



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Prev Med. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2017 August 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Prev Med. 2016 August ; 89: 337–344. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.05.033.

Shared vision, shared vulnerability: A content analysis of corporate social responsibility information on tobacco industry websites

Patricia A. McDaniel,

Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, School of Nursing, University of California, San Francisco San Francisco, CA 94118, USA

Brie Cadman, and

Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, School of Nursing, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94118, USA

Ruth E. Malone

Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, School of Nursing, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94118, USA

Patricia A. McDaniel: patricia.mcdaniel@ucsf.edu; Ruth E. Malone: ruth.malone@ucsf.edu

Abstract

Tobacco companies rely on corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives to improve their public image and advance their political objectives, which include thwarting or undermining tobacco control policies. For these reasons, implementation guidelines for the World Health Organization's Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) recommend curtailing or prohibiting tobacco industry CSR. To understand how and where major tobacco companies focus their CSR resources, we explored CSR-related content on 4 US and 4 multinational tobacco company websites in February 2014. The websites described a range of CSR-related activities, many common across all companies, and no programs were unique to a particular company. The websites mentioned CSR activities in 58 countries, representing nearly every region of the world. Tobacco companies appear to have a shared vision about what constitutes CSR, due perhaps to shared vulnerabilities. Most countries that host tobacco company CSR programs are parties to the FCTC, highlighting the need for full implementation of the treaty, and for funding to monitor CSR activity, replace industry philanthropy, and enforce existing bans.

Correspondence to: Patricia A. McDaniel, patricia.mcdaniel@ucsf.edu.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Introduction

The tobacco industry has embraced the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR), the notion that corporations have an obligation to address or ameliorate their broader social and/or environmental impacts.¹ Examples of tobacco industry CSR initiatives include the creation of youth smoking prevention (YSP) programs and voluntary marketing codes,^{2, 3} and financial support for nongovernmental organizations.^{4, 5} Research has shown that tobacco industry CSR initiatives are powerful political tools, used by tobacco manufacturers to improve their public image and enhance their credibility,^{4, 6} gain access to and influence policymakers,^{4, 5, 7} avoid or weaken regulation,⁸ influence the tobacco control agenda,⁶ and create allies.^{5, 6, 9} Many tobacco company CSR initiatives originated in high income nations, particularly the US¹⁰; however, as the tobacco industry expands into low and middle income countries, it adopts strategies that have been successful in thwarting public health and creating a tobacco-favorable policy environment in higher income countries, including CSR initiatives.^{11, 12}

The World Health Organization's Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), entered into force in 2005, addresses tobacco industry CSR via Article 5.3 and Article 13.¹³ Article 5.3 cautions treaty signatories to protect tobacco control policies from "commercial and other vested interests of the tobacco industry"¹⁴; implementation guidelines recommend denormalizing or regulating tobacco industry CSR by, for example, prohibiting public disclosure of tobacco industry CSR projects.¹⁴ Article 13 goes further, requiring parties to ban all forms of sponsorship and explicitly defining tobacco industry CSR as such.¹⁵ Nonetheless, to date, only a small number of parties to the treaty have prohibited tobacco industry CSR as a form of sponsorship (approximately 28 of 180 nations).¹⁶

Corporate websites are one means by which tobacco companies communicate their CSR agendas and practices to a broader public. Websites are more dynamic and less expensive than traditional communication channels, and allow tobacco companies to sidestep media gatekeepers, communicating quickly and directly with various audiences—policymakers, potential employees, investors, consumers, the general public, and potential jurors.¹⁷ A small body of research has examined CSR-related material on tobacco company websites, focusing on health-related information^{18–20} and image repair techniques²¹ on the Philip Morris USA website, and changes over time in statements regarding addiction on several tobacco companies' websites.²² However, no studies have documented the full range of CSR-related content on tobacco company websites. In this paper, we examine the types of CSR programs that tobacco companies describe on their websites, highlighting similarities and differences across companies and comparing US to multinational companies. We also examine the countries where those programs take place, noting both the regions with the most concentrated CSR activities and whether countries with CSR programs are parties to the FCTC. Identifying how and where tobacco company CSR resources are concentrated can highlight those areas where the industry perceives itself to be particularly vulnerable. This, in turn, may provide insight into areas that policymakers and advocates might most usefully exploit in countering the industry or suggest programs whose credibility may be called into question (as was the case in the US with tobacco industry-sponsored YSP programs).^{2, 8, 23}

