PLACE BUILDING AND MISSION STATEMENTS: A MATCH OR MISFIT?[*]

DAVID F. THOMAS[†]
Monfort College of Business, University of Northern Colorado, United States

JAMES H. BANNING
School of Education, Colorado State University, United States

ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study was to investigate possible relationships between organizational Mission Statements (MS) and Pace Building (PB). The basic question addressed in the study was do corporate MS statements contain a linkage to their possible place building strategies. Do the linkages suggest a match, a misfit, or is the linkage missing? Place building focuses on how an organization values the dimensions of place: nature, social relationships, material environment, ethics, and economic relationships in relation to the places in which they are located. We examined the MS from 41 businesses selected among a group of fortune 500 firms to determine if place building attributes were evident. Qualitative document analysis was employed to investigate the possible linkage between mission statements and the concepts of the place building model. The findings of the study suggest that corporate mission statements most often fail to address the strategies associated with organizational place building. These findings raise important questions for discussion regarding the future of organizations and their relationship to place building in the community: how is corporate space used in the community, what is the condition of the space, and what is the impact of organizational place on the community resources. The study concludes that the strategy of addressing place/community relations within corporate mission statements can provide a useful way forward in addressing the foregoing questions.

Keywords: Place; Mission Statements; Place Building; Qualitative Research; Corporate Social Responsibility.

INTRODUCTION
Corporate mission statements are ubiquitous, but their relationship to organizational practices, and specifically to place and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) remains a source of limited research. There is a plethora of research and volumes of texts on how to write a successful mission statement. Yet, there is limited research on the application of Mission Statements (MS) to ongoing operations and a lacuna of evidence on the relationship

---

[*] The views or opinions expressed in this manuscript are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the position, views or opinions of the editor(s), the editorial board or the publisher.
[†] Corresponding author: Assistant Professor Management, Monfort College of Business, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO 80631, United States.

between MS and a firm's ongoing operation. MS remain a prominent keystone to describing how a business will operate, its nature and purposes. The mission statement came into popular usage in the early 70's with the explosion of business books that popularized the design and critical need for MS. Tom Peters in his book in search of excellence and Drucker's work all kick started MS as a mandatory recital for any serious business plan. Even investors and the casual observers found the articulation of a MS an indication of a serous enterprise. MS gained increased popularity again in the 2000's with the advent of the "evaluator pitch"- that 30 second prose that capsulized the entire business concept. Business models, a favorite of the dot.com error in the late ninety's, all include MS as a key part of the strategic asset components. It seemed that without a MS the fledging techno-enterprise and software startup all regaled the MS as the legitimizing characters of their play (Sheaffer, Landau, Drori, 2008).

Perhaps the reason for limited research in this area is due to the difficulty in sorting through the multiple factors or variables that impact a firm's performance or a valid method for evaluating the relationships between MS and firm performances. Clearly, this is a rich area of future research we intend to pursue. However, for the purposes of this paper we selected a number of firms among America's top corporations to compare their MS to a set of place building principles.

After presenting a broad background to the concepts of mission statements and place building theory, the current study engages in a conceptual perspective of the relationship between the two and then concludes with an empirical investigation of the relationship between the two concepts within a selected number of United States' top corporations.

MISSION STATEMENTS

A MS is a broadly defined statement of purpose that specifies, "Who the organization is and what it does" (Levin, 2000, p. 93). As such, mission statements (henceforth MS) aim at providing organizations with a strategic direction and a unique sense of enduring purpose. Consequently, a MS focuses on describing preferable business domains and potential value to stakeholders aiming at distinguishing an organization from others of its type (Bart, 2001).

Mission statements serve as common corporate reporting tool. Their long-term use by corporations has been characterized by significant change, however, especially in the format and delivery of these statements (Williams, 2008) often found on an organizations' web sites, annual reports, various promotional material.An effective MS is inclusive in nature, embodying shared beliefs, organizational values and an indication as to its aspired future (Sheaffer, Landau and Israel, 2009). A MS also indicates how the organization will achieve its future objectives (Ireland & Hitt, 1992; Vandijck, & Desmidt, 2007) and we add to that, how the organization views its role in the community, industry and market place.

A MS facilitates performance by guiding resource allocation and it provides ground rules for a detailed and concrete action plan (Bart and Baetz, 1998; Bart, 1997). When the MS is aligned with intrinsic place building values and strategic planning, the ensuing place building strategies become deliberate and proactive, allowing the organization to generate its own MS is not merely a portrayal of the future to be, but it actively, if imperceptibly, encourages organization members to help attain future goals (Thomas and Cross, 2007).

Moreover, through its clear sense of direction, a MS nurtures and promotes an adaptive and innovative organizational culture, enabling the formation of an effective strategic planning process, augmenting organizational effectiveness, sustaining entrepreneurial spirit, guiding and directing HR activities and functional responsibilities (Cetro & Peter, 1992; Larwood, Falbe, Kreiger, & Miesing,1995).

