

A Social Media Policy Analysis: The Classification and Comparison of Social Media
Policies within Fortune 50 Companies

Kelsey L. Frank

Oklahoma State University

Table of Contents

1. Abstract	1
2. Introduction	2
3. Model	3
4. Social Media Policy Category Findings	
4.1 Employee Conduct.....	6
4.2 Legal Issues.....	9
5. Industry Findings	
5.1 Retail Trade.....	12
5.2 Finance and Insurance.....	14
5.3 Manufacturing, Wholesale Trade, and Information.....	15
6. Discussion	16
7. Conclusion	18
8. Works Cited	20

Abstract

In order to determine what methods companies are employing to account for increased social media utilization, the social media policies of the top 50 companies from the Fortune 500 list for the year 2018 were analyzed and categorized. The specific policy categories utilized were based on the findings of a 2010 study conducted by the Center for Technology in Government, in which eight social media policy categories were identified (employee access, account management, acceptable use, employee conduct, content, security, legal issues, and citizen conduct). The two most heavily utilized categories (employee conduct and legal issues) were the focus of this study, and they were analyzed through a technique known as text mining, which was used to return the most frequently used words within each compiled set of data. This research compared the verbiage of policies within the two aforementioned categories, and the results of this research found that social media policies within the employee conduct category (which 34 of the 50 companies had some form of) primarily utilized active, positive words including, but not limited to, “conduct,” “treat,” and “tolerated” to warn against making rude or inappropriate comments/posts on social media. On the other hand, social media policies within the legal issues category (47 companies) were generally more concerned with protecting company and consumer information (frequently used words included “confidential,” “financial,” and “trademark”).

A Social Media Policy Analysis: The Classification and Comparison of Social Media Policies within Fortune 50 Companies

Introduction

As social media outlets have become increasingly interwoven in the everyday lives of those with the ability to access them, companies have been forced to weigh the potential benefits and risks associated with these booming applications. Social media is defined by Meriam Webster as “forms of electronic communication (such as websites for social networking and microblogging) through which users create online communities to share information, ideas, personal messages, and other content (such as videos),” and the most frequently used social media outlets in the United States include (in descending order) are YouTube, Facebook, Instagram, Pinterest, Snapchat, LinkedIn, Twitter, and WhatsApp (Smith 2018). Social media policies are a relatively new element of interest within company policy documents, but they are undoubtedly necessary based on a sudden increase in social media usage over the last decade. Specifically, based on a 2015 study published by Pew Research Center, social media usage rose from approximately 7% in 2005 to 65% in 2015 among American adults (Perrin 2015).

As employee use of social media sites and applications has increased, the risk of a legal or ethical infraction occurring at the hands of employees, either unintentionally or deliberately, due to the posting of information to one or more social media outlets has increased. Statistically, younger generations of Americans utilize social media applications more frequently than older age groups, a fact which holds especially true for American adults between 18 and 24 years of age. To be exact, a study conducted by Pew Research Center and published in 2018 indicated that among those surveyed, social media sites such as YouTube (the social media site with the highest rate of utilization) were utilized by 94% of individuals within the age category of 18- to

24-years-old (the youngest age group studied), with subsequent age groups (25-29, 30-49, and 50+) each showing a lower percentage of overall usage than the preceding age group. Over the last two years, as these young Americans have moved into the workforce, the frequency of lawsuits concerning images or information found on social media and mobile devices has increased by 52% (Half 2017). Such statistics emphasize the importance of this study's purpose, which is the determination of what methods companies are employing to account for increased social media utilization by employees both on and off the clock.