Methods

In January 2014, the first and second authors examined the websites of the 4 largest multinational tobacco companies -- British American Tobacco (BAT), Philip Morris International (PMI), Imperial Tobacco, and Japan Tobacco International (JTI) (which together have a global market share of 40%)²⁴ -- and the 4 largest US tobacco companies (including any parent companies) -- Philip Morris USA (PM USA), Altria (parent company of PM USA), Reynolds American Inc. (RAI), and Lorillard (which was purchased by RAI in 2014, but maintains a separate website). We excluded RJ Reynolds Tobacco Company because it offered a very cursory view of the company's CSR activities, directing website visitors instead to its parent company, RAI. On each website, we searched for CSR-related information; an initial review of 3 websites revealed that this was typically encapsulated under a "responsibility" or "sustainability" heading on the home page. However, we also searched the websites for any mention of programs or positions that have been identified in the literature as CSR initiatives (e.g., YSP programs, acknowledgement of the health consequences of smoking)^{2, 19} regardless of where they were located on the website.

The second author downloaded CSR content from each company's website as PDF documents in February, 2014, with each PDF representing a webpage with a unique URL. She imported the PDF documents into NVivo 9.0 for categorization of types of CSR mentioned and the countries in which CSR projects were conducted (if mentioned). In the majority of cases, the categories she used to classify types of CSR were those employed by tobacco companies (i.e., the category "domestic violence" was drawn from the PMI web page entitled "domestic violence"). However, in some cases she combined categories used by some tobacco companies into one broader category (e.g., "child labor" and other tobacco farming-related issues were merged into "supply chain"). Because categorizing this information required minimal interpretation, we did not involve a second coder or conduct a formal analysis of inter-rater reliability; however, the first author confirmed the identification and categorization of CSR programs mentioned on the websites.

In analyzing the data, we summarized CSR areas of focus for each tobacco company and the countries in which CSR programs were conducted, noting programs and regions that garnered the most tobacco company attention. We also reviewed the website text that pertained to the CSR focus areas that were *universally* mentioned in order to summarize qualitatively similarities and differences in companies' approaches towards these common CSR focus areas.

Results

CSR focus areas

Tobacco company websites described a range of CSR-related activities (table 1). Four CSR focus areas were universally mentioned: YSP programs, voluntary marketing standards, acknowledgement of smoking's health harms, and management of the tobacco supply chain. There were no programs that were unique to a particular tobacco company, although some, such as smoking cessation and domestic violence prevention, were less common across

companies. With the exception of JTI, the multinational companies had more CSR-related webpages than the US companies (table 1).

Universally mentioned CSR focus areas

Youth smoking prevention—Websites focused on two types of tobacco company-sponsored efforts with the ostensible goal of preventing smoking initiation among youth. The first, mentioned by all companies except Altria, consisted of financial support for the creation and maintenance of retailer-based proof-of-age programs such as We Card (US),⁸ We Expect ID (Canada), and Citizen Card (UK). The second, mentioned only by US-based companies and PMI, was support for or creation and sponsorship of tobacco educational programs for youth. Examples included RAI's "Right Decisions Right Now" program for middle schoolers and Altria's "Success 360°," a partnership with a variety of youth-focused organizations.

Marketing standards—All tobacco companies stated on their websites that they limited their marketing to adults. All US companies except Altria devoted more text to the issue of marketing than multinational companies (an average of 835 words for US companies (excluding Altria), versus 172 words for multinationals). Both PM USA and RAI mentioned compliance with the US 1998 Master Settlement Agreement's advertising restrictions (which include prohibitions on targeting youth, most forms of outdoor advertising, product placement, and branded merchandise).²⁵ In addition, PM USA stated its opposition to smoking scenes in movies and mentioned its efforts to encourage the film industry to eliminate such scenes in youth-oriented films; RAI highlighted its "stringent" age verification process for its marketing database. BAT, Imperial, and PMI discussed more general marketing principles, such as "not misleading about smoking's risks" (BAT) and "respect[ing] global standards of decency and local cultures, traditions, and practices" (PMI).

Supply chain—As used on tobacco company websites, the term "supply chain" referred to the individuals and organizations involved in supplying materials to tobacco manufacturers. Two supply chain issues were commonly addressed by tobacco companies on their websites: child labor and the environmental impact of tobacco growing. All but two tobacco companies (RAI and JTI) addressed child labor on their websites, with most mentioning support for the Eliminating Child Labor in Tobacco Foundation, co-founded by BAT in 2000.²⁶ Imperial's and PMI's websites were the most expansive on the topic, discussing in detail their support for projects in Tanzania (Imperial) and Argentina (PMI) that aimed to ameliorate child labor in tobacco growing communities. Although both companies saw their support for such projects as important, they stated that governments, not corporations, ultimately were responsible for ending child labor practices.

