Business Linguistics in Internal Communications

Honors Thesis

Hannah Ratigan

Oklahoma State University

Abstract

The language used in internal communication is an inadequately researched topic that has the potential to impact nearly every working adult. Business linguistics are proven to affect external communications (Danyushina, 2011). Research shows that specific language evokes different emotions (Danyushina, 2011). This research discusses possible associations between internal communications, business linguistics and employee engagement by replicating the inductive study, Danyushina (2011) and applying the methodology to internal communications. The goal is to understand if language used in internal communications to employees impacts overall employee engagement. Other goals of this research are to address how present the key themes of internal communication are in the corporate rhetoric of four corporations that represent the corporate scene as a whole, if corporate rhetoric in internal communications changes dependent on the industry category of a corporation, and if corporate rhetoric in internal communications changes dependent on the publication category of a sample. Companies can utilize this research to improve the effectiveness of their internal communications.

Keywords

Business Linguistics

Internal Communication

Corporate Rhetoric

Employee Engagement

Bio Note

Hannah Ratigan,

B.S. Strategic Communications. School of Media and Strategic

Communications. Oklahoma State University. (hannah.ratigan@okstate.edu)

&

Skye Cooley, Ph.D.,

Assistant Professor of Strategic Communications. School of Media and Strategic

Communications. Oklahoma State University. (skye.cooley@okstate.edu)

Sophie Welch

Research Assistant. School of Media and Strategic Communications. Oklahoma State

University. (sophia.welch@okstate.edu)

Introduction

This research discusses possible associations between internal communication, business

linguistics, employee engagement and corporate rhetoric by applying the inductive study,

Danyushina 2011, to the internal communication field. The goal is to understand if language

used in communications to employees impacts overall employee engagement. Other goals of this

research are to address how present the key themes of internal communication are in the

corporate rhetoric of four corporations that represent the corporate scene as a whole, if corporate

rhetoric in internal communications changes dependent on the industry category of a corporation,

and if corporate rhetoric in internal communications changes dependent on the publication

category of a sample.

The previous study determines business linguistics to be a field "that explores the specific

functioning of language in a business context" (Danyushina, 2011). Danyushina applied these

findings by analyzing external blog posts from four corporate case studies. Danyushina

discovered business linguistics does socially impact external audiences.

Danyushina 2011 opened the door for business linguistics to impact business practices as a

whole. After examining Danyushina 2011, this research explores further research options from

the study including: Does business linguistics impact internal business practices? As most

existing research in the communication field focuses on external communication, the hope is to

draw attention to the importance of internal communication. Despite the importance accredited

to both internal communication and employee engagement, limited empirical research on their

association exists. The literature review established effective internal communication leads to

higher employee engagement and high employee engagement results in increased productivity,

quality, innovation, finances and more. The research found the most common best practices of

internal communication are "employee voice, transparency, strong corporate culture, supporting change, expectation setting and establishing purpose." These six key themes are the categories coded for in internal blogs evaluated via the content and narrative analysis portions of the research.

The content analysis found significant differences among how present the key themes were across groups (companies representative of four corporate rhetorics), significant differences among how present the key themes were across publication types (written types speaking to internal audiences) and means representative of how present each theme was across the population of internal communications available.

The narrative analysis portion found business linguistics (listed in Table 4) that were specific to each key theme.

These findings can influence how the internal communication field uses business linguistics intentionally to shape employee engagement.

Further research questions were drawn including:

- How could this research include a broader scope of companies?

- How does this research apply to smaller-sized companies?

- How does intention of the communication impact effectiveness of communication?

- How do employees perceive business linguistics?

Research Questions:

1. Does the use of business linguistics in internal communications impact employee engagement?

2. How present are the key themes of internal communication in the corporate rhetoric of four corporations that represent the corporate scene as a whole?

3. Does corporate rhetoric in internal communications change dependent on the industry category of a corporation?

4. Does corporate rhetoric in internal communications change dependent on the publication category of a sample?

Literature Review

Danyushina (2011)

In the study, *BUSINESS LINGUISTICS – A NEW INTERDISCIPLINARY SYNERGY*, author and researcher Yulia V. Danyushina, State University of Management, Moscow, Russia, identifies a new concept called business linguistics.

Danyushina (2011) investigates the question, "Do businesspeople speak a different "English" (Chinese, German, etc) – different from 'ordinary' English (Chinese, German, etc)?" (Danyushina, 2011). In other words, what linguistics differ from everyday language in the business world? The author determines business linguistics to be a field "that explores the specific functioning of language in a business context, investigates the use of language resources in business activities, and studies verbal and para-verbal aspects of business communication" through a comprehensive literature review (Danyushina, 2011). As a follow up to the literature review, Danyushina applies her findings by analyzing corporate web discourses via external blog posts from four corporate case studies. These four corporations were representative of the four classifications of companies active in the field of web communication. Google represented

companies directly related to the development of information and high-intellectual products. Coca-Cola was representative of manufacturers of consumer goods. Bank of America represented the financial sector. Exxonmobil represented large multinational corporations.

Danyushina identified the target audience of each representative company's external blog. The target audiences identified were as follows: Google, "intellectual" consumers;" Coca-Cola, "somatic" mass consumers;" Bank of America, "knowledgeable specialists, individuals belonging to at least the middle class and have a bank account, interested in social stability;" Exxonmobil, "the broad strata of society as a whole" (Danyushina, 2011). Danyushina then inductively identified what social implication the contents of each blog had on said target audience. Social implication was identified from language used in each blog and the predicted intent behind that language. First, each company was found to have a specific corporate rhetoric based on its web discourse. Google's corporate rhetoric was found to be a "high level of professional/technical expertise combined with the personalized style of messages about new products and services of the company" (Danyushina, 2011). After analyzing all of the listed corporations' web discourses, social implications were predicted. Google was identified to motivate "civil society through greater access to information and nation-wide socially relevant discussions" (Danyushina, 2011).

Danyushina (2011) opens up many opportunities for the new field of business linguistics to impact applied linguistics theory and business practices as a whole. The question follows: Does business linguistics also impact internal business practices, including internal communication practices?

The Communications Field

Communication is among the most prevalent activities of any organization (Men & Bowen, 2017). The communications field is made up of many subcategories. Two categories, external and internal communications, organize the many subcategories.

External communication is the process or means by which organizations manage outside stakeholder perceptions of the organization by the exchange of information ("What is external communication?", 2019). This field includes written, video, email, social media, etc. communications to stakeholders outside of the organization itself. These stakeholders can include, but are not limited to, "other business organizations, government offices, banks, insurance companies, customers, suppliers, leaders and general people" ("What is external communication?", 2019).

Internal communication has been called many things over the course of time including employee communication, employee relations, internal relations, organizational communication, and internal communication. Internal communication organizes direction from upper management and ultimately aims to align employees' understanding of the organization's vision, mission, goals and objectives (Men & Bowen, 2017). Internal communication can include, but is not limited to email, interpersonal, formal, written and face-to-face communications.

There is widespread understanding that the way that an individual or organization communicates affects the intended audience's listening or viewing experience. Wood & Duck (2006) identify that in order to compose relationships, communication does not only exist in a formal form but begins in the theory of framing communications and continues through many other elements of everyday life including small talk, vocational anticipatory socialization and more (Wood & Duck, 2006).

Through these brief definitions, the reader can see external and internal communication are not equivalent fields. Each category of communication impacts varying stakeholders. Each field is uniquely important in its individual way. After an extensive literature review, the author found that internal communication may even be more important than external communication. "Despite the importance accredited to both internal communication and employee engagement, limited empirical research on their association exists (Welch, 2011)" (Karanges et al., 2015). This research will attempt to explore gaps of knowledge in the field of internal communication by discussing possible associations between internal communications, business linguistics and employee engagement.

Importance of Internal Communication

Karanges et al. (2015) states that internal communication is important and integral to internal audiences. Seltzer et. al (2012) recognizes the internal communicator's role to act as an organization's official voice to align internal publics and facilitate contributions from employees to senior leadership. Factors that internal communication hopes to influence include employee retention (Ahmad et al., 2012), employee engagement (Hayase & Terumi, 2009) and employee perception (Men & Bowen, 2017). Clampitt & Downs (1993) shows benefits of internal communication including improved productivity, attendance, quality of service/products, innovation and finances (Verčič et al., 2012). These results all point to internal communication impacting not only internal benefits but unarguable benefits for return on investment, retention, reputation and more. "Managers should be aware that it is easy to change the price and the product, but it is another thing to create a behaviorally engaged workforce," (Macey &

Schneider, 2008). Internal communication "links to positive organizational and employee outcomes such as employee engagement" (Karanges et al., 2015).