In sum, a MS defines the enduring basic tenets of the organization's modus operandi as well as its values, norms and behavior. A well-articulated MS is expected to simplify and

actively interpret the general organizational vision and provide a concrete and accurate expression of this vision (Sheaffer, Landau & Drori, 2008).

PLACE-BUILDING THEORY

"Place building" as a concept is alluded to by sociologists, geographers, and other social scientists interested in matters such as enterprise movement, community and systems sustainability (Schneider, Brief, and Guzzo, 1996), sustainable development, and enterprise attributes of communities (Hudson, 2001; Schoenberger, 1997; Sagoff, 1996; Wright, 1994; Jacobs, 1984). In the past thirty years the concept of place has received examination from scholars in a variety of disciplines. Sense of place, community development, corporate culture, and organizational behavior have been researched by sociologists (Gans, 2002; Gieryn, 2000), geographers (Agnew, 1987; Buttimer and Seamon, 1980; Entrikin, 2000; Werlen, 1993), anthropologists (Geertz, 1983; Wright, 1994), environmentalists (Gustafson, 2005; Snyder, 1995), and business researchers (Delheim, 1986; Hatch, 1993; Weick, 1995; Morgan and Smircich).

Place is defined as both geographical and social and is organized around the meanings individuals and groups give to a place in its setting (Rodman, 1992). Places take on the meaning of events that occur there, and their descriptions are fused with human goals, values, and intentions. These "shared meanings" are held in common by the collective, and are historically generated and tend to be durable (Alvesson and Berg, 1991). Geographers refer to place as "context" explaining how social relations attach to space and place and only secondarily to people (Staeheli, 2007). Place is therefore described in this sense as a setting for social action. A university with its power can impact a given place in ways that influence social action, often on its own terms and seeking a certain outcome. As Entrikin (2000, p. 6) states "Place shares meanings or interpretive frames of events for different actions, and second it provides resources for action." Thus, place as a platform can mediate between individuals, social groups and broader political structure (Thomas and Cross, 2007).

Two Place Perspectives

An organization's *agent perspective* distinguishes two distinct viewpoints held by organizations, which encompass not only how organizations conceptualize themselves in relationship to place, but also the meaning they give to place, which then influences their goals, contributions to place, and all variety of their behavior. It is possible to distinguish two types of agent perspectives: one perspective conceptualizes organizations and their success as *interdependent* with the well-being of place and another that conceptualizes organizations and their success as *independent* of place (Thomas, 2004; Thomas and Cross, 2007).

Organizations with the *interdependent* perspective view themselves as members of a community and recognize that organizations and places are mutually dependent on each other. Interdependent organizations consider themselves responsible for the well-being of place, view their success as intimately tied with the greater well-being of the place, and actively seek a variety of opportunities to invest and contribute to the multiple aspects of place. In contrast, organizations with an *independent* perspective view themselves merely as occupants of place and economic agents, rather than integral members of place. Organizations that see themselves as independent agents focus their activities on satisfying internal goals while viewing the realms of place as resources to satisfy their needs. Their primary responsibility is to their shareholders, not the places in which they do business. They consider generating jobs and tax revenues as their primary, if not their only, contribution to place. Independent organizations are not committed to the well-being of place and will only maintain the relationship as long as it benefits their shareholders (Thomas, 2004; Thomas and Cross, 2007).

Four Types of Place Builders

Thomas, (2004) and Thomas and Cross, (2007) using a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) derived the place-building model. Place-building theory explains how an organization values place on five place dimensions: nature; social relationships; material environment; ethics; and economic relationships. *Nature* includes the natural—as opposed to man-made. Such as the landscape, earth, geography and natural resources. How does an organization relate and contribute to nature and the environment? *Social Relationships* includes the full spectrum of interactions between an organization's employees and stakeholders and among and between other organizations. How is certain space treated that reflects the culture, strategies and values of the organization?

Material Environment includes man-made buildings, roads, and other structures such as the office building an organization occupies and how that space is treated. This includes interior office spaces. This also reflects the value placed on the buildings architecture, landscaping and historical construction (if any). *Ethics* is the realm that describes the organization'sbusiness practices and its implicit and explicit contract with the community that seeks to establish itself as legitimate. How are an organization's practices modeled in its industry, its culture and all stakeholders? *Economic relationships* are described in terms of the organizations' level of investment in the fiscal well-being of the community. For example, how does the organization attract skilled labor to the community? How does it seek to improve the economic viability of the community? How does the organization create new opportunities for economic growth? How the organization values place in each of these dimensions suggests its type, and its strategies for building place. The Organizational Place Building (OPB) Model is a complex theoretical statement that has been subjected to both quantitative modeling and continuous empirical testing.

