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Abstract

Corporations unceasing exploitation of our planet and its people have resulted in the implementation of several laws, regulations and standardisations. To please their stakeholders, corporations engage in Corporate Social Responsibility, nonetheless, few succeed in operating responsible. Social Intrapreneurship is a relatively new concept, aimed at creating long-lasting social and environmental impact, while aiding the company in its mission. Given that Corporate Social Responsibility has failed to bring sufficient social change, social intrapreneurs can be the new solution to many of the great social problems of today. The aim of this study was to examine what enables employees to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours. Six semi-structured interviews were conducted with consultants located in Stockholm. 24 interview questions about the respondents’ corporate climate and culture, Corporate Social Responsibility work and possibilities for social innovation, were asked. The empirical findings showed that, to enable employees’ intrapreneurial behaviours, they required encouragement, clear communication, time and a network. These findings were in line with prior studies conducted in the field of intrapreneurship and social intrapreneurship.
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1. Introduction

This chapter will present the subject of this thesis. It is divided into six sections. The first part will provide the background and context for the problem of the thesis. The second part, the problem, aims to describe why the research is of interest. The third part is the purpose of the study, followed by the study’s research questions. The fifth part describes the delimitations in the study and the final part provides the disposition of the thesis.

1.1. Background

Our world was at year 2017 valued for nearly $78 trillion (Oxfam International, 2018a), a wealth of which 82 percent went to the world’s richest (Oxfam International, 2018b). Corporations are superseding the size of countries (Rodionova, 2016) while dodging taxes, causing a yearly cost of $100 billion for the poorest countries in the world (Oxfam International, 2018a). “The vast wealth and power of corporations are at the heart of so many of the world’s problems – like inequality and climate change” according to Nick Dearden, director of Global Justice Now (Rodionova, 2016). Unethical business practices and profit maximisation strain communities, countries and the environment (SustainAbility, 2008). Even if a growing number of regulations and international standards force companies to comply with anti-corruption practices, labour standards, human rights laws and regulations constraining them from exploiting the environment (United Nations Global Compact, 2015), these are minor restraints to major corporations (Székely & Knirsch, 2005). Many consider corporations to be the main cause of social and environmental problems, hence they should be more accountable (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011).

“Strong markets and strong societies go hand in hand” (United Nations Global Compact, 2015:29). In 2015 the United Nations (UN) provided the framework, 17 Sustainable Development Goals and the UN Global Compact (2015) ten principles1 to guide corporations and governments towards a sustainable society and to meet their fundamental responsibilities. Through these initiatives the UN has seen a growing number of sustainability reporting, which they believe to be largely driven by stakeholders and their demand for transparency (United Nations Global Compact, 2015). Stakeholders’ constant presence on social media and greater insight in corporations’ practices, intensifies the pressure (Curley & Abgrab Noormohamed, 2014). Their increased expectations on corporations to behave and act socially responsible, have caused an uprise of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) engagements (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; Ayuso, Rodriguez, García-Castro & Ariño, 2011; Hillman & Keim, 2001). CSR goes beyond legal compliance (Székely & Knirsch, 2005) and is “the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society” (European Commission, 2011). It occurs on a voluntary basis and can be shaped in accordance to the company’s practices and creates the means for long-term sustainable initiatives and responsible community engagements (Grafström, Göthberg & Windell, 2008; Jenkins, 2009; Mankelow, 2008).

Despite the growing interest in CSR few corporations succeed to do more good (Heath & Waymer, 2017). Kotchen and Jungbien Moon (2011) found that several corporations’ CSR engagements were a way of compensating for their negative influence, rather than decreasing the activities which take advantage of communities and the planet’s resources. Hence, some corporations use CSR for sharing their positive impact, while shielding negative information from stakeholders (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; Chiu & Sharfman, 2011; Sprinkle & Maines, 2010; Oberseder, Bodo, Schlegelmilch & Murphy, 2013). Many corporations fail to integrate CSR into their core business (Mostovicz, Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2009) and most CSR practices are developed in isolation, having no part in the company’s actual business
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1 See Appendix I
activities or is even incongruent with the company’s objectives (Székely & Knirsch, 2005). Since 51 percent of workers want to contribute to a sustainable society (Heldrich, Zukin & Szeltner, 2012) and 65 percent would consider leaving the company if it harmed the environment (Epstein-Reeves, 2010), retention of employees will become more difficult for corporations which fail to comply with stakeholders’ demands (Heath & Waymer, 2017). Studies conducted by Cone Communication also showed that 90 percent of customers worldwide are likely to change to brands which engage in a good cause (Cone Communication, 2013) and 87 percent let it affect where they shop (Heldrich, Zukin, & Szeltner, 2012). Hence, corporations need to find new and different ways of working socially responsible (Heath & Waymer, 2017; Helmsing, 2015; Phillips et al., 2015), to keep their competitive advantage and remain an attractive employer.

1.2. Problem

Globalization has caused an increased competitive landscape for companies, which requires them to act innovative to be able to retain their market shares (Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004). To meet the ever-changing opportunities and challenges of the global market, companies need to renew their strategies and innovate new products, processes, technologies and business models (Nidumolu, Prahalad & Rangaswari, 2009). The demands on companies to increase their growth, while cutting cost (Rejeb, Guimara, Boly & Assiélo, 2008) and simultaneously become more responsible, have caused companies to seek new sources of innovation (Mirvis, Herrera, Googins & Albareda, 2016). Social innovation, also referred to as corporate social innovation, has been trending, since CSR has not been able to deliver substantial social change (Helmsing, 2015; Phillips, Lee, Ghobadian, O’Regan & James, 2015). “Social innovation can be defined as the development and implementation of new ideas (products, services and models) to meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations” (European Commission, 2013). In comparison to CSR, social innovation aims to create revenues and competitive advantages through finding new sustainable social solutions (Mirvis et al., 2016). For companies to be able to deliver on their promises and the demands of stakeholders, they need to find ways of incorporating social innovation into their business strategies (Phillips et al., 2015).