Model

In order to analyze the specific policies implemented by companies within the data set, all publicly available company policy documents (which could be obtained digitally) were examined. These documents were often contained in the form of broad policy manuals (such as a code of ethics or an employee conduct manual) which was posted to the company's website, though some companies published their social media policies as independent web pages separate from their general policy manuals. If the company being analyzed had a policy which met the criteria outlined by the Center for Technology in Government for one or more of the previously described policy categories (of which there were eight), then the policy category in question would be marked with a "1" for that company, and the specific policy (from the company's policy document) would be copied over to a spreadsheet containing other policies belonging to that particular policy category. The data compiled during this phase of research was text mined in various ways throughout the project using the programming language R and its corresponding software program. After all data regarding the eight outlined social media policy categories had been obtained and sorted as appropriate, it was determined that the focus of this paper would be upon the two most prevalent social media policy categories. Namely, these policy categories

were (1) employee conduct, and (2) legal issues. As such, in order to delve further into the policies within these categories, the companies for the data set were grouped together on the basis of industry and text mined further. The industries assigned to each company were based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), which is a classification standard accepted and utilized by federal statistical agencies for purposes relating to the classification of businesses within the U.S. (“North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Main Page”). The top five most predominant industries were determined to be, in descending order: retail trade (17), finance and insurance (10), manufacturing (5), wholesale trade (5), and information (4). The descriptions assigned to each industry by the NAICS are as follows:

Table 1: NAICS descriptions for the analyzed industries

NAICS Industry Descriptions	
Retail Trade:	Activities of this sector are retailing merchandise generally in small quantities to the general public and providing services incidental to the sale of the merchandise.
Finance and Insurance:	Activities of this sector involve the creation, liquidation, or change in ownership of financial assets (financial transactions) and/or facilitating financial transactions.
Manufacturing:	Activities of this sector are the mechanical, physical, or chemical transformation of materials, substances, or components into new products.
Wholesale Trade:	Activities of this sector are selling or arranging for the purchase or sale of goods for resale; capital or durable non-consumer goods; and raw and intermediate materials and supplies used in production, and providing services incidental to the sale of the merchandise.
Information:	Activities of this sector are distributing information and cultural products, providing the means to transmit or distribute these products as data or communications, and processing data.

The industries outlined above were analyzed in order to determine a variety of factors, among which were (1) the number of companies within each industry that had implemented an employee conduct and/or legal issue policy, (2) the most frequently used terms within the employee conduct/legal issues policies utilized by companies within each industry (respectively), and (3) the semantics of the terms which appeared most frequently within the policy categories for each industry. Within this study, the term semantics refers to Osgood's three semantic dimensions as outlined within the Harvard IV dictionary (which has since merged with the Lasswell dictionary, and is now referred to as the General Inquirer) ("Descriptions of Inquirer Categories and Use of Inquirer Dictionaries"). The three semantic dimensions are as follows: positive (or good) vs. negative (or bad), strong vs. weak, and active vs. passive. Positive words either (1) denote certainty, or (2) invoke happy or pleasant emotions, while negative words imply the opposite (feelings of uncertainty, weakness, or sorrow). As for the remaining semantic categories, strong words carry more forceful, energetic, or influential meanings (with weak words implying the opposite), and active terms are associated with movements or actions (and passive terms concern a lack thereof). The twenty-five most frequently used words within each social media policy category/industry combination (employee conduct for retail trade, legal issues for retail trade, employee conduct for finance and insurance, etc.) were determined by text mining the compiled data for each possible category/industry combination, and the words returned were then marked as appropriate to indicate which of the aforementioned semantic categories they belonged to. Any given word could fall into 0, 1, 2, or 3 of the categories, as a word can only be marked as one of the options within each "vs." category (can be positive or negative, but not both), and is able to fall under multiple "vs." categories (can be positive and active, etc.), but also may not carry any semantic meaning. Words which did not carry any

semantic meaning were grayed-out within the Excel models utilized, and did not contribute to the overall semantic totals of any categories. Once finalized, the utilization of specific semantic categories within each social media policy category/industry combination was analyzed, and the findings for both the social media policy categories and industries are detailed below under their corresponding headers.

Employee Conduct

Employee conduct is one of the eight social media policy categories outlined in the white paper by the Center for Technology in Government, and this category is comprised of policies relating to topics such as “respecting the rules of the venue, striving for transparency and openness in interactions, and being respectful in all online interactions,” as well as other policies dealing with “...an expectation of “trust” that employees will provide professional-level comments or content whether in their professional or personal lives” (Hrdinová, Jana, et al. 2010). Rather than creating a dedicated social media policy to guide employee behavior, many companies chose to instead utilize a general statement advising employees to adhere to the company’s code of ethics. Two examples of this decision are DowDuPont’s use of the statement “Adhere to Dow’s Values in all authorized business communications,” and Google’s use of the statement “When communicating, keep in mind our Google Values. Respect the user, respect the opportunity, and respect each other” (“The Diamond Standard - Living Our Values Every Day” 2010; “Google Code of Conduct” 2018).

