealed only marginally significant results and therefore this RQ cannot be answered sufficiently with this model. The marginally significant results can indicate that level of information moderates the relation between fit and skepticism. However, the results from this study are inconclusive.

In figure 2 an overview of the mean differences throughout all conditions can be found. In figure 3 the adjusted model containing all significant results can be found.
Figure 2 Mean differences for skepticism throughout all conditions


* $p<0.05$, *** $p<0.001$, ns = not significant on 95% reliability

Figure 3: Adjusted model


* $p<0.05$, *** $p<0.001$, ns = not significant on 95% reliability
Conclusion and discussion

The aim of this study was to examine the effects of fit and the level of information about CSR on skepticism and reputation. It was assumed that the effect of fit on the reputation of the company would be mediated by skepticism of a company. It was also assumed that the relation between fit and skepticism would be moderated by the level of information the respondents received, in a way that the more information was given, the less skeptical respondents would be. When a respondent was not skeptical about the CSR initiative it would rate the reputation of Philips as more positive than when the respondent was skeptical.

The effects of corporate social responsibility have been examined throughout several studies (Barone et al., 2000; Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Du et al., 2010; Ellen et al., 2006). Research has been done on the effects of CSR in relation to fit, skepticism and reputation. This study contributed to the literature by researching the effect of the level of information that is used in communicating about a CSR initiative. The results of this study confirm that fit and how much information is given to consumers, influences how skeptical they are towards the CSR initiative.

In hypothesis 1 the assumption was stated that fit would have a positive effect on the reputation of the company. Choosing a CSR initiative that has a strong fit with the company increases the evaluation of the company’s reputation where a CSR initiative with non-fit will not (Becker-Olsen et al., 2006). No significant support was found for this assumption. This effect could be caused by the evaluation of the CSR initiatives by the consumers. Even though the manipulation check showed that consumers found the initiative with fit to be a logical choice and the condition with non-fit to be an illogical choice for Philips, they could evaluate them both as positive. Philips communicates very little about its CSR. However, Philips has been engaging in CSR for several years in both fit and non-fit initiatives. Regardless of whether consumers received any information directly from Philips about its CSR, they could
have formed an opinion based on other communication from Philips or based on information they received from other sources. Having a neutral or positive opinion about both fit and non-fit initiatives could result in little to no differences in the evaluation of the reputation of Philips.

Fit did prove to influence skepticism, although not in the way it was expected. Hypothesis 2 stated that fit between a company and the CSR initiative would decrease skepticism. This hypothesis is based on previous research on the effects of fit on skepticism which states that a good fit would lower the level of skepticism (Becker-Olsen et al., 2006; Elving, 2010). Also, according to the Elaboration Likelihood Model (Petty et al., 1983), people are likely to process information through the peripheral route when information is easy to relate to, as it is in case of fit, and would therefore be less likely to resist the message.

However, this research found evidence that fit increased the level of skepticism. The respondents in the fit condition were slightly more skeptical towards CSR after viewing the webpage. This is in line with research that indicates that a strong fit between a company and a CSR initiative could be considered an easy choice, insincere and purely designed for making a profit (Forehand & Grier, 2003; Nan & Heo, 2007; Yoon et al., 2006). Having a fit between the company and the initiative could positively influence the reputation of the company, but only when the company acknowledges the fact that the initiative could benefit the company. If a company acknowledges the benefits, consumers could become less skeptical towards the CSR initiative. However, this research did not include any type of motive for the initiatives. The lack of motive could cause the respondents to doubt the initiative and process the information through the central route. Not being offered information on why the company chose the initiative could increase skepticism. CSR initiatives that do not have a fit with the company could be perceived as more altruistic because there are no obvious benefits for the
company and therefore the initiative is considered as more sincere (Forehand & Grier, 2003; Nan & Heo, 2007).

This experiment also revealed that the respondents had a positive, non-skeptical view of CSR in general before viewing the web pages. Because Philips already has a CSR policy it could also be that the respondents have high expectations towards this ‘new’ initiative. Considering the initiative in the fit condition was directly related to the core business of Philips, respondents could consider it as obvious, or perhaps something that Philips should already have engaged in.