Social innovation is used to describe a wide range of initiatives (Tracy & Stot, 2016) both in newly established organizations (social entrepreneurship) or inside existing corporations (social intrapreneurship) (Nandan, London & Bent-Goodley, 2015). Social entrepreneurship is “the process of creating and growing a venture, either for-profit or non-profit, where the motivation of the entrepreneur is to address a particular social challenge or set of challenges” (Tracy & Stot, 2016:53). Social entrepreneurship is the creation of a new organization directed to solving social challenges using new and innovative ideas (Mair et al., 2006). Social intrapreneurship, on the other hand, is the process where individuals within an existing organization engage in social innovation, inside the frames provided by the corporation (Venn & Berg, 2013). The notion of social intrapreneurship was first defined by SustainAbility (2008) and has since been featuring in research by, among others, Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck who view social intrapreneurs as “people within a large corporation who take direct initiative for innovations that address social or environmental challenges while also creating commercial value for their companies” (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014:19).

The obstacles and advantages for the individuals who engage in social entrepreneurship and social intrapreneurship differs, since they work under different circumstances (Tracy & Stot, 2016). Social entrepreneurs face financial restrains and more risk due to them acting alone (Nijhof, Kees Looise & de Leede, 2012; Smith, Rees & Murray, 2016). There is often a single actor, the founder, who is forced to act out all the roles of the organization (Bulloch, 2013).
Social intrapreneurs do not face the same amount of risk or have similar financial issues, even if they can have problem getting their projects funded, they will have a stable salary (Antonicic & Hisrich, 2003; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014). Instead social intrapreneurs face bureaucracy and stale corporate structures, that provides little autonomy and support in their creative process (Antonicic & Hisrich, 2003; Nijhof, Kees Loose & de Leede, 2012). Both groups struggle with the scalability and sustainability of their initiatives (Berzin & Pitt-Catsouphes 2015; Parker, 2009), which is crucial for them to be able to create systematic change (Sen, 2006). Entrepreneurial behaviours have been found to be an important part in a company’s innovative process and overall performance (Dess, Lumpkin, & McGee, 1999; Renko, El Tarabishy, Carsrud & Brännback, 2015). According to Dess, Lumpkin and McGee (1999) all companies are striving towards becoming more innovative and hence promoting entrepreneurial behaviours. Especially mature corporations search for ways to become more innovative, to cope with the rapid changes of the market (Alpkan, Bulut, Gunday, Ulusoy & Kilic, 2010).

Social intrapreneurs have been “recognized as key players in tackling the world’s biggest problems like poverty, hunger, and the need for universal education” (Ashoka, 2014). These individuals act everywhere and at all levels of a company (Conniff, 2011). They create lasting social change by initiating projects within companies, while having a positive effect on the company’s financial performance (Wakkee, Elfring & Monaghan, 2010). Social intrapreneurship is an attractive solution for corporations, which want to engage socially and become more innovative. Since corporations fail to sufficiently integrate CSR and achieve sustainable change (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; Chiu & Sharfman, 2011; Mostovicz, Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 2009; Sprinkle & Maines, 2010; Széky & Knirsch, 2005; Öberseder et al., 2013), social innovation, in form of social intrapreneurship, could be a viable and alternative solution. In accordance to Gib Bulloch, co-founder of SustainAbility, “affecting even small change in large organisations can lead to significant positive social impact” (SustainAbility, 2008).

Nick Hughes, employee at Vodafone, came up with the idea of mPESA, a platform for financial transactions between mobile phones, which enabled people with low income to receive quick loans and transfer money (League of Intrapreneurs, 2018a). mPESA established financial inclusion in rural areas in Kenya, while creating value for the company (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014). Yet, his initiative was faced with resistance from senior management, who felt that the project was not in line with the company’s practices. Through funding from an external party, the project was initiated and launched in 2007 and today, the platform has more than 15 million users. (League of Intrapreneurs, 2018a) However, Nick Hughes terminated his employment at Vodafone shortly after the launch and became a social entrepreneur, offering sustainable electricity through the enterprise, M-kopa (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014). Intrapreneurs have been found to convert to entrepreneurship (Bosmaa, Stamab & Wennekers, 2012; Smith, Rees & Murray, 2016; Kistruck & Beamish, 2010), if management and corporate structures prevent them from exploring social initiatives. These innovative individuals are likely to resign, if their engagements are prohibited, causing financial as well as competence loss. Since social intrapreneurs work in the intersection of social good, the enterprise and innovation, they are a valuable resource to the company. (Hadad & Cantaragriu, 2017)

The work to innovate within corporations, do not go without challenges. Many companies are resistant towards change and feel threatened by it. Innovators often face regulations, lack incentives and feel constrained from engaging with socially innovative ideas. (Nandan, London & Bent-Goodley, 2015) Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) identified, in their study, several internal organizational factors, which influenced the work of social intrapreneurs, namely; Management and Leadership, Culture, Strategy, Organizational processes and
Infrastructure, HR and Resources. Out of these, culture (Dialogue, Autonomy, Risk-taking, Experimentation & Sustainability) and the factor of management and leadership, were most salient. A company’s culture could hinder social intrapreneurs, especially if their initiatives were not prioritized, they were not given sufficient resources and if they constantly faced scepticism from colleagues and managers. The mindset of managers and the corporate leadership frequently limited social intrapreneurs’ work. Their short-term thinking, lack of a sustainability focus, resilient to divert resources or resistance towards criticizing the way the company operated, prevented employees from engaging in social initiatives, as was the case at Vodafone. (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014)

“Social intrapreneurs are right now sitting within existing organizations at the intersection of innovation, social good, and entrepreneurship [...] working under the radar and struggling against bureaucracy to launch new programs, products, and initiatives” (Ashoka, 2014).