Within the context of the two agent perspectives described above, the OPB model includes four distinct *place agent identities*: transformational, contributive, contingent, and exploitive. *Place agent identities* reveal how organizations conceptualize themselves as social actors – agents – in relation to the places in which they are located and do business. The four types of place building organizations differ in how they conceptualize themselves as agents, the value they assign to the dimensions of place, their corporate culture, and their strategies and behaviors. *Transformational* organizations conceptualize themselves as change agents acting to improve the lives of individuals and groups in a place. *Contributive* organizations conceptualize themselves as investors and contributors to the well-being of places in which they operate. *Contingent* organizations view themselves simply as participants in places and *exploitive* organizations view themselves as independent agents with little to no obligations to the places in which they operate (Thomas, 2004; Thomas and Cross, 2007; Thomas, Gaede, Jurin and O'Connell, 2010).

Each of the four types of organizations, i.e. *transformational, contributive, contingent,* and *exploitive* create a mission statement which demonstrate different levels of commitment to place well-being and fiscal success. Organizations with the same agent perspective, but different agent identities, develop similar although not identical missions and strategies, which include similar commitments to place well-being and/or fiscal success. Organizations with an interdependent perspective strive for a relatively equal balance between place well-being and their own fiscal success, whereas those organizations with an independent agent identity put much more emphasis and weight on fiscal success with little concern for place well-being. The place building model illustrates the minor differences between types of place building organizations that share the same agent perspective, but distinct differences between organizations with different place agent identities (Thomas, 2004; Thomas and Cross, 2007).

Transformational organizations. Transformational organizations view themselves as critical agents with a mission and focus on improving life and creating positive change for both the organization and the place (Thomas, 2004; Thomas & Cross, 2007). The transformational organizational culture is highly focused on team learning, collaboration, openness to change, and building partnerships. They view themselves as *interdependent* members of a place, rather than independent members, and their success contributes to advantage beyond that of the organization (Thomas, 2004).

Transformational place builders demonstrate an *integrative* strategy that focuses on building a shared vision with the community and holding itself accountable to the community for the quality of its contribution to place. These behaviors are not solely for public relations advantage but an effort to surpass community business trends and regulations, perhaps even at a cost to the organization (Thomas & Cross, 2008). These strategies include initiating new policies and business practices for protecting the natural environment, neighborhoods, cultural heritage, local economy, and other local resources (Thomas & Cross, 2007).

Contributive organizations. Contributive organizations view themselves as being a contributing member of a network of business people and community leaders who share a common ideology. Their identity as a local contributor is affirmed by engaging with local organizations, fundraising, and by philanthropy that builds place (Schneider, Brief, and Guzzo, 1996; Chaskin, Brown, Venkatesh & Vidal, 2001). In contrast to transformational organizations that view themselves as responsible for the well-being of place, a contributive organization views itself as a contributor to the well-being of place. The organizational culture is focused on "investing in its community" and conforming to local norms and values (Thomas, 2004).

Contributive organizations value place first for its social relationships and second for its economic opportunities and potential for business growth. The natural world may simply be the geographic location of their business. These organizations need a place that needs them, where they can simultaneously prosper and give back. They practice an *integrative* strategy that cultivates their role as a key contributor in their community, through the network of organizations that facilitate social and philanthropic activity (Thomas, 2004; Thomas and Cross, 2007).

Contingent organizations. Contingent organizations view themselves as disassociated and autonomous agents. They narrowly define correct corporate behavior as "corporate social responsibility" with obeying existing laws, regulations, and ethical codes, yet they make a concerted effort to act accordingly. Rather than viewing themselves as interdependent with place (transformational), or key members of place (contributive), they view themselves as control agents. The contingent organization practices a *separatist strategy* that centers on a plan that distinguishes the organization in terms of its economic power. Contingent organizations value place for what it provides for the company, such as workers for its labor force. They practice philanthropy only as a method for advancing their own causes, not out of any intrinsic commitment to place, and their principle contribution is their economic contribution and adherence to laws and regulations (Thomas and Cross, 2007).

Exploitive organizations. Exploitive organizations view themselves as occupants of place and are more isolated from the values of the community. They are active users of the economic, cultural, social, and political resources, valuing place as a commodity that they utilize to their greatest economic benefit (Sagoff, 1996; Rodman, 1992; Entrikin, 2000). They largely plan and organize to control space in which short term financial progress and

cost effectiveness trump local needs (Thomas, 2004) and their preference is to be granted the rights and legal protections typically afforded only to individual citizens (Vogel, 2005).

The exploitive firm's mission to maximize profit determines their organizational philosophy, and it is usually practiced by deliberately targeting certain places for the potential to extract resources without accountability for the risks posed to the local population. While these organizations may employ locals and deal with local suppliers, they practice a *separatist* strategy in that they are not invested in ways that contribute to a sense of place. Exploitive organizations are likely to leave a place once they have determined they don't fit or the return is not as lucrative as originally anticipated (Thomas & Cross, 2007).