With the exception of Lorillard, all tobacco companies discussed on their websites their efforts to minimize the negative impact of tobacco growing on the environment. (Research has shown that tobacco company efforts to "green" their supply chains started in the 2000s.)²⁷ These seven companies all mentioned their support for or promotion of sustainable agricultural practices among farmers (e.g., crop rotation, soil mulching, water conservation,

and pesticide minimization). RAI was the only company to put a dollar figure to this support, noting that its subsidiary, Santa Fe Natural Tobacco Company, had provided over \$190,000 to the Carolina Farm Stewardship Program to “promote sustainable farming.” All of the multinational tobacco companies and one US company (PM USA) also discussed their financial support for reforestation programs that replaced trees cut down and used for fuel in curing tobacco leaves. A non-profit organization, “Total Land Care,” that addressed both sustainable agriculture and reforestation in several African tobacco growing countries, including Malawi, was supported by 4 tobacco companies (Imperial, JTI, PMI, and PM USA).

There was less agreement among companies on other aspects of responsible supply chain management and no real pattern in cases of agreement. For example, PM USA and its parent company Altria were the only two companies that mentioned an aspiration to contract with women and minority-owned businesses as evidence of responsible supply chain management, while Imperial and JTI were the only two to mention concerns about their suppliers’ carbon footprint. PMI was alone in its pledge to avoid purchasing genetically modified tobacco.

Smoking-caused harm—Philip Morris USA executives have acknowledged that the decision to publicly acknowledge that smoking-caused disease was driven by a desire to improve the company’s image;¹⁹ thus, we considered such website admissions to be forms of CSR. All tobacco companies mentioned that smoking caused harm to smokers. Altria’s website elaborated the least, simply stating that “Altria’s tobacco companies support several approaches to reducing the harm caused by tobacco products” without specifying the type of harm. Lorillard’s website, by contrast, noted that smoking caused “serious and fatal diseases” and listed thirty of them, including pancreatic, bladder, and renal cancer, and acute myeloid leukemia. Altria and Lorillard represented the two extremes in terms of health information provided on their websites; the remaining tobacco companies asserted, using similar language, that smoking caused “serious diseases” and listed four examples: lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema, and bronchitis. Only BAT followed Lorillard’s example and noted that these diseases were both serious and fatal. BAT and Imperial also noted that the link between smoking and disease had been determined by epidemiological studies, and pointed out that laboratory research conducted “over the years” (BAT) or over “decades” (Imperial) had failed to identify the particular component of cigarette smoke that caused disease. BAT stated that “[t]his means that science is still to determine which smokers will get a smoking related disease. Nor can science tell whether any individual became ill solely because they smoked.”

Tobacco companies were less consistently willing to acknowledge harms related to secondhand smoke. Five companies (Altria, PMI, PM USA, BAT, and Lorillard) stated that one or more public health authorities had concluded that secondhand smoke caused lung cancer and heart disease in nonsmoking adults, and asthma, respiratory infections, and Sudden Infant Death Syndrome in children. Lorillard went further, noting that “exposure of adults to secondhand smoke has immediate adverse effects on the cardiovascular system” and that secondhand smoke caused both premature death and disease. Four of the companies that reported the conclusions of public health authorities (PMI, PM USA, Altria and

Lorillard) advised the public to be “guided” by or “rely on” them when deciding whether to expose themselves to secondhand smoke. BAT, however, joined with Imperial and JTI in disputing the science linking secondhand smoke to disease. BAT and Imperial critiqued the epidemiological methods that underpinned the conclusion that secondhand smoking caused disease, while JTI simply stated that “[b]ased on the current science, JTI does not believe the claim has been proven that [environmental tobacco smoke] is a cause of disease such as lung cancer.” RAI’s website ignored the issue altogether, making no mention of secondhand smoke causing disease.

Location of CSR initiatives

Tobacco company websites mentioned CSR activities in 58 countries—all but 9 were parties to the FCTC (table 2). These activities exclude those, such as acknowledgement of health harms or the provision of smoking cessation information, that are restricted to tobacco company websites. Among the 58 countries mentioned were 4 countries which, according to the WHO, have prohibited tobacco industry CSR¹⁶ -- Chad, Colombia, Madagascar, and Spain -- although it is possible that the CSR projects mentioned have ended. While the 58 countries represented nearly every region of the world, the regions of North America and sub-Saharan Africa were most often mentioned. In North America, the US was the predominant site of tobacco company CSR programs, most provided by US tobacco companies. Projects varied, and included YSP and environmental programs, domestic violence prevention, and support for the arts. In Africa, multinational tobacco companies had a more consistent presence than US companies: while every multinational mentioned at least 3 CSR programs in African nations, PM USA and Altria were the only US companies with a CSR presence there, and both mentioned the same “sustainable agriculture” program in Malawi.²⁷ Imperial Tobacco accounted for the bulk of African-based CSR projects (22/38), spread among 9 countries and the region as a whole. Malawi and Tanzania attracted the most tobacco company attention, with 6 of 8 tobacco companies mentioning CSR programs in Malawi, and 4 companies mentioning programs in Tanzania. In terms of the content of CSR programs, Africa-based initiatives were less varied than those in the US: one-half of all African programs concerned tree planting and sustainable agricultural practices.