Researchers have still not been able to fully understand how companies can enable or embrace the work of intrapreneurs (Mair, 2005; Zahra, Nielsen & Bogner, 1999) and what it is that foster these behaviours (Brunáker & Kurvinen, 2006; Christensen, 2005; Smith, Rees & Murray, 2016). Even if executives believe that innovation can accelerate the pace of social change (Kuratko, Hornsby & Covin, 2014) few know how to enhance social or innovative behaviours within their employees (Kistruck & Beamish, 2010; Wakkee, Elfring & Monaghan, 2010).

1.3. Purpose

The aim of this thesis is to examine what enables employees to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours. By addressing the following research questions, I hope to enhance our knowledge of social intrapreneurship.

1.4. Research Questions

- How does the organizational culture and climate enable or disable the possibilities for employees to engage with social intrapreneurship?
- How can companies create an enabling environment that encourage employees’ social intrapreneurial behaviours?

1.5. Delimitations

Several internal factors have been identified to influence the work of social intrapreneurs, however, culture as well as management and leadership, appeared to be the ones which the social intrapreneurs found to be most influential. Hence, the thesis will focus on examining the organizational culture and touch upon management and leadership. The study is limited to examine consultants in international firms, located in Stockholm.

1.6. Disposition

The thesis is divided into seven main chapters, each have numbered subheadings and a short descriptive preamble to facilitate the reading. The final two chapters which contain the references and appendices, do not share the same structure. Chapter One, is divided under five headings. 1.1. Background provides general information about the field which this thesis will explore. Subheading 1.2. Problem discussed the issues which corporations face when engaging socially and 1.3. Purpose presents the aim of the thesis, followed by the research questions. The fifth subheading 1.5. Delimitation describes how the study has been limited. The final heading provides the disposition of the thesis.

Chapter Two, presents the literature review and the chosen theoretical framework. It presents prior research about 2.1. Corporate Social Responsibility, 2.2. Social Innovation, 2.3. Social Entrepreneurship and 2.4. Social Intrapreneurship. The fifth subheading, Research Frontier,
presents prior studies conducted in the field of Social Intrapreneurship. The final subheading 2.6. Theoretical Framework describes the theories that will be used in the study.

Chapter Three, Method & Material have two subheadings, 3.1. Research Model, which presents the chosen method and 3.2. Data Collection, that describes the sample selection and the process behind the study.

The second part of the thesis provides a description of the empirical findings and the analysis of the material. Chapter Four, Empirical Results is divided into six subheadings based on the DARES theory and one for Social Innovation. Each subheading shows the results gathered from the interview questions and selected quotes from the six interviewees.

Chapters Five, consists of the Analysis, which use the theoretical framework and the theory to analyse the empirical results. The analysis shares the same structure as the previous chapter.

Chapter Six, presents a discussion of the findings of the study. Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research will be presented in this chapter.

Chapter Seven, Conclusion, concludes the findings of the study, while the last two chapters provide the reader with the references used in the thesis and the appendices referred to in the text.
2. Literature Review & Theoretical Framework

The following chapter will dive deeper into the research behind the notions of Corporate Social Responsibility, Social Innovation, Social Entrepreneurship and finally Social Intrapreneurship. The end of the chapter will provide you with the theoretical framework used in this thesis. The concept of culture and climate will be discussed and the theory of Ekvall’s creative climate and Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck’s DARES culture will be examined.

2.1. Corporate Social Responsibility

Due to globalization, corporations are under increased pressure to allocate resources towards pressing social problems (Hillman & Keim, 2001). Stakeholders (shareholders, customers, the media, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), employees, suppliers, local communities, competitors, and governments) (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Ayuso et al., 2011; Hillman & Keim, 2001; Sprinkle & Maines, 2010), all over the world, demand that corporations engage and operate socially responsible (ISO, 2018). These actions can be referred to as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), a notion first mentioned by Clark (1926) as the obligation businesses have towards society (Freeman & Hasnaoui, 2010). Carroll (1979) later described CSR as a multi-dimensional construct, that encompasses the corporations: economic responsibility towards consumers, employees and investors; their legal responsibility to abide to the laws and regulations provided by the government; a philanthropic community responsibility and an ethical responsibility towards society. CSR has later been described as economic, social and environmental initiatives that go beyond that of which is required by law and the interest of the corporations (McWilliams & Siegel, 2001).

Little consensus appears in the various definitions of CSR and different countries and corporations have their own approach (Freeman & Hasnaoui, 2010). Aguinis and Glavas (2012) adopted the definition of CSR as a “context-specific organizational actions and policies that consider stakeholders’ expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance” (Aguinis, 2011:855). The European Commission defined CSR as “a concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their business operations and in their interaction with their stakeholders on a voluntary basis” (European Commission, 2001). However, year 2011 they presented a new definition where CSR was viewed as “the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society” (European Commission, 2011). The reason for the change was for the definition to mirror the European Union’s (EU) aspiration towards reaching the Enterprise 2020 Manifesto². Social innovation and transparency lie in the heart of the initiative and the European Commission hopes that the collaboration will help address some of society’s complex challenges. (CSR Europe, 2011) The definition used in this thesis is the one provided by the European Commission in 2011, due to this thesis exploring corporations which have an office in Sweden and the majority fall under the regulations provided by the EU.

“The European Commission believes that CSR is important for the sustainability, competitiveness, and innovation of EU enterprises and the EU economy” (European Commission, 2018). In 2016 a new EU directive 2014/95/EU was initiated, which seeks to make companies’ operation more transparent and increase the disclosing of non-financial information. The new directive mandates larger companies to institute sustainability reports in line with national or international guidelines provided by among others, ISO 26000 or the UN Global Compact. (Lindberg, 2016) The UN Global Compact is one of the world’s largest initiatives for corporate sustainability and was launched in year 2000. Through the Global Compact’s ten principles, companies can learn to approach their business’ practices in a
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² Read about the Enterprise 2020 Manifesto, the UN Global Compact, the SDGs and ISO 26000 in Appendix I.
responsible manner and offset harm on the planet and its people. (United Nations Global Compact, 2015) The UN has also created 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), which are used by among others, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) to provide guidance to corporations in their CSR reporting (GRI, 2018).