Another notable element of this category of social media policies pertains to the time frame in which they are applicable. In order to account for the fact that posts made by company employees during their personal time (either during breaks at work or while off the clock) can have a negative impact upon their employer’s reputation, employee conduct policies are often

stated as being applicable to all social media usage. One example of a policy designed to cover off-hour posts on social media can be found in the social media policy implemented by Berkshire Hathaway, which states that “Ultimately, you are solely responsible for what you post online. Harassment, bullying, discrimination or retaliation, as defined in the relevant company policies, that would not be permissible in the workplace is not permissible online, even if it is done after hours, from home or on personal devices” (“Employee Conduct and Business Ethics - Social Media”). Likewise, UnitedHealth Group has implemented a policy warning employees who post or publish content onto social media sites that they should “...exercise good judgment and follow the Company’s Guidelines for Social Media Use,” and that the aforementioned guideline applies to both use of social media at work and “...social media activity outside of the Company” (“Code of Conduct - Communications”).

Results from text mining the compiled policies within this category indicate that some of the most commonly utilized words within this type of social media policy were “conduct,” “harassment,” “respect,” and “offensive,” and the most frequent variant of this policy category (within the 50 companies analyzed) concerned the avoidance of malicious, rude, or inappropriate language for written posts on any/all social media sites while employed by the company. Out of the 34 companies found to possess at least a single policy within the employee conduct policy category, 24 had published a policy concerning the avoidance of the improper or malicious content, especially in regards to anti-harassment and anti-discrimination policies enforced by the company. In comparison, only 19 companies had at least one policy encouraging employees to act in a positive manner through social media. Out of these 19 companies with policies encouraging positive behavior, 11 used some form of the word “respect,” and the overall length of policies warning against negative behaviors were notably greater than those promoting

positive actions (which were often limited to one or two sentences). Examples of policies encouraging positive behavior while on social media include Marathon Petroleum’s policy requiring employees to “Be smart, safe and respectful. Never post content that may be viewed as malicious, obscene, harassing, defamatory or discriminatory,” and Google’s policy that “When communicating, keep in mind our Google Values. Respect the user, respect the opportunity, and respect each other” (“Code of Business Conduct - Social Media”; “Community Guidelines” 2018). Table 2 (located below) provides the full text mining results and semantic breakdown for the employee conduct policies utilized by the 50 companies analyzed.

Table 2: Semantic breakdown for all employee conduct policies utilized by the 50 companies analyzed

	Word:	Frequency:	Category 1:		Category 2:		Category 3:	
			Positive	Negative	Strong	Weak	Active	Passive
1	media	21						
2	social	20						
3	conduct	17					x	
4	may	15						
5	harassment	13		x				
6	including	12			x			
7	use	12					x	
8	law	11	x					
9	respect	11	x					x
10	offensive	10		x	x		x	
11	online	10						
12	policy	9			x			
13	work	9					x	
14	avoid	8		x		x		x
15	content	8						
16	customers	8						
17	employees	8				x		
18	inappropriate	8						
19	post	8					x	
20	remarks	8						
21	communications	7						
22	workplace	7						
23	code	6						
24	obscene	6						
25	others	6						
SUM:			2	3	3	2	5	2

Legal Issues

The other social media policy analyzed within this study was legal issues. As defined in the study conducted by the Center for Technology in Government, this category pertains to policies that “Take a general approach to legal issues, using generic text that requires all employees to adhere to all applicable laws and regulations (without actually specifying which laws and regulations are applicable),” as well as policies which “Point to specific areas of law such as privacy, freedom of speech, freedom of information, public records management, public disclosure, and accessibility” (Hrdinová, Jana, et al. 2010). There were a total of 47 companies that possessed at least a single policy within this category, and within the policies posted by these companies there were two general types of policies which occurred most frequently. These two areas of focus concerned the protection of either (1) the company’s confidential information, or (2) intellectual property rights. This tendency was reflected in one of the text mining models for the study, which returned frequently used words such as “confidential,” “intellectual,” “financial,” “copyright,” and “trademark” (as demonstrated below in Table 3, which is the semantic breakdown for the text mined data set containing all legal policies).