In hypothesis 3 it was expected that the level of skepticism would also influence reputation. The more skeptical a respondent was, the lower it would rate the reputation of the company. In previous research a positive effect of reputation on skepticism was found (Bae & Cameron, 2006; Elving, 2010). In this research it was expected that skepticism could also possibly affect reputation. However, no significant results were found to support this hypothesis and therefore it was rejected. Previous research focused on the effect of reputation on skepticism. It could be posed that the level of skepticism is not formed without taking the reputation of a company into consideration. Furthermore, this research focuses on situational skepticism which is a form of skepticism that is based on the evaluation of a message or the medium that delivers the message (for instance, a salesperson). Philips communicates very little about its CSR and therefore is not known as a company that promotes its social responsibility. By exposing respondents to communication about Philips’ CSR, this could be contradicting the notion that the respondents have of the company and therefore cause situational skepticism.

However, the effects could also be caused by the choice to research the effects in relation to a company that has a neutral to positive reputation. Choosing a company that has a negative reputation, or a company on which the consumers differ more in their opinion, could
provide insight in whether levels of skepticism are related to how the consumers rate the reputation. In this research skepticism functions as an exploratory variable in the relation between fit and reputation. With no direct significant results, hypothesis 4 in which a mediating effect of skepticism in the relation between fit and reputation was expected, was also rejected.

In this research the effects of the level of information respondents received on the CSR initiatives on skepticism were analyzed. Providing respondents with a high level of information on the goal of initiative, and which resources were used such as time, money and expertise, proved to lower the level of skepticism towards CSR. This confirms hypothesis 5, stating that a high level of information would lower the level of skepticism. This is consistent with literature on being transparent, and communicating in a non-persuasive matter to increase credibility and decrease skepticism towards the company (Ellen et al., 2006; Herbig & Milewicz, 1995).

Lastly, a research question was posed that stated that the level of information would not only influence skepticism in a positive way, but that it would also moderate the relation between fit and skepticism. Although only marginally significant results were found and therefore the research question could not be answered, providing a high level of information combined with an initiative that has a non-fit showed to lower the level of skepticism. This effect can be explained with the Elaboration Likelihood Model. In case of non-fit consumers are more likely to process the information through the central route instead of the peripheral route (Petty et al., 1983). By providing more information, or ‘proof’ about how the company is involved in the CSR initiative, possible doubts can be eliminated. A person can feel assured that the company isn’t ‘just saying’ that it’s involved, but actually is and that the company is willing to be transparent and provide specific information about its CSR.
Limitations and recommendations

Even though not many significant results were found, level of information proved to have an effect on skepticism towards CSR. However, the results that have been found should be considered with caution.

The sample in this study was not very large and consisted of mostly people in the age group of 20-30 who were generally highly educated. Future studies could benefit from larger sample. Making sure the sample is more diverse by selecting people from all age groups and levels of education is also very important. Also, this experiment was conducted online and respondents for the experiment were solicited through the University of Amsterdam and via my personal network. This allowed the sample to exist out of people that used self-selection for this experiment. Respondents were asked to voluntarily partake in this experiment. This could create a sample that already has an interest in CSR or has a general interest in partaking in (online) experiments. Self-selection sampling decreases the external validity of this research. For future research it is advisable to have a sample whereby it is made impossible or more difficult for respondents to select themselves, for instance by conducting the experiment in a company where participation is made mandatory by management.

Results in this study could be influenced by media reports on Philips’ CSR. However, this was not the case in this experiment because coming up to, and during the experiment, all media reports were scanned for messages on Philips and no news reports CSR were published in this particular period. Although no media coverage was found on Philips’s CSR, it is possible that respondents received information on this topic through their own network. Asking the respondents whether they have read anything on the subject recently could provide insight in whether or not this is the case.

