

Abstract

An analysis of: McDonald's 2017 chicken welfare policy announcement and the response by a group of six NGOs.

As social and environmental issues are becoming an increasingly important topic, both media and the public are progressively demanding more from companies social and environmental initiatives. Thus, companies are in the loop and pressured to increase their positive impact on society. While companies attempt to adapt to the growing demands, their communication of new commitments is studied for hypocrisy and discrepancies by an expanding stakeholder base. This thesis examines how McDonald's utilised its announcement of new and improved chicken welfare policies to construct a reality in which it appears as a company that is committed to animal welfare. In this regard, the thesis includes a public relations statement by a group of six NGOs that was issued as a response to McDonald's announcement, in which McDonald's constructed reality is questioned, as it meets a conflicting social reality.

To investigate this social phenomenon, Norman Fairclough's theory of Critical Discourse Analysis is applied to the selected data to infer potentially hidden power relations and ideologies in the texts. Additionally, Fairclough's three-dimensional framework is utilised to understand how the textual structures may be shaped by external discourses, at the situational, institutional and societal levels.

My research findings indicate that the authors construct different social realities by ascribing different meanings and values to similar words and phrases. Additionally, it was interpreted that the authors' perceptions or certain ideologies, such as what defines animal welfare, differ due to a gap in the definition at a societal level, which has subsequently been incorporated at the institutional level, and thus, the situational level implicitly reflects these hidden ideologies. However, there could also exist a sense egocentric motives, as both sides of the debate have something to gain by convincing recipients of their respective motives. McDonald's could keep its animal welfare investment at a minimum while still receiving positive attention by communication improvement. The NGOs become part of a public debate in which they present themselves as fighting animal cruelty, which may facilitate growth in their membership, and thus, implicit authority by representing more people.

Table of contents

1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 Literature Review	2
2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis	2
2.1.1 Fairclough’s Three-dimensional Framework.....	5
2.2 Animal Welfare Discourse	10
2.3 CSR Communication	12
3.0 Context	14
3.1 Fast-Food Nation	14
3.1.1 Corporate Policies on Public Demand.....	14
3.2 McDonald’s and ESG Reporting	16
3.2.1 Scale for Good	17
3.3 The Opposition	20
4.0 Methodology	22
4.1 Scientific Approach.....	22
4.2 Selection of theories	23
4.3 Qualitative approach	24
4.4 Empirical Data.....	24
4.5 Delimitations	25
5.0 Analysis	26
5.1 Textual Analysis of McDonald’s Chicken Welfare Announcement	26
5.1.1 Expressive values of words and sentences.....	27
5.1.2 Cohesion and ideologically based structures in vocabulary	28
5.1.3 Modes of sentence	28
5.1.4 Modality.....	28
5.1.5 The use of the personal pronoun ‘we’	29
5.2 Discourse Practice.....	30
5.3 Textual Analysis of NGOs response to McDonald’s Chicken Welfare Announcement	32
5.3.1 Expressive values of words and sentences.....	32
5.3.2 Cohesion and ideologically based structures in vocabulary	33
5.3.3 Modes of sentence	34
5.3.4 Modality.....	34
5.3.5 The use of the personal pronoun ‘we’	35
5.4 Discourse Practice.....	36
5.5 Social Practice Analysis	37
6.0 Conclusion	40
7.0 Bibliography.....	42
8.0 Appendices.....	46

1.0 Introduction

In 1970, the American economist Milton Friedman provided his famous definition of a company's objective as: 'The business of business is business' (Roepstorff 2010, 11). This statement implies that all corporate activities derive from economic incentives. This statement was later paraphrased by Grayson and Hodges (2001) as: 'Today the business of business is everybody's business' (Roepstorff 2010, 11). This paraphrased approach to Friedman's definition indicates how the public is becoming increasingly interested in the way in which corporations affect the environments in which they operate. Even though Friedman's quote was paraphrased by Grayson and Hedges in 2001, more recent literature is still pointing to growing consumer demands for animal welfare, and an increase in stakeholders' requirements for corporations social and environmental initiatives (Miele & Bock 2007, 2; Nielsen & Thomsen 2018, 492).

A recent example of the public's interest in corporations' social responsibilities is the case of McDonald's and its chicken welfare policies. In 2017, McDonald's was already receiving massive media attention and facing a growing demand for improving the living conditions for its chickens. However, when McDonald's announced its new commitments to improved chicken welfare (cf. Appendix 1), it only added fuel to the fire. Consequently, multiple animal rights organisations initiated broad media campaigns against McDonald's for lacking behind its competitors in relation to animal welfare (Shanker 2018; Unhappy Meals 2019; HSUS 2019). Just one of these media campaigns was publicly supported by more than twenty celebrities, which only facilitated its momentum and awareness (Shaker 2018).

This leads this thesis to the following problem statement:

How does McDonald's construct a social reality through a text in which it is committed to animal welfare when several NGOs claim that McDonald's chickens are among the most abused animals in the industry?

The following sub-questions will be examined to answer the problem statement:

- How does McDonald's and the NGOs, respectively, utilise communication to construct a reality that supports their message?
- What hidden motives and interpretations can be inferred from the communication?
- What underlying ideologies may have facilitated the construction of two conflicting realities?

2.0 Literature Review

In this section, the background of the literature utilised in this thesis is explored. First, the phenomenon of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is elaborated upon to provide an understanding of this thesis' analytical approach. Second, the US animal welfare discourse is examined, which will provide knowledge of the context that surrounds the entire debate of McDonald's chicken welfare. Lastly, different variations of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) communication is illuminated to arrive at an understanding of how this type of communication can be interpreted.

2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

In this section, the literature of Critical Discourse Analysis, hereinafter referred to as CDA, will be explored to provide a foundation for the perspective taken in this thesis. The point of departure will be Fairclough's first book, *Language and Power*, as this thesis is based on Fairclough's definition of CDA, and thus, the theory will be elaborated upon according to his literature. Additionally, this section will illuminate Fairclough's three-dimensional framework, as the analysis in this thesis will be structured after said framework. Finally, other notable contributions to the literature will briefly be presented to illustrate how CDA has evolved and expanded as an interdisciplinary field of study.

The addition of the critical notion to the discursive field of study originates from language philosophers and social theorists of the 20th century. In the 1970s, the theoretical framework within linguistics and social sciences transitioned from traditional linguistics to interactional and critical linguistics, as scholars realised the importance of connecting language and society (Rogers et al 2005, 365).

In 1989, Fairclough's *Language and Power* was published, in which Fairclough illuminates three contributions to the literature which has facilitated his perception of CDA (Fairclough 1989, 12).

First, Fairclough refers to the contribution to the literature of the *theory of ideology*, since ideology can both affect power relations in society as well as in texts (Fairclough 1989, 12).

Second, Fairclough acknowledges the contributions by Michel Foucault, as Fairclough believes Foucault's work has established the "modern forms of power" in relation to discourse (Fairclough 1989, 12). Foucault's interpretation of power implies that power exists in everything and can both be *repressive* and *normalising* (Foucault 1977). Repressive power is the visible form of power, as it revolves around using force in some sense (Foucault 1977). For instance, a police officer who arrests a thief. Normalising power is an invisible form of power, as it regards shaping peoples' ideology into thinking that something is normal (Foucault 1977). For instance, a school that teaches

its students that stealing is wrong, and thus, the students do not think about stealing.

Third, Fairclough refers to Jürgen Habermas' 'theory of communicative action', as it provides an understanding of language's impact on society (Fairclough 1989, 13). Habermas' theory entails that for a recipient to understand a sender's communication, the recipient must understand the sender's language, meaning and validity (Habermas 1984).

However, according to Fairclough, the issue with these contributions is that: "(...) they remain theoretical – they are not operationalized in the analysis of particular instances of discourse." (Fairclough 1989, 13). Thus, Fairclough's objective with this book was to develop a theoretical framework that could be utilised to conduct a discourse analysis.

When Fairclough presents his definition of *discourse*, he states he is committed to: "the view that language use is socially determined." (Fairclough 1989, 21). This definition indicates that discourse is closely connected with language and is socially constructed. According to Fairclough, the reason why texts can unravel the meaning behind social interaction is that language is: "the commonest form of social behaviour" (Fairclough 1989, 2). Fairclough's definition of discourse is more comprehensible when connected with his perception of how to conduct a discourse analysis, which he explains as: "(...) the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part. This process includes in addition to the text the process of interpretation, for which the text is a resource" (Fairclough 1989, 24). This definition illustrates that the textual level of discourse analysis is a tool to interpret a social phenomenon, however, to fully understand it, the researcher must examine the context of the text. When defining a *text*, Fairclough refers to the linguist Michael Halliday, who defines 'text' as both written and spoken discourse (Fairclough 1989, 24).

The *critical* approach to language study is described by Fairclough as: "(...) the special sense of aiming to show connections which may be hidden from people – such as the connections between language, power and ideology" (Fairclough 1989, 5). This definition implies that when analysing texts with a critical approach, it is not enough to examine the underlying elements – one must also illuminate the connections between these hidden elements.

Power relations are an important theme in *Language and Power* and to Fairclough's perception of CDA (Fairclough 1989). When Fairclough talks about power, he emphasises the relationship that exists between power and language (Fairclough 1989). In this sense, he introduces two aspects; power *in* discourse and power *behind* discourse (Fairclough 1989, 43).

According to Fairclough, power in discourse concerns: "face-to-face' spoken discourse, power in

'cross-cultural' discourse where participants belong to different ethnic groupings, and the 'hidden power' of the discourse of the mass media.” (Fairclough 1989, 43). It could be argued that face-to-face spoken discourse is Fairclough’s approach to Foucault’s repressive power, as it concerns a visible form of power that is being exercised (Fairclough 1989, 43-48; Foucault 1977). For instance, Fairclough provides an example of a doctor who represses his students by interrupting them, and thus, controlling the discourse (Fairclough 1989, 44-45). As this thesis will not concern different ethnic groups, the ‘cross-cultural’ approach will not be relevant to answer the problem statement, and thus, it will not be elaborated further. According to Fairclough, the hidden power in discourse exists in both written language and the mass media, such as television, movies, radio and newspapers (Fairclough 1989, 49). It differs from the face-to-face discourse due to its ‘one-sidedness’, as participants are only recipients and do not produce discourse (Fairclough 1989, 49). Additionally, in the face-to-face discourse, the senders can design their language according to the people they interact with, whereas texts and mass media must design their language to an *ideal subject* (Fairclough 1989, 49). Thus, due to its ‘one-sidedness’, the sender must incorporate an idea of what the position would be of an ideal subject (Fairclough 1989, 49). This will be relevant for this thesis, as the selected empirical data consists of two texts which imply that the communication is one-sided – from author to recipient. The hidden aspect of this sense of power relations comes to form as the sender determines the discourse, and thus, what is included and excluded (Fairclough, 1989, 50). This form of power will be relevant for this thesis, as both sides of the animal welfare debate present selective data to substantiate their socially constructed reality.

According to Fairclough, the power behind discourse regards how different types of discourse are combined to create a “hidden effect of power” (Fairclough 1989, 55). Here, Fairclough refers to the dimension of *standardization* as a process “whereby a particular social dialect comes to be elevated into what is often called a standard or even 'national' language.” (Fairclough 1989, 56). In this regard, Fairclough provides an example of how the British East Midland dialect became the standard English due to capitalist power of the merchant class of the medieval period (Fairclough 1989, 56). However, the power behind discourse also concerns “who has the power to impose and enforce constraints on access” (Fairclough 1989, 62). For instance, you can only control a church discourse if you are a priest, which is a constraint on access (Fairclough 1989, 63).

Besides the notion of power, Fairclough also emphasises the concept of ideology when addressing the critical approach to discourse analysis (Fairclough 1989, 5). According to Fairclough, power and ideology are closely connected, because ideological assumptions in discourse can appear as

‘common sense’ (Fairclough 1989, 77). It could be interpreted that the hidden power of communicating an assumption as common sense can be linked to Foucault’s *normalising* power (Foucault 1977), as it implicitly attempts to convince the recipient that sender’s specific ideology is the norm or common sense. To identify and interpret these implicit assumptions, Fairclough utilises the term *coherence* in a two-fold manner (Fairclough 1989, 78). First, one must find themes within the text of analysis that is coherent (ibid.). Second, one must examine how these themes can be linked to its context or “the world” (ibid.). Fairclough’s perception of ‘common sense’ can be extended to the meaning of words (Fairclough 1989, 93). This is evident as we do not need the dictionary for words we already are aware of – if we are familiar with a word the meaning of it is simply common sense (Fairclough 1989, 93).

