



Manuscript Title: Contested Discursive Framing: An Example from a Bank's Co-optative Collaborative Ventures Model for CSR

Recommendations: Accept with revisions

Basis for Revision: Jargon Not Explained
Theoretical Contribution is Unclear
Needs Clarity of Purpose
Key Literatures Are Not Cited
Analysis Not Sufficiently Explained
No Persuasive Theory

Comments to the Author:

The paper proposes an analysis of the discursive framing of the partnership between a bank and some NPOs. The Author/s collected a large amount of qualitative data for this study. These data are very rich and allow for a deep analysis of the interplay between the bank and its stakeholders.

In spite of these premises, the paper is not very convincing. There may appear some difficulties in following the presentation of the data and their analysis.

First of all, reading the paper and understanding the meaning of a lot of sentences was difficult, because of the massive use of acronyms. Some of them are very similar (e.g., CV and CVM), and thus you often need to go back to the position where they have been introduced to check what do they mean. Although this may look like a minor problem, it provides the impression that, metaphorically, the Author/s are still very close to the field and have not been able to raise the level of their analysis to a dimension that could be more understandable by a reader who does not know the structure of the organizations they analyzed and the implications of the various roles of the actors they refer to.

The analysis of the core topic of the paper is quite hermetic, too. The differences between the interpretations of the notion of adoption are not clear. The major issue is



Qualitative Sociology Review

www.qualitativesociologyreview.org

that the reader is not sufficiently informed about the relevance of this notion for the analysis. In the introduction, the Author/s present the concept of adoption as “allowing disadvantaged youth to benefit from social-outreach programs staffed by employee volunteers and financial sponsorship.” Does this interpretation refer to a specific definition provided by the bank or is it a synthetic definition provided by the Author/s?

Moreover, it is suggested that the Author/s provide more insights for justifying the claim that the discursive and contested implication of adoption’s “policies” by the bank is central in their relationships with the NPOs. The literature on CSR is rich in cases that illustrate the superficial and instrumental approaches companies may “adopt” for raising their legitimacy with their stakeholders. While the idea of a co-optative strategy seems plausible, it is not clear whether the actions promoted by the bank hold are necessary for their recipients. A broader description of the environmental conditions that frame the relationships between the bank and the NPOs could reinforce the logic of co-optation.

Furthermore, the methodological section requires more attention. One minor issue is that perhaps table 2 (interviews) should precede table 1 (observations). Additionally, it should be explained how the data have been analyzed (methodology), as well as how the participants have been recruited.

Finally, there are a lot of typos in the text, especially words that have not been separated by a space.