

**To Print: Click your browser's PRINT button.**

**NOTE:** To view the article with Web enhancements, go to:

<http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/451188>

**Managing Children's Risks: It Takes a Commitment. Papers From the Kids Risk Symposium at Harvard School of Public Health**

## How Much Do Kids Count in Corporate Board Rooms? Results from the First Survey of Fortune 1000 Companies

**Kimberly M. Thompson, ScD**

Medscape General Medicine 5(1), 2003. © 2003 Medscape

Posted 03/26/2003

### Abstract and Introduction

#### Abstract

**Objective:** The objective of this study was to characterize the extent of the business community's commitment to children, particularly with respect to understanding its role in assuring children's health and development, by conducting a survey of the largest US companies.

**Method:** A survey of year 2001 Fortune 1000 companies was performed to determine whether their mission statements, vision statements, or guiding principles include a commitment to children; whether they employ people under the age of 18 years in the United States; whether they encourage their employees to mentor children under the age of 18 years; whether they have an affiliated philanthropic foundation; whether their company's philanthropy focuses specifically on children; and whether they participate in any activities that particularly help disadvantaged children. The survey consisted of 2 mailings followed by phone calls to companies to obtain answers to the questions listed above and answers to additional questions that asked specifically about the company's financial expenditures for parental leave, child care, and healthcare for children of employees and about the company's specific philanthropic giving aimed at helping children. Descriptive information about some of the ways that companies impact the lives of children was also obtained to provide context for the responses.

**Results:** Data were obtained from 333 year 2001 Fortune 1000 companies (33%) between March 20, 2002 and March 20, 2003, with a good representation of all industry sectors. These data suggest that approximately 33% of the companies that responded have mission statements, vision statements, or guiding principles that specifically include a commitment to children. Employment opportunities for children under the age of 18 years in the United States exist at approximately 41% of these companies. These companies clearly see mentoring as a major theme, with 77% of them encouraging their employees to mentor children under the age of 18 years. Approximately 60% of the companies that responded support affiliated, independent philanthropic foundations, and approximately 55% of companies indicated that they focus their philanthropy specifically (although not exclusively) on children. Approximately 80% of these companies indicated that they participate in at least one activity that helps disadvantaged children. Many companies faced challenges in estimating their overall investments in children, particularly given their large and decentralized nature, but they were able to provide an overall sense of their commitment and they indicated that they could provide quantitative data prospectively if they knew it would be requested.

**Conclusion:** Many companies that responded play a major role in supporting children's health and development in the United States both directly and indirectly. Further efforts to better quantify the business community's aggregate commitments to improving children's health and development should be sought to allow better estimation of the amount of resources expended and the impact of these investments on children.

#### Introduction

The well-established and important role of the business community in the lives of Americans continues to evolve, most recently, with growing expectations associated with meeting the increased challenges of globalization in an uncertain world.

[1] Studies suggest that health and wealth appear to be intimately linked both on the aggregate and individual levels.<sup>[2,3]</sup> Businesses provide employment opportunities, healthcare to their employees and their dependents, and financial, volunteer, and other resources to communities and society. Nonetheless, the impact of their role on children, particularly on children's health and development, has not been extensively studied, and it is difficult to assess the relative importance of the business community compared with other stakeholders (eg, government, not-for-profit groups).

Clearly, businesses may invest in children out of altruism or because they recognize that today's children are tomorrow's employees. They may also, however, decide to invest in children because they sell products and services that are directed at children and families and their good deeds toward these groups may improve their visibility and competitiveness. In addition, they might find advantages in providing support in the form of child care, healthcare, education, and sponsorship of community events because their employees value these for their own children.

Whatever their motivation, businesses have the potential to be significant stakeholders in children's health and development, with spending on children in the billions of dollars each year. The choices and policies that they make related to children affect whether children have healthcare and high-quality day care and education, and whether community groups have resources to help children succeed. It is not possible to determine whether we are investing sufficiently in children without determining what we are investing and the impacts of these investments. Understanding corporate commitments to children is a critical first step in beginning to assess the magnitude of the business community's investment in children. The current lack of information about corporate giving aimed at children partly arises from the typical characterization of corporate philanthropic activities with categories like education, health and human services, civic and community activities, culture and the arts, etc., but not specifically focusing on youth.<sup>[4]</sup> A recent study indicated that education accounted for the largest portion of philanthropic contributions between 1978 and 1996, but contributions for health and human services were higher before 1978 and in 1997.<sup>[5]</sup> Given that support for activities related to education and health services is often targeted at youth, studies that show that these dominate corporate philanthropic efforts imply that companies do invest significantly in youth. In the first known study to focus on corporate programs that support youth, a survey of approximately one third of the 1997 Fortune 500 companies found that 99% of the companies that responded reported supporting youth and youth programs at some level.<sup>[4]</sup> The study measured philanthropic giving for youth in grades K-12 by the approximately 170 companies that responded, and found that approximately 27% of these companies directed 60% or more of their total giving towards youth and 69% of these companies had corporate foundations.<sup>[4]</sup> Studies of corporate volunteerism also suggest that most companies have extended their efforts in social investment programs well beyond traditional philanthropy, and they now support volunteerism in a variety of ways that benefit the community, their employees, and the corporation.<sup>[6,7]</sup>