It is argued that CSR creates several competitive advantages and can result in increased financial performance (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; Hillman & Keim, 2001). Multiple studies show that social initiatives will help retain, recruit and motivate employees (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014; ISO, 2018; Sprinkle & Maines, 2010) and Cone millennial cause study from 2006 showed that 80 percent of millennials want to work for corporations which take responsibility for the environment and society (Grayson et al., 2013). CSR initiatives have also a positive impact on consumers’ attitudes, their purchase intentions and loyalty (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Park, Chidlow & Choi, 2014). CSR can enhance a company’s reputation, build and strengthen relationships as well as work in favour of their marketing and communication (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; ISO, 2018). Due to the loose definition of CSR and the wide range of application areas, CSR can be applied in all enterprises, since it is flexible, and companies can choose to approach it differently depending on their circumstances (European Commission, 2011). By integrating CSR into policies, strategies and the organizational culture of the firm (ISO, 2018), companies can meet stakeholders’ demands, while protecting the environment and future generations (Sprinkle & Maines, 2010).

Companies which do not engage with CSR have been found to be penalized by stakeholders, given bad publicity and being boycotted (Kotchen & Jungbien Moon, 2011). To prevent this many companies appear to act responsible, through the use of PR and marketing campaigns, just to avoid being called out (Öberseder, Bodo, Schlegelmilch & Murphy, 2013). While some have true altruistic intentions with their CSR work, other use it as pure marketing to entice stakeholders into believing they act responsibly (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; Sprinkle & Maines, 2010). Kotchen and Jungbien Moon (2011) studied corporations which act with Corporate Social Irresponsibility, defined as “a set of actions that increases externalized costs and/or promotes distributional conflicts” (Kotchen & Jungbien Moon, 2011:2). The occurrence of corporate social irresponsibility was found in all types of firms, which seek to minimize costs by, for example, operate in undeveloped countries with few environmental and labour regulations. “When corporate social irresponsibility arises about corporate governance, companies seemingly choose to offset with CSR in other dimensions, rather than reform governance itself” (Kotchen & Jungbien Moon, 2011:16). They found that CSR initiatives that were prominent to the public, were prioritized by these companies, since it counterbalanced bad publicity (Kotchen & Jungbien Moon, 2011).

2.2. Social Innovation

2.2.1. Creativity & Innovation

The rapidly accelerating business world stresses corporations to continuously deliver new services and products (Amabile, 1997). There exist clear demands for corporations to improve their performance by doing things cheaper, faster and better. Innovation and creativity are viewed as the solution to these demands of enhanced performance. (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010) Creativity is the creation of new and unique ideas that appropriately provide a solution to a problem or creates an opportunity (Amabile, 1997). Creativity is the result of uninhibited experimentation, a combination of former elements building a new pattern and risk-taking (Amabile, Hennessey & Grossman, 1986). Innovation, on the other hand, is the result of the original and valuable idea created through creativity, that is implemented and applied (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010). Creativity can be viewed as the first stage of innovation, which is the effective
implementation of an idea (Amabile, 1997). Creativity and innovation are found in environments where employees feel valued, experience little stress, have positive interactions and are encouraged to use creative behaviours for problem solving (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010). Empirical evidence demonstrate that creativity primarily is the cause of intrinsic motivation, rather than by rewards, competitions or high surveillance. Since, corporations’ financial success is closely related to employees’ engagement and passion for their work, having an innovative business climate creates several advantages. (Amabile, 1997) Factors that are believed to initiate innovation are; new knowledge, changes in shared perceptions, unanticipated events or occurrences, inconsistencies between ‘what is’ and ‘what should be’, process needs, changes in market structures and new demographic markets (Drucker, 1985).

2.2.2. Social Innovation

Social Innovation, or Corporate Social Innovation, lacks a clear definition (Berzin & Pitt-Catsouphes, 2015). The concept addresses social issues and challenges through the use of innovation, by creating new products, processes or services (Nandan, London & Bent-Goodley, 2015). Phills Jr, Deiglmeier and Miller (2008) defined corporate social innovation as “a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just that existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals” (Phills Jr, Deiglmeier & Miller, 2008:36). Hence, it is the generation and direct implementation of applicable solutions that creates a sustainable outcome (Nandan, London & Bent-Goodley, 2015). The European Commission (2013) states that “social innovation can be defined as the development and implementation of new ideas (products, services and models) to meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations”. Social innovation occurred for the first time in Kanter’s study (1999) where she had noticed that corporations were moving towards corporate social innovation from CSR by producing innovations which profited society, as well as the market (Phillips et al., 2015). According to Hadad and Cantaragiu (2017) corporate social innovation strategies exceed the work of traditional CSR initiatives by being more social. By creating more with less and collaborating with different business sectors, corporate social innovation creates truly sustainable solutions (Nandan, London & Bent-Goodley, 2015).