Discussion

Tobacco companies had similar conceptualizations of some of the basic elements of CSR – YSP programs, supply chain management, voluntary marketing standards, and an acknowledgement of some of smoking’s harms. Within each common focus area, however, there were some differences between individual companies and between US and multinational companies. US companies appeared to be more concerned than multinational companies about the issue of youth smoking, mentioning more comprehensive YSP programs and voluntary marketing practices whose ostensible goals were to minimize youth smoking. In addition, US companies, unlike their multinational counterparts, were less likely to dispute the science linking secondhand smoke to disease and death. These differences may reflect the particular legal and/or social environments in which companies operate. For example, although the tobacco industry as a whole has faced criticism for marketing to

children, in the US, this criticism has been particularly acute, forming the basis in the late 1990s of an unsuccessful effort to regulate tobacco as a drug and an agreement by manufacturers to eliminate certain types of marketing.²⁸ Similarly, some US tobacco companies agreed in the late 1990s to no longer publicly debate smoking and health issues even if they disagreed with public health authorities.²⁹ Nonetheless, multinational companies appear to recognize that they share some of the same vulnerabilities as US companies, since they made some effort to address the issue of youth smoking and smoking's harms. Drawing public attention to these issues and the contradictions they raise (for example, claiming not to want kids to smoke while continuing to engage in marketing practices that appeal to youth) may help undermine the credibility that tobacco companies seek to advance through CSR.

Among the 58 countries that hosted tobacco industry CSR projects, the vast majority were parties to the FCTC, a reflection of the low rate of adoption among FCTC signatories of the CSR restrictions recommended by Articles 5.3 and 13.¹⁶ The presence of numerous sub-Saharan African nations among these countries is particularly worrisome, given the growing importance of Africa as a regional market for tobacco products: in the coming decades, the African continent is expected to have the largest increase in smoking prevalence, absent any intervention.³⁰ CSR is one strategy that can help tobacco companies undermine effective tobacco control interventions.¹² It may also help reinforce African countries' commitment to tobacco growing. Malawi and Tanzania, the two African nations mentioned most often as CSR recipients, are among the top 20 global producers of tobacco leaf, and the crop plays an important role in both countries' economies.³¹ Tobacco company tree planting and sustainable agricultural programs may help create or deepen alliances with local farmers, and deflect attention from the ongoing negative environmental impacts of tobacco growing.³²

Some reluctance on the part of low and middle income nations to prohibit tobacco industry CSR may stem from dependence on tobacco industry philanthropy for social services that the government is unlikely to provide.⁶ A dedicated tax on tobacco companies would help overcome this hurdle.⁶ For tobacco growing nations, intervention by tobacco control advocates is likely to be challenging, as witnessed by the difficulties faced by FCTC parties in addressing the issue of alternative crops;³³ however, creating and sustaining alliances with environmental organizations (who have not accepted industry funds)⁵ could add to the number of voices drawing attention to tobacco growing's environmental hazards.

Our finding that tobacco company websites advertised CSR projects in a handful of countries that have formally banned tobacco industry CSR highlights the importance of monitoring and enforcing such bans. Some governments may rely on a few underfunded tobacco control advocacy organizations to monitor and report tobacco company violations of the ban on CSR. Public and private funders of tobacco control initiatives should consider supporting programs to monitor CSR activity and legally enforce CSR bans. In cases where a dedicated tax on tobacco companies is not implemented as part of a CSR ban, they should also consider providing equivalent replacement resources for unmet needs.

Study limitations

Although we conducted a comprehensive search for CSR-related content on tobacco company websites, it is possible that we failed to capture some relevant content, particularly if it was not linked to a “responsibility” or “sustainability” heading and had not previously been identified as a CSR or public relations initiative. Moreover, it is unlikely that tobacco companies mentioned on their websites *all* of their CSR projects and *every* country in which the projects were located; thus, our findings represent a conservative estimate of the companies’ CSR practices and locations.

Conclusions

Tobacco company websites reveal a shared vision of how tobacco companies define “responsibility”: declaring an interest in reducing youth smoking, claiming to ameliorate some of the conditions under which tobacco is grown, stating that their marketing was limited to adults, and acknowledging some of smoking’s harms. The number and global reach of tobacco company CSR programs suggests not only that tobacco companies regard them as essential demonstrations of “responsibility,” but also that they help accomplish the tobacco industry’s political objectives. Full implementation of the FCTC’s guidelines concerning tobacco industry CSR, which would involve prohibiting tobacco industry CSR as a form of sponsorship, is essential to block this avenue of influence.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Cancer Institute at the National Institutes of Health (grant 1R01 CA120138).