Employee engagement "is the extent to which employees feel passionate about their jobs, are committed to the organization, and put discretionary effort into their work" (Ahmad et. al, 2012). Karanges et. al (2015) is not the only study proving internal communication's impact on employee engagement. Verčič & Vokić (2017) clearly states that when internal communication strategies are accurately practiced, this can lead to higher levels of employee engagement, "which leads to higher levels of performance" (Verčič & Vokić, 2017). These higher levels of performance include increased productivity, decreased attrition, improved reputation and increased financial returns (Karanges et al., 2015). In summary, internal communication leads to many organizational benefits (Seltzer et al., 2012) including one main benefit: employee engagement. And "employee engagement is recognised as important for organisational effectiveness and a factor in achieving innovation and competitiveness" (Ruck et al., 2017).

Internal Communication Best Practices

An extensive review of internal communication best practices was done to compile a list of potential factors to which the positive results of internal communication could be attributed. Researchers have identified best practices including employee voice (Ruck et. al., 2017; Sievert & Scholz, 2017) transparency (Doorley & Garcia, 2015; Sievert & Scholz, 2017; Verčič & Vokić, 2017), strong corporate culture (Sievert & Scholz, 2017; Doorley & Garcia, 2015; Yeomans et al., 2017), feedback (Verčič & Vokić, 2017), explicit information (Verčič & Vokić, 2017; Sievert & Scholz, 2017), clear chain of command (Martin, 2014; Doorley & Garcia, 2015),

timeliness (Martin, 2014), authenticity (Burton et al., 2013; Martin, 2014), legal obligations

(Yeomans et al., 2017), supporting change (Burton et al., 2013; Yeomans et al., 2017), reputation

management (Doorley & Garcia, 2015; Karanges et al., 2015; Yeomans et al., 2017), retention

management (Yeomans et al., 2017), expectation setting (Burton et al., 2013; Doorley & Garcia,

2015; Ruck et al., 2017), establishing purpose (Burton et al., 2013; Martin, 2014; Ruck et al.,

2017), reinforcement (Burton et al., 2013) and tracking progress (Burton et al., 2013).

The following table identifies additional language used for each best practice identified above.

Best practice:	Additional language:
Employee voice	Two-way communication, open channels, foster collaboration, engagement, collaboration, point of view, empower
Transparency	Honesty, trust
Strong corporate culture	Values, community
Feedback	
Explicit information	Clearly sharing information
Clear chain of command	Leadership, leader
Timeliness	
Authenticity	Trust, authentic voice
Legal obligations	
Supporting change	Communicating change, road map for change
Reputation management	Promoting external advocacy
Retention management	Stay, valuable employee
Expectation setting	Commander's intent, begin with the end in mind
Establishing purpose	Mission, motivation, challenge (don't

	cheerlead), empower
Reinforcement	Repeat
Tracking progress	

During the review of best practices, six standard best practices were identified including: employee voice, transparency, strong corporate culture, supporting change, expectation setting and establishing purpose. Employee voice was by far the most common best practice present in the literature reviewed for the purposes of this study. Employee voice is the process of leadership encouraging two-way communication from employees to management and vice versa (Ruck, 2017). "Satisfaction with employee voice, in terms of having sufficient opportunities for providing upward feedback, has been recognised as a driver of employee engagement" (Ruck, 2017).

Expectation setting was also a common standard for best practices of internal communication. The Commander's Intent (CI) theory states that internal communication should center around what the author wants the audience to **know, feel** and what they intend them to **do**. It is derived from military communication procedures (Doorley & Garcia, 2015). "When people know the desired destination, they're free to improvise, as needed, in arriving there" (Doorley & Garcia, 2015).

According to Tarver (2020), strong corporate culture "refers to the beliefs and behaviors that determine how a company's employees and management interact. Corporate cultures, whether shaped intentionally or grown organically, reach to the core of a company's ideology and practice, and affect every aspect of a business." (Tarver, 2020). Transparency can be seen as a subcategory of this strong corporate culture.

Establishing purpose is crucial in gaining employee engagement. "Transformational leaders convey a strong sense of purpose and collective mission and motivate employees by communicating inspirational vision and high performance expectations" (Ruck, 2017). Burton et al. (2013) states that challenging employees is one of the 10 most important best practices of internal communication.

Research Themes

After determining the target audiences of the internal blogs to be reviewed, researchers will look for key themes in business linguistics for the internal blogs being analyzed. When key themes arise, researchers will determine what language was used to arrive at a key theme and the social implications that could follow from the key theme. Here, researchers will evaluate the six standard best practices identified above: employee voice, transparency, strong corporate culture, supporting change, expectation setting and establishing purpose. The predicted target audiences of internal blogs include employees with a range of engagement levels in a range of positions throughout the company. Examples could include entry-level, professional, manager, senior-professional and middle-management employees. Senior management and corporate officers are predicted to be the employees in charge of developing said communications. The following table includes language that could indicate the six key themes that researchers will evaluate.

Key Theme:	Example Indicator:
employee voice	"Open and honest communication" "Your input is appreciated" "Feedback" "Improvements come from communication"
transparency	"The state of the company is" "Being honest" "To keep you informed"

strong corporate culture	"Values" "Community" "Openness"
supporting change	"Roadmap" "You can expect" "This is coming"
expectation setting	"Level-setting" "Challenge" "KPI"
establishing purpose	"Why" "Essential to business" "Business critical"

Conclusion

   RQ1: "Does the use of business linguistics in internal communications impact employee engagement?"

   The literature review established effective internal communication leads to higher employee engagement and high employee engagement results in increased productivity, quality, innovation, finances and more. The research found the most common best practices of internal communication are "employee voice, transparency, strong corporate culture, supporting change, expectation setting and establishing purpose." These six key themes are the categories coded for in internal blogs evaluated via the content and narrative analysis portions of the research.

Methodology

Through content analysis, this research will attempt to address the above research questions. The content analysis will track the prevalence of key themes in various documents written by upper level management to an internal audience in four different corporations. Each corporation was chosen to represent one of the four categories identified by Danyushina (2011). These four categories separate the corporate scene by industry. This broad approach to investigating internal communications across the entire corporate scene addresses research question number three.

Table 1: Key Themes

Key Theme:	Example Indicator:	Key Theme Definition
Employee Voice	"Open and honest communication" "Your input is appreciated" "Feedback" "Improvements come from communication"	The corporation uses language that encourages the participation of employees in influencing the organization's decision making.
Transparency	"The state of the company is" "Being honest" "To keep you informed"	The corporation uses language that shares difficult information in a forthcoming way.
Strong Corporate Culture	"Values" "Community" "Openness"	The corporation uses language that speaks to community creation and the importance of values.
Supporting Change	"Roadmap" "You can expect" "This is coming"	The corporation uses language that fosters an environment conducive to growth.
Expectation Setting	"Level-setting" "Challenge" "KPI"	The corporation uses language that creates clear boundaries for what employee behavior/performance is acceptable.
Establishing Purpose	"Why" "Essential to business" "Business critical"	The corporation uses language that helps employees understand their importance.

Table 2: Corporate Samples

Company	Corporate Rhetoric Represented	Identifier in data collection
Google	"directly related to the development of information and communication technologies, telecoms, information search and	1

	processing, manufacturing computer and communication equipment (i.e. producing "high-intellectual products") (Danyushina, 2011).	
Exxonmobil	"large multinational corporations... that maintain their websites and/or blogs mostly for the sake of prestige (e.g. big oil companies)" (Danyushina, 2011).	2
Bank of America	"financial sector companies, especially banks that at least partially distribute or deliver their products or services through the Internet" (Danyushina, 2011).	3
Coca-Cola	"manufacturers of consumer goods (mass market food and beverages, hygienic and cosmetic products)"(Danyushina, 2011).	4

Data Collection

A total of 46 internal communication samples were examined from 4 corporate rhetorics

represented by the companies Google, Bank of America, Exxonmobil and Coca-Cola from

August 2017 to August 2020; archive availability from internal communications published for

the public limited the timeframe to 3 years prior to 2020. The sources were accessed

utilizing each individual company website and other online sources including

https://blog.google/inside-google/life-at-google/, https://corporate.exxonmobil.com/,

https://about.bankofamerica.com/, https://www.coca-colacompany.com/,

https://www.indeed.com/, https://www.linkedin.com/feed/, and https://www.comparably.com/ .