Additionally, Fairclough has developed a three-dimensional framework to his CDA, which entails a “*description of text*” in the first dimension, “*interpretation of the relationship between text and interaction*” in the second dimension and “*explanation of the relationship between interaction and social context*” in the third dimension (Fairclough 1989, 109). This framework will be elaborated in the following section and applied to the analysis of this thesis to describe, interpret and explain the social phenomenon of the selected approach to animal welfare.

2.1.1 Fairclough’s Three-dimensional Framework

The first dimension is the textual level, which concerns the examination of senders’ language, such as the selection of words, grammar, cohesion, phrases and sentences that are explicit in texts (Fairclough 2001, 91). According to Fairclough, cohesion does not only concern the repetition of identical words but also regards the sender’s use of similar words or if the sender refers to something in the same text (Fairclough 1989, 130). Thus, the first level seeks to *describe* the object of analysis (Fairclough 2001, 91). Consequently, patterns discovered in the authors’ language may enable an interpretation of texts’ underlying intentions. For instance, if an advertisement repeatedly utilises the word “just”, or any of its synonyms, the advertisement may attempt to simplify how easy the product or service is to utilise. Due to the magnitude of this level, I will not explain every grammatical phenomenon or its effect. Instead, I will provide descriptions of the elements of relevance once they have been identified in the analysis, which will facilitate the immediate understanding of the grammatical structures in the selected empirical data.

The second dimension is discourse practice, which regards the *process of production* and the *process of interpretation* (Fairclough 1989, 24). When interpreting why sender has produced certain

elements of a text or how the recipient interprets a text, it is important to consider what Fairclough refers to as *members' resources*, hereinafter referred to as MR (Fairclough 1989, 24). MR regards sender' or recipient's prior knowledge to producing or consuming a text, such as: "their knowledge of language, representations of the natural and social worlds they inhabit, values, beliefs, assumptions" (Fairclough 1989, 24). Thus, MR is the elements that "people draw upon to produce and interpret texts (...)", hence, it may alter the way in which people understand texts (Fairclough 1989, 24). Thus, to analyse MR in this dimension, one must interpret how MR could be drawn upon by sender and recipient (Fairclough 1989, 160).

This level also concerns the historical aspects of CDA, as it seeks to explore the *intertextuality* and *interdiscursivity* of texts (Fairclough 1992, 269-271). Intertextuality concerns the use of existing texts in the production of a new text, which can both change the meaning of prior texts and/or create new ones (Fairclough 1992, 270). Fairclough distinguishes between two types of intertextuality, namely *manifest* and *constitutive* intertextuality (Fairclough 1992, 270). Manifest intertextuality regards the explicit presence of prior texts in the text which is being examined, such as quoting an external source (Fairclough 1992, 271). Constitutive intertextuality concerns the types of discourse in a text, and thus, Fairclough also refers to it as *interdiscursivity* (Fairclough 1992, 272).

To analyse intertextuality, this thesis seeks to examine *what* prior texts are used in the selected empirical data and *how* they are used, which Fairclough refers to as *discourse representation* (Fairclough 1992, 277). Fairclough distinguishes between two types of discourse representation, namely *direct* and *indirect* discourse representation (Fairclough 1992, 274). Direct discourse representation can be observed when the author utilises the original quote from an external source, for instance by utilising quotation marks. An indirect discourse representation occurs when the author refers to a statement, however, without utilising it directly (Fairclough 1992, 274). Thus, when encountering an indirect discourse representation, a recipient cannot be certain whether the words have been reproduced according to the original statement or if the message has been altered by the author. This is relevant for the analysis of this thesis, as the senders utilise external statements in various manners to support their individual messages.

When analysing interdiscursivity, Fairclough indicates that one must identify the different types of discourse and examine the relationship between them, which Fairclough refers to as "*orders of discourse*" (Fairclough 1992, 284). Fairclough utilises the term *genre* to describe the type of activity in which the discourse is created, such as informal chat, buying goods in a shop, job

interview or a scientific article (Fairclough 1992, 284). However, a genre does not provide a profound understanding of the discourse, as a genre such as a job interview may be both formal and informal. Thus, it is important to examine the *style* of the genre by observing three main parameters; *tenor, mode, and rhetorical mode* of the text (Fairclough 1992, 285). Tenor regards the relationship between sender and recipient, such as “casual” or “formal” (Fairclough 1992, 285). Mode concerns the style of the language, such as written, spoken or a combination of the two, for instance, “written-as-if-spoken” (Fairclough 1992, 285-286). Tenor and mode can also be combined, for instance, if a text is “informal written” or “academic”, which both indicates the relation between sender and recipient and the style of the language (Fairclough 1992, 286). Lastly, describing a text with terms such as “descriptive” or “argumentative” reflects the rhetorical mode (Fairclough 1992, 286). These elements are important for the analysis of this thesis, as they can illuminate senders’ underlying intentions. For instance, if a sender communicates in academic discourse, it may be to convince the recipient of sender’s integrity, as it may appear as if the sender has an academic background within the specific field of study, which implies that sender has acquired knowledge within that field.

The third dimension is social practice, in which the results of the two previous levels are combined and explained in their social context (Fairclough 2001, 91). In relation to the former dimension’s approach to production and interpretation, this dimension introduces the concept of *social conditions of production*, and *social conditions of interpretation* (Fairclough 1989, 25). The social conditions of a given phenomenon exist at the three levels; the situational, institutional and societal levels (Fairclough 1989, 25). The social situation is the “immediate social environment in which the discourse occurs” (Fairclough 1989, 25), and thus, the ‘closest’ level to the social phenomenon. Fairclough refers to social institutions as “a wider matrix for the discourse” (Fairclough 1989, 25), such as “education, the law, religions, the media, and indeed the family” (Fairclough 1989, 33). Finally, the societal level concerns the social conditions of society in its entirety (Fairclough 1989, 25). These levels entail power in relation to the way in which the context can structure discourse and incorporate ideologies in texts (Fairclough 1986, 31). Additionally, Fairclough emphasises the power gap which exists between social classes, such as the capitalist class and the working class (Fairclough 1989, 32-33). Fairclough provides a simple definition to illustrate the difference between these two classes; the capitalist class “owns the means of production”, whereas the working class “are obliged to sell their power to work to the capitalists, in exchange for a wage” (Fairclough 1989, 32). With this brief description, one can imagine different forms of power gaps in

social institutions, such as a boss who exercises his face-to-face power by verbally attacking an employee, or the *common sense* of not interrupting a boss during a meeting, in a formal business environment. This example illustrates how the context of an event can structure the discourse. From an analyst perspective, Fairclough refers to three important questions that must be answered in this dimension, namely; *social determinants, ideologies* and *effects* (Fairclough 1989, 166). To answer the question of social determinants, one must ask: “what power relations at situational, institutional and societal levels help shape this discourse?” (Fairclough 1989, 166). Thus, this question regards explaining how contextual power relations have shaped the discourse of the text. To answer the question of ideologies, one must ask: “what elements of MR which are drawn upon have an ideological character? (Fairclough 1989, 166). Thus, whereas the second dimension seeks to explore *how* MR is drawn upon in texts (Fairclough 1989, 160), the third dimension regards explaining their relation to different ideologies. Finally, to answer the question of effects, one must ask:

how is this discourse positioned in relation to struggles at the situational, institutional and societal levels? Are these struggles overt or covert? Is the discourse normative with respect to MR or creative? Does it contribute to sustaining existing power relations, or transforming them? (Fairclough 1989, 166).

To understand this final question, it is important to clarify the following elements; struggles as overt or covert and the normative and creative approach to MR, which can be related to sustaining or transforming power relations. First, in this thesis, I will refer to overt struggles as explicit and covert struggles as implicit, as I consider this terminology to be more distinctive, and thus, more recognisable. Second, a normative approach to MR implies that one does not seek change a social phenomenon according to the individual’s MR, whereas a creative approach indicates that an individual seeks to transform a social phenomenon by combining its MR in new and ‘creative’ ways (Fairclough 1989, 165). This final question concludes Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework, and thus, the way in which the analysis will be structured.

Other scholars have since contributed to the literature of CDA, which has only expanded its range as an interdisciplinary field of study. In the following, I will briefly present some of the notable contributors to the CDA literature to illuminate how they have either evolved CDA, created new branches to the field of study or a combination of both.

In 1993, Teun A. van Dijk presented his *Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis*, which facilitated the discussion of socio-political aspects of CDA, which revolves around examining the context of a subject in relation to a combination of social attitudes and political policies (van Dijk 1993). An example could be animal welfare, as it is both a phenomenon that has a public interest, but there is also created legislation to ensure that animals are not exposed to animal abuse. Additionally, the book introduces the study of examining patterns in public discourse for different social groups within a society (van Dijk 1993). In 2004, Van Dijk provided a new definition of discourse analysis, which exemplifies its diversity as a field of study, as he states: “(...) discourse analysis for me is essentially multidisciplinary. It involves linguistics, poetics, semiotics, pragmatics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, and communication research” (van Dijk 2004, 38). By this definition, it becomes evident that discourse analysis expands beyond linguistics, and thus, cannot be conducted solely on the textual level of messages.

In 1996, Ruth Wodak developed a theory called Discourse Sociolinguistics, which was presented in her book *Disorders in Discourse*. The theory revolves around the concept that text and context should be considered equal in the field of discourse (Wodak 1996). More specifically, it introduces the importance of examining implicit phenomena which can uncover speech barriers in different institutions, and how it affects communication in these institutions. Wodak refers to institutions as different contextual settings such as a hospital or a classroom (Wodak 1996). Such speech barriers can be studied by examining the gap in communication between members of an institution compared members speaking with non-members (Wodak 1996). An example could be a situation in a hospital, in which a doctor communicated the diagnoses of a patient to a colleague, and thus, it would be redundant to elaborate upon the patient's future, whereas the same message would have to be communicated differently to someone without a medical background.

In 1996, Gunther Kress and Theo van Leeuwen extended the visual approach to CDA, which was only briefly introduced by Fairclough (Fairclough 1989, 205-210), in their book *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design* (1996). The two authors present a theoretical framework for how one can analyse an image's communication by examining its colours, perspective, framing and composition. Hence, as its title indicates, it combines the visual communication of images with the grammar of language to achieve a profound understanding of their meaning (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996).

Norman Fairclough was selected as the main theorist in this thesis due to his emphasis on power and introduction of ‘common sense’ in a discourse which differs from the other authors.

Additionally, his three-dimensional framework provides a structure to the analysis that facilitates, what I consider, a logical chronological approach to study a social phenomenon.

However, to analyse the social practice of a specific phenomenon, one must first define what network the object of analysis ‘belongs’ to. In this thesis, it was determined that the two most important elements of the social context that has shaped the selected empirical data are the US animal welfare discourse, and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) communication. The entire selection of empirical data revolves around the animal welfare debate in the United States, and the texts are produced in an organisational context. Thus, the animal welfare discourse and elements from the CSR communication literature will provide information of how different members’ resources (MR) can lead to different interpretations of how the sender intended the text to be understood and the recipient may perceive it. Thus, these concepts will facilitate the examination of their impact on the selected empirical data and how they are interconnected. Albeit, to examine the discourse of animal welfare in the US and CSR communication in relation to the empirical data in the analysis of this thesis, it is, of course, necessary first to achieve an understanding of these discourses.

2.2 Animal Welfare Discourse

To understand the current animal welfare discourse, it is important to understand its beginning. Even though, there may always have been some humans who felt empathy for animals to some degree, the literature on the field can be traced back to the 1960s. In 1964, the animal rights advocate Ruth Harrison published the book *Animal Machines* which was the first book to heavily criticise the meat production industry (Fraser 2008, 2). Harrison specifically criticises processes which lead to unnatural behaviours, such as utilising cages for laying hens (Fraser 2008, 2). In 1975, the Australian philosopher Peter Singer suggested that animal welfare should be based on the pain or pleasure experienced by animals and stated that it should not be regarded as less important than the pain or pleasure felt by humans (Singer 1975). Thus, Singer’s discourse emphasises that animals do have feelings to some degree, such as feeling pain or pleasure, which should be considered equal to human feelings. In 1989, Astrid Lindgren, the famous author of the Pippi Longstocking stories, facilitated the animal welfare reform in Sweden, by proposing that farm animals must see the sun at least once (Fraser 2008, 2). In 1993, the American philosopher Bernard Rollin stressed that to solely consider animal welfare as a question of minimising pain is not enough

to claim that welfare is achieved, and instead initiatives to promote animals' natural behaviour must be enacted (Fraser 2008, 2). Rollin's perception of animal welfare can be interpreted as a development of Singer's contribution to the literature, as Rollin indicates that it is not solely a question regarding pain or pleasure, but a question of providing animals with natural habitat. Rollin's conception of animal welfare can be categorised as "anti-industrial", or a "Romantic/Agrarian world-view", as this perspective emphasises the emotions of animals and their freedom (Fraser 2008, 5). In contrast, the "Industrial/Rational world-view" considers nature as imperfect, and thus, to achieve an ideal state, science and technology are necessary (Fraser 2008, 5). According to this perspective, animal welfare regards their basic health and function. For instance, Ragnar Tauson studied the health of birds in cages and subsequently developed new cage designs which would prevent several of the health issues he had observed (Fraser 2008, 5). This was considered achieving welfare for the newly caged animals, even though they had simply received new cages. These examples illustrate one of the issues with the animal welfare debate, as it is based on different perspectives of what animals need to strive.