References

1. Carroll AB. Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Bus & Society*. 1999; 38(3):268–295.
2. Landman A, Ling PM, Glantz SA. Tobacco industry youth smoking prevention programs: protecting the industry and hurting tobacco control. *Am J Public Health*. 2002; 92(6):917–30. [PubMed: 12036777]
3. Mamudu HM, Hammond R, Glantz SA. Project Cerberus: tobacco industry strategy to create an alternative to the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. *Am J Public Health*. 2008; 98(9): 1630–42. [PubMed: 18633079]
4. Tesler LE, Malone RE. Corporate philanthropy, lobbying, and public health policy. *Am J Public Health*. 2008; 98(12):2123–33. [PubMed: 18923118]
5. McDaniel PA, Malone RE. British American Tobacco's partnership with Earthwatch Europe and its implications for public health. *Glob Public Health*. 2012; 7(1):14–28. [PubMed: 21347934]
6. Fooks GJ, Gilmore AB. Corporate philanthropy, political influence, and health policy. *PLoS ONE*. 2013; 8(11):e80864. [PubMed: 24312249]
7. Fooks GJ, Gilmore AB, Smith KE, Collin J, Holden C, Lee K. Corporate social responsibility and access to policy elites: an analysis of tobacco industry documents. *PLoS Med*. 2011; 8(8):e1001076. [PubMed: 21886485]
8. Apollonio DE, Malone RE. The “We Card” program: tobacco industry “youth smoking prevention” as industry self-preservation. *Am J Public Health*. 2010; 100(7):1188–201. [PubMed: 20466965]
9. McDaniel PA, Malone RE. Creating the “desired mindset”: Philip Morris's efforts to improve its corporate image among women. *Women Health*. 2009; 49(5):441–74. [PubMed: 19851947]

10. Yang JS, Malone RE. "Working to shape what society's expectations of us should be": Philip Morris's societal alignment strategy. *Tob Control*. 2008; 17:391–398. [PubMed: 18845623]
11. Lee S, Ling PM, Glantz SA. The vector of the tobacco epidemic: tobacco industry practices in low and middle-income countries. *Cancer Causes Control*. 2012; 23(Suppl 1):117–29. [PubMed: 22370696]
12. Gilmore AB, Fooks G, Drope J, Bialous SA, Jackson RR. Exposing and addressing tobacco industry conduct in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet*. 2015; 385(9972):1029–43. [PubMed: 25784350]
13. World Health Organization. [Accessed 14 Feb, 2012] WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control: Guidelines for implementation. http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2011/9789241501316_eng.pdf
14. World Health Organization. [Accessed 18 August, 2015] Guidelines for implementation of Article 5.3 of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. http://www.who.int/fctc/guidelines/article_5_3.pdf
15. World Health Organization. [Accessed 8 July, 2015] Guidelines for implementation of Article 13 of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (Tobacco advertising, promotion, and sponsorship). http://www.who.int/fctc/guidelines/article_13.pdf?ua=1
16. World Health Organization. [Accessed 14 July, 2015] WHO Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2015: Raising Taxes on Tobacco. http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/178574/1/9789240694606_eng.pdf?ua=1
17. Esrock SL, Leichty GB. Social responsibility and corporate web pages: self-presentation or agenda setting? *Public Relations Review*. 1998; 24(3):305–319.
18. Smith EA, Malone RE. Philip Morris's health information web site appears responsible but undermines public health. *Public Health Nurs*. 2008; 25(6):554–64. [PubMed: 18950420]
19. Friedman LC. Philip Morris's website and television commercials use new language to mislead the public into believing it has changed its stance on smoking and disease. *Tob Control*. 2007; 16(6):e9. [PubMed: 18048599]
20. Drope, J. The Development of Philip Morris's Position on Environmental Tobacco Smoke for Its Website. World Health Organization; 2004 Apr.
21. Smith EA. Corporate image and public health: an analysis of the Philip Morris, Kraft, and Nestle websites. *J Health Commun*. 2012; 17(5):582–600. [PubMed: 22420639]
22. Hirschhorn, N. Evolution of the tobacco industry positions on addiction to nicotine: Tobacco Free Initiative. World Health Organization; 2008.
23. Mandel LL, Bialous SA, Glantz SA. Avoiding "truth": tobacco industry promotion of life skills training. *J Adolesc Health*. 2006; 39(6):868–79. [PubMed: 17116518]
24. Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids. [Accessed 17 November, 2015] The Global Cigarette Industry. http://global.tobaccofreekids.org/files/pdfs/en/Global_Cigarette_Industry_pdf.pdf
25. Public Health Law Center. [Accessed 8 December, 2015] Master Settlement Agreement. <http://publichealthlawcenter.org/topics/tobacco-control/tobacco-control-litigation/master-settlement-agreement>
26. Otanez M, Muggli ME, Hurt RD, Glantz SA. Eliminating child labour in Malawi: a British American Tobacco corporate responsibility project to sidestep tobacco labour exploitation. *Tob Control*. 2006; 15(3):224–30. [PubMed: 16728754]
27. Otanez M, Glantz SA. Social responsibility in tobacco production? Tobacco companies' use of green supply chains to obscure the real costs of tobacco farming. *Tob Control*. 2011; 20(6):403–11. [PubMed: 21504915]
28. Kessler, D. A question of intent: a great American battle with a deadly industry. New York: Public Affairs; 2000.
29. Kessler, G. United States of America v. Philip Morris USA, Inc., et al. [Accessed 8 December, 2015] Civil Action No. 99–2496, Final Opinion. <http://tobaccofreekids.org/reports/doj/FinalOpinion.pdf>
30. Mendez D, Alshamqety O, Warner KE. The potential impact of smoking control policies on future global smoking trends. *Tob Control*. 2013; 22(1):46–51. [PubMed: 22535364]