Each of the four types stands out from the others in their perspectives on place and the consequences of their actions. Transformational organizations orchestrate their contributions in ways that transform themselves and place. As agents of change, they are distinguished from other organizations in that they view place in a holistic manner in which all five place dimensions are interactive and interdependent. Consequently, the business practices of transformational organizations contribute to place well-being through learning and teaching in partnership with clients (Thomas, 2004; Thomas and Cross, 2007).

PRINCIPLES OF PLACE BUILDING: A DESCRIPTIVE, PRESCRIPTIVE AND EVALUATIVE

Principles of place building are evident in every organization. The degree by which these principles are incorporated in the business model and the MS can help identify the type of place builder. The first principle is *descriptive* (see Appendix B) in the sense of strategies that reveal how an organization values or de-values place (Thomas, 2004; Thomas & Cross, 2007; Kimball and Thomas, 2012). The organization's valuation of place informs how the organization *designates the use of space* in ways that ascribe meaning and reflect the organization's culture.

Second principle of *evaluative* (see Appendix C) in the sense of revealing how an organization *determines the significance, worth or condition of a place*, and how that organization assesses or estimates the quality or condition of a place relative to its role. Each organization determines the significance of place across five place dimensions. This can be apparent in terms of the words and intentions of its MS.

The third principle of *prescriptive (*see Appendix D) specifies, generally through its mission statement, its *intentions toward the wider community*: how it will *use resources and engage in activities that impact the community*, and what social and ethical responsibilities it acknowledges and strives to meet. These three principles are the codes or the norms of place building that we contend are evident in an organization's business model and can serve to direct the organizations duties and responsibilities to place and community.

The three place building principles (evaluative, descriptive and prescriptive) explain the tentative framework for incorporating PB in the organization's MS. The principles can also direct or guide an organization that seeks legitimacy in its community. Finally, these principles reconfigure Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as an *integrated strategy* in which both the organization transitions from stakeholders to "place holders". This transition in strategy and intentions are intimately connected to a new paradigm- a place building paradigm. Although this place-building framework typically has been applied to business organizations, it seems equally applicable to other types of organizations such as institutions of higher education, small businesses and non-profit groups. Next we explore the conceptual link of mission statements to place building.

MISSION STATEMENTS AND PLACE BUILDING: A CONCEPTUAL PERSPECTIVE

MS's will continue to be a significant reporting tool in identifying an organization's strategic intentions and can signal how it builds place. The MS is one of several components of an organization's business model; however, we focus on the conditional fit of the attributes of OPB that might be evident in a MS. The MS can illustrate this in the same manner a mission statement can guide all matters of a firm's strategies and activities, such as its CSR, its marketing and operational imperatives. Another way of looking at it is this: if MS are an indication of how the firm competes and generates revenues, then how it values place can be an integral aspect of its mission. This paper offers litmus for identifying likely place building strategies incorporated in its business model and thus evident in its MS.

As Levin (2000) posits "an organizational mission is a broadly defined statement of purpose that specifies who the organization is and what it does" (Levin, 2000, p. 93) and what it values. As such, a MS aims at providing organizations with a strategic direction that can uncover or expose its intentions toward the places it occupies. In order to do this, we have extrapolated key terms from selected MS's that can help compare a MS to a particular type of organizational place builder. For precisely these points we found the notion of a MS as a link or connection to describing how an organization values and builds place an indication of how it will treat the places it occupies in a community.

MISSION STATEMENTS AND PLACE BUILDING: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION

This study investigates possible relationships between business mission statements (if any) and Thomas' typology of Organizational Place Building (OPB), thus producing a fair estimate of the organization's intentions in terms of how it builds place. We examined the MS's from 41 businesses selected among a group of fortune 500 firms to determine if place building attributes, as outlined in the OPB model, were evident.

Method

Qualitative document analysis (Bernard and Ryan, 2010) was employed to investigate the possible linkage between mission statements and the concepts of the place building model. For example, does a MS contain likely terms that are symbolic or indicative of its place building strategies or intentions as identified in the OPB typology? In terms of methods, the four types of organizational place building (transformational, contributive, contingent, and exploitive) served as deductive/ prior codes (Bernard and Ryan, 2010) by which to exam the corporation's MS. By the process of purposefully sampling (Willig, 2001), (i.e. selecting cases that would yield data for the research purpose to be fulfilled) the study located 41 corporate mission statements for inclusion in the study.

The study located 41 corporate mission statements for examination. The sample included major US corporations representing the business sectors of medical (5), retail(2), manufacturing/distribution (5), transportation (5), communications (4), financial (5), energy (3), entertainment (3), food/beverage/grocery (6), services(2), and one unassigned. The findings of the cross-case analysis (Miles and Huberman, 1994) of the document analysis using the typologies as deductive codes are presented using a meta-matrix display (See Table 1) (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

FINDINGS

The purpose of the study was to determine if a relationship exists between MSs and OPB. A Meta Matrix of Mission Statements and Organizational Place Building by Business Sector (see Table 1) presents the results.