In this online experiment the condition with fit was manipulated by constructing a CSR initiative that is directly related to the core business of Philips. The initiative could
therefore be considered solely as a part of Philips’ core business, instead of part of Philips’ CSR. A recommendation for future research concerns the manipulation of fit. It should be considered to choose an initiative that would be logical for the company, but is not so closely related to its core business.

It could also be considered to choose a different kind of company that is not easily relatable to CSR or a company with a more neutral or even negative reputation in order to analyze the effects of fit en level of information under those circumstances. For this research the choice was made to use an existing company. This was done in order to examine what effect fit or information would have on the evaluation of the initiative or reputation of an existing company. So far, research has primarily been done on fictitious companies and results from existing companies were missing (Elving, 2010).

Also, choosing Philips allowed this research to examine effects of fit and information on a company that is generally perceived as neutral to positive. When making use of an existing company it is advisable to analyze thoroughly what respondents already know about the company and its CSR in order to determine whether an opinion could be influenced by previous knowledge or experience. Even though respondents showed to have a positive opinion of Philips and were not skeptical towards its CSR in general, it is important to check how much knowledge the respondents already have about a company’s CSR to exclude this as a possible influence. To have an even better understanding of the effects it is advisable to test the same model with a fictitious company to see how this changes the outcome of the analysis. This should provide better insight in whether fit or the level of information was not suitable for testing these effects or the selection of the company had a bigger influence than expected.

Besides changing the company or using a fictitious company it is advised to measure the variable reputation over a period of two weeks. Research shows that a delay of two weeks in measuring provides the most accurate result in measuring reputation (Cornelissen, 2008).
Even though the choice was made to measure the construct on the same moment to secure response rate, it could be the cause for the lack of results and measuring over time could provide more insight on the effects on reputation.

The effects that were found were significant but rather small. For future research it is advisable to look into why these effects are so small. For this experiment a combination of two scales was used to form the variable skepticism. Perhaps a different scale would provide better results. A scale that is aimed to measure towards which specific types of CSR consumers are more skeptical could also pose as an option to better understand the effects. The scale used in this experiment was chosen because it measured general CSR. However, the web pages showed very specific forms of CSR and therefore for future research it could be considered to adapt the scale to the type of CSR that will be shown in the manipulation.

A different explanation for the size of the effects could be that a certain aspect of the manipulation was considered as not realistic. Respondents might be familiar with the actual Philips CSR webpage or either the text or the initiative could be perceived as unlikely to originate from Philips. The general response of the respondents to the experiment however was very positive and in all cases the respondents expressed that they thought that both the web page as well as the initiative were genuine.

Research could also benefit from focusing on the underlying processes of the Elaboration Likelihood Model to determine how much and what kind of information consumers actually need in order to feel reassured that the information they have received is trustworthy. This could also help determine what kind of (tangible) information they actually look for in communication about corporate social responsibility.
Managerial implications

In this research the manipulation consisted of fit and non-fit conditions combined with a high or low level of information. The choice for a CSR initiative can be based on several things and can be made based on scientific literature as well as personal preferences. The current research could not prove whether fit or non-fit is better. Previous research can perhaps aid in determining what type of CSR is suitable for a certain company. However, the level of information did prove to affect the level of skepticism. In this research the condition of high level of information was manipulated by giving information about which initiative Philips was involved in and why. Also, information on what specific goals the company had set in relation to the initiative and how they were spending time and money to reach this goal. It was also mentioned that Philips invited their employees to contribute in their own way. What information should be shared with consumers depends on the company and the initiative. However, in supplying information to consumers it is important to be specific. This will allow people to get a good understanding on what the company wants to achieve. Even though no effects on reputation were found, it can be concluded that giving specific information on a CSR initiative can benefit companies with non-fit initiatives. An initiative with non-fit can perhaps cause consumers to question a company’s motives. Showing why this initiative was chosen, giving information on what goals a company hopes to achieve and how the company is planning to reach these goals may make consumers less skeptical.
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Appendix

Appendix 1: Questionnaire (Dutch translation)

Introduction

Welkom bij het onderzoek naar Maatschappelijk Verantwoord Ondernemen. Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd door Simone Pouw, masterstudente Corporate Communicatie aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam. Het onderzoek duurt vijf à tien minuten en draait geheel om uw mening.