The key themes employee voice (KTEV), transparency (KTT), strong corporate culture

(KTSCC), supporting change (KTSC), expectation setting (KTES) and establishing purpose

(KTEP) identified by the literature review to point toward strong internal communication, were

assessed across all samples included in the study. All sources available to the public were

utilized and assessed to be the total population for these four companies. A population of

samples (N=46) at a 95% confidence interval with 5% margin of error was taken across the

samples proved reliable at 94% in the intercoder reliability test.

Data Analysis

Researchers employed a content analysis. First, researchers conducted a

quantitative content analysis including categories examining the six key themes present in strong

internal communication. Coding categories were reliably assessed with two coders over the

course of a one month staging period in which the codes were inductively applied to twenty-five

percent of the overall sample. The first coding book was successful with an overall reliability of

.94 percentage agreement for all categories across the final two coders. Second, a qualitative

narrative analysis was conducted to provide further context on what specific business linguistics

were used to imply the six key themes. Narrative was operationalized following Miskimmon et

al. (2013)'s definition of strategic narratives and included acts, agents, scene, instrument of

action and purpose/intention of action following Burke's notion of narratives containing a

grammar of identifying human motivations (1969). Finally, a series of descriptive statistics and t-

tests were conducted on the data and analyzed for statistical significance at p=.05, while

qualitative findings were grouped and assessed according to narrative function.

Results

RQ2: *How present are the key themes of internal communication in the corporate rhetoric of four corporations that represent the corporate scene as a whole?*

Researchers found the following mean scores for each key theme when n=47. Due to the present/not present nature of the content analysis, each key theme had a minimum of .00 and a maximum of 1.00. Each key theme was present at least once in the 47 sample population. KSCC was most prevalent with a m=.79, sd= .41. The second most prevalent key theme was KTES n=47, m= .62 and sd= .49. Thirdly, KTEV was m= .57 and sd= .50. KTEP m= .55 and sd= .50. KTSC m= .43 and sd= .50. KTT had the lowest mean (m= .32) and sd= .47. KTEV was present in 27 of the 47 samples. KTT was present in 15 of the 47 samples. KTSCC was present in 37 of the 47 samples. KTSC was present in 20 of the 47 samples. KTES was present in 29 of the 47 samples.

RQ3: *Does corporate rhetoric in internal communications change dependent on the industry category of a corporation?*

KTEV, KTT, KTSCC, KTSC and KTEP all showed significant differences in the ANOVA analysis between groups (Google (1), Exxonmobil (2), Bank of America (3) and Coca-Cola (4)). KTEP had the largest significant difference (F=11.80, p =.00). The next largest was KTSC at (F=11.18, p= .00). KTEV also saw a significant difference (F=3.82, p=.02), followed by KTT (F=3.11, p=.04), and KTSCC (F=3.09, p=.04). KTES was the only key theme that did not see a significant difference across groups.

These significant differences were further assessed in a Bonferroni Post Hoc Procedure (See

Table I in the Appendix). KTEV for Google (1) and Bank of America (3) were found

significantly different with Google md= .55. KTEV for Coca-Cola (4) was also significantly

different where Coca-Cola md= .55 from Bank of America. In this case, the Bonferroni Post Hoc

Procedure proves Bank of America is significantly different from the other categories for KTEV.

For KTSC, the Bonferroni Post Hoc Procedure showed that Coca-Cola was significantly

different from every other company with md=.48 from Google, md= .92 from Exxonmobil and

md= .72 from Bank of America. Google had significantly more KTEP than Exxonmobil (md=

.53) and Bank of America (md= .65). Coca-Cola had significantly more KTEP than Exxonmobil

(md= .69) and Bank of America (md= .82).

RQ4: *Does corporate rhetoric in internal communications change dependent on the publication*

category of a sample?

KTT, KTSCC and KTES all showed significant differences in the ANOVA analysis between

publication types (CEO Notes (A), Mission Statement (B), Human Resources Pages (C),

LinkedIn Bio (D) and Indeed.com Job Call(E)). KTT had the largest significant difference

(F=22.67, p =.00). The next largest was KTES (F=11.37, p= .00). KTSCC also saw a significant

difference (F=7.87, p= .00). KTEV, KTSC and KTEP did not see a significant difference across

publication types.

These significant differences were further assessed in a Bonferroni Post Hoc Procedure (See

Table J in the Appendix). KTEV for CEO Note (A) and Mission Statement (B) were found

significantly different where md= .80 for CEO Note. KTT for CEO Note was significantly

different from Mission Statement (md=.62), Human Resources Page (md= .62), LinkedIn Bio

(md=.87) and Indeed.com Job Call (md= .87). KTSCC showed significant differences where

LinkedIn Bio had significantly less occurrences than every other publication type (md= -1.00

CEO Note, md= -1.00 Mission Statement, md= -.75 Human Resources Page and md= -.75

Indeed.com Job Calls). KTES was significantly more present in Indeed.com Job Calls (md= .67

compared to CEO Note, md= 1.00 compared to LinkedIn Bio). In the Bonferroni Post Hoc Test,

KTSC and KTEP saw no significant differences among publication types.

Narrative Analysis:

According to the narrative analysis, most publications were found in an online format. Other

publications were found in emails to employees that were later published to the internet making

them accessible to the public. The most common purposes of each publication were to inform

employees, persuade potential employees or gain new employees. Other common purposes were

encouraging employees, addressing hardships within the company (ie. sexual harassment,

racism, etc.), or to establish new policies as well known. The majority of publications pointed

toward positive language. The most common individual agent was the CEO. The most common

departmental agent was HR or upper-level management in a broad sense.

Language Indicative of Each Key Theme:

Language that was confirmed to indicate each of the six key themes of internal communication is

listed below. This list is not exhaustive, but is representative of a majority of language used.

Table 3: Language Indicative of Each Key Theme

Key Theme	Language Used by Companies	
	1	"talk to your manager," "Follow us," "Please let us know," "Feedback," "listening to," "call for ideas," "Met with black leaders," "Express," "talk with your manager," "heard your feedback," "can express opinions," "discuss as a group,"
	2	"engagement," "welcome your feedback," "please email," "follow us," "like us," "love to talk,"
	3	"Let me know,"
KTEV (Employee Voice)	4	"Encourage you to bring your ideas" "Shared helpful and meaningful feedback," "We sincerely appreciate it," "Questions welcome!" "follow us," "challenge the status quo, make bold recommendations," "ask," "say it,"
	1	"a limited number of Googlers whose roles are needed back," "Go online," "revisiting things when we don't get them right," "we experienced," "We recognize that we have not always gotten everything right.. sorry, time to make changes," "this has been a very difficult time," "violates" policy, "harmful,"
	2	"proud to share our Sustainability Report,"
	3	"progress our company made,"
KTT (Transparency)	4	"eco-friendly plan based on large carbon footprint," "Animal abuse," "we all need to do more," "Fuzzy connection," "if we make mistakes, we act to quickly make things right," "conscience,"
KTSCC (Strong Corporate Culture)	1	"collaboration and community," "You can make money without doing evil," "Life at google," "Teamwork," "Our community," "Team that aligns interests," "Human-face," "collaboration," "Culture," "Team," "Community," "come together," "showing support," "team needs," "together," "build a workplace," "we support Googlers to express themselves," "code of conduct," "culture that is free of harassment, intimidation, bias..," "Communities in pain,"

		2	"commitment," "our mission," "committed," 'we value," "team," "Core Values," "commitment to our values," "Family,"
		3	"teammates," "Mission," "vision," "cultivating a strong culture," "unified," "our team,"
		4	"we invest in people's lives, from our employees," "shared value," "Coca-cola family," "refresh communities," "invest in people's lives," "home," "nurturing culture," "expression of who we are," "communities," "working together," "team," "culture," "collaborating with our diverse network," "smart alone, together we are genius," "collaboration," "inclusive, value and trust each other,"
		1	"choice for employees," "A lot has changed," "Growth," "meaningful change starts within our company," "improve," "choice for employees," "Going forward," "progress," "Action plan,"
		2	
		3	"in this report,"
KTSC (Supporting Change)		4	"Journey to evolve," "Shaping," "evolution," "we must play a stronger role," "Evolution," "much has changed," "growth of our people," "growth mindset," "continuously strive," "transforming," "Grow together," "push for progress, not perfection," "version 1.0, 2.0 3.0," "development for self and the organization," "growth behaviors,"
		1	"we encourage you to," "Great isn't good enough," "You're expected to," "skills required," "Our goal," "We encourage you," "if you do not complete," "to be clear"
		2	"responsibilities," "duties," "exceed expectations," "duties,"
		3	"conduct expectations," "exceeding critical performance standards," "responsibilities," "required skills," "responsible," "required to have," "Consistently meet or exceed expectations," "Meet key performance indicators,"
KTES (Expectation Setting)		4	"Expected to act as leaders" *listing values,* *career descriptions,* "key responsibilities," "stay curious," "own the outcomes," "this candidate is expected to," "expected behavior,"

	1	"making a big difference," "Useful," "Proud to work at Google," "Organize," "The heart and soul," "Ground-breaking," "Your knowledge," "important work that makes a big difference," "Thank you," "Proud to share," "help people," "herculean efforts to continue to support our users," "empowers employees," "our job" "make a difference"
	2	"critical role," "Impact,"
	3	"real impact,"
KTEP (Establishing Purpose)	4	"we exist to," "why we exist," "needed now, more than ever," "the people of our company can create the changes our communities need," "Incredibly proud of the way our team has stepped up to lead," "purpose," "made a difference," "make a difference," "empower our people," "tremendous demands," "strengths is tied to the people behind," "putting people at the heart of our business," "empower employees," "putting people at the heart of our business," "you push us to the next level," "empowered,"

Discussion

Performing research with replicated methodology of Danyushina (2011) tested the theory that business linguistics, internal communications and employee engagement are all connected. If business linguistics leave an impact on employees in internal communications, the implications could lead to improved organizations.