In the past twenty years, the attention to animal welfare has been increasing (Kalof and Fitzgerald 2007) and like the literature presented in the section above, most of the literature regards what animals need to have a good life. However, it is also important to note that much of the literature points to increased consumer demands for animal welfare (Miele & Bock 2007, 2). According to a phone survey of over 1,000 U.S. residents, 44% of males and 60% of women take the well-being of farm animals into consideration when purchasing meat (Prickett 2007, 18). The increase in consumer demand may be interconnected with the increase of animal welfare as a scientific field of study. Most of the modern literature is critical towards modern farming systems and often refer to it as *factory farming*, which is also the terminology used by some animal rights organisations (Miele & Bock 2007; Fraser 2008; HSUS 2019). This indicates that most researchers follow the Romantic/Agrarian world-view, whereas the industry tends to follow the Industrial/Rational world-view. However, it is important to note that both the meat industry and animal rights activists may promote their socially constructed reality out of self-interest. In relation to the self-interest of animal rights organisations, it is important to introduce an additional world-view which is increasing in popularity, namely the "nonspeciesist world-view" (Freeman 2010, 165). From the nonspeciesist world-view, all living beings should be considered subjects, hence animals should not be regarded as objects (Freeman 2010, 165). This world-view is followed by many animal rights organisations which have an agenda of promoting vegan/food campaigns, and thus, persuade people

to stop eating meat, and in some cases replace meat with products sold by said ‘animal rights’ organisations (Freeman 2010, 163). Thus, it is important to examine the motives of these animal rights organisations and what they can potentially gain from their campaigns.

2.3 CSR Communication

To understand how the respective senders’ and recipients’ prior perception of CSR communication can have affected the production and interpretation of the selected empirical data, it is important to illuminate how CSR communication can be perceived.

In a review of CSR communication from a legitimacy perspective (Nielsen & Thomsen 2018), the authors illuminate that many companies incorporate stakeholders’ expectations in their strategy. The article argues that this may be since “stakeholders are increasingly requiring that corporations justify their social and environmental actions.” (Nielsen & Thomsen 2018, 492). This statement is substantiated by the animal welfare literature, which pointed to increased consumer demand for animal welfare (Miele & Bock 2007, 2), which falls under the category of companies’ social actions. First, to understand the broadness of what a stakeholder can be interpreted as, a brief definition can be obtained from R. Edward Freeman, who introduced stakeholder theory to strategic management, who defined a “stakeholder” as: “(...) any group or individual who can affect or who is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives” (Freeman 1984, 46). The most relevant stakeholders in this thesis are represented by animal rights organisations, as the selected empirical data revolves around McDonald’s chicken welfare policies and NGOs’ approach to said policies.

Corporate legitimacy can be defined as “a process whereby organizations seek approval for their acts from groups in society” (Kaplan and Ruland 1991, 320). Thus, from this perspective, the themes in a company’s CSR communication are constructed to portray the company as meeting or exceeding the demands of its stakeholders. Hence, legitimacy can be considered “vital for the survival of organizations and a prerequisite for the flow of resources and stakeholder support.” (Nielsen and Thomsen 2018, 494). Suchman’s definition follows the social constructivist approach to the concept of legitimacy, as he regards it as the way in which organisations’ actions are perceived within a “socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions” (Suchman 1995, 574). Suchman’s approach to legitimacy is important for this thesis, as this thesis also follows the social constructivist perspective since it seeks to explore how different senders can construct conflicting social realities on the same social phenomenon.

The concept of legitimacy is of increasing importance, as many companies incorporate

stakeholders' expectations in their strategy (Nielsen and Thomsen 2018, 494), which can be supported by the following statement from McDonald's: "Delivering on stakeholder-driven priorities requires a robust materiality process and transparent governance structures that enable action." (McD Stakeholder 2019). Thus, this statement implies that McDonald's does have a focus on meeting the demands of its stakeholders. However, it is important to stress that the topic of CSR communication regards how companies communicate, and therefore, the communication may not necessarily reflect their genuine objectives, for instance in the case of *greenwashing*. CSR communication can be categorised as greenwashing if "a claim about the environmental or social benefits of a product is unsubstantiated or misleading" (Bazillier & Vauday 2013, 1). Thus, greenwashing constitutes a critical approach to CSR communication, as it seeks to uncover gaps between a company's claims and its actions. However, on the contrary, another approach to CSR communication cherishes the gap between talk and action and claims that it can lead to improvements (Christensen, Morsing, and Thyssen 2013, 1). In the article "CSR as Aspirational Talk", the authors argue that CSR communication should concern ideals and intentions rather than actual behaviour, as such linguistics can potentially act as a motivational factor for members of an organisation, and thus, improve organisational standards (Christensen, Morsing, and Thyssen 2013, 2). However, the authors do discuss the hypocrisy related to their approach, and thus, they distinguish between two types of hypocrisy; positive and negative (Christensen, Morsing, and Thyssen 2013, 6-7). The positive hypocrisy considers the way in which a company pretends that the future already exists, and thus, deliberately constitutes a gap between talk and action so members of the organisation have something to *aspire* to (Christensen, Morsing, and Thyssen 2013, 7). When the authors illuminate the negative hypocrisy, they do acknowledge that this gap may be considered as greenwashing, which can damage the organisation's reputation (Christensen, Morsing, and Thyssen 2013, 6).

Thus, it becomes evident that senders' and recipients' MR can determine the way in which they produce and interpret texts. For instance, an employee at a company may feel proud, and thus, be motivated to perform better, if the individual's company announces that it supports the hungry children in Africa. Hence, the employee may feel as if he/she somehow supports the same cause by working at the company. On the contrary, if an NGO that supports children in third world countries receives the company's announcement but cannot find any evidence that the company has walked the talk, the NGO might observe it as an attempt of greenwashing. Consequently, the NGO's trust in and perception of said company will most likely diminish.

3.0 Context

In this section, the context of the empirical data will be illuminated to provide an understanding of the current debate and the subject of analysis. First, a review of the public issues that McDonald's has experienced in the US is examined to provide an understanding of how McDonald's has previously reacted to public crises. Subsequently, it will be illuminated how McDonald's communicates its sustainability initiatives. Second, the opposition to McDonald's current chicken welfare policy is explored to comprehend the contradictory realities.

3.1 Fast-Food Nation

As McDonald's is one of the largest fast-food franchises in the world, it is inevitable that the and companies within its supply chain are studied by external sources for a variety of reasons. As McDonald's has a global impact, issues in the company's supply chain can quickly catch the attention of the media and public alike.

Eric Schlosser's "Fast-Food Nation" was first published in Rolling Stone in 1998, and later became a New York Times Bestseller (Schlosser 1998, Schlosser 2005). The discourse of the book is mainly critical towards the fast-food industry of the United States by illuminating events that have led to bad publicity for several fast-food companies, including McDonald's and its supply chain, through the history of the American fast-food industry. Events that consequently made McDonald's change its policies will be explored in the following section to achieve an understanding of how McDonald's has reacted to different public crises in the past.

3.1.1 Corporate Policies on Public Demand

In the epilogue of Schlosser's 2005 edition of Fast-Food Nation, Schlosser provides examples of previous occasions in which McDonald's changed its policies after being met with consumer protests (Schlosser 2005, 267). In the 1960s, McDonald's was establishing numerous new restaurants in minority neighbourhoods, however, McDonald's did not accept minorities as franchisees, which caused a public backlash from the African-American community. Subsequently, McDonald's began to actively recruit African-Americans for franchisee positions, which enabled the company to lower the tensions and engage with the urban markets (Schlosser 2005, 267). Another example of McDonald's changing its policies due to public pressure can be observed when McDonald's was still using polystyrene for its hamburger packaging. Environmentalists in the US attacked McDonald's by claiming it was environmentally irresponsible, which caused McDonald's to enter a partnership with the Environmental Defense Fund in August 1990. and subsequently,

discard its polystyrene packaging in the US. This initiative provided McDonald's with some positive publicity in the US, even though, McDonald's continued to use polystyrene in other countries, where the company had not been met with environmental criticism (Schlosser 2005, 267). The common denominator of these two examples is the fact that McDonald's has previously changed its corporate policies of specific geographical locations based on the location of the public pressure that the company experienced. Thus, it is important to note that even though McDonald's is a global company, its policies can vary. Therefore, it will be necessary to examine if McDonald's recent policy announcements include communication that indicates if the changes are global or simply local.

Furthermore, McDonald's has previously illustrated the power it holds over the suppliers in the company's supply chain. For instance, at the beginning of this century, McDonald's informed its US suppliers of frozen French fries, Lamb Weston and the J. R. Simplot Company, that it would no longer purchase genetically engineered potatoes (Schlosser 2005, 267). As a result, the two suppliers immediately told their farmers to stop using Monsanto's biotech potatoes. McDonald's US initiative may be traced back to its Western Europe branch, which had banned genetically engineered potatoes in 1999, as genetically modified foods had received massive media attention and were dubbed "Frankenfoods" (Schlosser 2005, 267).

Additionally, according to Schlosser, at the beginning of the twentieth century, hamburgers had a reputation of being made from old meat pumped and contained chemicals, and thus, unsafe to consume (Schlosser 2005, 198). This reputation can, to some degree, be substantiated by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Before 1996, the USDA would estimate the quality of ground beef on inspections based on "sight, touch, and smell" (USDA 2016). Thus, many people became sick and several children even died after having consumed tainted ground beef (Schlosser 2005, 200-201). This became the establishment of organisations with the objective of illuminating the potential danger of consuming contaminated food, which created a public pressure. One of those organisations was Safe Tables Our Priority (STOP), whose president had a six-year-old son who suffered a horrible death after eating a tainted hamburger, in 1993 (Schlosser 2005, 201). The pressure from such organisations and the public resulted in President Clinton announcing that the USDA would initiate a science-based meat inspection system, in July 1996 (Schlosser 2005, 215). Later that same year, the USDA published a nationwide study which concluded that 78.6% of the collected ground beef samples were contaminated with microbes most commonly found in faeces

(Schlosser 2005, 197-198). Inevitably, such a conclusion entailed a “shit” storm in the media, once again damaging the image of fast-food chains.

Consequently, McDonald’s told its ground beef suppliers to ensure that their meat did not contain lethal pathogens, and thus, these suppliers immediately invested in new equipment and microbial testing to live up to their customer’s demand (Schlosser 2005, 267). This is common throughout the industry, as fast-food chains have very specific demands which their suppliers must adhere to regarding sugar and fat content, size, shape, etc. (Schlosser 2005, 267). These examples illustrate that McDonald’s has the potential to demand that its suppliers change their policies. This information is relevant for this thesis, as McDonald’s occasionally disclaims any/all responsibility of how the chickens are raised on the farms within its supply-chain. For instance, as McDonald’s state: “While we don’t raise chickens ourselves, the health and welfare of the chickens in our supply chain is important to us.” (McD Chicken 2019). In this statement, McDonald’s implies that even though they are not responsible for how the chickens are treated, the company still value their welfare.

The subsequent section will elaborate upon the way in which McDonald’s currently communicate its Economic, Social and Governance (ESG) reporting. Additionally, the section will illuminate the reason behind the selection of the social aspects as the only aspects relevant for this thesis in regard to ESG reporting.