Mivris et al. (2016) differentiate corporate social innovation from CSR in four respects, 1) CSR often occurs in collaborations with NGOs, corporate social innovation on the other hand is based on collaborations within the company, a collective interplay between different sectors and sometimes external parties. 2) CSR programs are usually the cause of philanthropic engagements, while corporate social innovation is a strategic investment. 3) While companies hope to gain goodwill and an enhanced reputation by their work with CSR, corporate social innovation aims to generate new products and services, as well as improving the innovative climate, which in the long run enhances the companies’ financial performance and recruitment opportunities. 4) CSR initiatives involve the donations of money or volunteering of man-power, corporate social innovation uses all the companies’ different resources to research and develop new solutions to pressing social problems and is hence not a one-time initiative. (Mivris et al., 2016) Social innovation is hence a broad range of activities within organizations, designed to address problems in the world (Tracy & Stot, 2016). Corporations can by the implementation of social innovation deliver more value to their stakeholders, than what they can do with CSR (Phillips et al., 2015). This could be the cause of the growing interest in social innovation (Phillips et al., 2015; van der Havea & Rubalcaba, 2016) and its family: social entrepreneurship and social intrapreneurship (Phillips et al., 2015; Tracy & Stot, 2016) which will be discussed in the following sections.
2.3. Social Entrepreneurship

2.3.1. The Entrepreneur

The term *entrepreneur* is believed to have first been used by Richard Cantillon in 1734 (Çağrı Gündoğdu, 2012; Smith, Rees & Murray, 2016) to describe an individual who is innovative and a risk-taker. Jean-Baptiste Say (1803) went further to recognize an entrepreneur as a coordinator, with intellectual skills, who through the determination of market assets figures out the needs of customers and how to meet them (Forget, 1999). Later, Schumpeter (1934) considered an entrepreneur to be innovative, as a result of new knowledge, and a creator of high quality products or methods, who is involved in a new industry or organization. In 1985, Peter Drucker, influenced by Say’s definition “the entrepreneur shifts economic resources out of an area of lower and into an area of higher productivity and greater yield” (Drucker, 1985:21) goes about describing the entrepreneur as someone who “always searches for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity” (Drucker, 1985). A more up to date definition was provided and used by Davidsson (2016) where entrepreneurship was defined as, “the competitive behaviors that drive the market process, alternatively phrased as the introduction of new economic activity that leads to change in the marketplace” (2016:1). The characteristics of an entrepreneur is someone who seizes opportunities (Çağrı Gündoğdu, 2012), is motivated by financial returns (Schumpeter, 1934), is innovative (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001; Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby, 1990; Parker, 2009) and converts ideas and money into new enterprises (Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012; Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011).

2.3.2. The Social Entrepreneur

The definitions of *Social Entrepreneurship* have been described as both vague (Jones & Donmoyer, 2015) and fuzzy (Mair & Marti, 2006). Hence, the concept is believed to have different meaning, to different people (Dees, 1998). Social entrepreneurship first appeared in academic journals in 1991 (Dacin, Dacin & Tracey, 2011), but the phenomenon is not new (Kistruck & Beamish, 2010). Social entrepreneurship was coined by William Drayton, founder of Ashoka – a global organization prone to identify and assist social entrepreneurs (Sen, 2006). He describes social entrepreneurs as “individuals who combine the pragmatic and results-oriented methods of a business entrepreneur with the goals of a social reformer” (Sen, 2006:536). In 1998, Gregory Dess, influenced by the work of Say, Drucker and Schumpeter, discussed the role which social entrepreneurs and changemakers play in society. He characterized the following aspects of social entrepreneurs; 1) they adopt a social mission, 2) recognize and pursue new opportunities aimed at aiding them in their social mission, 3) they engage in innovation and activities of continuous learning, 4) they feel accountable for their impact and the outcome of their initiatives, and 5) they act confidently, and mission driven despite lacking resources. (Jones & Donmoyer, 2015)

According to Ashoka, the personal qualities of entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs are similar; clear vision, creative and innovative, pragmatic and determine to create system changes (Sen, 2006). These individuals emerge when a gap builds between individuals in society and institutions, or when governmental systems fail (Miller et al., 2012). By creating a social enterprise, social entrepreneurs strive to create large-scale and sustainable social change (Dees 1998; Light, 2006). They confront different environmental or social problem in an entrepreneurial fashion (Chell, Nicolopoulou & Karataş-Özkan, 2010). Their role as an altruistic problems-solver (Dacin, Dacin & Tracey, 2011) is criticized by some researcher, who feel they cannot create sustainable change given that they must compete with for-profit corporations and their ‘race to the bottom’ (Helmsing, 2015). Social entrepreneurs also face a lot of risks (Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010) since they need to autonomously bear the losses of failures (Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012). Many social entrepreneurs also struggle to sustain
their enterprise, scale or expand their operation, have a hard time master the role of being a leader (Berzin & Pitt-Catsoupes, 2015) and the entrepreneur is often tied to the survival of the entire enterprise (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011). Social entrepreneurs originate from for-profit enterprises, where they have not been able to engage with their dream, hence causing them to leave the company (Kistruck & Beamish, 2010). Since entrepreneurial behaviours have been found to enhance a company’s competitive advantages and financial performance (Alpkan et al., 2010; Hornsby et al., 2002; Wakkee, Elfring & Monaghan, 2010; Zahra, 1991) companies need to find the means to keep these individuals within the company and have them engage in intrapreneurship. The concept of intrapreneurship will be further discussed in the following section.

2.4. Social Intrapreneurship

2.4.1. The Intrapreneur

Gifford Pinchot coined the term Intrapreneurship in 1985 and defined it as “dreamers who do” and entrepreneurship inside corporations. The intrapreneur is self-proclaimed and motivated to innovate within an existing organization. (Pinchot, 1985) Their initiatives occur bottom-up and they exploit opportunities in an unexpected or new fashion, which depart from how the company usually do business (Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012). Brunåker and Kurvinen (2006) defined an intrapreneur as a proactive changemaker, who identify opportunities and initiatives which have good potentials. The actions of intrapreneurs can be carried out in companies of all sizes and fields (Antonicic & Hisrich, 2001). “The intrapreneur is the individual who acts not as a change agent for someone else’s intentions but as the one who initiates and drives the process of creating unequivocal interpretations of equivocal events” (Brunåker & Kurvinen, 2005:130). Intrapreneurship ultimately results in new products, projects or services, which strengthens corporations overall performance (Antonicic & Hisrich, 2003; Felício, Rodrigues & Caldeirinha, 2012). Hence, intrapreneurship is important, especially in larger corporations, for development, profitability, renewal and organizational survival (Zahra, 1991). Behavioural aspects found in intrapreneurs are among other; ‘out of the box’ thinking, risk-taking, championing and finding solutions (Bosmaa, Stamab & Wennekers, 2012). Similar factors where identified by Monnavarian and Ashena (2009) who detected risk-taking, proactiveness in business, competitive aggressiveness and innovation.