De door u verstrekte informatie wordt verder uiteraard anoniem en strikt vertrouwelijk behandeld en is alleen te zien door mijzelf. Voor het slagen van het onderzoek is het erg belangrijk dat u alle vragen invult. Als u twijfelt over het antwoord wil ik u vragen alsnog een keuze uit de gegeven mogelijkheden te maken. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden, het gaat in dit onderzoek puur om uw mening.

Heeft u vragen over dit onderzoek of bent u geïnteresseerd in de uitkomsten dan kunt u contact met mij opnemen door te mailen naar simonepouw@hotmail.com.

Alvast heel erg bedankt voor uw deelname aan mijn onderzoek!

Simone Pouw

Questions for measuring reputation Philips

Answers: 1 completely disagree to 5 completely agree

1. Ik vind Philips oprecht
2. Ik vind Philips betrouwbaar
3. Ik vind Philips een expert
4. Ik vind Philips overvaren
5. Ik vind Philips goed in wat ze doen
6. Ik vind Philips onprettig
7. Een bedrijf dat mijn voorkeur heeft
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Questions for measuring CSR skepticism

Answers: 1 completely disagree to 5 completely agree

1. Bedrijven die maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen doen dit vanuit interesse in de samenleving
2. Bedrijven die maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen doen dit met oog voor winst
3. Bedrijven die maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen doen dit vanuit eigenbelang
4. Bedrijven die maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen doen dit om te compenseren voor de kwalitatief mindere producten die zij maken
5. Maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen is een verlies van demiddelen (tijd, geld) die een bedrijf heeft
6. Bedrijven leveren kwalitatief mindere producten doordat zij tijd en geld in maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen steken

Introduction text before viewing the manipulation

U krijgt hierna een pagina van de website van Philips te zien. Ik wil u vragen de website goed te bestuderen voordat u doorgaat naar de vragen.

Manipulation check items fit

Answers: yes, no

1. Vind u dat Philips en het maatschappelijk verantwoorde initiatief sterke overeenkomsten hebben?
2. Past het maatschappelijk verantwoorde initiatief bij Philips?
3. Vind u de keuze voor het maatschappelijk verantwoorde initiatief een logische keuze voor Philips?

Manipulation check items level of information

Answers: yes, no

1. Heeft u voor uw gevoel voldoende informatie gekregen over het initiatief?
2. Heeft u teveel informatie gekregen over het maatschappelijk verantwoorde initiatief?
3. Heeft u het gevoel dat Philips u van niet voldoende informatie heeft voorzien?

Questions for measuring reputation Philips (repeated measuring)

Answers: 1 completely disagree to 5 completely agree

1. Ik vind Philips oprecht
2. Ik vind Philips betrouwbaar
3. Ik vind Philips een expert
4. Ik vind Philips ervaren
5. Ik vind Philips goed in wat ze doen
6. Ik vind Philips onprettig
7. Een bedrijf dat mijn voorkeur heeft

Questions for measuring CSR skepticism

Answers: 1 completely disagree to 5 completely agree

1. Bedrijven die maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen doen dit vanuit interesse in de samenleving
2. Bedrijven die maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen doen dit met oog voor winst
3. Bedrijven die maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen doen dit vanuit eigenbelang
4. Bedrijven die maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen doen dit om te compenseren voor de kwalitatief mindere producten die zij maken
5. Maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen is een verlies van de middelen (tijd, geld) die een bedrijf heeft
6. Bedrijven leveren kwalitatief mindere producten doordat zij tijd en geld in maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen steken
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Demografic variables

Geslacht:
- Man
- Vrouw

Leeftijd: (open vraag)

Wat is uw hoogst genoten opleiding? Als uw opleiding er niet tussen staat kies dan de opleiding die er het meest op lijkt.
- Lagere school
- Mavo, LBO
- Havo, MBO
- VWO
- HBO
- WO