Given the fact that children lack rights as individuals in the United States, the commitments of parents, the government, and other stakeholders in their health and development are critical, and efforts are needed to assess the sufficiency of current investments. At the same time that health policy analysts ask government agencies and foundations to specifically characterize their investments and spending on children and challenge them to evaluate their effectiveness and impact, we must also assess the roles of other key players and expect to measure their investments and impact. All such efforts must begin with an understanding of the current expectations and baseline data, and this study sought to provide baseline data about the significant corporate contributions to children by surveying the 2001 Fortune 1000 companies.

## Methods

To begin to characterize the commitment of the largest corporations to children under the age of 18 years in the United States, we surveyed the 2001 Fortune 1000 companies.<sup>[8]</sup> The Fortune 1000 companies represent a significant part of the US labor force, accounting for more than 29,000,000 employees (ie, equivalent to approximately one tenth of all Americans) and in 2001 they collectively produced revenues of more than 8 trillion dollars. Only 16 of these companies employed greater than 200 but less than 1000 employees; the remaining 984 companies all employed more than 1000 employees, with 8 companies employing more than 300,000 and 1 company (Wal-Mart) employing more than 1,000,000 workers.

We asked each company specifically the following questions:

- Does your company have a commitment to children as part of its mission statement, vision statement, or guiding principles?
- Do you encourage your employees to mentor children under the age of 18 years?
- Do you employ people under the age of 18 years in the United States?

- Does your company have an affiliated, independent philanthropic foundation?
- Does your company's philanthropy focus specifically on children?
- Does your company participate in at least one activity that helps disadvantaged children?

We sent letters with the survey to the CEOs of all of the 2001 Fortune 1000 companies on March 20, 2002 and a single follow-up letter in April of 2002. Following these mailings, we began randomly contacting companies that had not responded by phone until we had responses from at least one third of the companies (see the Appendix for the list of the 333 companies that responded). We also requested qualitative information about what the companies did for any of the questions above to which they responded "yes," and we checked every company's Web site for information and to determine which companies had created any Web sites specifically for children.

Finally, we requested some additional information about company spending on children. Given data that suggested that more than 99% of private firms that employ more than 1000 people offer one or more major health plan,<sup>[9]</sup> we assumed that all of these companies offered health insurance to their employees and the employees' minor dependents. Consequently, we asked each company about the amount of resources it spent providing coverage for minor children in the United States in 2000. With the growth in company-sponsored child care programs for children of employees and coverage of parental leave, we also asked about the dollar amount spent in the year 2000 in the United States for these programs. Finally, we requested estimates of the percentage of the company's philanthropy that was directed at helping children, and specifically at disadvantaged children.

We report the aggregate results from this survey as the percentage of companies that responded that answered yes to each of the 6 key questions, and we provide examples to demonstrate the types of efforts that companies described when we asked them for more information about their efforts. We obtained limited information on financial expenditures, and consequently we report estimates based on the data that we did obtain as hypotheses to be explored in future studies. In particular, many companies found it difficult to estimate their spending for children's healthcare separate from spending on all dependent care because they do not typically capture these data. Further, the large and decentralized nature of these companies also made it difficult in some cases for them to aggregate over the entire company.

## Results

This is the largest study to date to attempt to characterize what companies do for children in the United States. [Table 1](#) shows the breakdown of the 2001 Fortune 1000 companies by industry and the corresponding breakdown of our sample. Overall, this sample appears to represent companies in all of the industries reasonably well, although we did not get responses from any of the 6 companies in the "Building materials, Glass" category or any of the 4 Railroads, but both of the toy companies did respond.

We found that approximately 33% of the companies that responded reported that their mission statements, vision statements, or guiding principles specifically include a commitment to children. These commitments generally included specific mention of the company's philanthropic focus on children, and in some cases specifically on disadvantaged children, or mention of the company's efforts to be involved in the community, primarily by supporting or engaging in children's educational activities. In spite of the lack of a large social movement demanding a corporate commitment to children (eg, comparable to the demands for corporate environmental responsibility), the fact that nearly a third of all companies have a commitment to children at this level is significant, and it represents a clear vision by the leaders of these corporations about investing in the future of business by investing in today's children.

Jobs also represent a significant contribution of the business community to children. Not only do companies employ parents and enable them to be productive members of society, they also provide important employment and career opportunities for youth as well. In our survey, we found that approximately 41% of the companies that responded provide employment opportunities for children under the age of 18 years in the United States. These opportunities included internships, summer and after-school hour jobs, and vocational-training opportunities, primarily part-time jobs for high-school students. Companies provide incentives for these young employees to encourage them to complete high school, for example by specifically limiting the number of after-school hours that youth can work per week, setting minimum grade point average requirements for employment, and in some cases offering on-site courses that help employees pass the General Educational Development (GED) test. Companies also encourage young employees and the children of employees to pursue a college education by offering scholarships and work-study programs. Responses to this question also revealed that many multinational companies now also have or they are developing strict policies on child labor, primarily related to their overseas operations, a direct result of globalization and concerns about human rights.