3.2 McDonald’s and ESG Reporting

Since 2013, McDonald’s has not published a traditional annual Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) report (McD ESG reporting 2019). Instead, the company has “transitioned into a dynamic environmental, social and governance (ESG) performance reporting website platform” (McD ESG performance 2017). There can be a variety of reasons for this transition. For instance, the transition to an online version enables the company to change specific statements immediately, compared to a published report which is static. The reason why McDonald’s moved from CSR to ESG reporting is publicly unknown, however, it could be to strengthen investment possibilities. For instance, many institutional and private investors are signatories to the United Nations’ Principles for Responsible Investment (UNPRI). The UNPRI rates investment possibilities (companies) on their ESG performance and states the following in its principles: “As institutional investors, we have a duty to act in the best long-term interests of our beneficiaries. In this fiduciary role, we believe that environmental, social, and corporate governance (ESG) issues can affect the performance of

investment portfolios (...)” (UNPRI principles 2019). This statement illustrates that some investors rate companies specifically on their ESG performance. Thus, public issues such as NGOs protesting a company’s animal welfare policy can potentially harm the company’s social reporting, and therefore, investment potential. Additionally, ESG reporting appears to be of increasing importance, as several third-party data providers now rate companies based on their ESG performance (Harjoto & Lee 2015, 1). Thus, investors can compare companies to each other based on their environmental, social and governance activities. Environmental issues regard areas such as climate change, sustainable land use, plastic waste (UNPRI ESG issues 2019). Social issues concern aspects such as human and animal rights and employee relations (UNPRI ESG issues 2019). Finally, governance issues revolve around tax avoidance, corruption, cyber security, etc. (UNPRI ESG issues 2019). Thus, McDonald’s chicken welfare policy concerns the company’s social reporting, which is the phenomenon that currently receives the most public attention, hence, this thesis will solely concern McDonald’s social issues related to said policy.

An example of the potential consequences of McDonald’s chicken welfare policy can be observed in form of a letter from an investor, who wrote a letter of complaint to McDonald’s that was obtained by Bloomberg News (Shanker 2018). The letter, dated August 22, 2018, was written by New York State Comptroller Thomas P. DiNapoli, on behalf of the New York State Common Retirement Fund, which holds more than \$300 million in McDonald’s stock (Shanker 2018). The essence of the letter revolves around how McDonald’s is supposedly lacking behind its competitors regarding its chicken welfare policies. Among others, DiNapoli states: “Although these standards are important from an animal welfare perspective, they also make business sense.” (Shanker 2018). In the letter, DiNapoli refers to the negative publicity McDonald’s has received lately, regarding the treatment of chickens in its supply chain, and that the consumer demand for higher animal welfare products is increasing (Shanker 2018). Thus, companies’ philanthropic activities are not simply selfless acts of kindness, or initiatives executed solely to establish a positive image in the eyes of the public but are almost mandatory when relying on investors’ funds. The social initiatives within McDonald’s ESG reporting have been incorporated in its Scale for Good program, which will be elaborated upon in the following section.

3.2.1 Scale for Good

Scale for Good is McDonald’s umbrella term for all its sustainability initiatives. Scale for Good’s various branches include aspects such as: “climate action, animal health and welfare, packaging and recycling, and supporting local communities” (McD Our Approach 2019). However, as previously

mentioned, this thesis will solely concern McDonald's policies regarding the welfare of its chickens.

McDonald's refers to Scale for Good as a platform, as all related information is communicated online through the company's websites (McD ESG performance 2017). McDonald's does not provide a specific date for the launch of its Scale for Good platform, as it was a transition process from its previous Global Sustainability Framework. However, the company states that the transition began in 2014 and finished in 2018 (McD Stakeholders 2019). Although, corporate news related to the Scale for Good platform can be traced all the way back to September 14, 2012 (McD News Scale for Good 2019).

McDonald's claims that Scale for Good is one of its core values, and as the company is one of the largest in its field of business, it states that it has: "the responsibility and opportunity to take action on some of the most pressing social and environmental challenges in the world today." (McD Our Approach 2019). Thus, this statement indicates that McDonald's acknowledges that it should fight *social* issues. Regarding how well the company does so, Francesca DeBiase, Executive Vice President and Chief Supply Chain and Sustainability Officer of McDonald's Corporation, provides the following explanation: "We want to use our Scale for Good and continue raising the bar on what it means to be a responsible company committed to people and the planet." (McD Our Approach 2019). By claiming that the company wants to "continue raising the bar what it means to be a responsible company" it implies that McDonald's already considers itself to be a responsible company. The perception of being a responsible company can further be observed in McDonald's communication of chicken welfare, as the company states: "we're committed to sourcing chickens raised with improved welfare outcomes." (McD Chicken 2019). McDonald's substantiates this claim by mentioning several times that it collaborates with animal welfare organisations, scientists and industry experts to ensure chicken sustainability throughout its supply chain (McD Chicken 2019). In 2003, McDonald's introduced its first chicken sustainability initiative, by developing its first global antibiotic policy (McD Chicken Timeline 2019). Although antibiotics can be both proactive and reactive by ensuring farm animals' health and preventing diseases from spreading, it is vital for human health to limit the amount of the drug to a responsible level. If farm animals have been fed with an irresponsible amount of antibiotics and are subsequently consumed by humans, the antibiotics are transferred to humans, which can lead to antimicrobial resistance (FDA antibiotics 2019). If humans are resistant to antibiotics, a variety of treatable diseases become life-threatening, as they become untreatable (FDA antibiotics 2019). In 2008, McDonald's presented its first chicken

welfare initiative, by implementing third-party auditing on all chicken supply locations globally (McD Chicken Timeline 2019). Thus, a supposedly independent company inspects and verifies if the company meets a standard set of requirements. However, on McDonald's website, the company states: "As there are no broadly accepted standards for chicken sustainability, we've been working with stakeholders across the industry to define what it means." (McD Chicken 2019). Hence, there are currently no official requirements that McDonald's must meet or exceed to claim that it has achieved welfare for its chickens. One of the stakeholders mentioned in the quote by McDonald's is the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), which McDonald's partnered with in 2010, and still collaborates with to this day (McD Chicken Timeline 2019). The purpose of partnering with an NGO, such as an animal rights organisation, and subsequently communicating it through public relations statement could indicate that McDonald's is seeking the approval of its stakeholders (cf. Section 2.3). In 2010, McDonald's also implemented Key Welfare Indicators (KWIs) for chickens, however, only in its European markets (ibid.). Thus, McDonald's requirements for accomplishing chicken welfare are still largely set by the company itself. From 2010-2017, McDonald's did not present any new initiatives with the purpose of improving its chicken welfare policies and mostly focused on its antimicrobial commitment (ibid.). In August 2017, McDonald's published an update on its global chicken welfare policy. The essence of the policy update concerns that McDonald's chicken suppliers must raise chickens in cage-free systems (McD Chicken Policy 2017). Additionally, the company established the McDonald's Advisory Council for Chicken Sustainability (McD Chicken Timeline 2019). According to McDonald's, said council consists of academics, suppliers, animal welfare and environmental advocates, scientists and industry experts (McD ESG performance 2019). Establishing such a council implies that McDonald's is supported by experts within multidisciplinary fields, which builds an implicit authority claim (cf. Section 2.1). Furthermore, McDonald's states that it is developing state-of-the-art welfare measurement technology to improve the chickens living conditions (McD Chicken Timeline 2019). Thus, McDonald's has invested in welfare technology, which sole function is to measure if the company's own welfare requirements are being met. In October 2017, McDonald's made a public announcement regarding the initiatives which has been elaborated upon in this section, along with a couple of new commitments to improve the welfare of chickens in its supply-chain (cf. Appendix 1). However, this specific announcement quickly became the foundation for animal welfare campaigns targeted at McDonald's, as multiple NGO's utilise the statement as a reference point to indicate the flaws of McDonald's chicken welfare policy (cf. Appendix 2; Unhappy Meals 2019). Albeit, McDonald's

claims to be listening to its stakeholders in a section of its website called “Engaging Stakeholders”, in which McDonald’s claims to be listening to issues and concerns raised by its independent *stakeholders* (McD Stakeholders 2019). Thus, it can be interpreted that all animal rights activists who attempt to affect McDonald’s chicken welfare objectives can be considered stakeholders to the company. However, in contrast to McDonald’s claim to be listening to its stakeholders, many animal rights activists are actively trying to make McDonald’s change its chicken welfare policies.

3.3 The Opposition

Throughout McDonald’s history, the company has had many controversies with NGO’s as well as the public. In this section, the parties which are currently the most dominant opponents of McDonald’s chicken welfare policies will be illuminated to achieve a more profound understanding of the current public debate.

In the previously mentioned investor-letter sent to McDonald’s from the New York State Common Retirement Fund, Thomas P. DiNapoli warned McDonald’s that the company’s chicken welfare policies entail financial and reputational risks (Shanker 2018). In said letter, DiNapoli referred to a specific NGO called The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), as the NGO had recently targeted McDonald’s in a broad media campaign that acquired the NGO with more than 20 celebrity signatories, which only facilitated its momentum and reputation (Shanker 2018). The Humane Society’s campaign began June 21, 2018, and was aimed directly at McDonald’s, hence the name of the campaign “Unhappy Meals” (Block 2018). The NGO solely focuses on corporate animal cruelty, which is explicitly stated in its mission: “We fight the big fights to end suffering for all animals. Together with millions of supporters, we take on puppy mills, factory farms, trophy hunts, animal testing and other cruel industries.” (HSUS Mission 2019). Thus, HSUS categorises McDonald’s chicken farms as “factory farms” which is defined by the NGO as:

Most chickens raised for meat spend their entire lives in windowless warehouses packed wing-to-wing with other birds. Due to their rapid growth and living conditions, these animals often suffer from heart attacks, lung failure and other illnesses or injuries. (HSUS Chicken 2019).

The chickens’ rapid growth, which is referred to in the statement, is not solely due to a vast amount of feeding. The chickens raised on McDonald’s farms are a specific breed, known as broiler chickens or broilers (McD Chicken 2019). Broiler chickens are bred to gain weight faster and have larger breast-muscles than other chicken breeds (CWIF Broilers 2013, 1). Thus, the breed is

specifically designed for meat production, which is not without its consequences, according to animal rights activists (HSUS Chicken 2019). The HSUS claims that as the chickens grow so quickly, their bones and organs can barely keep up the pace, which can lead to multiple illnesses and/or injuries (HSUS Chicken 2019). However, it is important to note that the broiler industry has not only grown due to corporate greed, but also due to consumer demand for cheaper poultry meat (CWIF Broilers 2013, 1), and thus, we, as consumers, are partially to blame. This brief definition of the breed is important to understand the chicken welfare debate, as both sides of the debate construct different realities regarding the chickens at the farms.

On the website of HSUS' campaign, Unhappy Meals, the NGO has issued a statement, in which elements of McDonald's chicken welfare announcement (cf. Appendix 1) are cited to stress the NGO's concern with McDonald's communication of its new chicken welfare commitments, while comparing the commitments to commitments made by McDonald's competitors (Unhappy Meals 2019). Besides creating awareness, the goal of the campaign is to put direct stress on McDonald's, which can be observed at the bottom of the website, as it asks readers to call McDonald's directly, while providing McDonald's telephone number, instead of asking recipients to join the cause or donate (Unhappy Meals 2019).

Besides the Unhappy Meals campaign, multiple petitions have been established which explicitly addresses McDonald's chicken policies. The current two largest petitions are called "Do Better for Chickens" and "I'm not loving it". The petition "Do Better for Chickens" has just below 300,000 signatories and was initially created by an animal rights activist named Sharonda Dawson through the organisation Change.org, which is a platform that allows anyone to create petitions about anything. However, since its creation, the petition has been facilitated by the support of six animal welfare organisations, namely; World Animal Protection, Mercy for Animals, animal EQUALITY, Compassion in World Farming, Compassion Over Killing, and the Humane League. In connection with the campaign, a website has been formed called www.truthaboutmcdonaldschicken.com. The website has also issued a public statement (cf. Appendix 2) which is almost identical to the public statement by the Unhappy Meals campaign (Unhappy Meals 2019), in which the group of NGO's quotes statements made in McDonald's chicken welfare announcement (cf. Appendix 1), and subsequently provide their response to them. Even though, McDonald's claims that there are no broadly accepted standards for chicken sustainability (McD Chicken 2019), multiple other sources state that the standards provided by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) or the Global Animal Partnership (GAP) are widely accepted as best practices in the

industry (Shanker 2018; Appendix 2; Unhappy Meals 2019). This is another example of the conflicting realities of the debate, which will be examined in the analysis.