Table 3: Semantic breakdown for all legal issue policies utilized by the 50 companies analyzed

	Word:	Frequency:	Category 1:		Category 2:		Category 3:	
			Positive	Negative	Strong	Weak	Active	Passive
1	information	97	x		x			
2	confidential	33						
3	laws	33	x					
4	property	26						
5	intellectual	25	x		x			
6	must	25						
7	disclosure	21						
8	media	21						
9	social	21						
10	financial	18						
11	proprietary	18	x					
12	including	17			x			
13	may	17						
14	employees	14				x		
15	respect	14	x					x
16	copyright	13						
17	policy	13			x			
18	trade	13					x	
19	trademarks	13						
20	rights	12	x		x			
21	data	11						
22	disclose	11						
23	law	11	x					
24	personal	11						
25	post	11					x	
SUM:			7	0	5	1	2	1

The overall semantic results for the legal issue policy category showed that the semantic groups with the highest usage were positive (with a total count of 19) and strong (a total of 15) terms (based on the summation of policies utilized within each industry, as demonstrated below in Table 4).

Table 4: Semantic category totals, totals per industry (not including all 50 companies)

		Positive	Negative	Strong	Weak	Active	Passive		
INDUSTRY TOTALS =	Category Total - Employee Conduct	21	10	17	9	27	9	Category Totals for the 5 industries (not all 50 companies)	
	Ratios	21:10		17:9		3:1			
	Category Total - Legal Issues	19	9	15	6	10	7		
	Ratios	19:9		5:2		10:7			
SUM:		40	19	32	15	37	16	Overall Totals	

Examples of such phrases within the legal issues policy category include “intellectual” (both positive and strong, used 25 times), “proprietary” (positive, 18), and “rights” (positive and strong, 12). Although terms such as “confidential” and “financial” occurred quite frequently, these terms do not carry any semantic meanings (based on the three semantic categories analyzed in this study), meaning they were not included in the word totals for any of the semantic groups analyzed.

Among companies with policies within the legal issues category, 37 had at least a single policy concerning the protection of the company’s confidential information (in the form of a general, blanket statement), and 16 had a policy concerning the protection of financial information (a specific type of protected company information). The specific frequency of the word “confidential” within this category was 33, while the frequency of “financial” was 18. While most companies specifically used the word “confidential” while referring to the corresponding policy focus area, that was not always the case (with companies such as General Electric using the term “proprietary” instead). Conversely, the word “financial” was used multiple times in one company’s policy (used thrice by Berkshire Hathaway), causing the total

number of companies with financial information policies to be slightly less than the overall count of the word “financial” within the text mining model (“Employee Conduct and Business Ethics - Social Media”). The overlap between these two types of policies (general and specific references to confidential company data) was 14, indicating the preservation of financial disclosure laws was a notable concern of companies that focused on protecting their confidential/proprietary information.

The second focus area for legal issue policies related to the protection of intellectual property that was owned by both the company of origin (the one that posted and enforced the relevant policy) and other, third party groups or organizations. The number of companies with policies exhibiting this particular focus was 25, and commonly observed terms (obtained via text mining) included “intellectual,” “copyright,” and “trademark.” The specific usage of these terms was 25 for intellectual, 13 for copyright, and 13 for trademark. Policies concerning the protection of intellectual property cautioned employees to not include any protected items (such as images, software, and text) in their posts, profiles, etc. without first obtaining permission to do so from the owner of the protected material. Two notable companies that possess policies concerning intellectual property are Exxon Mobil and General Motors. The policy implemented by Exxon mobile is “You must not post, email, or otherwise transmit images, software, text, or other material protected by intellectual property laws... unless you own or control the rights thereto or have received all necessary authorizations to do the same” (“Terms and Conditions - Other Prohibited Actions”). Likewise, General Motors maintains a policy that “Many Social Media sites impose restrictions regarding proprietary information...trademarks and copyrights of others. It is important to be mindful of these restrictions...and not to post material...without securing all necessary permissions first.” (“Social Media Policy - Protecting Other Peoples’ Information”).