Our results also suggest that the companies that responded clearly see mentoring children as a major theme, with 77% of the companies that responded encouraging their employees to mentor children under the age of 18 years. All of the companies encourage their employees to be involved in the community in some form or another,<sup>[4]</sup> but the observation that more than three fourths of them specifically focus on mentoring children is very significant, and it's good news for current efforts like the National Mentoring Partnership. Companies offer incentives to employees that in some cases include paid time off for volunteer work, monetary bonuses for employees who volunteer at least a certain number of hours, recognition within the company for employees that volunteer, and programs for matching gifts. Many companies now have established programs that help put their employees in schools (some companies have even "adopted" schools) where their employees mentor children one-on-one. These include programs that send employees out to teach business and computer skills to disadvantaged middle school children, lunch buddy programs where employees mentor specific children during the lunch hour at a local elementary school, reading programs where employees take books to schools to donate and read to kids, and high school job fairs that include mentoring related to careers and interviewing. Companies also provide job-shadowing opportunities, and they support numerous national mentoring programs like Junior Achievement, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, and youth-focused organizations. Finally, companies also encourage parents to mentor their own children by sponsoring activities and opening their doors for very popular "take a child to work" days, and some companies provide scholarships for parent-child seminars.

In our survey, approximately 60% of the companies that responded indicated that they support affiliated, independent philanthropic foundations. This question appeared to be complicated by the fact that, in some cases, the companies are owned by a larger trust and, consequently, the reverse statement might be more appropriate (ie, that an affiliated, independent trust supports the corporate entity). Many companies indicated that independent of whether they had a corporate foundation, they did have direct corporate giving programs. Approximately 54% of respondents also indicated that they focus their philanthropy specifically (although not exclusively) on children, indicating that for more than half of these companies, children are a priority in corporate giving. We noted that responses to this question may have depended on whether the individual responding interpreted philanthropy related to education as a specific focus on children or not, and we suspect that future studies should provide more specific criteria.

With respect to disadvantaged children, we found that approximately 80% of the responding companies do participate in at least one activity that particularly helps disadvantaged children, whether this is through contributions to local charities that focus on disadvantaged children, adopting child care centers in great need, or focusing their larger philanthropic efforts and engaging in programs to combat the conditions that place children at risk. One key observation with respect to giving resources to disadvantaged children is the reality that children in developing countries often become the focus of giving due to their relatively much greater need, and this has led to some significant corporate philanthropic efforts by multinational corporations that focus specifically on improving the lives of children in parts of the developing world.

Finally, we received limited data from 78 companies about their human resources spending and specific philanthropy related to children. Analysis of these data suggests several hypotheses for testing in future studies. First, it appears that spending is highly variable among companies with the amount of money spent providing healthcare for children of employees ranging from approximately \$100 per child to \$3000 per child (in year 2000 dollars), with a mean of approximately \$1000 and one company with unique employment reporting spending as low as \$10 per child. If companies spent approximately \$1000 per child,<sup>[10]</sup> with employees of these 1000 companies assumed to be parents of approximately 10% of the 70,400,000 children in the United States under the age of 18 years,<sup>[11]</sup> then this implies that the top 1000 companies in aggregate probably spent on the order of approximately 7 billion dollars covering healthcare insurance costs for children of their employees. Recognizing that 64% of children get healthcare from private/employer-based coverage,<sup>[12]</sup> employers probably spend in excess of 45 billion dollars annually supporting healthcare for children, an amount that exceeds government spending on Medicaid for the approximately 21% of children eligible for Medicaid.

The types and costs of child care programs these companies support are extremely variable, with some companies offering very extensive child care benefits (eg, including on-site day care through kindergarten, back-up child care, and school holiday programs), and others offering relatively few child care benefits. Given this incredibly large variability and the relatively small sample size, we did not feel comfortable providing an aggregate estimate of corporate spending on child care. Companies also generally found it difficult to estimate the costs associated with supporting parental leave, but depending on their policies, some invested considerable financial resources in supporting leaves for maternity and in some cases for paternity and for adoption.