Research on this subject could largely influence the communications world. It could prove the importance of internal communication in corporate strategy (especially in a corporate world focused on external communication). Showing that internal communications impact employee engagement could allow companies to effectively shape future communication strategies to impact employee output evidenced in much of the above-mentioned research.

With a synthesized process of applying business linguistics to internal communication,

companies could create more efficient and impactful messages. The long-term effects of this

research could include increased company profit and ROI, as these are products of advanced,

healthy employee engagement.

The key themes were confirmed to be central to internal communication standards by the finding

that each key theme was present at least once in each 47 samples in the population. This finding

means that internal communication specialists can use the key themes when checking if their

current company/organization's internal communication practices are including suitable

messaging. KSCC was the key theme most present when N=47. This could imply that companies

represented by this research's four cases studies focus on a strong corporate culture more than

any of the other best practices. Companies may think a strong corporate culture is most important

to employee satisfaction/engagement, or KTSCC might be the easiest key theme to represent in

written context. The next most present key theme was KTES. By setting expectations in job calls

and other publication types, companies can create healthy relationships with their employees.

This key theme being second-most present is interesting. This finding could imply that

companies are focused on what they need from employees more than what employees need in

the company (KTEV). KTEV was the third-most present key theme. Employee voice was an

easily identifiable key theme by written language, making it easy to see what industries see

employee voice as important. It was clear in this research that companies either ask for employee

voice routinely, or ignore it completely. While the literature clearly identified KTT as a best

practice for all industries in internal communication, this key theme was least present. This

finding indicates that while transparency is a best practice, companies have not standardized

using this key theme in their internal communication with employees. Some explanations for this

finding could include that companies still do not want to disclose uncomfortable information,

companies see transparency as only necessary when they are called out for doing something

against policy or normalcy, companies want to avoid transparency to protect themselves, or

companies do not see the increasing inability to keep information private in the technology age.

Overall, the key themes were found to be present among their four companies internal

communications representing their presence among the corporate rhetoric as a whole. Further

research could be done to discuss the presence of each key theme compared to the others.

While the ANOVA Test shows significant differences for each key theme across industry

categories represented by four corporations besides KTES, the significant differences found in

the Bonferroni are harder to dispute, therefore this research will focus on those significant

differences.

Google, representing the tech industry, had significantly more KTEV than Bank of America,

representative of the financial industry. This could be attributed to a number of reasons. One

explanation is that the tech industry moves faster, therefore requiring more input from

employees. One explanation could be the financial sector might not attribute importance to

employee voice. There could be less competition for top talent in the financial industry compared

to the growing need for tech employees, therefore employee engagement could be more

important to companies like Google. This significant difference was also found where Coca-

Cola, representing the consumer goods industry, had more KTEV than Bank of America. Again,

this could be explained by any of the above factors. For KTSC, Coca-Cola had significantly

more language indicating "supporting change" than any other company/industry. This might be

explained by the need to adapt to an always changing consumer market. The consumer goods

industry could be used to adapting to change in the external market and therefore, could expect

to change in a similar way internally whereas the other industries represented by Google, Bank

of America and Exxonmobil have less long-term changes in each market with the tech industry

being comparatively new, the financial sector staying comparatively stagnant and the

multinational industry being unpredictable (sometimes stagnant, sometimes changing). Google

had significantly more KTEP than Exxonmobil or Bank of America. This finding implies that the

tech industry could potentially focus on establishing purpose in their employees more than the

multinational industry or the financial industry. Coca-Cola was also successful in establishing

purpose (KTEP) compared to Exxonmobil and Bank of America. This again shows that the

multinational and financial industries might focus less on establishing purpose for their

employees. Further research in this regard could be interesting if it examined company intention

from an internal perspective vs. actual output in business linguistics used. This will be discussed

more in the further research section of this paper.

While the ANOVA Test shows significant differences for each key theme across publication

type for the key themes KTT, KTSCC and KTES, the significant differences found in the

Bonferroni are harder to dispute, therefore this research will focus on those significant

differences.

The CEO Note was a successful publication type across all industries for the key themes KTEV,

KTT and KTSCC. The CEO Note makes sense to have significantly more success indicating key

themes due to its tendency for personal tone, attribution to a human being and increasing

importance in the communication field. While KTT was not as present as the rest of the key

themes (discussed under RQ2), if it was present, it was usually discussed in the CEO Note. This

could mean that more CEO Notes were created to respond to negative press or upset employees, or that disclosing uncomfortable information is easier when the information comes with a face to the information (in this case, the CEO). Further research on this topic could examine what companies/industries find CEO Notes to be necessary, helpful or important. While KTSCC was the most present key theme when N=47, it was least present among the LinkedIn Bio publication type compared to every other publication type. This is interesting because showcasing strong company culture on a recruiting/community tool could be beneficial to all companies. This could be looked at in future research. KTES was most present in the Indeed.com Job Calls. Significantly more KTES was present in Indeed.com Job Calls than CEO Notes and LinkedIn Bios. This finding absolutely makes sense due to the fact that job calls' purpose is to set expectations for a career at the company to prospective employees. With that being said, it would be interesting to examine if that is what employees really look for in a job call or if they would be more satisfied with the other key themes being extremely present as well. This research implies so far that they would due to the key themes being best practices and according to RQ1, resulting in overall employee engagement.

By researching and recording language that indicates each key theme of internal communication, this research comes one step closer to showcasing business linguistics in action. The language recorded can be used in future internal communication as a standard or example when a company or organization hopes to achieve one of the key themes it is indicative of. For example, if a tech company similar to Google (1) hopes to begin facilitating a strong corporate culture (KTSCC), they could use language like "team," "family," etc.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the extensive literature review, content analysis and narrative analysis resulted in examining four following research questions: Does the use of business linguistics in internal communications impact employee engagement? How present are the key themes of internal communication in the corporate rhetoric of four corporations that represent the corporate scene as a whole? Does corporate rhetoric in internal communications change dependent on the industry category of a corporation? and Does corporate rhetoric in internal communications change dependent on the publication category of a sample? The research found that the use of business linguistics does impact employee engagement through the literature review portion. The literature review also identified six key themes of internal communication: employee voice (KTEV), transparency (KTT), strong corporate culture (KTSCC), supporting change (KTSC), expectation setting (KTES) and establishing purpose (KTEP). The research then used content analysis to determine that those six key themes were present among current internal communications. The content analysis also determined how the key themes varied among four corporations (Google=1, Exxonmobil=2, Bank of America=3, Coca-Cola=4) that represented four all-encompassing industries (Respectively, Tech, Multinational, Financial and Consumer Goods) and how the key themes varied across publication type available to the public (CEO Note=A, Mission Statement=B, Human Resources Pages=C, LinkedIn Bio=D, Indeed.com Job Call=E). Findings also resulted in a language bank of existing business linguistics used by these four companies (and potentially their respective industries) to imply each of the key themes. This research could be influential for corporations/organizations hoping to improve their internal communication using business linguistics. The use of business linguistics could in turn, impact those organizations' employee engagement. With a growing "work-from-home" culture, companies will turn to internal communications in written form to foster company culture and

other factors that are important for employees to succeed. This piece of research could be influential in that regard. Further research needs are discussed below to entertain the possibility of business linguistics in internal communication applying to smaller companies and broader scopes of organizations.