Overall, intellectual property and confidential/proprietary information policies made up a majority of the policies within the legal issues policy category, and the length of policies within these two focus areas was notably larger than the next largest subset of policies (blanket legal policies which advised employees to follow all applicable laws, and were covered in only one to two sentences).

Retail Trade

Table 5: Semantic breakdown for the retail trade industry

		Positive	Negative	Strong	Weak	Active	Passive
Industry 1) Retail Trade:	Retail Trade - Employee Conduct	2	3	5	1	4	2
	Retail Trade - Legal Issues	0	4	1	1	0	0
	SUM:	2	7	6	2	4	2

Standing as the most predominant general industry amongst companies within the top 50 of the Fortune 500 list for the year 2018, the retail trade industry revolves around companies that retail merchandise (generally in small numbers) to consumers, and the highest ranked businesses within this category (based on the Fortune 500 list) are Walmart (ranked first overall), Exxon Mobil (ranked second overall), CVS Health (ranked seventh overall), and Amazon (ranked 8th overall) (“Fortune 500 Companies 2018: Who Made the List”). Within the 17 companies that fell within this industry, 11 (64.7%) had at least one policy concerning employee conduct, while 15 (88.2%) utilized at least a single policy within the legal issue category. The semantic breakdown for the retail trade industry indicated the two most commonly used semantic categories were negative (7) and strong (6) words. While the utilization of negative words was almost perfectly split between the employee conduct and legal issues policy categories (with employee conduct having three frequently shared terms carrying a negative connotation, and legal issues similarly having four), strong words were used almost entirely within employee conduct policies (with

five of the six commonly used strong semantic terms having been utilized in employee conduct policies rather than legal issues policies). Examples of strong or negative words include “offensive” (strong and negative), “harassment” (negative), and “policy” (strong). The utilization of these semantic categories by retail trade policies would lead to the inference that this industry is primarily focused on preventing employees from committing negative acts through social media (such as harassment or the use of inappropriate language towards customers or other employees). Since strong terms were used scarcely by legal issue policies implemented by the retail industry, it appears as though the company’s image (as upheld by its employees and promoted through positive interactions with its customers) is overall the focus of this industry.

Out of the specific industry subsets within this category (among the companies observed), the one that occurred most frequently was pharmacies and drug stores. Comprised of 5 of the 17 companies within the retail trade industry, pharmacies and drug stores are defined by the NAICS as “establishments known as pharmacies and drug stores engaged in retailing prescription or nonprescription drugs and medicines” (“NAICS - Pharmacies and Drug Stores”). Among these companies, three utilized both an employee conduct policy and legal issues policy, while the remaining two only implemented policies concerning employee conduct. The lack of policies referring to legal issues within this industry subset was entirely unexpected due to the many additional legalities organizations tied to the health industry are expected to uphold (especially in regards to the confidentiality of records). Instead, not a single company among those analyzed had only implemented one or more legal issue policies regarding social media usage, meaning this industry subset is overall less interested in issues commonly covered in policies belonging to the legal issues policy category. Conversely, the second most common industry subset within the retail trade industry, department stores, showed an opposite tendency.

Among the three companies classified as belonging to the department stores industry, two had enacted both employee conduct and legal issues policies, while one company had only published a policy in the legal issues category. Though it is hard to pinpoint definitive trends with such a small number of companies within this subset (a limitation which also applies to any observations made concerning the pharmacies and drug stores industry subset), a continuation of this study utilizing an increased data set (using 100 or more of the companies from the Fortune 500 list) could potentially support the currently observed trends within the two previously mentioned subcategories of the retail industry.