Overall, of the 78 respondents that reported spending information sufficient to estimate the percent specifically directed at children, 37%, 31%, 15%, 10%, and 8% spent between approximately 0% and 19%, 20% and 39%, 40% and 59%, 60% and 79%, and 80% and 100% of their corporate philanthropy, respectively, on efforts to help children. This suggests that 33% of these companies directed 60% or more of their philanthropy to youth. (Diane Gingold & Associates reported a similar result of 27%).<sup>[4]</sup>

Companies also provided information about their largest single gifts made to help children. Most of these gifts were in the hundred thousand to millions of dollars range, and they included contributing to major capital campaigns, for example to support the building of children's hospitals, children's museums and science centers, houses where children could stay with their families while receiving medical care, and child care and youth centers; gifts to support science and technology education or curriculum development in schools; gifts directly to youth organizations to support their programs (eg, Boy Scouts, YMCA); funds given to a state to provide health insurance for uninsured children; major contributions to existing funds like the Children's Health Fund; and gifts to support the creation and development of new initiatives like youth mentoring, literacy, after-school care, early education, or child abuse and neglect prevention programs. While we collected year 2000 data, several companies also noted that they had contributed significantly to funds related to September 11 disaster relief efforts, with some companies focusing their support on helping the children affected (eg, Computer Associates' gift of \$2 million to New York Kids in Need, DuPont's \$5 million for support of the educational expenses of the children of firefighters, police officers, and other uniformed emergency personnel).<sup>[13]</sup>

Finally, we also found that more than 20% of the 2001 Fortune 1000 companies are reaching out to children and parents with information using the Internet. While this includes a range of Web sites that are product-related, a number of the sites are educational Web sites designed to (1) teach kids important skills like how to manage money (eg, <http://www.fleetkids.com>), (2) give the facts about health issues (eg, the Pfizer-sponsored The Naked Truth about sexually transmitted diseases site at <http://www.unspeakable.com>), (3) provide science and safety information (eg, <http://aep.electricuniverse.com>), and (4) offer advice to help parents (eg, Procter & Gamble's <http://www.pampers.com>).

## Discussion

The history of corporate giving and of expectations for employee benefits evolved tremendously over the last century,<sup>[14,15]</sup> and the business community is playing an increasingly important role in supporting children's health and development. Given the significant expectations placed on corporations today, it may be difficult to imagine that only 100 years ago corporations were restricted in the use of their capital such that it could only be used for the production of profit, and altruism was precluded.<sup>[15]</sup> Altruism fell to individuals, and, not surprisingly, individual gifts still dominate philanthropy,<sup>[16]</sup> with leaders of corporations being some of the greatest philanthropists, a trend that continues to this day. Notably, in the year 2000, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which the Gateses endowed by donating Microsoft stock, became the world's largest foundation based on its assets.

According to some historical accounts, corporate giving first reached a significant level in 1917, with contributions to the Red Cross War Fund,<sup>[17]</sup> and by 1948, a *Fortune* story called "The Business of Giving" noted that "No one has yet thoroughly measured the stake that American business has in philanthropy.... It's big and getting bigger."<sup>[18]</sup> As recently as 1953, the *A.P. Smith Mfg. Co. v. Barlow* landmark legal case resolved issues about the legality of corporate giving by finding that corporate contributions fell under the implied and incidental powers consistent with common law principles stating: "... since in our view the corporate power to make reasonable charitable contributions exists under modern conditions, even apart from express statutory provision, its enactments simply constitute helpful and confirmatory declarations of power, accompanied by limiting safeguards" (p. 14).<sup>[15]</sup> Not surprisingly, growth in corporate foundations increased dramatically in the 1950s,<sup>[15]</sup> and current tax laws require that Foundations give away 5% of their market value assets or interest income each year, whichever amount is greater, in order to maintain their not-for-profit status.

Research suggests that corporate contributions track with GDP and net income, and that giving is closely linked to the economy.<sup>[16,19]</sup> Overall, this has generally meant an increasing amount of corporate gifts given back to the community each year.<sup>[5]</sup> However, this growth in corporate giving has not replaced individual giving. While corporate charitable contributions, including grants from corporate foundations, are estimated to be almost \$11 billion in 2000 (approximately 5% of total overall giving),<sup>[16]</sup> individual contributions still dominate. What remains unmeasured is the significant role that leaders and employees of corporations play in individual giving and in creating and maintaining expectations for individual giving, specifically to help children.

The changing nature of corporate commitments to children suggests important opportunities associated with matching the resources and vision of corporate leaders with opportunities for effective partnerships.<sup>[20,21]</sup> The motivation for the business community's commitment to education may come from similar views to those expressed in 1999 by Louis Gerstner, Jr., chairman and CEO of IBM, who said: "IBM's commitment to improve the quality of life is most apparent in our worldwide efforts in public education. We approach this work with two fundamental beliefs. First, nothing is more essential to a vibrant, well-functioning community than the quality of its schools. No community can thrive without good schools, and no business can be successful in a community where the schools are failing. Second, we believe we can make a difference."<sup>[5]</sup> This commitment continues in spite of the economic challenges that many businesses currently face. For example, Craig Barrett, CEO of Intel, stated that: "Education is a critical focus for Intel and for our employees around the world.... Intel will continue

to support our education efforts and our communities for the same reason we continue to spend on our research and development programs -- they are long-term investments in our future and the future of our world."<sup>[22]</sup> With their significant commitments to education, businesses also play a critical role in setting expectations for quality in education, and they are playing an increasing role in early child education and after-school care policies. With more and more women in the work force, companies are responding to the changing needs of families and recognizing the importance of their commitments to children, at least of their employees. These huge contributions must be recognized and cultivated to create effective partnerships that lead to real improvements in the quality of children's lives. Similarly, innovation in philanthropy is also critical,<sup>[23]</sup> and continued tracking of all foundation giving to support children should continue to ensure that investments in children and the future continue to grow,<sup>[24]</sup> which makes good business sense.<sup>[25,26]</sup>