The petition “I’m not lovin’ it” is created by the Humane League, which is also one of the NGO’s behind the previously mentioned website www.truthaboutmcdonaldschicken.com and the public statement that comments on McDonald’s new chicken welfare commitments (Humane League 2019; Appendix 2). Thus, all the mentioned sources and data against McDonald’s appears to be somewhat connected. Albeit, it is important to note that these petitions and websites only account for a small percentage of the combined online data created against McDonald’s.

Albeit, a variety of sources are accusing McDonald’s of having poor chicken welfare policies through different media channels, it was determined that the most relevant source to examine was the press release conducted by the six NGOs (cf. Appendix 2), as it directly responds to the selected press release by McDonald’s (McDonald’s Chicken PR 2017) in the most elaborate manner.

To analyse the selected data, it has been determined that a strictly linguistic approach will not suffice, as the social issues expand beyond the texts themselves. Thus, this thesis will take a critical discourse analytic approach which seeks to investigate both the textual level and subsequently, examine the data in its social context. How this will be conducted in the analysis, will be elaborated upon in the following section.

4.0 Methodology

In this section, the methodological reflections of this thesis will be accounted for. The section will begin by illuminating the *scientific approach* in the thesis to clarify how phenomena are interpreted. This foundation will facilitate the understanding of the *selection of theories* that have been chosen to answer the problem statement. Then, the qualitative approach will be presented to provide an understanding of how this thesis will approach the primary empirical data. Subsequently, the reason behind the specifically selected *empirical data* will be accounted for. Finally, *delimitations* will be discussed to clarify the scope of this thesis by briefly commentating on the elements that extend beyond the purpose and/or capabilities of the thesis.

4.1 Scientific Approach

This thesis follows a social constructivist perspective to phenomena, which implies that reality is constructed through social interaction (Collin & K ppe 2012, 248). Thus, this perspective indicates that there is not one ‘real’ reality, but rather different realities depending on the contextual settings

(Collin & K ppe 2012, 248). Additionally, the social constructivist approach claims that knowledge is not directly transmittable, but something that must first be tested against our prior knowledge (Collin & K ppe 2012, 248). This perspective is coherent with Fairclough's perspective on CDA and its concept of *members' resources* (MR), as it implies that people interpret texts (social phenomena) differently, depending on their prior knowledge, values, belief, etc., which are socially constructed (Fairclough 1989, 24). This ideology is relevant for this thesis, as it will be applied to the examination of both the processes of production and interpretation of the texts (Fairclough 1989, 25).

4.2 Selection of theories

As this thesis seeks to examine how senders' can construct different realities through text, and how the recipient may interpret such text with respect to their prior knowledge, the primary theory will be Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which will be applied to the empirical data by means of his three-dimensional framework.

At the first level, I will focus on the following grammatical features: expressive values of words and sentences, cohesion and ideologically based structures in vocabulary, modes of sentence, modality and the use of the personal pronoun 'we' in the texts. The effects of said features will be elaborated upon when presented in the analysis. Thus, the concept of these effects will be fresh in readers memory, rather than having explained a variety of grammatical features when presenting the first dimension of Fairclough's three-dimensional framework.

At the second level, I will examine the text for signs of intertextuality and interdiscursivity. Subsequently, this information can be utilised to interpret how the senders, respectively, intended the texts to be interpreted, and how the text may be interpreted by individuals with different MR. To understand how recipients can potentially interpret the two texts, I have included different perceptions of the animal welfare discourse and CSR communication. The entire debate revolves around the animal welfare discourse, however, what it entails is still unclear according to the literature, and thus, it is important to understand different definitions. Similarly, the concept of CSR communication has different definitions varying from the purpose of such communication to how the gap between talk and action should be interpreted. Thus, understanding variations in these concepts will facilitate the interpretation of how individuals with different ideologies may perceive the selected data.

At the third level, I will explain the results discovered in relation to social conditions at the societal, institutional and societal level. Furthermore, I will interpret how power relations may have affected the discourse at these levels. Subsequently, the results from the analysis will be utilised to infer the senders' hidden motives in relation to what they are trying to accomplish with their respective texts, and how it may relate to different levels of social practice. This will display how the senders' different MR can have affected the construction of two conflicting social realities.

4.3 Qualitative approach

This thesis will take the qualitative approach to data, as I seek to uncover different underlying social phenomena in the texts, such as ideologies, meanings, motives, etc. The essence of the qualitative approach revolves around interpreting a specific object to reach a conclusion (Collin & Kjøppe 2012, 279-280). Thus, by solely selecting one text to represent each side of the debate, the qualitative approach enables one to delve into the texts and examine specific words and phrases in their context, which facilitates an understanding of senders' intentions when producing the texts and how recipients' may interpret them.

4.4 Empirical Data

The selected public relations statement by McDonald's will account for the primary empirical data of McDonald's perspective for two reasons. First, albeit the announcement accounts for less than two pages (4,406 characters), it is McDonald's the most detailed answer concerning its most recent chicken welfare policy (cf. Appendix 1). Second, this specific statement became the foundation of the most recent public debate regarding McDonald's chicken welfare policies. Consequently, the debate revolves around this specific text, hence, it was found to be the most relevant representation.

McDonald's chicken welfare announcement initiates with a headline and an introduction to McDonald's current state on the area, followed by a presentation of the company's eight new commitments (cf. Appendix 1). These eight commitments will hereinafter be referred to by their given number, respectively; 1. Commitment, 2. Commitment, 3. Commitment, etc.

To represent the opposition of McDonald's chicken policies, the group of NGOs was selected as their text represents the shared opinions of six organisations. When comparing the texts by the group of NGOs and the Unhappy Meals campaign, respectively (cf. Appendix 2; Unhappy Meals 2019), it becomes evident that the content of both is almost identical. To provide an example of how closely related the two texts are, the following two statements are incidents in which the two texts *differ*:

“We are deeply concerned about this and feel obliged to clarify what the company is and is not doing.” (Unhappy Meals 2019).

“We, the above animal protection charities—representing tens of millions of people—are deeply concerned about this and, in light of McDonald’s PR statements, feel obliged to clarify what the company is and is not doing.” (cf. Appendix 2).

As it can be observed, there are only two sequences which separate the statements from one another. First, the second statement addresses who the personal pronoun “we” refers to, which the first statement does not. Secondly, the second statement refers to McDonald’s PR statements, which is not mentioned in the first statement. These minor differences are consistent throughout both texts, even though they are almost identical. Thus, due to the homogeneity of these two texts, this thesis will solely analyse the text conducted by the group of animal rights organisations, as it is both generally more elaborate (12,032 characters compared to 7336) (cf. Appendix 2; Unhappy Meals 2019) and represented by six NGOs rather than one. In this text, the NGOs include four of McDonald’s eight presented commitments, and thus, four others are excluded. However, due to the amount of data in the text, I will not include the entire text myself, as I intend to select certain words, phrases and sentences that express hidden ideologies, and subsequently, analyse what can be inferred from such data. Therefore, including the entire text would lead to much unnecessary repetition.

4.5 Delimitations

Regarding the textual level of the analysis, this thesis is delimited, as it will only focus on two separate texts. Thus, certain elements of the debate will not be illuminated if it exists outside of these texts. There is a vast number of sources that comments on McDonald’s chicken policies through different media channels, such as news media articles, academic literature, social media, public relations statements by other organisations, etc. Examining all these sources would provide a more profound understanding of the public’s perception of McDonald’s. However, as this thesis seeks to how McDonald’s constructs its social reality through a single text, it was determined that it would establish a more balanced analysis to solely examined it in relation to one response in the same genre, name a public relations statement from other organisations. Additionally, regarding the production and consumption of the texts, this thesis is delimited by a lack of data that could have provided knowledge of McDonald’s true intentions or how groups of the public would interpret the

texts. For instance, if an interview had been conducted with a social responsibility employee at McDonald's or if study groups had been established to examine their interpretation of the texts.

As mentioned in the empirical data section, this thesis delimits itself from the entire data in the selected texts, as it would generate an excessive amount of redundant and repetitive arguments, which sole purpose would be to support the basis of the first argument.

Regarding the sections Animal Welfare Discourse and CSR Communication, this thesis could have committed itself more to the literature in these fields of study. However, as the purpose of including these sections is to illuminate that different perceptions on identical concepts exist and how such differences can shape a discourse, a review of the entire literature would not serve the purpose of this thesis. Additionally, this thesis could have included literature regarding stakeholder communication. However, as the thesis mostly concerns a single stakeholder group, namely animal rights organisations and the people they represent, it was determined that different concept of CSR communication would have a more significant impact on reaching a conclusion to the problem statement.

5.0 Analysis

The analysis in this thesis will be structured after Fairclough's three-dimensional framework. As the analysis will to examine two separate texts, the following will consist of five sections of analysis. First, the texts' first two dimensions will be analysed separately to examine how they communicate and why. Second, these results will be utilised to discuss the two texts in relation to each other and their social practice. Since the text by the group of NGOs comments directly on McDonald's statements (cf. Appendix 2), the analysis will initiate by examining McDonald's chicken welfare announcement (cf. Appendix 1), which will facilitate the understanding of the NGOs' response.

5.1 Textual Analysis of McDonald's Chicken Welfare Announcement

At this level, I will explore five grammatical features in the text, namely; expressive values of words and sentences, cohesion and ideologically based structures in vocabulary, modes of sentence, modality and the use of the personal pronoun 'we' in the text. Each section will initiate by defining the respective grammatical element(s) and effect(s), according to Fairclough's theory (Fairclough 1989).

5.1.1 Expressive values of words and sentences

According to Fairclough, words and sentences express a certain value, for instance, if a word or sentence is positively or negatively loaded (Fairclough 1989, 118;125). Such information is important to discover, which is evident from Fairclough's statement: "Differences between discourse types in the expressive values of words are again ideologically significant." (Fairclough 1989, 118). Thus, the results discovered in this section will be utilised to interpret the underlying ideologies in the second dimension of this analysis.

The headline of McDonald's statement is: "McDonald's Announces Commitments to Advancements in Chicken Welfare." (cf. Appendix 1, 1). The meaning of the noun 'commitment' varies from "a willingness to give your time and energy to something that you believe in" to "a promise or firm decision to do something" (Cambridge). Thus, even though it is linked to the positively loaded noun 'advancement', the sequence still expresses a degree of positive progress. The second time the word 'commitment' is mentioned is in the introduction in the following sentence: "Today, we are elevating our global commitment to source chickens raised with improved welfare outcomes." (cf. Appendix 1, 1). In this statement, 'commitment' relates to both 'elevating', which expresses an improvement, and 'global', which illustrates the geographical magnitude of the commitment. Thus, as the sequence is linked with "improved welfare outcomes", the sentence expresses positive company progress. However, as these positively loaded words relate to a commitment, the extent of the effect becomes vague. Furthermore, in the next sentence, McDonald's elaborates that the combination of commitments will "impact more than 70 percent of our global chicken supply (...)" (cf. Appendix 1, 1). Thus, the strength of presenting the commitment as global is reduced, as it will only account for approximately 70 percent of its chicken supply. However, the sentence still expresses positive global progress. Six of McDonald's eight commitments initiate with a positively loaded word, which is the following; improved, innovative, natural, stunning, accountability and feasibility (Commitment 1,2,3,5,6,7). The combination of these words signals an implicit claim that McDonald's is trustworthy (accountability), and that the commitment will be a sustainable (natural) progress (improved) that is both achievable (feasibility) and "innovative". The word stunning is ambiguous, as stunning can both relate to something that is breathtakingly beautiful when associated with other positively loaded words, however, in this case, it relates to the way in which the chickens are killed. These positive expressions are consistent throughout the entire text, without the inclusion of a single negatively loaded word or sentence. For instance, each time McDonald's mentions the changes that will occur at the farm-level, it uses

positively loaded words, such as “pecking, perching and dust-bathing” (cf. Appendix 1, 1). Here, McDonald’s could have stated that it did not allow cages or chickens to walk on the concrete floor. The reason McDonald’s solely utilises positively loaded words, could be an attempt to avoid creating negative associations with its current policies.

5.1.2 Cohesion and ideologically based structures in vocabulary

Cohesion does not only concern the repetition of identical words but also regards the sender’s use of similar words or if the sender refers to something in the same text (Fairclough 1989, 130).

According to Fairclough, identifying such elements in a text can facilitate the identification of “ideological bases in the text” (Fairclough 1989, 116). For instance, by identifying how the McDonald’s refers to animal welfare, it enables the interpretation of how McDonald’s attempts to display its ideological point of view regarding said topic.