Further Research

Each of the RQ1-4 could be further expanded upon in each having its own respective research project. Specifically, the research could be expanded to include smaller companies, a broader survey of companies representing each corporate rhetorics, more than four corporate rhetorics to achieve more specificity or insider publication types in the form of a case study. A library of business linguistics specifically used for internal communication would be helpful for all internal communication specialists when hoping to imply one of the key themes in communications from their corporation. The beginning of this library would include Table 3: Language Indicative of Each Key Theme present in this research paper. There is much to be done in the communication field, especially with the growing prospect of business linguistics value to corporations.

References

Ahmad, N., Iqbal, N., & Sheeraz, M. (2012). The Effect of Internal Marketing on

Employee retention in Pakistani Banks. *International Journal of Academic Research in*

Business and Social Sciences, *2*(8). Retrieved from http://hrmars.com/admin/pics/1055.pdf

Bank of America Values & Principles: Our Core Company Values. (n.d.). Retrieved from

https://about.bankofamerica.com/en-us/who-we-are/values-and-

principles.html#fbid=D2yDtZEqrnE

Burton, K. , Grates, G. and Learch, C. (2013), "Best-in-class practices in employee

communication: through the lens of 10 global leaders", Institute for Public Relations

White Paper, April, available at: www.instituteforpr.org/wp-

content/uploads/IPR_Best_in_Class_White_Paper_Final_04_20131.pdf.

Career opportunities. (n.d.). Retrieved from

https://corporate.exxonmobil.com/Company/Careers

Career Areas: The Coca-Cola Company. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.coca-

colacompany.com/careers/career-areas

Chairman's letter: ExxonMobil. (n.d.). Retrieved from

https://corporate.exxonmobil.com/Community-engagement/Sustainability-

Report/Chairmans-letter

Clampitt, P. G., & Downs, C. W. (1993). Employee Perceptions of the Relationship

Between Communication and Productivity: A Field Study. *Journal of Business*

Communication, *30*(1), 5–28. doi: 10.1177/002194369303000101

Danyushina , Y. V. (2011). BUSINESS LINGUISTICS – A NEW

INTERDISCIPLINARY SYNERGY. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*. Retrieved

from http://www.openaccesslibrary.org/images/0418_Yulia_V._Danyushina.pdf

Doorley, J., & Garcia, H. F. (2015). *Reputation Management: The Key to Successful*

Public Relations and Corporate Communications (3rd ed.). New york, NY: Routledge.

Find great places to work. (n.d.). Retrieved from

https://www.indeed.com/companies?from=gnav-viewjob

Google Mission, Vision & Values. (2020, October 02). Retrieved from

https://www.comparably.com/companies/google/mission

Hayase, Lynn Kalani Terumi, "Internal communication in organizations and employee

engagement" (2009). UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones.

1176. https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/1176

Hemp, P., & Stewart, T. A. (2004). Leading Change When Business Is Good. *Harvard*

Business Review.

Karanges, E., Johnston, K., Beatson, A., & Lings, I. (2015). The influence of internal

communication on employee engagement: A pilot study. *Public Relations Review*, *41*(1),

129–131. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.12.003

Life at Google. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://blog.google/inside-google/working-google/

LinkedIn. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.linkedin.com/

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Cambridge University Press*, *1*(1), 3–30. doi: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x

Martin, D. (2014). The value of thinking inside out. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *35*(2), 46–48. doi: 10.1108/JBS-02-2014-0020

Men, R. L., & Bowen, S. A. (2017). *Excellence in internal communication management*. New York: Business Expert Press.

Miskimmon A, O'Loughlin B and Roselle L (2013) Strategic Narratives, Communication Power and the New World Order. New York: Routledge.

Our CEO, Brian Moynihan, Discuss Responsible Growth. (2017, April 04). Retrieved from https://about.bankofamerica.com/en-us/who-we-are/hear-from-our-ceo.html#fbid=D2yDtZEqrnE

Ruck, K., Welch, M., & Menara, B. (2017). Employee voice: An antecedent to organisational engagement? *Public Relations Review*, *43*(5), 904–914. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.04.008

Seltzer, T., Gardner, E., Bichard, S., & Callison, C. (2012). PR in the ER: Managing internal organization–public relationships in a hospital emergency department. *Public Relations Review*, *38*(1), 128–136. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.12.002

Sievert, H., & Scholz, C. (2017). Engaging employees in (at least partly) disengaged companies. Results of an interview survey within about 500 German corporations on the

growing importance of digital engagement via internal social media. *Public Relations*

Review, *43*(5), 894–903. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.06.001

Tarver, E. (2020, January 29). How to Tell If Your Corporate Culture Is Healthy.

Retrieved from https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/corporate-culture.asp

Verčič, A. T., Verčič, D., & Sriramesh, K. (2012). Internal communication: Definition,

parameters, and the future. *Public Relations Review*, *38*(2), 223–230. Retrieved from

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.12.019

Verčič, A. T., & Vokić, N. P. (2017). Engaging employees through internal

communication. *Public Relations Review*, *43*(5), 885–893. doi:

10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.04.005

What is external communication?: Objective of external communication. (2019).

Retrieved March 2020, from https://thebusinesscommunication.com/what-is-external-

communication-objective-of-external-communication/

Who we are. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://corporate.exxonmobil.com/Company/Who-we-

are

Wood, J. T., & Duck, S. (2006). *Composing relationships: communication in everyday*

life. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Yeomans, L, FitzPatrick, L, & Tench, R. (2017). Internal Communication. Pearson

Education.

Appendix

Table A: Coding Scheme/Definitions

		Code Description/Operational Definition	Code Example
	Company Code	1= Google, 2=Exxonmobil, 3= Bank of America, 4= Coca-Cola with links to Google doc sample sheets	
	Publication Code	A= Letter from CEO; B= Mission, vision, values; C= Human Resources page; D= Linkedin Bio; E= Job Calls; Link all publication links	
	Date	00/00/0000	
Key Themes	**KTEV: Key Theme- Employee Voice**	The corporation uses language that encourages the participation of employees in influencing the organization's decision making. Specifically asking for social media engagement where employees are present is an example.	"Open and honest communication" "Your input is appreciated" "Feedback" "Improvements come from communication"
	KTT: Key Theme- Transparency	The corporation uses language that shares difficult information in a forthcoming way including: performance, finances, internal processes, sourcing, pricing, and business values.	"The state of the company is" "Being honest" "To keep you informed"
	KTSCC: Key Theme- Strong Corporate Culture	The corporation uses language that speaks to community creation and the importance of values.	"Values" "Community" "Openness" "mission" "Vision" INTERNAL not external.
	KTSC: Key Theme- Supporting	The corporation uses language that fosters an environment conducive to growth in a non-economic sense.	"Roadmap" "You can expect" "This is coming"

	Change		
	KTES: Key Theme-Expectation Setting	The corporation uses language that creates clear boundaries for what employee behavior/performance is acceptable.	"Level-setting" "Challenge" "KPI"
	KTEP: Key Theme-Establishing Purpose	The corporation uses language that helps employees understand their importance.	"Why" "Essential to business" "Business critical"
Narrative Analysis	**Act**	What happened? What is the action? What is going on?	annual report
	Scene	When and where	virtually, at year end
	Agent	Who did it	CEO
	Agency/instrument	How? How was the "instrument"/topic used?	Email
	Purpose	Why did the thing occur?	update them on company news

Table B: Raw Data Collection Quantitative

			Key Themes				
			K T E V	K T S			

					C C			
			1		1	1	1	1
			0		1	0	1	1
			1		1	0	0	1
			0		0	1	0	1
			1		1	0	1	1
			1		1	0	1	1
			1		1	0	1	1
			1		1	1	1	0
			1		1	0	1	1
			1		1	1	0	0

			1		1	1	0	0
			1		1	1	1	1
			0		1	0	0	1
			0		1	0	0	0
			1		1	1	1	1
			1		1	0	1	1
			0		1	1	0	1
			1		1	0	0	1

			1		1	1	0	1
			1		1	1	1	1
			0		1	1	1	1
			0		1	1	1	1
			1		0	1	0	0
			1		1	1	1	1
			1		1	1	1	1
			1		1	1	1	1

			1		1	1	1	1
			1		1	1	1	1
			1		1	0	0	1
			0		1	0	0	0
			1		0	0	0	1
			1		0	0	0	0
			0		0	0	1	0
			0		1	0	1	0

			1	1	0	1	0
			0	0	0	1	0
			0	1	0	1	0
			1	1	1	0	0
			0	1	0	0	0
			0	1	0	1	0
			0	0	0	0	0
			0	1	0	1	1

			0		1	0	1	0
			0		0	0	1	0
			0		0	0	1	0
			0		0	0	1	0
			1		1	**1**	0	0

Table D: Example Text

Company	Sample	Data
1	A	*Editor's Note: CEO Sundar Pichai sent the following note to the company today.* Hi everyone,

Over the past several weeks, violent and racist attacks against the Black community have forced the world to reckon with the structural and systemic racism that Black people have experienced over generations. My own search for answers started within our own walls. Listening to the personal accounts of members of our Black Leadership Advisory Group and our Black+ Googlers has only reinforced for me the reality our Black communities face: one where systemic racism permeates every aspect of life, from interactions with law enforcement, to access to housing and capital, to health care, education, and the workplace.

As a company, and as individuals who came here to build helpful products for everyone, Google commits to translating the energy of this moment into lasting, meaningful change. Today we are announcing a set of concrete commitments to move that work forward: internally, to build sustainable equity for Google's Black+ community, and externally, to make our products and programs helpful in the moments that matter most to Black users.

Building sustainable equity

Creating meaningful change starts within our own company. Strengthening our commitment to racial equity and inclusion will help Google build more helpful products for our users and the world. To that end, we're announcing several commitments to build sustainable equity for our Black+ community.

First, we're working to improve Black+ representation at senior levels and committing to a goal to improve leadership representation of underrepresented groups by 30 percent by 2025. To help achieve this, we'll post senior leadership roles externally as

well as internally, and increase our investments in places such as Atlanta, Washington DC, Chicago, and London, where we already have offices. We'll take the same approach across regions, using site and country-specific plans to recruit and hire more underrepresented Googlers in communities where the social infrastructure already supports a sense of belonging and contributes to a better quality of life.

Second, we'll do more to address representation challenges and focus on hiring, retention, and promotion at all levels. To help direct that work, I'm establishing a new talent liaison within each product and functional area to mentor and advocate for the progression and retention of Googlers from underrepresented groups. I'm also convening a task force, including senior members of the Black+ community at Google, to develop concrete recommendations and proposals for accountability across all of the areas that affect the Black+ Googler experience, from recruiting and hiring, to performance management, to career progression and retention. I've asked the task force to come back with specific proposals (including measurable goals) within 90 days.

Third, we're working to create a stronger sense of inclusion and belonging for Googlers in general and our Black+ community in particular. Our internal research shows that feelings of belonging are driven by many aspects of our experiences at work, including the psychological safety we feel among our teams, the support of our managers and leaders, equitable people processes, and opportunities to grow and develop our careers. Across all of these dimensions, we're committed to building more inclusive practices and policies—and revisiting them when we don't get them right.

As one example, we've had a security practice of Googlers watching for "tailgaters" in order to reduce instances of unauthorized visitors in offices. We have realized this process is susceptible to bias. So, over the past year, our Global Security and Resilience team partnering with a cross-functional working group, conducted extensive research, listened to Black Googlers' experiences, and developed and tested new security procedures to ensure we could maintain the safety and security of the Google community without relying on this type of enforcement. Now, as we prepare to return to the office, we will end the practice of Googlers badge-checking each other and rely on our already robust security infrastructure.

Fourth, we'll establish a range of anti-racism educational programs that are global in view and able to scale to all Googlers. We'll be welcoming external experts into Google to share their expertise on racial history and structural inequities, and start conversations on education, allyship, and self-reflection. And this week we've begun piloting a new, multi-series training for Googlers of all levels that explores systemic racism and racial consciousness, to help develop stronger awareness and capacity for creating spaces where everyone feels they belong. We plan to roll out this training globally by early next year. We'll also integrate diversity, equity, and inclusion into our mandatory manager trainings.

Fifth, we're focused on better supporting the mental and physical health and well-being of our Black+ community. For example, over the past year, we've worked with our mental health provider in the U.S., to increase their Black network of counselors. Our global EAP

providers are also working to further diversify their network of counselors. Over the next 90 days, our Benefits team will work with the Equity Project Management Office and Black Leadership Advisory Group to identify areas where we could expand our benefits or provide additional support to Googlers and their families. As one example of the kinds of programs that work: we've made the medical second opinion service available to Googlers' extended family—something that our Black+ community told us was important to supporting a family structure that includes siblings, parents, parents-in-law and grandparents.

Building products for change

Turning to our external announcements, we want to create products and programs that help Black users in the moments that matter most. Two weeks ago, I put out a call for ideas, and Googlers from all over the world have submitted more than 500 suggestions. We've assembled a product task force to prioritize and implement these ideas in partnership with our Black Leadership Advisory Group and members of our Black Googler Network.

Some activations have already launched, including the Assistant's responses to questions related to Black Lives Matter and—as of this week—Juneteenth. We're also working quickly to give merchants in the U.S. the option of adding a "Black-owned" business attribute to their Business Profile on Google to help people find and support Black-owned local businesses by using Search and Maps. This opt-in feature is in development and will roll out to Business Profiles in the coming weeks.

Creating products for everyone is a core principle at Google, so our product teams will work to ensure that all users, and particularly Black users, see themselves reflected in our products. In addition, building on YouTube's announcement last week, our Trust and Safety team will work to strengthen our product policies against hate and harassment. Helping create economic opportunity

Beyond our products, we know that racial equity is inextricably linked to economic opportunity. So today we are announcing a $175 million+ economic opportunity package to support Black business owners, startup founders, job seekers and developers, in addition to YouTube's $100 million fund to amplify Black creators and artists. This new commitment includes:

- **$50 million** in financing and grants for small businesses, focused on the Black community and in partnership with Opportunity Finance Network. This commitment builds on our recent $125 million Grow with Google Small Business Fund that is helping underserved minority and women-owned small businesses across the U.S.
- **$100 million** in funding participation in Black-led capital firms, startups and organizations supporting Black entrepreneurs, including increased investments in Plexo Capital and non-dilutive funding to Black founders in the Google for Startups network.
- **$15 million** in training, through partners like the National Urban League, to help Black jobseekers grow their skills.
- **$10 million**+ to help improve the Black community's access to education, equipment and economic opportunities in our

| | | developer ecosystem, and increase equity, representation and inclusion across our developer platforms, including Android, Chrome, Flutter, Firebase, Google Play and more.

Mentorship is also critical to growing networks and successful businesses. Today, we are launching our Google for Startups Accelerator for Black Founders, a three-month digital accelerator program for high potential Seed to Series A startups and announcing an expansion of our Digital Coaches program to 8 new cities, including Memphis, Birmingham, and Cleveland, to provide 50K Black-owned businesses in the U.S. with the mentorship, networking and training they need to grow.

Improving education

We're also committing nearly $3 million to help close the racial equity gaps in computer science education and increase Black+ representation in STEM fields. This starts with making sure Black students have access to opportunities early on in their education. To that end, we're expanding our CS First curriculum to 7,000 more teachers who reach 100,000+ Black students, scaling our Applied Digital Skills program to reach 400,000 Black middle and high school students, and making a $1 million Google.org grant to the DonorsChoose #ISeeMe campaign, to help teachers access materials to make their classrooms more inclusive.

Beyond the classroom, we're increasing our exploreCSR awards to 16 more universities to address racial gaps in CS research & academia, and we're also supporting Black in AI with $250,000 to help increase Black representation in the field of AI. |
|---|---|---|

These efforts build on our other education initiatives, including CodeNext, focused on cultivating the next generation of Black and Latinx tech leaders, and TechExchange, which partners with historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and Hispanic-serving Institutions (HSIs) to bring students to Google's campus for four months to learn about topics from product management to machine learning.

Supporting racial justice organizations

We also continue to support organizations working to advance criminal justice reform. Earlier this month, Google.org pledged another $12 million, in addition to the $32 million we've already contributed since the Charleston shooting five years ago today. We're announcing the next round of grants—at $1 million each—to the Leadership Conference Education Fund, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund's Policing Reform Campaign and the Movement for Black Lives. We've also created a public donation page to help raise even more for organizations fighting against racism and inequality. Recognizing that racism is a problem the world over, looking ahead, we will focus on more global solutions, and will be giving grants to local community organizations tackling these issues in Brazil, and across Europe and Africa.

Let me close by simply saying thank you to the many Googlers who have come together to drive these efforts. That includes our Chief Diversity Officer Melonie Parker and the Employee Engagement team, our Equity Project Management Office working in partnership with our Black Leadership Advisory Group and members of our Black Googler

		Network, and everyone who has stepped up with ideas on how we can build a better workplace, and, in turn, better products for the world. -Sundar

Table E: Descriptives (Key Themes across Companies Representing Corporate

Rhetorics)

						95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
KTEV	Google	16	0.75	0.44721	0.1118	0.5117	0.9883
	Exxon	9	0.4444	0.52705	0.17568	0.0393	0.8496
	BankAm	10	0.2	0.42164	0.13333	-0.1016	0.5016
	Coca-Cola	12	0.75	0.45227	0.13056	0.4626	1.0374
	Total	47	0.5745	0.49977	0.0729	0.4277	0.7212
KTT	Google	16	0.5625	0.51235	0.12809	0.2895	0.8355
	Exxon	9	0.1111	0.33333	0.11111	-0.1451	0.3673
	BankAm	10	0.1	0.31623	0.1	-0.1262	0.3262
	Coca-Cola	12	0.3333	0.49237	0.14213	0.0205	0.6462
	Total	47	0.3191	0.47119	0.06873	0.1808	0.4575
KTSCC	Google	16	0.9375	0.25	0.0625	0.8043	1.0707
	Exxon	9	0.5556	0.52705	0.17568	0.1504	0.9607
	BankAm	10	0.6	0.5164	0.1633	0.2306	0.9694
	Coca-Cola	12	0.9167	0.28868	0.08333	0.7333	1.1001
	Total	47	0.7872	0.41369	0.06034	0.6658	0.9087
KTSC	Google	16	0.4375	0.51235	0.12809	0.1645	0.7105

	Exxon	9	0	0	0	0	0
	BankAm	10	0.2	0.42164	0.13333	-0.1016	0.5016
	Coca-Cola	12	0.9167	0.28868	0.08333	0.7333	1.1001
	Total	47	0.4255	0.49977	0.0729	0.2788	0.5723
KTES	Google	16	0.625	0.5	0.125	0.3586	0.8914
	Exxon	9	0.5556	0.52705	0.17568	0.1504	0.9607
	BankAm	10	0.6	0.5164	0.1633	0.2306	0.9694
	Coca-Cola	12	0.6667	0.49237	0.14213	0.3538	0.9795
	Total	47	0.617	0.49137	0.07167	0.4728	0.7613
KTEP	Google	16	0.75	0.44721	0.1118	0.5117	0.9883
	Exxon	9	0.2222	0.44096	0.14699	-0.1167	0.5612
	BankAm	10	0.1	0.31623	0.1	-0.1262	0.3262
	Coca-Cola	12	0.9167	0.28868	0.08333	0.7333	1.1001
	Total	47	0.5532	0.50254	0.0733	0.4056	0.7007

Table F: Descriptives (Key Themes across Publication Type)

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
KTEV	CEO Note	15	0.8	0.41404	0.1069	0.5707	1.0293
	Mission Statement	4	0	0	0	0	0
	Human Resources Page	4	0.5	0.57735	0.28868	-0.4187	1.4187

	LinkedIn Bio	4	0.5	0.57735	0.28868	-0.4187	1.4187
	Indeed.com Job Call	20	0.55	0.51042	0.11413	0.3111	0.7889
	Total	47	0.5745	0.49977	0.0729	0.4277	0.7212
KTT	CEO Note	15	0.8667	0.35187	0.09085	0.6718	1.0615
	Mission Statement	4	0.25	0.5	0.25	-0.5456	1.0456
	Human Resources Page	4	0.25	0.5	0.25	-0.5456	1.0456
	LinkedIn Bio	4	0	0	0	0	0
	Indeed.com Job Call	20	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	47	0.3191	0.47119	0.06873	0.1808	0.4575
KTSCC	CEO Note	15	1	0	0	1	1
	Mission Statement	4	1	0	0	1	1
	Human Resources Page	4	0.75	0.5	0.25	-0.0456	1.5456
	LinkedIn Bio	4	0	0	0	0	0
	Indeed.com Job Call	20	0.75	0.44426	0.09934	0.5421	0.9579
	Total	47	0.7872	0.41369	0.06034	0.6658	0.9087
KTSC	CEO Note	15	0.6667	0.48795	0.12599	0.3964	0.9369
	Mission Statement	4	0.25	0.5	0.25	-0.5456	1.0456
	Human Resources Page	4	0.25	0.5	0.25	-0.5456	1.0456
	LinkedIn Bio	4	0.5	0.57735	0.28868	-0.4187	1.4187
	Indeed.com Job Call	20	0.3	0.47016	0.10513	0.08	0.52
	Total	47	0.4255	0.49977	0.0729	0.2788	0.5723
KTES	CEO Note	15	0.3333	0.48795	0.12599	0.0631	0.6036
	Mission Statement	4	0.5	0.57735	0.28868	-0.4187	1.4187
	Human Resources Page	4	0.5	0.57735	0.28868	-0.4187	1.4187
	LinkedIn Bio	4	0	0	0	0	0
	Indeed.com Job Call	20	1	0	0	1	1

	Total	47	0.617	0.49137	0.07167	0.4728	0.7613
KTEP	CEO Note	15	0.6667	0.48795	0.12599	0.3964	0.9369
	Mission Statement	4	0.5	0.57735	0.28868	-0.4187	1.4187
	Human Resources Page	4	0.75	0.5	0.25	-0.0456	1.5456
	LinkedIn Bio	4	0.25	0.5	0.25	-0.5456	1.0456
	Indeed.com Job Call	20	0.5	0.51299	0.11471	0.2599	0.7401
	Total	47	0.5532	0.50254	0.0733	0.4056	0.7007

Table G: ANOVA Test (Key Themes across Companies Representing Corporate

Rhetorics)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
KTEV	Between Groups	2.417	3	0.806	3.819	0.016
	Within Groups	9.072	43	0.211		
	Total	11.489	46			
KTT	Between Groups	1.82	3	0.607	3.108	0.036
	Within Groups	8.393	43	0.195		
	Total	10.213	46			
KTSCC	Between Groups	1.396	3	0.465	3.089	0.037
	Within Groups	6.476	43	0.151		
	Total	7.872	46			
KTSC	Between Groups	5.035	3	1.678	11.182	0

	Within Groups	6.454	43	0.15		
	Total	11.489	46			
KTES	Between Groups	0.067	3	0.022	0.088	0.966
	Within Groups	11.039	43	0.257		
	Total	11.106	46			
KTEP	Between Groups	5.245	3	1.748	11.797	0
	Within Groups	6.372	43	0.148		
	Total	11.617	46			

Table H: ANOVA Test (Key Themes across Publication Type)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
KTEV	Between Groups	2.139	4	0.535	2.402	0.065
	Within Groups	9.35	42	0.223		
	Total	11.489	46			
KTT	Between Groups	6.979	4	1.745	22.665	0
	Within Groups	3.233	42	0.077		
	Total	10.213	46			
KTSCC	Between Groups	3.372	4	0.843	7.869	0
	Within Groups	4.5	42	0.107		
	Total	7.872	46			
KTSC	Between Groups	1.456	4	0.364	1.524	0.213

	Within Groups	10.033	42	0.239		
	Total	11.489	46			
KTES	Between Groups	5.773	4	1.443	11.366	0
	Within Groups	5.333	42	0.127		
	Total	11.106	46			
KTEP	Between Groups	0.784	4	0.196	0.76	0.557
	Within Groups	10.833	42	0.258		
	Total	11.617	46			

Table I: Bonferroni Post Hoc Test (Key Themes across Companies Representing Corporate Rhetorics)

DV	(I) Company	(J) Company	Mean Difference (I-J)	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
KTEV	1	2	0.30556	-0.2238	0.8349
		3	.55000*	0.0379	1.0621
		4	0	-0.4852	0.4852
	2	1	-0.30556	-0.8349	0.2238
		3	0.24444	-0.3393	0.8282

		4	-0.30556	-0.8658	0.2547
	3	1	-.55000*	-1.0621	-0.0379
		2	-0.24444	-0.8282	0.3393
		4	-.55000*	-1.094	-0.006
	4	1	0	-0.4852	0.4852
		2	0.30556	-0.2547	0.8658
		3	.55000*	0.006	1.094
KTT	1	2	0.45139	-0.0578	0.9605
		3	0.4625	-0.0301	0.9551
		4	0.22917	-0.2375	0.6958
	2	1	-0.45139	-0.9605	0.0578
		3	0.01111	-0.5503	0.5726
		4	-0.22222	-0.7611	0.3166
	3	1	-0.4625	-0.9551	0.0301

			2	-0.01111	-0.5726	0.5503
			4	-0.23333	-0.7565	0.2899
		4	1	-0.22917	-0.6958	0.2375
			2	0.22222	-0.3166	0.7611
			3	0.23333	-0.2899	0.7565
K T S C C	1		2	0.38194	-0.0653	0.8292
			3	0.3375	-0.0952	0.7702
			4	0.02083	-0.3891	0.4307
	2		1	-0.38194	-0.8292	0.0653
			3	-0.04444	-0.5376	0.4487
			4	-0.36111	-0.8344	0.1122
	3		1	-0.3375	-0.7702	0.0952
			2	0.04444	-0.4487	0.5376
			4	-0.31667	-0.7763	0.1429