31. Hu TW, Lee AH. Tobacco control and tobacco farming in African countries. *J Public Health Policy*. 2015; 36(1):41–51. [PubMed: 25428192]
32. Lecours N, Almeida GE, Abdallah JM, Novotny TE. Environmental health impacts of tobacco farming: a review of the literature. *Tob Control*. 2012; 21(2):191–6. [PubMed: 22345244]
33. Assunta M. Tobacco industry's ITGA fights FCTC implementation in the Uruguay negotiations. *Tob Control*. 2012; 21(6):563–8. [PubMed: 22634569]

Highlights

- Multinational and US tobacco company websites contain CSR information.
- There appears to be broad agreement across companies on what constitutes CSR.
- Tobacco company websites mentioned CSR activities in 58 countries.
- One-half of all African-based CSR programs were related to tobacco farming.

Table 1

CSR areas of focus mentioned on tobacco company websites, February 2014

CSR FOCUS	Altria	Philip Morris USA	Reynolds American	Lorillard	Philip Morris International	British American Tobacco	Imperial Tobacco	Japan Tobacco International
Youth smoking prevention	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Marketing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Supply chain	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Acknowledgement of health harms	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Illicit trade	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Environment ^a	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Harm reduction	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Local community philanthropy	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Education	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Disaster relief	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Hunger/poverty	X		X		X	X	X	X
Arts	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Disease prevention /health promotion	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Research funding		X			X	X		
Smoking cessation		X		X				
Domestic violence	X				X			
Total number of CSR-related webpages	24	40	50	15	78	73	91	35

^aExcluding programs focused on the environmental impact of tobacco farming.

Table 2

Tobacco company CSR projects, by country (February 2014)

Country ^a	Company	Project(s)	CSR Focus Area
Argentina ^b	PMI	Somos Capaces (vocational training program)	Education
		Porvenir (child labor prevention)	Supply chain
Australia	BAT	Butt Free Australia	Environment
	Imperial	Keep South Australia Beautiful	Environment
		Emergency donations/Salvation Army Disaster Youth smoking prevention	Disaster relief Youth smoking prevention
Bangladesh	BAT	Rice paddy curing	Supply chain
		Soil improvement	Supply chain
Brazil	BAT	Earthwatch Institute partnership	Environment
	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: environmental projects	Environment
		Altadis Foundation: education Water conservation	Education Environment
Burkina Faso	Imperial	HIV/AIDS prevention	Disease prevention
Canada	Imperial	We Expect ID	Youth smoking prevention
	JTI	Computer literacy programs	Education
Canary Islands	Imperial	Employee volunteering, forest clean up	Environment
		Water pumps	Environment
Chad ^c	Imperial	Water pumps	Environment
Chile	PMI	Disaster relief	Disaster relief
Colombia ^c	PMI	Irrigation project	Environment
		Supporting improved teaching curriculum	Education
		Renovating rural schools	Education/local community philanthropy