While it provides useful baseline data and it is the largest and most comprehensive study to date to characterize corporate commitments to children, this study is limited in many important ways. First, the sample size of 33% limits the ability to generalize the results to the full Fortune 1000, and future studies should view the information presented here as baseline data that may form the bases for hypotheses. In particular, given that data were obtained from only one third of the companies, there may be some bias toward response by companies that do have greater commitments to children. Our approach may have reduced the impact of any selection bias given that we randomly called companies to follow up, and given that our sample appears to represent all the industries reasonably well. Nonetheless, we cannot test for any self-selection bias that may exist. We note that a previous study identified slightly higher numbers of companies reporting corporate foundations (eg, Diane Gingold & Associates<sup>[4]</sup> found 69% compared with our 60%). We hypothesize that this may represent a difference in the actual population sampled (ie, the Fortune 1000 in this study vs the Fortune 500 by Diane Gingold & Associates<sup>[4]</sup>), error associated with sampling given that each study only captured a third of the population, and different wording with the questions (since we asked specifically about an "affiliated, independent" philanthropic foundation and Diane Gingold & Associates<sup>[4]</sup> asked about a corporate foundation). Another important limitation of these results is that respondents may have been inclined to provide the answers that they believe are expected or socially desirable, even on an anonymous survey.

Finally, we recognize and emphasize that using the Fortune 1000 companies to represent the entire business community is looking only at the tip of the iceberg. First, we note that globalization is creating a large set of internationally based multinational corporations with strong interests and commitments to children in the United States. Discussions with 14 of these companies revealed that many of them commit the same types and levels of resources in the United States as companies with US headquarters, although we have not attempted to quantify this in this study. Similarly, many of the Fortune 1000 companies play large positive roles in investing in and improving the lives of children around the world. Second, by looking at only the very largest companies, we fail to capture the hundreds of thousands of small, medium, and large-sized businesses that also play a significant role in their local communities, nationally, and internationally with respect to the overall business community's commitment to children. Future studies can provide valuable information by obtaining a better, broader, and quantitative overview of the overall business community's commitment to children, and also by attempting to characterize the indirect benefits from leaders in business that translate their commitment to children not only into corporate policy and giving, but also into significant individual contributions.

## **Conclusion**

Many companies that responded play a major role in supporting children's health and development in the United States both directly and indirectly. Further efforts to better quantify the business community's aggregate commitments to improving children's health and development should be performed to allow better estimation of the amount of resources expended and the impact of these investments on children.

## Tables

**Table 1. Breakdown of the 2001 Fortune 1000 Companies by Industry Overall in our Sample**

<b>INDUSTRY</b>	<b># of companies</b>	<b># in sample</b>	<b>% in the sample</b>
Advertising, Marketing	5	1	20%
Aerospace and Defense	11	3	27%
Airlines	10	4	40%
Apparel	10	2	20%
Automotive Retailing, Services	7	2	29%
Beverages	9	3	33%
Building Materials, Glass	6	0	0%
Chemicals	32	14	44%
Commercial Banks	42	18	43%
Computer and Data Services	22	10	45%
Computer Peripherals	9	4	44%
Computer Software	12	6	50%
Computers, Office Equipment	12	3	25%
Diversified Financials	20	9	45%
Diversified Outsourcing Services	13	6	46%
Electronics, Electrical Equip.	21	5	24%
Energy	14	5	36%
Engineering, Construction	27	10	37%
Entertainment	5	1	20%
Food and Drug Stores	19	3	16%
Food Consumer Products	19	5	25%
Food Production	12	1	8%
Food Services	11	5	45%
Forest and Paper Products	19	5	26%
Furniture	6	3	50%
General Merchandisers	16	2	13%
Healthcare	37	17	46%
Hotels, Casinos, Resorts	12	5	42%
Industrial and Farm Equipment	32	8	25%
Insurance: Life, Health (mutual)	12	6	50%
Insurance: Life, Health (stock)	18	7	39%
Insurance: P & C (mutual)	6	1	17%
Insurance: P & C (stock)	21	5	24%