Finance and Insurance

Table 6: Semantic breakdown for the finance and insurance industry

Industry 2) Finance and Insurance:	Finance and Insurance - Employee Conduct	4	1	2	0	7	1
	Finance and Insurance - Legal Issues	3	1	4	1	2	1
	SUM:	7	2	6	1	9	2

Finance and insurance was the second largest industry group among the analyzed companies, and the NAICS's industry description outlines companies bearing this classification as being "primarily engaged in financial transactions (transactions involving the creation, liquidation, or change in ownership of financial assets) and/or in facilitating financial transactions." ("Finance and Insurance: NAICS 52"). There were a total of 10 companies in the finance and insurance industry among the studied organizations, and examples of businesses in this industry include Berkshire Hathaway and JPMorgan Chase. Among the companies reviewed, only five (50%) had implemented an employee conduct policy, whereas nine (90%) utilized policies concerning legal issues. The finance and insurance industry had the overall lowest percentage of companies with employee conduct policies (in regard to policies applicable to the use of social media for both personal and professional use). Only one company in the

entire finance and insurance industry had an employee conduct policy, but not a legal issues policy (with that company being Wells Fargo), with the remaining nine companies being split between having both types of social media policies (4) and having only a legal issue policy (5). The lack of employee conduct policies within the finance and insurance industry is unusual considering the breakdown of semantic terms indicated the most frequently used semantic categories were active (9) and strong (6), two types of terms which were noted as occurring more frequently within employee conduct policies than within policies devoted to legal issues.

Manufacturing, Wholesale Trade, and Information

Table 7: Semantic breakdown for the wholesale, manufacturing, and information industries

Industry 3) Wholesale:	Manufacturing - Employee Conduct	4	0	2	1	8	1
	Manufacturing - Legal Issues	6	2	3	2	4	2
	SUM:	10	2	5	3	12	3
Industry 4) Manufacturing:	Wholesale - Employee Conduct	5	4	4	3	4	3
	Wholesale - Legal Issues	4	2	2	2	2	2
	SUM:	9	6	6	5	6	5
Industry 5) Information:	Information - Employee Conduct	6	2	4	4	4	2
	Information - Legal Issues	6	0	5	0	2	2
	SUM:	12	2	9	4	6	4

Due to the limited sample size of files within the manufacturing, wholesale, and information industry groups (5, 5, and 4, respectively), they will be compared with each other more closely than to the previously discussed industries (since retail trade was comprised of 17 companies, while finance and insurance encompassed 10 companies). Each of the newly introduced industries had a 100% policy implementation rate for the legal issue policy category). Likewise, the percentage of companies possessing an employee conduct policy was 75% (3 out of 4) for the information industry, and 80% (4 out of 5) for both the manufacturing and wholesale trade industries. Yet another similarity between these three industry groups can be found within the results of the semantic analysis conducted on the policies within each industry.

All three industries showed that one of their highest semantic categories was positive terms (positive words were utilized 10, 9, and 12 times, respectively), with the distribution of these terms either (1) being split perfectly (in the case of the information industry, in which there was an even distribution of six positive terms for both policy categories), or (2) being separated by a difference of only one or two (one in the case of the wholesale trade industry, and two for manufacturing). While positive terms were ranked first for both the wholesale trade and information industries, they were only ranked second for manufacturing. Instead, the highest ranking category for the manufacturing industry was active phrases. While the manufacturing industry possessed approximately the same sample size as the wholesale trade and information industries, the manufacturing industry used the active semantic category 12 times, which was two times more than both the wholesale trade and information industries (both of which utilized active terms on six occasions). This discrepancy was primarily caused by the notably higher utilization of action words within employee conduct policies for the manufacturing industry. The commonality and frequency of action words within the policies analyzed from the manufacturing industry indicate that, compared to the wholesale trade and information industries, manufacturing is generally more focused on the specific behaviors of their employees, an indication supported by the frequency of terms such as “conduct,” “build,” “connect,” and “apply” with the aforementioned policies.