Insert Table 1 about here

Research revealed that 23 of the 41 organization's business MS manifested **no place** building characteristics. 18 organizations had MS's that manifested **some place building values**. Of these 18 MS, two were coded contingent, 14 exhibited certain characteristics associated with a contributive type of place builder and two were a combination of contributive and transformational.

The findings in this study of organizational mission statements and place building concepts illustrates that a relationship can be found, but over half of the mission statements do not give sufficient information to warrant an assignment of a place building type. However, an organization's MS relationship to the principles of OPB may serve as a key in evaluating how it may operate in a community.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Each type of OPB builds place in different ways, with a variety of results that should be coded to give organizations and their communities a chance to understand how OPB principles are subscribed to in a MS. For example, how does the organization *designate the use of space* in ways that ascribe meaning and reflect the organization's culture; *determine the significance, worth or condition of a place*, and how that organization assesses or estimates the quality or condition of a place relative to its role; and most importantly, the mission statement, signals its *intentions toward the wider community*: how it will *use resources and engage in activities that impact the community*, and what social and ethical responsibilities it acknowledges and strives to meet. This article concludes by predicting that mission statements will continue to be a significant reporting tool to identify the type of place building organization.

Research Limitations/Implications

Thinking theoretically OBP theory can contribute to the study of organizations and their roles in a community in several practical ways: First, as a way to co-join place as an interdisciplinary study with some larger issue such as the growing emphasis on organizational and community social responsibilities, especially to each other. Second, this study offers a critical perceptive on the traditional view of CSR which has come to be regarded as an appearance of responsibility geared toward some particular business objective that may be connected to its MS. And third, offers an anthropological view of an organization as an *interdependently* acting agent with varying degrees of contributions to the places they occupy at some point in the time of their development.

OPB is more holistic approach that is a shift in thinking about the relationship between place and organization that proffers new questions about the organization and its place in a community. For example it's clear that replacing traditional commerce and modern industry is upon us. How will we respond? What new systems will emerge and from whom do we or will we take our quest? Certain organizations are in a better position to innovate and create places in which shareholders can become placeholders. Or will larger economic forces reconfigure and change how our organizations value place? What new metrics will we use to create new thinking about what kind of organizations communities need and what will be their role in the places we call important? Place building emerges as a practical method for identifying, describing, evaluating and making some reasonable guesses at the level of contribution beyond what is known as being socially responsible.

In essence OPB excels beyond stakeholder thinking and redefines socially responsible behavior as a strategy for protecting and advocating for place, enhancing an organization's role in a community as a "place holder" resulting in building a competitive advantage for both the organization and the community.

This study is the first to assess whether or not place building performance is evident in an organization's MS. Clearly we would need to explore other dimensions of performance, operational activities, marketing, consistencies in financial reporting for example which is outside this article, rather we attempt to discern if and how PB principles are evident in the MS and provide a method for doing so.

REFERENCES

Agnew, J. A. (1987). *Place and politics*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Alvesson, Mats. (1990). On the popularity of organizational culture. *Acts Sociologica*, 33, 1:31-49.

Amit, R., and C. Zott. (2001). "Value Creation in E-Business," *Strategic Management Journal* 11(22), 493–520.

Bart, C. K. (2001). Exploring the application of mission statements on the World Wide Web. *Internet research: electronic networking applications and policy.* 11, 360-368.

Bart, C. K. (1998). Mission matters. *CPA Journal*, 68 (6), 56-57.

Bart, C. K. and Baetz, M. C. (1998). the relationship between mission statements and firm performance: an exploratory study. *The journal of management studies. 36*, 823-853.

Bart, C. K. (1997). Industrial firms and the power of the mission. *Industrial marketing management, 26*. 371-378.

Bernard, H.R. and Ryan, G.W. (2010). *Analyzing qualitative data: Systematic approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Buttimer, A. & Seamon, D. Eds. (1980). *The human experience of space and place*. London: Croom Helm.

Cetro, S, & Peter, P. (1992). Strategic management: A focus on progress. New York: Mc Graw- Hill.

Chaskin, R. J., Brown, P., Venkatesh, s., and Vidal, a. (2001). *Building community Capacity*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Entrikin, J. N. (2000). The betweeness of place: Towards geography of modernity. New York: Routledge.

Gans, H. J. (2002). The sociology of space: a use-centered view. *City and Community,* 1(4): 329-339.

Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge..* New York: Basic Books.

Gieryn, T. F. (2000). A Space for Place in Sociology. *Annual Rev. Social., 26*:463-496.