Country ^a	Company	Project(s)	CSR Focus Area
Cote d'Ivoire	Imperial	Vaccination program for employees	Disease prevention/health promotion
Czech Republic	JTI	Residential programs (unspecified)	Local community philanthropy
Dominican Republic ^d	Imperial	Sustainable tobacco growing	Supply chain
	PMI	Domestic violence prevention	Domestic violence
France	JTI	Funding for the Louvre Museum	Arts
Germany	PMI	Vocational training	Education
Greece	Imperial	Employee volunteering: tree planting	Supply chain
		Youth access prevention campaign	Youth smoking prevention
Guatemala	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: emergency relief	Disaster relief
Haiti ^b	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: emergency relief	Disaster relief
	JTI	Disaster relief	Disaster relief
Holland	JTI	Adult literacy	Education
Honduras	Imperial	Sustainable tobacco growing	Supply chain
India	BAT	Earthwatch Institute partnership	Environment
Indonesia ^d	BAT	Alternative tobacco curing fuel	Supply chain
		Tree planting	Supply chain
	PMI	Conserving mangrove forests	Environment
		Farming support	Supply chain
Italy	JTI	Disaster relief	Disaster relief
		Tree planting	Supply chain
Italy	JTI	Youth smoking prevention	Youth smoking prevention
		Support of La Scala Opera House in Milan	Arts
		Support of Teatro alla Scala Museum in Milan	Arts

Country ^a	Company	Project(s)	CSR Focus Area
Japan	Imperial	TASPO (tobacco passport)	Youth smoking prevention
	JTI	Disaster relief	Disaster relief
	PMI	Disaster relief Domestic violence prevention	Disaster relief Domestic violence
Kyrgyzstan	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: education	Education
		Eliminating Child Labor in Tobacco Foundation	Supply chain
Laos	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: Mines Advisory Group	Disease prevention/health promotion
		Cooperative orthotic and prosthetic enterprise	Disease prevention/health promotion
		Altadis Foundation: economic development	Hunger/poverty
		Tree planting	Supply chain
Lithuania	PMI	Social needs TV show	Arts
Macedonia	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: social welfare	Local community philanthropy
Madagascar ^c	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: social welfare	Local community philanthropy
		Well digging	Environment
		Employee volunteering: tree planting	Supply chain
		Wildlife Conservation Society project	Environment
		Disaster relief	Disaster relief
Malawi ^d	Altria	Total Land Care	Supply chain
	BAT	Alternative fuel curing barn	Supply chain
		Imperial	Total Land Care
Well digging/tartrines	Environment		
Eliminating Child Labor in Tobacco Foundation	Supply chain		
Opportunity International (microfinance)	Hunger/poverty		
		Fuel efficient curing barn	Supply chain
	JTI	Tree planting	Supply chain

Country ^a	Company	Project(s)	CSR Focus Area
	PMI	School construction	Education
		Total Land Care	Supply chain
		Tree planting	Supply chain
	PM USA	Total Land Care	Supply chain
Mali	Imperial	Freedom from Hunger (microfinance/credit for women)	Hunger/poverty
Mexico	PMI	Fundacion Merced (hunger and poverty alleviation)	Hunger/poverty
Morocco ^b	Imperial	Social Responsibility in Tobacco Production	Supply chain
		Altadis Foundation: education	Education
		Employee volunteering: Clean Beaches	Environment
Mozambique ^b	Imperial	Opportunity International (microfinance)	Hunger/poverty
		Total Land Care	Supply chain
Netherlands	JTI	Support of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam	Arts
		Adult literacy scheme	Education
Nicaragua	Imperial	Sustainable tobacco growing	Supply chain
Pakistan	PMI	Disaster relief	Disaster relief
		JTI	Disaster relief
Pan-Africa	Imperial	Support of the African Virtual University	Education
Philippines	Imperial	Emergency relief	Disaster relief
		PMI	Education (funding of a school-based TV program)
		JTI	Tree planting
Poland	Imperial	Tree planting	Supply chain
		Employee volunteering: tree planting	Supply chain

Country ^a	Company	Project(s)	CSR Focus Area
	JTI	"Neighborhoodly aid" (unspecified)	Local community philanthropy
	PMI	Assistance for the disabled	Disease prevention/health promotion
Puerto Rico	Reynolds Ashtrays	Positivo (makes disposable ashtrays)	Environment
Republic of Congo	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: emergency relief	Disaster relief
Romania	PMI	Social Canteen Otopeni	Hunger/poverty
Russia	JTI	Support of the Marinsky Theater	Arts
	PMI	Education/teacher training	Education
Serbia	PMI	Grants to develop small businesses	Local community philanthropy
Singapore	PMI	Food from the heart	Hunger/poverty
South Korea	JTI	Computer literacy programs	Education
	PMI	Refrigerated trucks	Hunger/poverty
Spain ^c	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: social welfare	Hunger/poverty
		Altadis Foundation: education	Education
		Altadis Foundation: employee volunteering	Local community philanthropy
	JTI	Support of the Museo Del Prado	Arts
Sri Lanka	BAT	Sustainable leaf curing	Supply chain
		Restoring forests	Supply chain
Sub-Saharan Africa	BAT	Tropical Biology Association partnership	Environment
Sub-Saharan/Central Africa	Imperial	Malaria prevention, HIV/AIDS, clean drinking water	Disease prevention/health promotion
Switzerland ^b	BAT	Portable ashtrays at music festivals	Environment
Taiwan	Imperial	Rice donation/farmland adoption	Supply chain