Intrapreneurship is related to the concept Corporate Entrepreneurship (Antonicic & Hisrich, 2003), coined by Robert Burgelman (1983), which refers to corporations’ top-down approach to foster innovation and development (Bosmaa, Stamab & Wennekers, 2012). Intrapreneurship and corporate entrepreneurship are by some researchers used as synonyms (Brunåker & Kurvinen, 2006; Felício, Rodrigues & Caldeirinha, 2012; Monnavarian & Ashena, 2009; Parker, 2009). Zahra (1991) defined corporate entrepreneurship as the “formal and informal activities aimed at creating new business in established companies through product and process innovations and market developments. These activities may take place at the corporate, division (business), functional, or project levels, with the unifying objective of improving a company’s competitive position and financial performance” (1991:262). Hence, compared to intrapreneurship, which focuses on the initiatives conducted by individuals, corporate entrepreneurship are organizational activities coordinated by management (Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012).

Intrapreneurs are found among individuals with a higher education and in the middle of their career (Bosmaa, Stamab & Wennekers, 2012). Employees between age 25 – 44 where found in Parker’s (2009) study to be more likely to start a new business, while the youngest and oldest employees engaged in intrapreneurial behaviours. Intrapreneurship appears to a large extent in innovation-driven and high-income countries (Bosmaa, Stamab & Wennekers, 2012) and in
corporations where the organizational atmosphere support and encourage these types of initiatives (Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby, 1990). Intrapreneurs are more likely than other employees to start a new independent business (Bosmaa, Stamab & Wennekers, 2012), hence corporations need to provide a corporate culture which foster these individuals and provide them with the right incentives to stay (Monnavarian & Ashena, 2009).

2.4.2. The Social Intrapreneur

The term Social Intrapreneur was coined by SustainAbility (2008) - a think tank and advisory firm, which consults and inspire businesses towards acting sustainable, founded by John Elkington and Julia Hailes in 1987 (SustainAbility, 2017). SustainAbility describes a social intrapreneur as someone working within an organization or corporation in a similar manner as a social entrepreneur (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014). McGaw (2013) defined social intrapreneurs as “a new breed of business professional [...] finding creative - and in many cases disruptive - ways to tackle some of society's toughest problems and create long-term value for their companies as well” in her article Have a real impact; keep your day job, in Harvard Business Review. Social intrapreneurs’ role within large companies, help them tap into the company’s global resource pool and deliver large scale social change (McGaw, 2013). These individuals are “employees who identify opportunities for social innovation within their corporation or organisation, playing a part in making businesses better from the inside out” (Mitchell, 2013) and are commonly found in larger for-profit corporations (Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012). The Circle of Young Intrapreneurs believes that “social intrapreneurship is a process by which we can convert social problems into business opportunities by delivering sustainable solutions which aim to profitably-do-good” (Circle of Young Intrapreneurs, 2018:9). Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck use the definition, “people within a large corporation who take direct initiative for innovations that address social or environmental challenges while also creating commercial value for their companies” (2014:19) in their book Social Intrapreneurism and all that Jazz. This definition will be used in the thesis. Nijhof, Looise and de Leede (2012) characterize social intrapreneurs as employees in larger corporations, who address environmental and social challenges and commence in initiatives for innovation. Social intrapreneurs know how to leverage organizations’ infrastructure and competences, for social good and challenges their employers, by acting proactive (Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012).

Social intrapreneurship has received a lot of attention recently, however, due to it being a new concept, limited research exists on the subject (Hadad & Cantaragiu, 2017; Tracy & Stot, 2016). Similarities exist with the concept Corporate Social Entrepreneurship, “a dynamic, flexible, multi-faceted vehicle delivering positive social impact, people and organisation development and new core business opportunities in pursuit of corporate sustainability” (Hadad & Cantaragiu, 2017:256). The term was coined by Hemingway (2004) and has received little academic ground (Hadad & Cantaragiu, 2017). Hadad and Cantaragiu (2017) compared the two constructs, corporate social entrepreneurship is a top-down and centralized process carried out by management, while social intrapreneurship is decentralized, and bottom-up initiatives created by individual employees. Due to the aim of the thesis, the focus of this study will be on the concept of social intrapreneurship.

The work of Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011, 2014) identified different individual, external and internal aspects, which impact the work of social intrapreneurs. Individual factors were among others, personality, mind-set, skills and behaviours of individuals. Characteristics like, proactiveness, willingness to take risks, need for autonomy, inner lotus of control, creativity and a clear sense of purpose, were also identified in social intrapreneurs (Nandan, London & Bent-Goodley, 2015; Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012). External aspects which impact the extent or occurrence of social intrapreneurs found in Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck’s study (2011) were: 1) social networks, like League of Intrapreneurs and Circle of
Young Intrapreneurs, which help motivate and support these individuals, 2) the engagement of organizations and NGOs, that inspire individuals into engaging socially and act altruistic, and finally 3) business schools and specialised consultants, who can offer the right tools for intrapreneurs and corporations which want to engage in social intrapreneurship. (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014) Nevertheless, the aspect which separate the work of social intrapreneurs from that of social entrepreneurs, is the corporate environment in which they act, hence a major focus is placed on the internal aspects, in the following section.