Gustafson, P. (2001). Meanings of place: Everyday experience and theoretical conceptualization. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 21, 5-16.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Harsh, V. V. (2009). Mission statements: A study of intent and influence. *Journal of Services Research*, 9(2).

Hatch, M. J. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture. *The academy of management review*, 18(4):657-693.

Hudson, R. (2001). *Producing places*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Sagoff, M. (1996). Values and preferences. *Ethics*, 2: 301-316.

Ireland, R. and Hitt, M. (1992). Mission statements: Importance, challenge and recommendations for development. *Business Horizons*, 35(3). 34-42.

Kotter, J. P. (1997). Leading Change. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kimball, M. & Thomas, D. (2012). Place-Building Perceptions: A New Model for Catalyzing Change in University-Community Relations and Student Civic Development. *Michigan Journal?*

Larwood, L., Falbe, C. M., Kreieger, M. & Miesing, P. (1995). An empirical study of the structure and meaning of organizational vision. Academy of Management Journal. 38, 740-769.

Levin, (2000). Vision revisited. The journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 36, 91-108.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Rodman, M. (1992). Empowering place: Multilocality and multivocality. *American Anthropologist, New series.* 94. (3), 640-656.

Schoenberger, E. (1997). *The cultural crisis of the firm.* Cambridge: Blackwell.

Sheaffer, Z., Landau, D., Drori, I. (2008). Mission Statement and Performance: An Evidence of "Coming of Age" *Organization Development Journal,* 26(2), 49-62.

Shafer, S., H. J. Smith, and J. Linder (2005). "The Power of Business Models," *Business Horizons* 48(3), 199–207. pg 202.

Schneider, B., Brief, A..P., & Guzzo, R..A. (1996). Creating a climate and culture for sustainable organizational change. *Organizational Dynamics*. Spring: 7- 18.

Snyder, G. (1995). *A place in space: Ethics, aesthetics, and watersheds*. Washington D.C.: Publishers Group West.

Staeheli, L. A. Chapter 11 *in A companion to Political Geography edited by john Agnew, Place Mitchell, K and Toal, G. Blackwell publishing.*

Sheaffer, Z., Landau, D., Drori, I. (2008). Mission Statement and Performance: An Evidence of "Coming of Age". *Organization Development Journal* 26. 2 (summer): 49-62.

Thomas, D. F. (2004). *Toward an understanding of organization place building in communities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Co.

Thomas, D. & Cross, J. (2007). Organizations as Place Builders. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 9(1).

Thomas, D. F., Gaede, D., Jurin, R. & Connolly, L. S. (2008). Understanding The Link Between Organizational Behavior And Community Sense Of Place. *Community Development;* 2008; 39(3).

Thomas, D. F., Gould, J., Gaede, D., & Jurin, R (2012). Transformational Place Building: A Mixed Method Exploration of Small Businesses. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy.*

Vandijck, D. & Desmidt, S. (2007). Relevance of mission statements in Flemish not-for-profit healthcare organizations. *Journal of Nursing Management, 15* (2), 131-141.

Verma, H. V. (2009). Mission Statements: A Study of Intent and Influence. *Journal of Services Research* 9. 2 (Oct 2009-Mar 2010): 153-172.

Weick, K.E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage

Werlen, B. (1993). Society, Action, and Space: An Alternative Human Geography. London: Routledge.

Williams, L.S. (2008). The mission statement: a corporate reporting tool with a past, present and future. *Journal of Business Communication, 45*(2), 94-119.

Willig, C. (2001). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.

Wright, S. (1994). (Eds.). *Anthropology of organizations*. New York: Routledge.

Vogel, D. (2005). *The market for value: The potential and limits of corporate social responsibility*.   Brookings   Institution   Press: Washington   D.C.

TABLE 1
A Meta Matrix of Mission Statements and Organizational Place Building Type by Business Sector

Business Sector	Unassigned	Exploitive	Contingent	Contributive	Transformational	Contributive/Transformational
	23	0	2	14	0	2
Medical	2	0	1	2	0	0
Retail	1	0	0	1	0	0
Manufacturing	3	0	0	1	0	1
Transportation	3	0	1	0	0	0
Communications	3	0	0	1	0	0
Financial	3	0	0	2	0	0
Energy	1	0	0	1	0	0
Entertainment	2	0	0	1	0	0
Food	2	0	0	3	0	1
Services	1	0	0	1	0	0