Country ^a	Company	Project(s)	CSR Focus Area
Tanzania	JTI	Hondao Senior Citizens Welfare Foundation	Hunger/poverty
	BAT	Alternative fuel curing barn	Supply chain
	Imperial	Oxen donation	Hunger/poverty
		Eliminating Child Labor in Tobacco Foundation	Supply chain
		Altadis Foundation: economic development Crop diversification/rotation	Hunger/poverty Supply chain
	JTI	Tree planting Programs for those marginalized by society	Supply chain Hunger/poverty
PMI	Total Land Care	Supply chain	
Taiwan	JTI	Hondao Senior Citizens Welfare Foundation	Disease prevention/health promotion
Thailand	PMI	Rainwater catchment tanks, "Water from Health to Wealth"	Environment
Turkey	JTI	Tree planting	Supply chain
Uganda	BAT	Sustainable forest management	Supply chain
		Forest and freshwater health	Supply chain
UK	Imperial	Keep Britain Tidy	Environment
		Employee flu vaccinations	Disease prevention/health promotion
		Employee volunteering: wildlife conservation	Environment
		Employee volunteering: Keep Britain Tidy	Environment
	Citizen Card	Youth smoking preventions	
JTI	Support for the Royal Academy of Arts	Arts	
USA ^b	Altria	Success 360	Youth smoking prevention
		Arts funding	Arts
		Employee community fund	Local community philanthropy
		Anti-smuggling, counterfeit prevention	Illicit trade

Country ^a	Company	Project(s)	CSR Focus Area
		Sustainable agriculture Disaster relief Consumer anti-litter Altria Companies Employee Community Fund: domestic violence, hunger, etc.	Supply chain Disaster relief Environment Domestic violence; hunger/poverty
	Lorillard	Youth Smoking Prevention program We Card	Youth smoking prevention Youth smoking prevention
	PMI	Support of the Whitney Museum Domestic violence prevention Doors of Hope	Arts Domestic violence Domestic violence
	PM USA	Good agricultural practices Farm labor/child labor Youth smoking prevention Success 360 Economic development Keep America Beautiful Arts and culture "Other focused giving" Disaster relief We Card Grants to school and youth programs	Supply chain Supply chain Youth smoking prevention Youth smoking prevention Local community philanthropy Environment Arts Unknown Disaster relief Youth smoking prevention Education
	Reynolds American	Big Boy Scouts badge "Right decisions, right now" Cigarette butt litter recycling program Arts Council of Winston-Salem Reynolds American Foundation education scholarships Tobacco supply chain Carolina Farm Steward Foundation Land donation	Youth smoking prevention Youth smoking prevention Environment Arts Education Supply chain Supply chain Local community philanthropy

Country ^a	Company	Project(s)	CSR Focus Area
		Crosby Scholars Program, youth tobacco prevention	Education; youth smoking prevention
		Tree planting	Environment
		Santa Fe Natural Tobacco Company Foundation: American Indian college scholarships, leadership training	Education
		Donations to arts organizations	Arts
		Food banks	Hunger/poverty
		College scholarships	Education
		Red Cross	Disaster relief
		Habitat for Humanity	Hunger/poverty
		American Snuff Company Charitable Trust: Ronald McDonald House, St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital, Special Olympics	Disease prevention/health promotion
		United Way	Local community philanthropy
		Carolina Farm Stewardship Association	Supply chain
		We Card	Youth smoking prevention
Uzbekistan	BAT	Sustainable agriculture	Supply chain
Viennam	BAT	Rice paddy curing	Supply chain
	Imperial	Altadis Foundation: environmental projects	Environment
		Altadis Foundation: Project Symphony (building homes)	Hunger/poverty
		Altadis Foundation: social welfare	Hunger/poverty
		Employee volunteering: tree planting	Supply chain
West Africa	Imperial	Vaccinations	Disease prevention/health promotion
Zimbabwe	BAT	Alternative fuel curing barn	Supply chain

^a Unless otherwise indicated, countries are parties to the FCTC

^b Countries that have signed but not ratified the FCTC

^c Countries that have prohibited tobacco industry CSR

^dCountries that are neither signatories nor parties to the FCTC

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript