

Index

- 10-Ks reports (SEC), 137–139, 143, 148, 150, 154
- Abercrombie & Fitch, 142
- activism, *see also* public backlash; boycotts; firestorms, 65–66
- activists, 54–56
- adverse policies, 1–2, 7, 51–54
- advocacy, political, *see also* influence-seeking, influence, political
- “careful”, 81–82, 90, 93, 166
- “creative”, 79–81, 90, 93, 165, 190
- “distanced”, 77–79, 164–165, 185–188
- “hidden”, 75–76, 164–165, 184–185, 191
- company size, 178, 177–179
- future research, 202–203
- gender differences, 180, 179–181
- strategies for, 21, 72–74, 79, 83, 164–165, 167, 184, 188, 192
- traditional methods of, 174–179, 190–191
- advocacy, political
- “creative”, 188
- Affordable Care Act (2010), 42
- Amazon, 64
- “America Is Not a Democracy” (Mounk), 61
- American Beverage Association, The, 77
- American Public Education, Inc., 145
- Ascena Retail Group, 145
- assets
- corporate, 29–31, 69–70
- intangible, 69
- astroturfing, 78
- Bloomin’ Brands (Outback Steakhouse, Carrabba’s Italian Grill, etc.), 145
- Boot Barn, 155
- boycott tweets, *see also* Twitter; social media, 122, 120–123
- boycotts, *see also* public backlash; activism as statement of values, 66–68, 87–88
- corporate responses to, 135–137
- counterclaims, 90–93, 135–137, 167–168
- impact on companies, 3, 160, 66–160, 196–197
- role of partisanship, 86, 88–89, 106, 194
- traditional vs. online, 133–134
- brand damage, 20–21, 132, 135, 143–145, 147–154, 194, 196–197
- brand, corporate
- fragility of, 69–70, 131, 134, 147–149, 194, 196–197
- impact of social media on, 145, 144–147
- public perceptions of, 154–155, 160
- business interests, *see also* interest groups; special interests, 10–11, 25
- buycott, 168
- Callon Petroleum, 146
- campaign contributions, *see also* donations, political; philanthropy, 4, 41–42, 174, 176
- careful advocacy, 81–82, 90, 93, 166
- carve-outs, 2
- Cassava Sciences, 146
- Chambers of Commerce, 77
- Chick-fil-A, 62

Index

239

- Citizens United v. FEC*, 6
City Limits (Peterson), 27
 Coca-Cola Company, 158
 community service, *see also* public/municipal services; philanthropy, 80
 consumerism, political, *see also* boycotts, 19–20, 62, 64, 66
 consumption good, 6
 contract lobbyists, *see also* lobbyists, 8, 31, 36, 187, 198
 corporate assets, 29–31, 69–70
 COVID-19, corporate response to, 204
 creative advocacy, 79–81, 90, 93, 165, 188–190

 Darden Restaurants (Olive Garden), 156
 distanced advocacy, 77–79, 164–165, 185–188
 Domino's, 142
 donations, political, *see also* campaign contributions, 75
 Dunkin' Donuts, 141

 exchange theory, 4–6, 33–35
 exit, voice, and loyalty framework, 25

 Federal Election Commission (FEC), 32, 75
 firestorms, *see also* public backlash; activism; boycotts, 70–72, 82–83
 Ford Motor Company, 142

 geo-fencing, 187
 Google, 142
 Goya Foods, 19, 84–85

 hidden advocacy, 75–76, 164–165, 184–185, 191
 Hirschman, Albert O., 25
 Home Depot, 123, 126

 identity, political, *see also* signaling, political, 85–86, 88
 industry groups, *see also* trade associations, 77–78

 influence strategies, 4, 23, 49–50, 164–165, 167, 187–188, 192, 195–197, 200
 influence, political, *see also* influence-seeking, advocacy, political
 as problem-solving, 37, 38, 193
 definition of corporate, 17
 extent of, 12, 24
 in local government, 13–16
 methods of, 4
 negative perceptions of, 4, 11, 61–62
 theories regarding, 25–26
 influence-seeking, *see also* advocacy, political, influence, political
 as a relationship, 8–9, 18, 22, 36–37, 48–49, 200
 as form of exchange, 4–6, 33
 as form of persuasion, 35–36
 definition of, 18
 impact of corporate mobility on, 26–27
 in exit, voice, and loyalty framework, 25
 informal, 78, 187–188, 198
 public backlash and, 3, 11–12, 19, 130, 193–194
 public perceptions of, 128
 traditional methods of, 31–33, 41–42, 175
 information gaps, legislative, 6–8, 38–40, 198
 insurrection, corporate response to, 203
 intangible assets, 69
 interest groups, *see also* business interests, 10

 job performance, political, 44–48
 Johnson & Johnson, 69

 King, Steve (Rep.), 19, 62

 Land O'Lakes, 19, 62
 legislative subsidy, 4, 7, 36, 49
 lobbying, *see also* advocacy, political “grassroots”, 187–188
 as form of persuasion, 6–7
 as legislative subsidy, 7, 36
 corporate use of, 174, 175
 definition of, 4, 31, 33

- negative perceptions of, 22, 33, 158–159
- reporting requirements, 75–76, 200–201
- lobbyists, *see also* contract lobbyists, 31, 35, 40, 198

- mass public, 60–61, 89–90
- mass recruitment, 65–66
- Micheletti, Michele, 66
- mobility, corporate, 26–31
- Monster Beverage Company, 158
- Mouk, Yascha, 61

- National Restaurant Association, The, 77
- negative partisanship, 63
- Nike, 123, 126

- obsolescing bargain, 26, 28
- Ocasio-Cortez, Alexandria, 84
- Olive Garden, 19
- organized interests, *see also* business interests, 9, 22

- PACs (political action committees), 4, 9, 32, 98–101, 174, 176, 181–183
- partisanship, 62–65, 68, 81–82, 86, 98–106, 121, 126–128, 194
- Peterson, Paul E., 27
- philanthropy, *see also* public/municipal services, 33, 80, 189–190
- political action committees, *see* PACs
- Political Consumerism*, 66
- private politics, 55–56
- probability, role of, 52, 54, 55, 59, 68, 72–74, 82–83
- public backlash, *see also* boycotts; activism, firestorms
 - influence-seeking and, 3, 11–12, 19, 130, 193–194, 197
 - internet and, 65–66, 204–205
 - mass public and, 60–61, 89–90
 - partisanship and, 62–65, 81–82, 194
 - probability and, 52, 54, 55, 59, 68, 72–74, 82–83
- public/municipal services, *see also* community service; philanthropy, 188–189

- reporting requirements, 75–76, 200–201
- risk factors, corporate
 - brand damage, 150–152
 - company size as, 57, 153, 160–161
 - gender differences as, 57–59
 - social media and, 160–161
 - study methodology, 142–144, 152–153
 - types of, 135, 141–142, 150, 149–150, 194
- Rocky Mountain Chocolate Factory, 141

- Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), 20, 132, 137, 160
- signaling, political, *see also* identity, political, 68, 123, 128, 193
- social media, *see also* Twitter; boycott tweets, 145, 144–149, 153, 155–156, 204–205
- special interests, *see also* business interests, 10
- Starbucks, 158
- Stolle, Dietlind, 66
- study methodology
 - 10-Ks reports (SEC), 137–139, 143, 148, 150, 154
 - local government, 16
 - boycott tweets, 95, 122, 120–123
 - corporate risk factors, 142–144, 149–150, 152–153, 160–161
 - influence strategies, 97–98, 111–112, 114, 172–173, 195
 - influence-seeking, 128
 - interviews, 139–141, 154, 169, 172–173, 195
 - lobbying and campaign finance data, 169–171
 - Nike, Home Depot, 123–126
 - PAC donations, 98–101
 - partisan language, 121, 127, 124–129
 - partisanship, 101, 102, 103, 105, 107, 108, 110, 96–111, 116, 117, 114–118, 127, 128
 - political signaling, 128
 - social media, 94–96, 128–129
 - survey data, 93–94
 - Twitter data, 119
 - Walmart, 96, 98
- Target, 157

Index

241

Tiebout model, 27, 28

trade associations, *see also* industry
groups, 185Twitter, *see also* social media; boycott
tweets, 20, 95–96, 119Walmart, 96, 98, 99–101, 103, 105, 107,
108, 110wants and needs, political
campaign financing, 41
definition of, 9, 18, 23–24, 193
information gaps, 38–40
job performance, 44