APPENDIX A

Meta-matrix Display of Deductive Codes

Company	Industry	Mission statement	Exploitive	Contingent	Contributive	Transformational
ADM	Agriculture	To unlock the potential of nature to improve the quality of life.			improve the quality of life	improve the quality of life
Albertsons	Grocery	Guided by relentless focus on our five imperatives, we will constantly strive to implement the critical initiatives required to achieve our vision. In doing this, we will deliver operational excellence in every corner of the Company and meet or exceed our commitments to the many constituencies we serve. All of our long-term strategies and short-term actions will be molded by a set of core values that are shared by each and every associate.			Commitments to the many constituencies we serve. core values that are shared	
Ashland	Chemical	We are a market-focused, process-centered organization that develops and delivers innovative solutions to our customers, consistently outperforms our peers, produces predictable earnings for our shareholders, and provides a dynamic and challenging environment for our employees.				
Amerisource Bergen	Pharmaceutical	To build shareholder value by delivering pharmaceutical and healthcare products, services and solutions in innovative and cost effective ways. We will realize this mission by setting the highest standards in service, reliability, safety and cost containment in our industry.				
American standard	to "Be the best in the eyes of our customers, employees and shareholders."					
AutoNation	Car dealerships	To be America's best run, most profitable automotive retailer.				

Avaya	Communication systems	Provide the world's best communications solutions that enable businesses to excel				
AGCO	manufacturer and distributor of agricultural equipment	Profitable growth through superior customer service, innovation, quality and commitment.				
Aflac	Aflac is a supplemental insurance company in the US. Its main business is into health and life insurance policies that cover special conditions, particularly cancer.	To combine aggressive strategic marketing with quality products and services at competitive prices to provide the best insurance value for consumers.		combine aggressive strategic marketing		
Computer services corp	IT	to use our extensive IT experience to deliver tangible business results enabling our clients in industry and government to profit from the advanced use of technology. We strive to build long-term client relationships based on mutual trust and respect.				
CHUBB	insurance	We are dedicated to providing excellent underwriting and loss control advice up front, and to ensuring superior customer service through the life of the policy.				
Becton, Dickinso n and	Medical/Manufacturi ng	To help all people live healthy lives.			To help all people live healthy lives	.

company						
13 Barnes and noble	Specialty retail	Our mission is to operate the best specialty retail business in America, regardless of the product we sell. Because the product we sell is books, our aspirations must be consistent with the promise and the ideals of the volumes which line our shelves.			consistent with the promise and the ideals of the volumes	
cooper tire and rubber	manufacturing	earn money for its shareholders and increase the value of their investment				
Coventry health care	Coventry Health Care is an institution that offers health care services that includes HMOs, PPOs, Medicare, Medicaid products, Worker's Compensation and Network Rental	Our mission is to provide high quality care and services to our members and to be profitable in the process. Coventry Health Care is also committed to maintaining excellence, respect, and integrity in all aspects of our operations and our professional and business conduct. We strive to reflect the highest ethical standards in our relationships with members, providers, and shareholders.			maintaining excellence, respect, and integrity in all aspects of our operations and our professional and business conduct.	
CSX	Transportation	To be the safest, most progressive North American railroad, relentless in the pursuit of customer and employee excellence.				
chevron,	Energy	to be the global energy company most admired for its			admired for its people,	

		people, partnership and performance.			partnership	
Conoco Philips		Use our pioneering spirit to responsibly deliver energy to the world.			responsibly deliver energy	
Disney	Entertainment	The mission of The Walt Disney Company is to be one of the world's leading producers and providers of entertainment and information. Using our portfolio of brands to differentiate our content, services and consumer products, we seek to develop the most creative, innovative and profitable entertainment experiences and related products in the world				
Darden restaurants	Restaurant	"To nourish and delight everyone we serve."			To nourish	
Dean foods,	Food and beverage	Maximize long-term stockholder value, while adhering to the laws of the jurisdictions in which it operates and at all times observing the highest ethical standards.			Adhering to the laws of the jurisdictions in which it operates and at all times observing the highest ethical standards.	
Dow chemical	Chemical	To constantly improve what is essential to human progress by mastering science and technology.				essential to human progress
Dole Food Company ,		Committed to supplying the consumer and our customers with the finest, high-quality products and to leading the industry in nutrition research and education. A corporate philosophy of adhering to the highest ethical conduct in all its business dealings, treatment				highest ethical conduct

		of its employees, and social and environmental policies.				
Este lauder	Skin care	"Bringing the best to everyone we touch".				
Eco Lab	Sanitizing and cleaning	We will achieve aggressive growth and fair return for our shareholders. We will accomplish this by exceeding the expectations of our customers while conserving resources and preserving the quality of the environment.			Conserving resources and preserving the quality of the environment.	
Fed express	Transportation	FedEx will produce superior financial returns for shareowners by providing high value-added supply chain, transportation, business and related information services through focused operating companies				
Ford motor company	Automotive	We are a global family with a proud heritage passionately committed to providing personal mobility for people around the world.				
Family dollar stores	Retail	For Our Customers A compelling place to shop. . . by providing convenience and low prices For Our Associates A compelling place to work. . . by providing exceptional opportunities and rewards for achievement For Our Investors A compelling place to invest. . . by providing outstanding returns				
Golden west financial corporati	Financial services	Golden West Financial Corporation's vision is to create long-term value for customers, shareholders, employees, and neighbors by providing high quality consumer financial services through our World				