Wat is uw huidige woonplaats? (open vraag)

End message

Hartelijk dank voor uw deelname aan dit onderzoek. De in dit onderzoek vertoonde informatie over maatschappelijk verantwoorde activiteiten van Philips is geheel fictief. Philips is op geen enkele wijze geaffilieerd met dit onderzoek en heeft geen toegang tot de door u ingevulde antwoorden. Mocht u meer informatie willen over het onderzoek of bent u geïnteresseerd in de uitkomsten van het onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen met simonepouw@hotmail.com
Appendix 2:

*Condition 1: Fit, low information*

Bij Philips is duurzaamheid belangrijk en proberen we bij te dragen aan efficient energieverbruik. Dit wordt gedaan door groene producten te maken en mensen te bewegen tot kleine veranderingen waarmee grote resultaten geboekt kunnen worden.

*Duurzaamheid*
*Efficiënt energieverbruik*
*Groene producten*
*Voedselprogramma Ethiopië*
*Algemene gedragscode*

We maken het graag makkelijker voor u om te kiezen voor milieuvriendelijke producten. Carole Wainaina, Chief Sustainability

We zoeken naar nieuwe oplossingen die een verantwoorde omgang met energie stimuleren en houden al jarenlang rekening met de energieneutraleheid van onze producten en productieprocessen.

Terug naar Philips duurzaamheid

Bekijk het duurzaamheidsverslag van 2012
Condition 2: Fit, high information

"Wij gaan niet voor belofte maar streven naar tastbare resultaten waar we als bedrijf samen aan kunnen werken. Carole Wainaina, Chief Sustainability"

Naast het ontwikkelen van energiezuinige producten maakt Philips voor de fabrikantactiviteiten zelf ook gebruik van stroom die via windmolens wordt opgewekt. Philips streeft er naar om in 2020 voor minimaal 50% gebruik te maken van duurzame stroom. Ook worden 400 medewerkers ingezet om nieuwe energiezuinige producten te ontwikkelen. Klik op de video voor meer informatie over hoe de medewerkers bijdragen.

Terug naar Philips duurzaamheid
Condition 3: Non-fit, low information

VOEDSELPROGRAMMA EThIOPIE

As onderdeel van Philips Duurzaamheid is een voedselprogramma voor de inwoners van Ethiopië opgezet. Met dit programma probeert Philips bij te dragen aan het terugdringen van honger in de wereld.

"Philips wil een verantwoordelijke partner in samenlevingen over heel de wereld zijn. Carole Wainaina, Chief Sustainability"

Ongeveer 1,5 miljoen mensen in Ethiopië kunnen zichzelf niet van voldoende voedsel voorzien. Philips ondersteunt hierin door voedsel te verstrekken maar ook door de bevolking te ondersteunen in het zelf verbouwen van voedsel. Dankzij het voedselprogramma kunnen nu veel mensen voor wie de hongerdoed dreigde worden geholpen.

Terug naar Philips duurzaamheid

Bekijk het duurzaamheidsverslag van 2012
**Condition 4: Non-fit, high information**

---

**PHILIPS Duurzaamheid**

*VOEDSELPROGRAMMA ETHIOPIE*

**Analysis Sustainability**

- Duurzaamheidsposten (in sectoren)
  - Philips: 84.3
  - Sector: 52.4
- Social: 82.8

Met behulp van het voedselprogramma in Ethiopië probeert Philips bij te dragen aan het tot een einde brengen van hongermaat in Ethiopië. Naast het uitdelen van voedselpakketten wordt 40% van het budget voor het voedselprogramma besteed aan het ondersteunen van de bevolking in het zelfstandig worden bij het verbouwen van voedsel.

"Ondersteunen door het verstrekken van voedsel, maar juist ook het zelfstandig maken van de bevolking is wat het voedselprogramma zo succesvol maakt."

Carole Waimana, Chief Sustainability


**Terug naar Philips duurzaamheid**

---

**PHILIPS**

*Bekijk het duurzaamheidsverslag van 2012*