Mail, Package, Freight Delivery	6	3	50%
Medical Products & Equipment	8	6	75%
Metal Products	17	8	47%
Metals	12	1	8%
Mining, Crude-Oil Production	15	6	40%
Motor Vehicles and Parts	23	6	26%
Network and Other Communications Equipment	11	3	27%
Oilfield Services	2	1	50%
Petroleum Refining	16	3	19%
Pharmaceuticals	11	6	55%
Pipelines	8	2	25%
Publishing, Printing	20	6	30%
Railroads	4	0	0%
Real Estate	4	2	50%
Rubber and Plastic Products	8	2	25%
Savings Institutions	9	2	22%
Scientific, Photo, Control Equip.	13	5	38%
Securities	13	6	46%
Semiconductors and Other Electronic Components	22	8	36%
Soaps, Cosmetics	9	4	44%
Specialty Retailers	57	20	35%
Telecommunications	22	9	41%
Temporary Help	7	2	29%
Textiles	7	2	29%
Tobacco	5	2	40%
Toys, Sporting Goods	2	2	100%
Transportation	2	1	50%
Transportation Equipment	4	1	25%
Trucking, Truck Leasing	13	2	15%
Utilities: Gas & Electric	55	17	31%
Waste Management	3	1	33%
Wholesalers: Diversified	19	3	16%
Wholesalers: Electronics and Office Equipment	18	4	22%
Wholesalers: Food and Grocery	11	4	36%
Wholesalers: Healthcare	8	2	25%
Miscellaneous	9	1	11%
Total	1000	333	33%



## References

1. Muirhead SA, Bennett CJ, Berenbeim RE, Kao A, Vidal DJ. Corporate Citizenship in the New Century: Accountability, Transparency, and Global Stakeholder Engagement. New York, NY: The Conference Board; 2002:Report Number: R-1314-02-RR.
2. Pritchett L, Summers LH. Wealthier is healthier. *J Hum Res.* 1996;31:842-868.
3. Wildavsky A. Searching for Safety. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books; 1988.
4. Diane Gingold & Associates. The FORTUNE 500 Survey of Corporate Social Responsibility for Youth. Washington, DC: Diane Gingold & Associates; 1999.
5. Muirhead SA. Corporate Contributions: The View From Fifty Years. New York, NY: The Conference Board; 1999:Report R-1249-99-RR.
6. Wild C. Corporate Volunteer Programs: Benefits to Business. New York, NY: The Conference Board; 1993:Report 1029-93-RR.
7. Business for Social Responsibility. White Papers: Volunteerism. Available at: <http://www.bsr.org/BSRResources/WhitePaperDetail.cfm?DocumentID=158>. Accessed March 24, 2003.
8. 2001 FORTUNE 1000 Database. New York, NY: Time Inc.; 2002.
9. US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Private Sector Data by Firm Size, Industry Group, Ownership, Age of Firm and Other Characteristics: United States: 1998.
10. McCormick MC, Weinick RM, Elixhauser A, Stagnitti MN, Thompson J, Simpson L. Annual report on access to and utilization of health care for children and youth in the United States--2000. *Ambul Pediatr.* 2001;1:3-15. [Abstract](#)
11. Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being, 2002. Available at: <http://childstats.gov/americaschildren/>. Accessed March 24, 2003.
12. American Academy of Pediatrics. Improving Access to Children's Health Insurance in the United States: Health Insurance Status of Children Through Age 18 in the United States -- 2000 Projections. Elk Grove Village, Ill: American Academy of Pediatrics; 2000. Fact sheet available at: <http://www.aap.org/advocacy/chi2/us.pdf>. Accessed March 24, 2003.
13. The Foundation Center. Philanthropy's Response to 9/11: Creating the Record and Telling the Story. Available at: [http://www.fdncenter.org/research/911/table2\\_corporate.pdf](http://www.fdncenter.org/research/911/table2_corporate.pdf). Accessed March 24, 2003.
14. Heald M. The Social Responsibilities of Business: Company and Community, 1900-1960. Second Edition. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books; 1988.
15. Fremont-Smith MR. Philanthropy and the Business Corporation. New York, NY: Sage Foundation; 1972.
16. American Association of Fundraising Counsel. Giving USA 2002. Abstract available at: <http://www.aafc.org/giving/>. Accessed March 24, 2003.
17. Andrews FE. Corporate Giving. New York, NY: Sage; 1952.
18. The business of giving. *Fortune.* 1948;XXXVIII:90-92.
19. Muirhead SA. Corporate Contributions in 2001. New York, NY: The Conference Board; 2003:Report Number R-1326-03-RR.
20. Diane Gingold & Associates. Business and Education Partnerships. Washington, DC: Diane Gingold & Associates; 2001.
21. Otterbourg S. Innovative Public-Private Partnerships: Educational Initiatives. New York, NY: The Conference Board; 1998:Report Number R-1228-98-RR.
22. Barrett C. Intel is committed to being an asset to our communities worldwide. Available at: [http://www.intel.com/education/projects/contributions/letter\\_exec.htm](http://www.intel.com/education/projects/contributions/letter_exec.htm). Accessed March 24, 2003.
23. Diane Gingold & Associates. New Frontiers in Philanthropy. Washington, DC: Diane Gingold & Associates; 2000.
24. Lawrence S. The Foundation Center's 2002 Children and Youth Funding Update. The Foundation Center. Available at: [http://fdncenter.org/research/trends\\_analysis/pdf/cyupdt.pdf](http://fdncenter.org/research/trends_analysis/pdf/cyupdt.pdf). Accessed March 24, 2003.
25. Zadek S. Doing Good and Doing Well: Making the Business Case for Corporate Citizenship. New York, NY: The Conference Board; 2000:Report Number R-1282-00-RR.
26. Kramer MR, Porter ME. The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. *Harv Bus Rev.* 2002;80:56-68. [Abstract](#)