on,		Savings and Atlas subsidiaries.				
Hersey Company	food	Undisputed Marketplace Leadership				
kindred Heathrow	Health care	The Compliance and Quality Committee is appointed to assist the Board of Directors in monitoring (1) the Company's compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and policies; (2) the Company's compliance with its Corporate Integrity Agreement and its Code of Conduct; and (3) the Company's programs, policies and procedures that support and enhance the quality of care provided by the Company.				
H & R block	Financial services	To help our clients achieve their financial objectives by serving as their tax and financial partner.				
Hughes Supply, Inc.	a wholesale distributor of construction	To supply outstanding service and solutions through dedication and excellence.				
IBM	Technology	Operating a safe and secure government.				
Kelly services	Human resources	To serve our customers, employees, shareholders and society by providing a broad range of staffing services and products.				
Lucent	Telecom	Philanthropy supports the social responsibility cornerstone of Lucent's mission: To live up to our responsibilities to serve and enhance the communities in which we work and live and the society on which we depend.			Supports the social responsibilities to serve **and enhance the communities** in which we work and live and the society on which we depend.	

Mc Graw hill	Publishing	Dedicated to creating a workplace that respects and values people from diverse backgrounds and enables all employees to do their best work. It is an inclusive environment where the unique combination of talents, experiences, and perspectives of each employee makes our business success possible. Respecting the individual means ensuring that the workplace is free of discrimination and harassment. Our commitment to equal employment and diversity is a global one as we serve customers and employ people around the world. We see it as a business imperative that is essential to thriving in a competitive global marketplace.				
MBNA	Banking	We strive to be the acknowledged global leader and preferred partner in helping our clients succeed in the world's rapidly evolving financial markets.				
MGM Mirage		MGM MIRAGE supports responsible gaming and has implemented the American Gaming Association's Code of Conduct for Responsible Gaming at its properties. MGM MIRAGE also has been the recipient of numerous awards and recognitions for its industry-leading Diversity Initiative and its				

		community philanthropy programs. For more information about MGM MIRAGE, please visit the company's website at www.mgmmirage.com				
Mutual of Omaha	Insurance	We will continue to build a corporate culture that respects and values the unique strengths and cultural differences of our associates, customers and community.			respects and values the unique strengths and cultural differences	
Mattel toy	manufacturing	Mattel makes a difference in the global community by effectively serving children in need. We also enrich the lives of Mattel employees by identifying diverse volunteer opportunities and **supporting their personal contributions** through the matching gifts program.			makes a difference enrich the lives of Mattel employees	makes a difference

APPENDIX B
Descriptive

Type	Description
Exploitive	Organization values place in quantifiable terms that *describe place as a product or commodity*. The organization negotiates its position in the community without regard to the impact of its operations and operates outside acceptable practices – no local knowledge of the place and its historic or cultural history.
Contingent	Values place primarily in *measureable terms. What* is the return on its contributions to place (i.e. how does the organization gauge its investments and estimates of the economic and financial worth to the organization). What economic and political advantages can be gained that advance its mission.
Contributive	Values place in terms of its *social network*. The organization's contributions are intended to gain recognition and favorably position the owner or leader as an important player in the community.
Transformational	Values place equally on all five place dimensions. The organization invests its assets to build competitive advantages for both place and organization. Assumes a leadership role in advancing new community capacities and competencies that improve community well-being

APPENDIX C
Prescriptive

Type	Designates the use of strategic resources and assets that value and/or de-value place
Exploitive	To capture financial gains through aggressive and organization-centric strategies that often value place as an acquisition or commodity.
Contingent	Conditional development of resources and assets to attain some good or purpose for the firms benefit
Contributive	Commits resources and assets to help build place, seek membership community organizations as a way of enhancing its reputation as a contributor.
Transformational	Commits resources and assets to lead and create new opportunities for civic participation and economic partnerships. An advocate for change and improvements consistent with it's and the community's business mission and purposes.

APPENDIX D
Evaluative

Type	Description
Exploitive	Assesses value of place primarily as an economic factor. It monetizes place and spaces as resources for its own purposes.
Contingent	Calculates the value of place in terms of its worth based on what it can contribute to the organization. What place affords that can enhance its market position and business model.
Contributive	Determine values based on the organization's relationship to some propositional good, such as the owners "fit" in the community.
Transformational	Determines the value of place based on the shared qualities of all five dimensions (economics, ethic, social, nature and the built environment). Each of which are viewed for their intrinsic values that gain prominence from an integrated and complex setting in which it operates. Transformational organizations can help revive the long dormant assets in a community by changing their business structure(s) to facilitate new investments in community capacity and or adopting new policies that value place on all five dimensions.