	4	1	-0.02083	-0.4307	0.3891
		2	0.36111	-0.1122	0.8344
		3	0.31667	-0.1429	0.7763
K T S C	1	2	0.4375	-0.009	0.884
		3	0.2375	-0.1945	0.6695
		4	-.47917*	-0.8884	-0.07
	2	1	-0.4375	-0.884	0.009
		3	-0.2	-0.6923	0.2923
		4	-.91667*	-1.3892	-0.4442
	3	1	-0.2375	-0.6695	0.1945
		2	0.2	-0.2923	0.6923
		4	-.71667*	-1.1755	-0.2579
	4	1	.47917*	0.07	0.8884
		2	.91667*	0.4442	1.3892

		3	.71667*	0.2579	1.1755
KTES	1	2	0.06944	-0.5145	0.6534
		3	0.025	-0.5399	0.5899
		4	-0.04167	-0.5768	0.4935
	2	1	-0.06944	-0.6534	0.5145
		3	-0.04444	-0.6883	0.5994
		4	-0.11111	-0.7291	0.5068
	3	1	-0.025	-0.5899	0.5399
		2	0.04444	-0.5994	0.6883
		4	-0.06667	-0.6667	0.5334
	4	1	0.04167	-0.4935	0.5768
		2	0.11111	-0.5068	0.7291
		3	0.06667	-0.5334	0.6667
KT	1	2	.52778*	0.0841	0.9714
		3	.65000*	0.2208	1.0792

E P		4	-0.16667	-0.5733	0.2399
	2	1	-.52778*	-0.9714	-0.0841
		3	0.12222	-0.367	0.6114
		4	-.69444*	-1.1639	-0.2249
	3	1	-.65000*	-1.0792	-0.2208
		2	-0.12222	-0.6114	0.367
		4	-.81667*	-1.2726	-0.3608
	4	1	0.16667	-0.2399	0.5733
		2	.69444*	0.2249	1.1639
		3	.81667*	0.3608	1.2726

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table J: Bonferroni Post Hoc Test (Key Themes across Publication Type)

				95% Confidence Interval	
DV	(I) Publication Type	(J) Publication Type	Mean Difference (I-J)	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
KTEV	A	B	.80000*	0.0133	1.5867

	C	0.3	-0.4867	1.0867
	D	0.3	-0.4867	1.0867
	E	0.25	-0.2275	0.7275
B	A	-.80000*	-1.5867	-0.0133
	C	-0.5	-1.4885	0.4885
	D	-0.5	-1.4885	0.4885
	E	-0.55	-1.3157	0.2157
C	A	-0.3	-1.0867	0.4867
	B	0.5	-0.4885	1.4885
	D	0	-0.9885	0.9885
	E	-0.05	-0.8157	0.7157
D	A	-0.3	-1.0867	0.4867
	B	0.5	-0.4885	1.4885
	C	0	-0.9885	0.9885

		E	-0.05	-0.8157	0.7157
	E	A	-0.25	-0.7275	0.2275
		B	0.55	-0.2157	1.3157
		C	0.05	-0.7157	0.8157
		D	0.05	-0.7157	0.8157
KTT	A	B	.61667*	0.154	1.0793
		C	.61667*	0.154	1.0793
		D	.86667*	0.404	1.3293
		E	.86667*	0.5859	1.1475
	B	A	-.61667*	-1.0793	-0.154
		C	0	-0.5813	0.5813
		D	0.25	-0.3313	0.8313
		E	0.25	-0.2003	0.7003
	C	A	-.61667*	-1.0793	-0.154

		B	0	-0.5813	0.5813
		D	0.25	-0.3313	0.8313
		E	0.25	-0.2003	0.7003
	D	A	-.86667*	-1.3293	-0.404
		B	-0.25	-0.8313	0.3313
		C	-0.25	-0.8313	0.3313
		E	0	-0.4503	0.4503
	E	A	-.86667*	-1.1475	-0.5859
		B	-0.25	-0.7003	0.2003
		C	-0.25	-0.7003	0.2003
		D	0	-0.4503	0.4503
KTSCC	A	B	0	-0.5458	0.5458
		C	0.25	-0.2958	0.7958
		D	1.00000*	0.4542	1.5458

	E	0.25	-0.0813	0.5813
B	A	0	-0.5458	0.5458
	C	0.25	-0.4358	0.9358
	D	1.00000*	0.3142	1.6858
	E	0.25	-0.2812	0.7812
C	A	-0.25	-0.7958	0.2958
	B	-0.25	-0.9358	0.4358
	D	.75000*	0.0642	1.4358
	E	0	-0.5312	0.5312
D	A	-1.00000*	-1.5458	-0.4542
	B	-1.00000*	-1.6858	-0.3142
	C	-.75000*	-1.4358	-0.0642
	E	-.75000*	-1.2812	-0.2188
E	A	-0.25	-0.5813	0.0813

		B	-0.25	-0.7812	0.2812
		C	0	-0.5312	0.5312
		D	.75000*	0.2188	1.2812
KTSC	A	B	0.41667	-0.3983	1.2316
		C	0.41667	-0.3983	1.2316
		D	0.16667	-0.6483	0.9816
		E	0.36667	-0.128	0.8613
	B	A	-0.41667	-1.2316	0.3983
		C	0	-1.024	1.024
		D	-0.25	-1.274	0.774
		E	-0.05	-0.8432	0.7432
	C	A	-0.41667	-1.2316	0.3983
		B	0	-1.024	1.024
		D	-0.25	-1.274	0.774

		E	-0.05	-0.8432	0.7432
	D	A	-0.16667	-0.9816	0.6483
		B	0.25	-0.774	1.274
		C	0.25	-0.774	1.274
		E	0.2	-0.5932	0.9932
	E	A	-0.36667	-0.8613	0.128
		B	0.05	-0.7432	0.8432
		C	0.05	-0.7432	0.8432
		D	-0.2	-0.9932	0.5932
KTES	A	B	-0.16667	-0.7608	0.4275
		C	-0.16667	-0.7608	0.4275
		D	0.33333	-0.2608	0.9275
		E	-.66667*	-1.0273	-0.306
	B	A	0.16667	-0.4275	0.7608

	C	0	-0.7466	0.7466
	D	0.5	-0.2466	1.2466
	E	-0.5	-1.0783	0.0783
C	A	0.16667	-0.4275	0.7608
	B	0	-0.7466	0.7466
	D	0.5	-0.2466	1.2466
	E	-0.5	-1.0783	0.0783
D	A	-0.33333	-0.9275	0.2608
	B	-0.5	-1.2466	0.2466
	C	-0.5	-1.2466	0.2466
	E	-1.00000*	-1.5783	-0.4217
E	A	.66667*	0.306	1.0273
	B	0.5	-0.0783	1.0783
	C	0.5	-0.0783	1.0783

		D	1.00000*	0.4217	1.5783
KTEP	A	B	0.16667	-0.6801	1.0135
		C	-0.08333	-0.9301	0.7635
		D	0.41667	-0.4301	1.2635
		E	0.16667	-0.3473	0.6807
	B	A	-0.16667	-1.0135	0.6801
		C	-0.25	-1.3141	0.8141
		D	0.25	-0.8141	1.3141
		E	0	-0.8242	0.8242
	C	A	0.08333	-0.7635	0.9301
		B	0.25	-0.8141	1.3141
		D	0.5	-0.5641	1.5641
		E	0.25	-0.5742	1.0742
	D	A	-0.41667	-1.2635	0.4301

	B	-0.25	-1.3141	0.8141
	C	-0.5	-1.5641	0.5641
	E	-0.25	-1.0742	0.5742
E	A	-0.16667	-0.6807	0.3473
	B	0	-0.8242	0.8242
	C	-0.25	-1.0742	0.5742
	D	0.25	-0.5742	1.0742

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table K: Key Theme Frequencies

		Frequency	Valid Percent
	0	20	42.6
	1	27	57.4
KTEV	Total	47	100
	0	32	68.1
	1	15	31.9
KTT	Total	47	100
	0	10	21.3
	1	37	78.7
KTSCC	Total	47	100
KTSC	0	27	57.4

	1	20	42.6
	Total	47	100
	0	18	38.3
	1	29	61.7
KTES	Total	47	100
	0	21	44.7
	1	26	55.3
KTEP	Total	47	100