McDonald’s mentions ‘welfare’ a total of 13 times and different forms of ‘improve’ six times (cf. Appendix 1). Five of these times are ‘animal welfare combined with ‘improved’, except for the headline which utilises the synonym ‘advance’. This indicates that McDonald’s seeks to illustrate that its animal welfare policies will be improved with these new commitments. It cannot be concluded if McDonald’s genuinely believes that its animal welfare policies need improvement or if it due to changes at the societal level. This becomes evident in the text, as McDonald’s states the following in the introduction: “Since our beginning, McDonald’s has evolved with our customers’ tastes and society’s changing needs.” (cf. Appendix 1, 1). In this quotation, McDonald’s explicitly states that it has “evolved with” society’s changing needs, which could also imply that the company has changed due to these changing needs.

5.1.3 Modes of sentence

A sentence is declarative when sender provides information, and thus, can be observed as a sign of power if the sender provides information without being asked for It (Fairclough 1989, 125). It could be argued that McDonald’s has been asked to provide an update on its chicken welfare commitments due to the public criticism it has received, however, as this level solely concerns the textual level, I will consider it as a sign of power. As the text is an announcement of McDonald’s new commitments, the entirety of the text is declarative since McDonald’s provides information on how it will change as a company in the future.

5.1.4 Modality

Modality signals possibility, permission or obligation and is expressed by modal auxiliary verbs, such as “may, might, must, should, can, can’t, ought, but also by various other formal features

including adverbs and tense.” (Fairclough 1989, 127-128). In the case of McDonald’s, the company attempts to convince the recipient of its message, which Fairclough refers to as *relational modality* (Fairclough 1989, 126). This is evident, as McDonald’s attempts to convince the recipient of these new and improved commitments. However, in the text, McDonald’s does not utilise a single modal auxiliary verb (cf. Appendix 1). This enables two potential interpretations. First, as modality signals possibility, McDonald’s eliminates any uncertainty regarding what the company commits itself to. However, as modality also signals obligation, McDonald’s neither signals any obligation to fully commit to these statements. For instance, if McDonald’s had stated that its chicken suppliers ‘should’ or ‘must’ provide the chickens with more space, it would indicate different certainties of the statement. However, McDonald’s does utilise other verbs which describe a level of possibility or obligation to its message. For instance, in the 1. Commitment, McDonald’s states: “We plan to set targets (...)” (cf. Appendix 1, 1). The fact that McDonald’s ‘plans’ to do something implicitly implies that McDonald’s is not obligated to do so, which expresses uncertainty. However, in the 3. Commitment, McDonald’s states that it: “Require chickens to be raised in housing environments that promote natural behaviors (...)” (cf. Appendix 1, 1). The fact that McDonald’s ‘requires’ something from its chicken suppliers illustrates a strong commitment to the statement. However, as the requirement refers to housing environments that “promote natural behaviors”, it becomes a vague obligation once again, as McDonald’s simply requires the farms “to encourage or support” (Cambridge) natural behaviour. Hence, the statement does not illuminate any processes or features that are required in these environments.

5.1.5 The use of the personal pronoun ‘we’

Fairclough refers to two versions of the personal pronoun ‘we’, namely the ‘*inclusive*’ we and the ‘*exclusive*’ we (Fairclough 1989, 127). The ‘inclusive we’ implies that the sender ‘includes’ the recipient in the statement, whereas the ‘exclusive we’ refers to the sender and others, but not the recipient (Fairclough 1989, 127). According to Fairclough, by utilising the inclusive we, it becomes a matter of power, as sender claims an implicit authority that “sender has the authority to speak for others.” (Fairclough 1989, 128).

McDonald’s utilises the personal pronoun ‘we’ ten times in its text (cf. Appendix 1). Each utilisation is in the form of the exclusive we, as McDonald’s solely refers to the people behind the company. However, occasionally McDonald’s refers to itself as a company, for instance in the headline: “McDonald’s Announces (...)”, which refers to McDonald’s as a single unit. This is evident as the addition of the letter ‘s’ in the verb ‘to announce’ implies third person singular in the

simple present tense, and thus relates to he/she or *it*, which is the case here. McDonald's use of the exclusive we often indicates certain ideological values, which can be observed in the following examples;

“(…) *the core* of who we *are* and what we *stand for*.”

“We're *proud* to share the following (…)”

“(…) we *believe* these commitments (…)”

The first example portrays McDonald's as a community in which the people share common core ideologies. The second example illustrates that this 'community' has shared feelings – they feel proud to share this with us. The third example indicates the 'community' has shared beliefs – they all believe in these commitments. These statements display McDonald's as a place of unity, by implicitly including both the capitalist class and the workers of McDonald's.

The following section will provide an interpretation of grammatical features discovered in this section, in relation to the meaning behind their production and potential consumption.

5.2 Discourse Practice

At this level, I will examine the text for signs of intertextuality and interdiscursivity and interpret how these discourses relate to their production and potential consumption.

McDonald's text does not include any intertextuality in form of discourse representation, neither direct or indirect. It could be argued that McDonald's has excluded any external references, as this statement solely concerns McDonald's and its new commitments. However, in the introduction, McDonald's mentions once that it has been working with NGOs for more than a decade, and in the 8. Commitment, McDonald's states it has established an advisory council which includes “animal welfare and environmental advocates” (cf. Appendix 1, 2). Both statements could have been supported by including the names of the related NGOs and a quotation from them. Such a quotation could have displayed that external 'experts' in the field of animal welfare support McDonald's and are seeing progress. In the context section, we established that McDonald's only mentions one NGO, namely World Wildlife Fund (WWF), which McDonald's has been collaborating with since 2010 (McD Chicken Timeline 2019). Thus, it could be argued that McDonald's attempts to exaggerate how many NGOs it has been working with and for how long, since this statement was published in 2017 (cf. Appendix 1, 1). This indicates an implicit authority claim, as McDonald's has constructed a social reality through this text in which the company has “more than a decade” (cf. Appendix 1, 1) experience of working with animal welfare organisations to improve its

processes. This implies that McDonald's has a lot of knowledge in this field and that its current animal welfare policies have been approved by animal rights organisations. Thus, by claiming that said policies will be improved implicitly indicates that McDonald's chickens will receive state of the art welfare.

In relation to interdiscursivity, the *genre* of the text is a public relations statement. This can be observed as the activity in the text entails an organisation that provides information to the public. The *style* of the text includes elements of being 'informal written', which can be observed, among others, as McDonald's utilises contractions, such as "We're" and "What's" (cf. Appendix 1) instead of the phrases 'we are' and 'what is'. However, the text also includes styles which appear formal, such as the statement in the 7. Commitment: "Complete an assessment by the end of 2018 to measure the feasibility of extending these commitments to the remaining global markets where McDonald's operates." (cf. Appendix 1, 2). In this statement, McDonald's describes a corporate objective in a formal discourse and refers to itself in the third person singular – "where McDonald's operates" rather than 'where we operate'. As established in the first dimension, McDonald's often utilise the personal pronoun 'we' to express certain desirable corporate ideologies. Thus, it could be interpreted that McDonald's refers to itself as a company in this case, as the statement does not express any norms, values or beliefs that McDonald's attempts to display itself of possessing to the recipient. This implies that McDonald's may have had an underlying motive when producing the text - portraying itself as an ethical company, which could be an indication that McDonald's seeks the approval of the recipients. In relation to the *rhetorical mode*, the discourse is descriptive which implies how McDonald's may perceive the recipients' *members' resources* (MR) in the process of producing the text. For instance, in the 4. Commitment, McDonald's elaborate of different elements that its new trails will incorporate, in which McDonald's, among others, states: "stocking density (space allowance)" (cf. Appendix 1, 1). In this statement, McDonald's elaborates upon the meaning of 'stocking density', which can be interpreted in two way. First, it could be that 'stocking density' is the terminology in this line of business, and thus, McDonald's do not consider that all recipients will understand the meaning, and therefore, it provides a brief explanation. However, it could also be interpreted that when McDonald's produced the text, it considered that animal rights activists would be part of the recipients, and thus, the terminology "space allowance" provides a more positive image than "stocking density". Space allowance indicates that the chickens will receive more space, as the context concerns improvement. Whereas, an animal rights activist may interpret 'stocking density' as an implicit indication that McDonald's perceives chickens as a commodity

that can be cramped together like items in stock, which would create negative associations. By providing both terminologies it appears as if it is not solely McDonald's who refers to animals' space as 'stocking density'. In other situations, McDonald's does not provide a description. For instance, when McDonald's refers to its collaboration with "NGOs" in the introduction, McDonald's does not elaborate upon the abbreviation of non-governmental organisations. This implies that McDonald's considers the recipients of the text to have MR that would make it redundant to explain the meaning.

Thus, it could be interpreted that McDonald's had identified animal rights organisations as part of the *ideal subject* in the production of this text.

As the empirical data of this thesis illustrates, this was a correct assessment by McDonald's as several rights organisations have since commented on the communication of this text. To achieve a profound understanding of NGOs interpretation of McDonald's statement, an analysis of their response will be conducted in the following section.

5.3 Textual Analysis of NGOs response to McDonald's Chicken Welfare Announcement

As mentioned in the context section, the NGOs referred to as the authors of this article are: Animal Equality, Compassion in World Farming, Compassion over Killing, Mercy for Animals, the Humane League and World Animal Protection.

At this level, I will examine the same five grammatical features that were explored at the first level of the previous analysis, which will facilitate the interpretation of how these two texts differ. The five sections are; expressive values of words and sentences, cohesion and ideologically based structures in vocabulary, modes of sentence, modality and the use of the personal pronoun 'we' in the text.

5.3.1 Expressive values of words and sentences

The headline of the NGOs' article is: "The Truth About McDonald's & Animal Welfare." (cf. Appendix 2). In this sentence, the noun 'truth' expresses a sense of righteousness, as implies that the following text will be correct and transparent. Besides the mentioning of 'animal welfare' in the headline, the following time the noun 'animal' is mentioned, it is in connection with:

"Unfortunately, [McDonald's] statement lacks the meaningful reforms needed to address the most pressing animal cruelty problems" (cf. Appendix 2, 2). The shift from the concept of animal welfare to animal cruelty provides this sentence with a lot of negative value. First, the initiation of "the most pressing" expresses that the message is a matter of significant urgency. If an element 'presses' against a surface, it implies that something has to be done before the surface breaks. Thus, as this

phrase refers to “animal cruelty problems”, it entails that something must be done quickly. Additionally, the noun ‘problem’ is already a negatively loaded word, at it implies that something is not right, and therefore, needs to be solved. However, in this sequence, it is accompanied by ‘cruelty’, which emphasises the negative expressive value of the sentence. The word ‘cruelty’ is a nounification of the adjective ‘cruel’, which Cambridge Dictionary defines as: “extremely unkind and unpleasant and causing pain to people or animals intentionally.” (Cambridge). Thus, the statement implies that the urgency of the problem is grounded in the fact that some people deliberately are causing pain to animals. By referring to such problems in a statement that relates to McDonald’s, it implies that are the ones who are intentionally causing pain to these animals.

These negatively loaded words and sentences are consistent throughout the text in various levels of expressional value. In some instances, the negative expressions are very explicit, such as: “Because these genetically manipulated Frankenbirds are killed at only about 6 weeks old, they are still developing” (cf. Appendix 2, 2). In this sentence, the chickens are referred to as “genetically manipulated Frankenbirds”, which implies that humans have made scientific experiments on them, which has caused them to become monsters. Subsequently, it is stated that these birds are “killed at only about 6 weeks old”, which expresses a negative value, as it implies that they are killed too early.

In other instances, the negative value is expressed in a passive-aggressive manner, such as in the section “Now, The Good News”, which contains the following statement: “Improvements are available and are being implemented by nearly 100 major food companies, including McDonald’s competitors.” (cf. Appendix 2, 2). By illuminating several improvements followed by the exclusion of McDonald’s, it implicitly expresses how everyone is making progress, except for McDonald’s.

5.3.2 Cohesion and ideologically based structures in vocabulary

In this text, the authors utilise a variety of words to describe the chickens’ physical conditions that would also be applicable to human conditions. For instance, they refer to the chickens as being ‘killed’ (cf. Appendix 2, 2) rather than ‘slaughtered’ which is the word utilised to describe the killing of animals for meat (Cambridge). Additionally, they mention physical conditions such as; heart attacks, broken legs, crippling deformities, etc. (cf. Appendix 2, 2), which are conditions that can all occur to humans, and thus, may be more relatable to the recipient. This indicates that the authors consider chickens to be more than a commodity utilised to process food, hence, value animal welfare.