## Sidebar: Appendix

### List of companies that responded listed according to the company's rank by 2000 revenue in the 2001 Fortune 1000

#### Revenue Rank

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | Exxon Mobil Corporation |
| 4 | Ford Motor Company      |
| 5 | General Electric        |

8	International Business Machines (IBM)
9	AT&T
10	Verizon Communications
11	Philip Morris & Co., Ltd.
17	Duke Energy
21	State Farm Insurance Companies
23	The Home Depot, Inc.
24	Morgan Stanley
26	Fannie Mae
29	Sears, Roebuck & Co.
30	Merck & Co., Inc.
31	Procter & Gamble
32	WorldCom, Inc.
33	TIAA-CREF
34	Motorola, Inc.
38	Albertsons
41	Intel Corporation
44	ConocoPhillips
45	Costco Wholesale Corporation
47	Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (MetLife)
49	Ingram Micro
50	Freddie Mac
51	Cardinal Health
52	United Parcel Service
56	E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company
60	Aquila, Inc. (UtiliCorp United)
63	Aetna, Inc.
64	United Technologies
66	BellSouth
69	Lockheed Martin Corporation
73	Wachovia
74	American Express Company
78	The Dow Chemical Company
81	FleetBoston Financial Corporation
86	El Paso Corporation
87	New York Life Investment Management LLC
91	UnitedHealth Group
93	Coca-Cola Company
94	PepsiCo, Inc.
104	UAL Corporation
106	Electronic Data Systems
108	Lowe's Corporation

109	Xerox Corporation
115	Johnson Controls, Inc.
122	Weyerhaeuser
123	Delta Air Lines
129	Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc.
133	Occidental Petroleum Corporation
135	Fleming Companies, Inc.
136	Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company
138	McDonald's Corporation
143	Wyeth (American Home Products Corporation)
144	Abbott Laboratories
146	American Electric Power
148	Halliburton
149	Deere & Company
150	Textron
153	Dana Corporation
156	Best Buy
157	Waste Management
161	Household International, Inc.
166	Xcel Energy
167	Office Depot, Inc.
169	PacifiCare Health Systems
171	Tenet Healthcare Corporation
173	Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company
174	AIG American General
176	Eli Lilly and Company
177	Manpower, Inc.
178	Staples, Inc.
179	Humana
182	Bear Stearns
183	Marsh & McLennan
185	Limited Brands
187	Entergy Corporation
188	The Gillette Company
189	Illinois Tool Works
192	Schering-Plough Corporation
193	AFLAC
195	The TJX Companies, Inc.
196	Applied Materials
197	Consolidated Edison, Inc.
198	UnumProvident Corporation
200	Computer Sciences

203	Dominion Resources
204	WellPoint Health Networks
210	National City Corporation
213	Eaton Corporation
214	Guardian Life Insurance Company of America
219	Anthem Insurance
223	Cenex Harvest States
234	Ashland
235	R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company
239	Avista Corporation
241	Boise Cascade Corporation
242	PNC Financial Services Group
244	John Hancock Financial Services
248	Micron Technology
250	Crown Cork & Seal
252	Corning, Inc.
254	Chubb Group of Insurance Companies
258	Baxter International
264	FPL Group
266	FirstEnergy
269	Kellogg Company
270	Newell Rubbermaid
272	Unisys
274	Lincoln National
275	Public Service Enterprise Group
277	Progressive
278	General Mills
286	Automatic Data Processing
289	CNF Transportation
295	Computer Associates Intl.
298	Federal-Mogul
303	Providian Financial
315	PPL Corporation
317	Interpublic Group
318	DTE Energy
319	Mattel
321	Engelhard
324	Air Products & Chemicals
325	Fortune Brands
326	Ikon Office Solutions
327	Capital One Financial
332	BB&T Corporation

334	Eastman Chemical
335	Baker Hughes
339	OfficeMax
340	ArvinMeritor
341	Smithfield Foods
349	Medtronic
357	ITT Industries
361	American Family Ins. Group
362	Dole Food Company
369	Advanced Micro Devices
373	Nucor
381	Kelly Services
382	AutoZone
383	Cooper Industries
386	Starwood Hotels & Resorts
388	MeadWestvaco
392	Leggett & Platt
393	Fifth Third Bancorp
400	Healthsouth
401	USA Education (Sallie Mae)
406	Progress Energy
410	Barnes & Noble
420	Foster Wheeler
421	Golden West Financial
423	United Stationers
425	FMC
430	Thermo Electron
437	Lexmark International
438	Hasbro
444	AmSouth Bancorp
447	Fleetwood Enterprises
448	Administaff
449	Darden Restaurants
453	Ball Corporation
456	Becton Dickinson
464	Interstate Bakeries
467	Owens & Minor
468	New York Times
469	Cooper Tire & Rubber
470	Harrah's Entertainment
471	Emcor Group
472	Hilton Hotels