Discussion

Between the two social media policy categories studied (employee conduct and legal issues), and the five industries analyzed (retail trade, finance and insurance, manufacturing, wholesale trade, and information), several trends were observed. The first trend was within the industries analyzed, and specifically referred to the usage of certain semantic categories. Across

all industries, active terms were used more frequently in employee conduct policies than in legal issue policies, with the specific breakdown being as follows: 4 vs. 0 (retail trade), 7 vs. 2 (finance and industry), 8 vs. 4 (manufacturing), 4 vs. 2 (wholesale trade), and 4 vs. 2 (information). One of the tables used to organize these findings is provided below, with the “Combined” rows reflecting the findings of two broad data sets (all employee conduct and all legal issue policies, respectively, upon being text mined), and the “Industry Totals” rows being a summation of the individual results returned within each industry’s text-mining model (excluding the results tabulated in the “Combined” fields).

Table 8: Semantic category totals, summation of industry totals

		Positive	Negative	Strong	Weak	Active	Passive
Industry 1) Retail Trade:	Retail Trade - Employee Conduct	2	3	5	1	4	2
	Ratios	2:3		5:1		2:1	
	Retail Trade - Legal Issues	0	4	1	1	0	0
	Ratios	0:4		1:1		0:0	
	SUM:	2	7	6	2	4	2
Industry 2) Finance and Insurance:	Finance and Insurance - Employee Conduct	4	1	2	0	7	1
	Ratios	4:1		2:0		7:1	
	Finance and Insurance - Legal Issues	3	1	4	1	2	1
	Ratios	3:1		4:1		2:1	
	SUM:	7	2	6	1	9	2
Industry 3) Wholesale:	Manufacturing - Employee Conduct	4	0	2	1	8	1
	Ratios	4:0		2:1		8:1	
	Manufacturing - Legal Issues	6	2	3	2	4	2
	Ratios	3:1		3:2		2:1	
	SUM:	10	2	5	3	12	3
Industry 4) Manufacturing:	Wholesale - Employee Conduct	5	4	4	3	4	3
	Ratios	5:4		4:3		4:3	
	Wholesale - Legal Issues	4	2	2	2	2	2
	Ratios	2:1		1:1		1:1	
	SUM:	9	6	6	5	6	5
Industry 5) Information:	Information - Employee Conduct	6	2	4	4	4	2
	Ratios	3:1		1:1		2:1	
	Information - Legal Issues	6	0	5	0	2	2
	Ratios	6:0		5:0		1:1	
	SUM:	12	2	9	4	6	4
All 50 Companies' Employee Conduct/Legal Issue Policies (Respectively)	Combined - Employee Conduct	2	3	3	2	5	2
	Ratios	2:3		3:2		5:2	
	Combined - Legal Issues	7	0	5	1	2	1
	Ratios	7:0		5:1		2:1	
	SUM:	9	3	8	3	7	3
INDUSTRY TOTALS =	Category Total - Employee Conduct	21	10	17	9	27	9
	Ratios	21:10		17:9		3:1	
	Category Total - Legal Issues	19	9	15	6	10	7
	Ratios	19:9		5:2		10:7	
	SUM:	40	19	32	15	37	16

Active terms are commonly verbs, and are consequently used to indicate the implementation of a specific action or behavior. For this reason, it can be understood why employee conduct (the category dedicated to guiding or dissuading specific behaviors by employees) would utilize active phrases words more frequently than the legal issues category (which focuses more on the type of information or law being regulated than the specific employee actions taken to avoid committing any legal infractions). Similarly, another semantics trend was observed between industries in relation to positive semantic terms. Out of the five industries considered, all but one (the retail trade industry) utilized positive words more frequently than negative terms, with the greatest gap between the two categories (positive and negative) being a difference of 10 (which is a notable amount considering only the 25 most frequently used words within each industry were classified by their semantic meaning). Due to the most frequently used categories within the retail industry, an assumption was made regarding the industry's overall priority (that each company was primarily concerned with protecting their own images). This more finely honed purpose, which is overall more specific than the more generalized policies and mentalities exhibited by other analyzed industries, could explain the discrepancy between the five industries analyzed.

Conclusion

The driving question of this study was to discover and analyze the specific types of social media policies companies are implementing to account for stakeholders' increased utilization of social media on a daily basis. Based on social media's ever growing rate of daily usage, the companies that have yet to implement policies in both the analyzed policy categories (employee conduct and legal issues) and the other, less discussed policy categories (employee access, account management, acceptable use, content, security, and citizen conduct) will likely do so in

the years to come. Companies that fail to adapt as appropriate to the increasingly inseparable role social media plays in how businesses are promoted, represented, and evaluated will ultimately be confronted with a scenario in which they have no choice but to respond retroactively (in response to incidents such as racially/sexually derogatory employee posts which take the Internet by storm). Proactive policy implementation today can potentially save companies hundreds of thousands, or even millions, of dollars, and can potentially prevent the individual companies from suffering long-term harm to their corporate and social reputations.

Works Cited

- “Code of Business Conduct - Social Media.” *Code of Business Conduct - Commitment to Integrity*, Marathon Petroleum Corporation,
www.speedway.com/images/code_book_med.pdf.
- “Code of Conduct - Communications.” *Code of Conduct Our Principles of Ethics & Integrity*, UnitedHealth Group, May 2018,
www.unitedhealthgroup.com/content/dam/UHG/PDF/About/UNH-Code-of-Conduct.pdf.
- “Community Guidelines.” *Twitter*, Google, 27 June 2018,
twitter.com/Google_Comms/status/1012040562713620480.
- “Descriptions of Inquirer Categories and Use of Inquirer Dictionaries.” *General Inquirer*, Harvard, 12 Sept. 2002, www.wjh.harvard.edu/~inquirer/homecat.htm.
- “Employee Conduct and Business Ethics - Social Media.” *Berkshire Hathaway Energy Human Resources Policies*, Berkshire Hathaway Energy, 15 Oct. 2014,
www.midamerican.com/ess/policies/mehc/social_media.html.
- “Finance and Insurance: NAICS 52.” *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics*, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, www.bls.gov/iag/tgs/iag52.htm.
- “Fortune 500 Companies 2018: Who Made the List.” *Fortune*, Fortune,
fortune.com/fortune500/list/.
- “Google Code of Conduct.” *Alphabet Investor Relations*, Alphabet, 31 July 2018,
abc.xyz/investor/other/google-code-of-conduct.html.
- Half, Robert. “Survey: Lawyers Report Surge In Litigation Related To Social Media And Mobile Devices.” *PR Newswire: News Distribution, Targeting and Monitoring*, PR Newswire, 1

June 2017, www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/survey-lawyers-report-surge-in-litigation-related-to-social-media-and-mobile-devices-300466996.html.

Hrdinová, Jana, et al. “Designing Social Media Policy for Government: Eight Essential Elements” *Center for Technology in Government*, The Research Foundation of the State University of New York, 2010, www.nwcphp.org/documents/communications/tools-resources/social_media_policy_for_Govt.pdf.

“NAICS - Pharmacies and Drug Stores.” *SICCODE.com*, SICCODE, siccocode.com/en/naicscodes/446110/pharmacies-and-drug-stores.

“North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Main Page.” *Census Bureau QuickFacts*, United States Census Bureau, 15 May 2012, www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/.

Perrin, Andrew. “Social Media Usage: 2005-2015.” *Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech*, Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech, 12 Oct. 2015, www.pewinternet.org/2015/10/08/social-networking-usage-2005-2015/.

Smith, Aaron. “Social Media Use 2018: Demographics and Statistics.” *Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech*, Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech, 19 Sept. 2018, www.pewinternet.org/2018/03/01/social-media-use-in-2018/.

“Social Media.” *Merriam-Webster*, Merriam-Webster, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/social%20media.

“Social Media Policy - Protecting Other Peoples’ Information.” *General Motors - Social Media Policy*, General Motors, www.gm.com/full-social-media-policy.html.

“Terms and Conditions - Other Prohibited Actions.” *ExxonMobil - Terms and Conditions*, Exxon Mobil Corporation, 12 June 2018, corporate.exxonmobil.com/en/global-legal-pages/terms-and-conditions.

“The Diamond Standard - Living Our Values Every Day.” *Dow's Code of Business Conduct*, DowDuPont, Dec. 2010, www.dow.com/-/media/dow/business-units/dow-us/pdf/code-of-business-conduct-translations/cbcenglish.ashx.