When the authors describe the statement presented by McDonald's (Appendix 1), they often refer to it as 'vague' or to 'lack' certain elements (cf. Appendix 2). The word 'vague' is mentioned seven times, while 'lack' is mentioned four times throughout the text - each time to describe the authors' perception of McDonald's statement (cf. Appendix 2, 2). This cohesion provides an indication of what the authors consider to be the problem with McDonald's statement.

5.3.3 Modes of sentence

Like McDonald's statement, this text has many declarative aspects, as it seeks to describe its stand on chicken welfare. As the headline of the text included 'truth' the declarative mode can be observed as a sign of power exercising, as it creates an implicit claim or the authors' perception to be the right one. Additionally, this text introduces imperative clauses, which Fairclough refers to as *grammatical questions*, which occurs when the sender asks the recipient for information (Fairclough 1989, 126). There is a total of 15 questions in the text, of which 14 questions McDonald's practices. Even though, the text does not explicitly address the recipient by utilising the personal pronoun 'you', it could still implicitly refer to the reader of the text. However, the questions could also imply that the authors present these imperative clauses to 'think out loud'. Regardless, the authors attempt to raise questions regarding the statements made by McDonald's, and thus, the readers may consequently ask themselves the same questions. For instance, in a response to McDonald's 1. Commitment (cf. Appendix 1, 1), the authors state: "What are the outcomes McDonald's will measure? How are those outcomes set? When will McDonald's set targets? How will it measure performance? What are the "key" issues it will cover?" (cf. Appendix 2, 3). The repetitiveness of presenting five questions in a row in a response to one commitment emphasises how questionable the authors perceives McDonald's commitment to be. This can also be interpreted as a sign of power struggle, as it appears as if the authors demand a more profound answer from McDonald's.

5.3.4 Modality

In McDonald's case, it was discovered that the text encompassed the *relational modality*, as McDonald's attempts convince the recipient of its message. In this text, the authors also attempt to convince the recipient of their perspective, however, they are also attempting to establish an "authority with respect to the truth or probability of a representation of reality", which Fairclough refers to as *expressive modality* (Fairclough 1989, 127). This is evident as the entire text revolves around the authors' critical approach to McDonald's representation of its socially constructed

reality, and how they attempt to establish authority by claiming their perspective to be the “truth” (Appendix 2).

The authors utilise three different modal auxiliary verbs in the text, namely ‘should’, ‘can’ and its opposite ‘can’t’. The authors utilise ‘should’ in the following statement: “(...) we believe that McDonald's is ignoring the already existing scientific research and evidence that tells us what the targets *should* be for welfare outcomes.” (cf. Appendix 2, 3). This use of a modal auxiliary verb signals obligation, as the authors claim that there are more optimal animal welfare objectives than those presented by McDonald’s, and thus, McDonald’s should change its objective. To support this argument, the authors provide the following statement: “peer-reviewed science as basic environmental improvements that *can* have significant effects on the welfare of chickens.” (cf. Appendix 2, 3). This use of ‘can’ regards probability and implies that the authors’ claim is not completely certain. Hence, the authors presented improvements *can* have an effect. Thus, the authors disclaim a certain responsibility for peer-reviewed science which does not have an effect. Finally, the authors utilise the modal auxiliary ‘can’t’ in the following sentence: “all McDonald’s is saying is that its suppliers *can’t* abuse birds in ways that are so cruel that all of the E.U. has already banned them.” (cf. Appendix 2, 6). In this sentence, ‘can’t’ refers to what the chicken suppliers can do by McDonald’s, and thus, concerns permission. However, it has a demeaning effect as it indicates that McDonald’s gives its chicken suppliers free rein to *abuse* their chickens if it is in compliance with the law.

5.3.5 The use of the personal pronoun ‘we’

When excluding quotes that contain the personal pronoun, the authors state ‘we’ a total of nine times in the text (cf. Appendix 2). Thus, albeit the text is almost three times as long as McDonald’s statement (12,032 characters compared to McDonald’s 4,406 characters), it is still one less use compared to McDonald’s. Additionally, as this text is produced by a group of NGOs, they do not once refer to themselves in the third person singular. This indicates that the NGOs are less focused on displaying their ‘personal’ perspective and ideologies compared to McDonald’s. Regarding whether the authors utilise the inclusive or exclusive ‘we’, they provide the following information:

We, the above animal protection charities - representing tens of millions of people - are deeply concerned about this and, in light of McDonald’s PR statements, feel obliged to clarify what the company is and is not doing. (cf. Appendix 2, 2).

The quotation is written below the logos of the six NGOs behind the text, and thus, “the above animal protection charities” refers to said NGOs. In this quotation, it can be observed that the authors include “tens of millions of people” when they refer to ‘we’. It is interpreted that these millions of people are the sum of all the members of the NGOs combined. This indicates an implicit authority claim, as the authors claim to have the power to speak on behalf of all these people. Thus, the authors attempt to strengthen the credibility of the entire text, as it does not simply represent the opinions of a few NGOs. By being represented by millions of people, the socially constructed reality in the text may be more likely to be interpreted as *common sense*, as the recipient is made aware that the presented ideologies are shared by millions of people.

5.4 Discourse Practice

At this level, I will once again examine the text for signs of intertextuality and interdiscursivity and interpret how these discourses relate to their production and potential consumption.

There is a vast presence of intertextuality in this text, as the authors present sections of direct discourse representations from McDonald’s statements (cf. Appendix 2, 3-6). Subsequently, in the authors’ response to McDonald’s statements, the authors once again utilise quotation marks to refer to specific parts of McDonald’s text. The fact that the authors utilise direct discourse representation, rather than indirect, strengthens their credibility, as the recipient is not left to question if the authors have changed the original statements to support their message (Fairclough 1992, 274).

There is also a notion of intertextuality in relation to how the authors have labelled the breed of broiler chickens as “genetically manipulated Frankenbirds” (cf. Appendix 2, 2). First, it is similar to how genetically engineered potatoes were labelled “Frankenfoods”, in the 1990s, after genetically modified foods had received massive media attention (Schlosser 2005, 267). Second, the source of intertextuality in both cases derives from the Frankenstein novel (Shelley 1968). The story of Frankenstein regards a professor who creates a monster in his laboratory that spreads terror, and thus, he regrets his invention (Shelley 1989). Hence, the moral of the story is that humans should not play god, as it will come back to haunt them. Thus, when the NGOs produced this text, they had the assumption that an ideal subject would at least have the concept of Frankenstein in its MR. However, the ideal subject would also be familiar with the term “Frankenfoods”, as it would be an individual who cares about social and environmental issues. Consequently, this use of intertextuality has hidden power, as recipients may have MR which immediately associates the breed with something negative, which supports the authors’ message.

In relations to interdiscursivity, the genre of the text is a public relations statement, as it still concerns an organisation that communicates information to the public.

The text is more academic compared to the style in McDonald's text. The authors use a formal language and refer to external literature on numerous occasions. This can be observed in the following quote: "For example, the input requirements for stocking density (to ensure birds aren't crammed as tightly together) is based on independent scientific research and consensus." (cf. Appendix 2, 2). This statement is presented before the text starts quoting McDonald's directly, however, it still compasses what may be either a coincidence or a subliminal hit at McDonald's. As explored in the Discourse Practice section of McDonald's text, McDonald's also presented a short definition of stock density, as it stated: "stocking density (space allowance)" (cf. Appendix 1, 1). Here, it was interpreted that McDonald's made such a definition as it considered NGOs to be among its ideal subject. Thus, it defined "stocking density" with the more positively loaded word "space allowance" so that such recipients would have a more positive interpretation of the text. In this regard, the NGOs definition of "stocking density" may be a sarcastic comment on McDonald's definition, as they also provide a definition, however, define it as "to ensure birds aren't crammed as tightly together" (cf. Appendix 2, 2). This definition implies that the chickens are currently crammed together and that an improvement would be to lessen the extent. By stating "crammed tightly", it provides the recipient with a figurative picture of poor living conditions, which associates the phrase 'stocking density' with a negative meaning. Intentional or not, the difference between the two texts' definitions illustrate how the two separate senders attempt to ascribe different expressive values to identical words or phrases, such as 'stocking density', to support their respective messages.

5.5 Social Practice Analysis

In this section, I will discuss the *social conditions* in relation to the production and interpretation of the two texts, which exists at three levels, namely; the situational, institutional and societal levels (Fairclough 1989, 25). The situational and institutional level of these two texts is lumped together, as both situations are public relations statements that refer to institutional objectives, values, beliefs, etc. However, certain differences can still be inferred.

As argued in the analysis of the two texts, McDonald's attempts to explain itself and how it is committed to improving chicken welfare, while the NGOs are unsatisfied with McDonald's "vague" statements and demands that McDonald's provides more specific action. It could be argued that as McDonald's is a company its primary objective is to generate revenue, and thus, any

improvement to animal welfare should be greeted by animal welfare organisations. However, the power relations in these two texts display the contrary. The discourse is more similar to an examination, in which the NGOs constitute a teacher and examiner that ask McDonald's to elaborate, while McDonald's is using general terms in an attempt to defend its project. When McDonald's is proud of its 'project' it takes responsibility by utilising the personal pronoun 'we', whereas in vague statements such as when the company 'plans to' do something, it disclaims responsibility by referring to the company. These power relations are shaped by the societal level, which has subsequently affected the institutional level.

First, as discovered in the sections of both animal welfare and CSR communication, stakeholders' and consumers' demand for corporations to justify themselves and improve animal welfare conditions is increasing (cf. Section 2.2). As this perspective is coherent with the ideology of animal welfare organisations, said organisations implicitly claim more authority, which changes the power relations at the societal level.

These changes at the societal level may have subsequently shaped companies' strategy at the institutional level, as some companies must communicate new social or environmental initiatives to gain the approval of society. In this sense, the concept of corporate legitimacy is becoming increasingly important, as companies must adapt to the changes that are socially constructed in the societies in which they operate. However, demanding that a company of McDonald's magnitude initiate immediate global changes may indicate how these increasing demands are becoming unrealistic. A company such as McDonald's could benefit from the concept on CSR as aspirational talk (cf. Section 2.3), as it could communicate aspirational ideologies on animal welfare to the company's global network of suppliers, which could consequently have a positive impact on the ideologies of these suppliers. However, I do not believe the issue concerns whether the farmers are deliberately being cruel to animals or not, but rather a question of the practices they must follow, which are ultimately stated and determined by McDonald's. Additionally, with the increasing interest in corporate social actions and animal welfare, an increasing amount of people may become interested in the concept of greenwashing, and thus, develop an interest in examining corporate communication for discrepancies or share related stories of corporate hypocrisy on social media. If a company is exposed to bad publicity, it can have multiple economical consequences such as boycotts or investors who may withdraw their funding, as they perceive it as a bad investment. An example can be observed in form of the investor letter that was illuminated in the context section (cf. Section 3.3), in which one of McDonald's largest investors told the company to change its

chicken policies due to massive media attention. The extent of the media attention can be observed on the website created by NGOs (www.truthaboutmcdonaldschicken.com), in which the NGOs refer to 46 news articles from 41 different media channels that revolve around McDonald's and its chicken welfare policies.

Furthermore, there appears to be a struggle between the two constructed realities in the way in which they perceive animal welfare. McDonald's appears to possess the "Industrial/Rational world-view", which implies that nature is imperfect, and that science is needed to achieve an ideal state of animal welfare (cf. Section 2.2). This is evident as McDonald's communicate animal welfare outcomes in relation to science, for instance in its 2. Commitment, titled: "Innovative On-Farm Animal Health and Welfare Monitoring Technologies." (cf. Appendix 1, 1). This statement illustrates how McDonald's consider animal welfare to be a question regarding the health of animals and how an ideal state is achieved through technology. Additionally, McDonald's defining stocking density as 'space allowance' implies a physical condition rather than emotional. On the contrary, the NGOs appear to possess the "Romantic/Agrarian world-view", as this perspective emphasises the emotions of animals and their freedom (cf. Section 2.2). This is again evident in the NGOs definition of stocking density as: "to ensure birds aren't crammed as tightly together" (cf. Appendix 2, 2). This definition emphasises the uncomfortable feeling of not being able to move freely, and thus, relates to the emotions of these chickens. Thus, a struggle between the two texts at the situational level concern the respective institutions' MR, in relation to how they define the ideal state of animal welfare, as it is shaped by the ideologies at the institutional level. Hence, in the fast-food industry, animals' well-being may be perceived as a matter of health, whereas activists compare it to a broader spectrum of requirements. Thus, it appears as if McDonald's has a normative approach to MR, as the discourse seeks to preserve the current industrial perception of animal welfare. It could be argued that McDonald's seeks to maintain this social reality, as the incorporation of the "Romantic/Agrarian world-view" in its suppliers' operations would entail an increase in the cost of chicken meat. The NGOs has a creative approach to MR, as the discourse attempts to transform the way in which recipients will interpret McDonald's statement and its approach to animal welfare. However, the NGOs discourse is not creative in respect to their own MR, as the discourse does not question the ideological position of the authors, but solely the position in the intertextual elements included from McDonald's text. Thus, the discourse in the NGOs text does attempt to transform the power relations at the industrial and societal level, by claiming an implicit authority. The increasing public interest in animal welfare may be the root of

the massive exposure of McDonald's chicken welfare policies in the media (cf. Section 3.3). As the NGOs were aware of the public attention to said topic, they might have produced the text to facilitate a momentum of public support. This would benefit the NGOs, as it could potentially lead to the acquirement of new members, as they represent the common sense in the form of the ideology that animals should not be abused.