**Internal organizational factors**

The internal organizational factors which Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) identified in their study, to influence the work of social intrapreneurs were; Management and Leadership, Strategy, Culture, Organizational processes and Infrastructure, HR and Resources. Similar factors were also identified by the League of Intrapreneurs (2018b) in a case study and workshop which they conducted with 25 intrapreneurs. The internal factors they found to foster an intrapreneurial environment were; Leadership and Strategy, Culture, Operations, Governance, Purpose and Talent.

**Management and Leadership** – was found to be a key aspect in both studies. The League of Intrapreneurs (2018b) identified that leaders’ call to action in social and innovative processes did have a significant impact on intrapreneurs engagement. Several studies have showed that it is important that leaders communicate the importance of innovation and have a clear corporate vision (Christensen, 2005; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004; Mantere, 2005; Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011). A leader needs to be engaged and accountable for the company’s impact, for it to transcend to his/her employees (Angus-Leppan, Metcalf & Benn, 2010; Greenberg, McKone-Sweet & Wilson, 2011; League of Intrapreneurs, 2018b). An inspirational leader is crucial to the success of CSR practices (Angus-Leppan, Metcalf & Benn, 2010) and social intrapreneurship initiatives (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). Since leaders can impact the corporate climate, they have a prominent role in altering employees’ behaviours (Ekvall, 1996). Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2014) also noticed the role of the ‘godparent’, a senior colleague or manager, who supports and encourages the work of the intrapreneur.

**Strategy** – by having a long-term approach when creating business strategies (Christensen, 2005; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004) and processes, which encourage and handle risks, are important for social intrapreneurship (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). Having CSR or Sustainable Development Goals integrated in the company’s core strategy helps encouraging the work of intrapreneurs (League of Intrapreneurs, 2018b).

**Culture** – organisational climate and culture highly influence the work of social intrapreneurs. Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) identified; Dialogue, Sustainability, Autonomy, Experimentation and Risk-taking, as particularly salient in both their literature review and study. These aspects will be further discussed in the following section, 2.5.3. DARES Culture. The League of Intrapreneurs (2018) also identified culture and 1) the importance of providing employees with a culture that grants them permission to experiment and fail. 2) Offering places where ideas can be explored and developed. 3) Encourage and support collaboration and initiatives for further learning. But also 4) share stories of successful social innovation or intrapreneurs’ initiatives. (League of Intrapreneurs, 2018b)

**Organizational processes and Infrastructure/Operations** – a flat, non-hierarchical organisation (Christensen, 2005) which allows open communication (Brunäker & Kurvinen, 2006; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004; Mantere, 2005) is essential for the work of social intrapreneurs. Intrapreneurs need to be able to take full advantage of organizational resources and have the possibility to create cross-functional teams and incubators, where collaboration across different business
sectors is possible (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). The League of Intrapreneurs (2018b) call this factor, Operations and discuss organizational mechanisms for scaling and integrating new ideas as well as having structured innovation processes in the company.

**Human Resources/Governance** – training and personal development (Mantere, 2005; Parker, 2011), volunteering support, education, innovation time and group brainstorming are a few of the initiatives HR can put in place to enhance innovation (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). By providing rewards and recognize those who partake in these types of projects, also help encourage others to follow suit. Governance, was used by the League of Intrapreneurs (2018b), and described as having decision-making being distributed all across the company and having different metrics (not just financial) measuring the company’s results.

**Resources/Talent** – the company need to be able to offer time and capital to intrapreneurs who are engaged in a new project (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). Often these resources are allocated or provided by management (Christensen, 2005; Kuratko, Ireland, Covin & Hornsby, 2005; Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby, 1990) The League of Intrapreneurs (2018b) discusses this under the term, Talent, which they describe as employee’s access to resources and tools, that they receive opportunities for skill development and rewards or incentives for their work.

**Purpose** – this factor was identified by the League of Intrapreneurs (2018b) and by Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2014) but it fell under their chapter of individual factors. The League of Intrapreneurs (2018b) describes Purpose, as an important aspect, both that the individual employees feel a strong social purpose with their work, but also that the company have an articulated purpose and vision of their social engagements.

**Why social intrapreneurship?**

Why then should companies have their employees allocate time to work as social intrapreneurs? Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) used the acronym STIR: Sustainability, Talent, Innovation and Reputation, to describe the advantages and opportunities created when engaging in social intrapreneurship. **Sustainability** – by having employees engaged with social and sustainable initiatives as a part of their work, less focus and resources need to be placed on CSR initiatives. By becoming more social and sustainable, corporations can tap into new markets and create a diversified set of products and services (Circle of Young Intrapreneurs, 2018).

**Talent** – social intrapreneurship helps retain, develop and attract talent (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). By providing a purpose for one’s employees creates employee engagement and motivation, which improve their performance. If employees feel committed and proud of their work it enhances the legitimacy of the company (Circle of Young Intrapreneurs, 2018).

**Innovation** – by having employees who innovate daily, increases corporations’ ability to think ‘outside the box’ and tackle problems in a new social way (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). Innovation is not easy and Foley (2013) found the failure rates to be as high as 50-90 percent. Since social intrapreneurs are an important driver for innovation and creativity within firms, their work should be encouraged (Nijhof, Kees Looise & de Leede, 2012). **Reputation** – social intrapreneurship enhances companies’ reputation and build their brand, companies can communicate stories of the initiatives to external stakeholders and push marketing. Like CSR, social intrapreneurship helps build a strong reputation (Venn & Berg, 2013).