476 Jacobs Engineering Group  
477 Aid Association for Lutherans  
479 Tellabs, Inc.  
480 We Energies  
481 Steelcase, Inc.  
489 Airborne, Inc.  
491 Mohawk Industries  
492 Charter Communications  
493 Lennox International  
501 Solutia, Inc.  
508 Gevity HR, Inc.  
509 Liz Claiborne  
511 Union Planters Corp.  
512 Enterprise Products  
515 Unified Western Grocers  
519 Crompton Corporation  
522 Energy East  
523 Erie Insurance Group  
525 Ace Hardware  
538 NTL Group, Ltd.  
539 A.G. Edwards  
550 Adelpia Communications  
554 Maxtor  
557 General Cable Corporation  
560 Marshall & Ilsley Corp.  
570 Fisher Scientific International  
575 Huntington Bancshares  
580 Guidant Corporation  
584 Mandalay Resort Group  
587 Bowater  
588 International Multifoods  
594 CellStar  
597 Penn Traffic Company  
598 Budget Group  
601 Genesis Health Ventures  
602 The Pantry, Inc.  
603 First Tennessee National Corporation  
609 Adolph Coors  
610 Washington Post  
616 HCR Manor Care  
617 Sovereign Bancorp  
620 America West Holdings

625	Silicon Graphics
629	Borden
630	Nicor, Inc.
634	Apache
636	Springs Industries
638	Equity Office Properties
640	Michaels Stores
642	Alberto-Culver
644	Universal Health Services
647	Compuware Corporation
658	Alaska Air Group
666	Convergys
678	M & T Bank Corporation
679	Hillenbrand Industries
685	Broadwing
686	Value City
696	Metals USA
697	Simon Property Group
698	Atmel
699	Harsco
708	Minnesota Life Ins.
710	Affiliated Computer Services
713	RPM International Inc.
715	WPS Resources
716	Weatherford International
717	Herman Miller
721	Champion Enterprises
722	Laboratory Corp. of America
724	Energizer Holdings
729	CKE Restaurants
731	Cintas Corporation
739	Freeport-McMoRan Copper & Gold
741	GATX Corporation
742	Polaroid
744	CenturyTel
746	Arkansas Best
747	Unova, Inc.
753	Zions Bancorp.
755	Toll Brothers
757	ABM Industries
758	Harris Corporation
761	Siebel Systems

766	Marsh Supermarkets
767	CUNA Mutual Group
768	Crown Central Petroleum
769	Actuant Corporation
772	The Lubrizol Corporation
774	CBRL Group
780	UGI Corporation
791	BMC Software
793	DynCorp
799	Benchmark Electronics
802	Expeditors International of Washington
804	Dollar Tree Stores
812	Great Lakes Chemical
815	Lithia Motors
816	Fiserv
822	Dial, Inc.
823	Jack in the Box
828	Charming Shoppes
830	Public Service Company of New Mexico
833	Briggs & Stratton
834	Belo
844	Linens'n Things
847	Wallace Computer Services
848	Allergan
856	Banknorth Group
863	Gentiva Health Services
866	KLA-Tencor
870	Cytec Industries
873	Tektronix
874	EOG Resources
876	DaVita
877	Mid Atlantic Medical Services
880	Jo Ann Stores
882	Host Marriott
883	Hibernia Corporation
885	International Flavors & Fragrances
895	Symbol Technologies
900	Metris
906	Polaris Industries
917	Scholastic
919	Noble Affiliates
920	Sierra Health Services



924	Ceridian Corporation
925	A.O. Smith Corporation
926	Altera Corporation
928	Legg Mason
929	ACT Manufacturing
931	Nabors Industries
932	DST Systems
938	Granite
939	Community Health Systems
941	Men's Wearhouse
942	Martin Marietta Materials
944	Minnesota Power
945	MasTec
949	Standard Pacific
950	Pacific Century Financial
952	Dade Behring
955	Iomega
956	Knight Trading Group
961	Amtran
962	Cypress Semiconductor
963	Oakwood Homes
967	American Management Systems
968	First National of Nebraska
969	Pro-Fac Cooperative
970	Adobe Systems
971	Questar Corporation
972	Standard Register
977	Grey Global Group
979	Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer
981	priceline.com Inc.
984	AnnTaylor Stores Corporation
985	Pier 1 Imports
989	Rayonier
996	Frank Russell Company
998	T. Rowe Price
999	VERITAS Software

## **Acknowledgements**

The author gratefully acknowledges grant support from The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Award No. 201-2905. The author also thanks the numerous individuals in the companies that took the time to respond to the survey, and Karen Gondro and Nicole Rosie for research assistance.

**Kimberly M. Thompson, ScD**, Associate Professor of Risk Analysis and Decision Science, Director of the Kids Risk Project, Harvard School of Public Health, Departments of Health Policy and Management and Maternal and Child Health, Boston, Massachusetts; email: [kimt@hsph.harvard.edu](mailto:kimt@hsph.harvard.edu)