6.0 Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis was to explore how McDonald's could construct a social reality in its public relations statement which portrays the company as committed to animal welfare when NGOs report that chickens are exposed to cruelty at the farms of McDonald's suppliers. The text selected to represent the NGOs' perspective in the debate is produced by six different animal welfare organisations, such as the global NGO World Animal Protection (WAP).

In the analysis, different hidden ideologies were inferred from the respective senders' ascription of different expressive values and meanings to identical words and phrases, such as 'stocking density' which is a phrase that both senders refer to. McDonald's positive definition of the phrase (space allowance) does not illuminate the current conditions, however, implies that the chickens will receive more space. Thus, this description supports McDonald's message, as it portrays McDonald's as a company that is committed to improving chicken welfare beyond what is required by law.

The NGOs negative definition of the phrase (to ensure birds aren't crammed as tightly together) indicates that the chickens are currently raised in overcrowded environments, and thus, an improvement will solely entail that the conditions will not be *as* immoral. Thus, by associating the phrase with a state of not being able to move due to overcrowding, it supports the NGOs' message of the issues with McDonald's practices.

However, these definitions may not have been constructed on the situational level simply to strengthen the senders' respective messages. The different interpretations of animal welfare may derive from societal perceptions of animal welfare, which have been incorporated in the institutional level of both organisations. These societal perceptions differ in their concept of how and when the ideal state of animal welfare is accomplished. McDonald's may genuinely perceive the social phenomena of animal welfare through an Industrial/Rational world-view, which implies that nature is imperfect, and that science is needed to achieve an ideal state of animal welfare, as it concerns the health of animals. Thus, McDonald's focus on improving its technologies may reflect

how the company is striving to achieve welfare for its chickens.

Contrary to McDonald's industrial ideology, the NGOs may possess the Romantic/Agrarian world-view, as this perspective emphasises the emotions of animals and their freedom. Therefore, the NGOs believe that McDonald's is not addressing the 'real' issues, as they regard animal welfare as well-being in the psychological sense.

Thus, to end the debate, there would need to be established a consensus between the industry and animal rights activists, regarding the definition of animal welfare and transparency from companies in relation to what can be required from them to still function as a profitable business. However, for companies to agree to such demands, it could be argued that public pressure, and its reputational and financial consequences, would have to exceed the required corporate investments.

7.0 Bibliography

- Bazillier, Rémi and Vauday, Julien. 2013. "The Greenwashing Machine: is CSR more than Communication." *Hal archives-ouvertes*. HAL Id: hal-00448861
- Benn, Suzanne, Dunphy, Dexter, & Griffiths, Andrew. 2014. "Organizational Change for Corporate Sustainability." 3rd edition; *Routledge*, London. pp: 157-160
- Block, Kitty. "Our Unhappy Meals campaign puts McDonald's on alert to end chicken cruelty." *The Humane Society of the United States*. June 21, 2018
<https://blog.humanesociety.org/2018/06/unhappy-meals-campaign-puts-mcdonalds-alert-end-chicken-cruelty.html>
- Cambridge. n.d. "Make your words meaningful." *Cambridge Dictionary*. Accessed May 31, 2019
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
- Change Chickens. n.d. "Tell McDonald's: Do Better for Chickens." *Change.org*. Accessed March 25, 2019.
<https://www.change.org/p/do-better-for-chickens>
- Christensen, Lars and Morsing, Mette and Thyssen Ole. 2013. "CSR as Aspirational Talk." *Sage Publications* vol. 20 no. 3: 372-393. DOI: 10.1177/1350508413478310.
- CIWF Broilers. n.d. "The Life of: Broiler chickens." *Compassion in World Farming*. Last Updated: 1 Maj, 2013
<https://www.ciwf.org.uk/media/5235306/The-life-of-Broiler-chickens.pdf>
- Collin, Finn & Kjøppe, Simon. 2012. "Humanistisk videnskabsteori." *DR Multimedie*.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2001. "Language and power." 2nd edition. *Harlow: Pearson Education Limited*
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. "Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis." *The University of Lancaster. Linguistics and Education* 4: 269-293.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. "Language and Power." 10th ed. *New York: Longman, Inc.*
ISBN: 0-582-01133-8

FDA antibiotics. 2018. "Antimicrobial Resistance." *U.S. Food & Drug Administration*. Last modified September 17, 2018.

<https://www.fda.gov/animal-veterinary/safety-health/antimicrobial-resistance>

Foucault, Michel. 1977. "Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison." *Pantheon Books*. ISBN-10: 0-394-49942-5

Fraser, David. 2008. "Understanding Animal Welfare." *Acta Veterinaria Scandinavica* 50, no. S1. DOI:10.1186/1751-0147-50-s1-s1.

Freeman, Carrie Packwood. 2010. "Framing Animal Rights in the "Go Veg" Campaigns of U.S. Animal Rights Organizations." *Society & Animals* 18, no. 2: 163-82. DOI:10.1163/156853010x492015.

Freeman, R. Edward. 1984. "Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach." *Boston: Pitman*.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. "Theory of Communicative Action. Volume One: Reason and the Rationalization of Society." *Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press*. ISBN 978-0-8070-1507-0.

Harjoto, M., Laksmana, I. & Lee, R. 2015. "Board Diversity and Corporate Social Responsibility." *Journal of Business Ethics* 132, no. 4. DOI:10.1007/s10551-014-2343-0

HSUS Chicken. n.d. "Protecting Chickens Used for Meat." *The Humane Society of the United States*. Accessed April 21, 2019.

<https://www.humanesociety.org/issues/protecting-chickens-used-meat>

HSUS Mission. n.d. "Our Mission." *The Humane Society of the United States*. Accessed April 21, 2019.

<https://www.humanesociety.org/our-mission>

Humane League. n.d. "What's really inside your child's Happy Meal?" *The Humane League*. Accessed April 25, 2019.

Kalof, L. and Fitzgerald, A. 2007. "The Animals Reader: The Essential Classic and Contemporary Writings." *Oxford and New York: Berg*.

Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen. 1996. "Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design." *Psychology Press*. ISBN: 0-415-10599-4.

Miele, Mara & Bock, Bettina. 2007. "Competing Discourses of Farm Animal Welfare and Agri-Food Restructuring." *International Journal of Sociology of Food and Agriculture* 15, no. 3. ISSN: 0798-1759.

McD Chicken. n.d. "Responsibly sourced Chicken." *Corporate McDonald's*. Accessed March 19, 2019.

<https://corporate.mcdonalds.com/corpmcd/scale-for-good/our-food/chicken.html>

McD Chicken Policy. 2017. "McDonald's Animal Health & Welfare Update." *Corporate McDonald's*, August 2017.

<https://corporate.mcdonalds.com/content/dam/gwscorp/scale-for-good/CHICKEN%20-%20McD%20Animal%20HW%20Update%20Aug%202017.pdf>

McD Chicken Timeline. n.d. "Chicken Sustainability – We're on a journey to build a better McDonald's." *Corporate McDonald's*. Accessed April 5, 2019.

https://corporate.mcdonalds.com/content/dam/gwscorp/scale-for-good/CHICKEN_McDonalds-Chicken-Sustainability-Timeline.pdf

McD ESG performance. n.d. "Progress and Performance." *Corporate McDonald's*. Accessed March 19, 2019.

<https://corporate.mcdonalds.com/corpmcd/scale-for-good/esg-reporting/progress-and-performance.html>

McD ESG reporting. n.d. "Our ESG reporting." *Corporate McDonald's*. Accessed March 19, 2019.

<https://corporate.mcdonalds.com/corpmcd/scale-for-good/esg-reporting.html>

McD News Scale for Good. n.d. "Scale for Good." *News McDonald's*. Accessed March 19, 2019.

<https://news.mcdonalds.com/stories/using-our-scale-for-good>

McD Our Approach. n.d. "Our Approach." *Corporate McDonald's*. Accessed March 19, 2019.

<https://corporate.mcdonalds.com/corpmcd/scale-for-good/using-our-scale-for-good.html>

McD Stakeholders. n.d. "Engaging Stakeholders." *Corporate McDonald's*. Accessed April 11, 2019.

<https://corporate.mcdonalds.com/corpmcd/scale-for-good/using-our-scale-for-good/engaging-stakeholders.html>

- Nielsen, Anne Ellerup, and Christa Thomsen. 2018. "Reviewing Corporate Social Responsibility Communication: A Legitimacy Perspective." *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* 23, no. 4: 492-511. doi:10.1108/ccij-04-2018-0042.
- Prickett, W. Robert. 2007. "Consumer Preferences for Farm Animal Welfare: Results from a Telephone Survey of U.S Households." *Oklahoma State University*.
- Roepstorff, K, Anne. 2010. "CSR. Virksomheders sociale ansvar som begreb og praksis." *Hans Reizels forlag*. ISBN: 978-87-412-5349-7
- Rogers, Rebecca, Elizabeth Malancharuvil-Berkes, Melissa Mosley, Diane Hui, and Glynis O'Garro Joseph. 2005. "Critical Discourse Analysis in Education: A Review of the Literature." *Review of Educational Research* 75(3): 365-416.
ISSN: 0034-6543
- Schlosser, Eric. 1998. "Fast-Food Nation Part One: The True Cost of America's Diet." *Rolling Stone*. September 3, 1998. Accessed March 15, 2019.
<https://www.rollingstone.com/culture/culture-news/fast-food-nation-part-one-the-true-cost-of-americas-diet-72563/>
- Schlosser, Eric. 2005. "Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the All-American Meal." *New York: Harper Perennial*.
- Shanker, Deena. 2018. "McDonald's Gets a Warning From New York's Pension Fund Over Chickens." *Bloomberg*. September 21, 2018.
<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-09-21/mcdonald-s-gets-a-warning-from-new-york-s-pension-fund-over-chickens>
- Shelley, Mary. 1968. "Frankenstein" *Penguin English Library*.
- Singer, P. 1975. "Animal Liberation." *London: Cape*.
- Unhappy Meals. n.d. "The Truth About McDonald's and Animal Welfare." *The Humane Society of the United States*. Accessed April 13, 2019.
<https://unhappymeals.com/background.html>
- UNPRI ESG issues. n.d. "ESG issues." Accessed March 28, 2019.
<https://www.unpri.org/esg-issues>

UNPRI principles. n.d. “What are the Principles for Responsible Investment?” Accessed March 27, 2019.

<https://www.unpri.org/pri/what-are-the-principles-for-responsible-investment>

USDA. 2016. “Ground Beef and Food Safety.” *United States Department of Agriculture*. February 29, 2016. Accessed March 18, 2019.

<https://www.fsis.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsis/topics/food-safety-education/get-answers/food-safety-fact-sheets/meat-preparation/ground-beef-and-food-safety>

van Dijk, Teun A. 1993. “Principles of critical discourse analysis.” *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 249-283. DOI: 10.1177/0957926593004002006

van Dijk, Teun A. 2004. “From Text Grammar to Critical Discourse Analysis: A brief academic autobiography.” *Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona*. Version 2.0.

Wodak, Ruth. 1996. “Disorders of discourse.” *London: Longman*. ISBN: 0582099560

8.0 Appendices

The appendices have been uploaded in PDF format together with the thesis.

Information:

Appendix 1. “McDonald’s Announces Commitments to Advancements in Chicken Welfare.” News McDonald’s. October 27, 2017.

<https://news.mcdonalds.com/stories/our-food-details/advancements-in-chicken-welfare#>

Appendix 2. “The Truth About McDonald’s & Animal Welfare.” The Truth About McDonald’s Chickens. Accessed March 27, 2019.

https://truthaboutmcdonaldschicken.com/mcdonalds_backgrounder.pdf