Circle of Young Intrapreneurs (2018) added two factors in their first Social Intrapreneurship Report, namely; Growth and Leadership. **Growth** – social intrapreneurship helps companies to diversify and grow. Social intrapreneurship provides financial benefits for the company while acting in a social and sustainable manner. Circle of Young Intrapreneurs motto is to “do well and do good” (2018:7). If employees feel committed to their work, it improves their performance and the overall results of the company. **Leadership development** – by fostering an entrepreneurial environment also creates leaders with an entrepreneurial mind-set. This helps
leaders to become more effective and innovative. (Circle of Young Intrapreneurs, 2018) Entrepreneurial leaders are more flexible and open to change, ready to challenge old structures and view problems as opportunities. By having a corporate culture that encourage entrepreneurial behaviours in employees and leaders, can help improve the company’s overall performance. (Greenberg, McKone-Sweet & Wilson, 2011)

2.5. The Research Frontier

Limited research exists on the relatively new notion of social intrapreneurship. In Grayson, McLaren and Spitzbeck’s book, Social Intrapreneurism and All That Jazz (2014), based on 25 interviews with social intrapreneurs conducted during their study in 2011, the authors developed a context for this new field of research. According to the researchers’ prior articles there are several individual, external and internal factors, which impact the work of social intrapreneurs, that needs to be explored further (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzbeck, 2011; Grayson et al., 2013). “Corporations interested in social intrapreneurship should be thinking of providing a supportive environment in which social intrapreneurs can develop and test their ideas” (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzbeck, 2011:40). Grayson, McLaren and Spitzbeck (2014) called out for more empirical studies which examine what, among other things, create an “enabling environment for social intrapreneurism and employee engagement for sustainability more generally?” and “What are the kinds of practical things that companies can do, and are doing, to stimulate such an enabling environment?” (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzbeck, 2014:224).

Kistruck and Beamish (2010) conducted 10 case studies in Africa and Latin America looking at the work of social intrapreneurs and social entrepreneurs, in both for-profit and non-profit sectors, engaged at finding market-based solutions to poverty. “We have attempted to explore how form can influence the effectiveness of social intrapreneurship and how structure can be used as a tool for addressing the cognitive, network, and cultural embeddedness that can constrain organizational change” (2010:753). Their findings suggested that a variety of decoupled structural approaches could be used to lessen the constraints of organizational structures.

Nandan, London and Bent-Goodley (2015) used a similar approach by looking at 10 social workers’ engagement with social innovation (social entrepreneurship and social intrapreneurship) in the United States. The participants in their study tried to create systematic change within their organization, to achieve the desired impact. By recognizing opportunities, acquiring relevant knowledge and assessing the amount of risks they were willing to take, they successfully launched initiatives both within and outside of the organization. “Even though adequate funding is often cited as a major impediment to implementing innovative ideas [...] time commitments and the ability to juggle different roles and responsibilities were more of a challenge for participants in this study” (2015:52). In their study they found that time constraints were considered to have had the largest impact on the participants’ work. “Innovation in the social sphere means accomplishing more with less, working together, leveraging resources for creating sustainable change” (Nandan, London & Bent-Goodley 2015:52). According to the authors, courses in social innovation should be included across more fields and not just in business education.

Nijhof, Looise and de Leede (2012) performed a literature review to conceptualize a model of social intrapreneurship, by analysing prior theories of corporate entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship and entrepreneurial behaviours. They explored the meaning and possible contribution of social intrapreneurship and hence contributed to the understanding of the concept and its applicability. In their thesis they clarified the important role of the social intrapreneurs as a driver for innovation within established corporations. “Many employees are looking for work that is more meaningful. Social intrapreneurs cease this opportunity by
turning their ambition towards meaningful work into actual practice. Depending on the impact of these initiatives, their visibility and the number of initiatives, this might have an effect on the overall corporate culture and strategy” (2012:124-125). In their article they call for more empirical research for testing their conceptual model as well as “an important line for future research is to analyze to what extent social intrapreneurs can be a driving force for internal transformation” (Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012:124).

Venn and Berg (2012) examined the competitive advantages of social intrapreneurship in South Asian Philips Electronics’ offices. Their study provides novel insight on social intrapreneurship and helps to enhance the understanding of the many benefits, but also barriers of inclusive business practices. Their results showed benefits such as motivation, retention and employer attractiveness, when the corporation engaged with social intrapreneurship and that the intrapreneur’s mindset helped the company become more competitive. “If MNCs allow employees to invest a small fraction of working hours in social innovation incubators, spill-over effects to “regular work” might be enhanced. Thereby, sustainability thinking could trickle deep into an organization” (2012:120). Through their study Venn and Berg found that social intrapreneurs use personal time and resources to contribute to the company’s sustainable development, as well as corporate mission. “If MNCs want to exploit beneficial effects of inclusive business, novel organizational structures and managerial practices are needed to foster social intrapreneurship” (Venn & Berg, 2012:119).

Over the years, communities like; the League of Intrapreneurs (2017) which has provided a toolkit for future intrapreneurs and the Circle of Young Intrapreneurs (2018b) which released their first Social Intrapreneurship Report in spring 2018, help strengthening the field. These communities help provide up to date intel on this relatively new and continuously growing concept. This thesis aims to explore what enables employees to engage in social intrapreneural behaviours and will add further understanding in this area of research. By finding what creates an enabling environment, can help corporations to engage in social innovation and accomplish more lasting social change.

2.6. Theoretical Framework

2.6.1. Organizational Culture & Climate

Several studies show that organizational culture and climate impact the extent of intrapreneurial behaviours which occur inside corporations (Christensen, 2005; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzbeck, 2011; Kuratko, Montagno, & Hornsby, 1990). To be able to understand how a company can enable and encourage the work of social intrapreneurs, one need to understand the concepts of culture and climate.

Culture is “customary beliefs and values that ethnic, religious, and social groups transmit fairly unchanged from generation to generation” (Guiso, Sapienza & Zingales, 2006:23). It is hence collectively held and rooted in society (Denison, 1996), which makes culture hard to alter or impact, since it is taken for granted assumptions and beliefs (Schein & Scheiner, 2016). Organizational culture is defined by Schein (1985:9) as, “a pattern of basic assumptions — invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration— that has worked well enough to be considered […] the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems”. It is unwritten corporate agreements, which are shared by co-workers and managers in the company (Kreps, 1990). According to Denison (1996:624) a corporate culture “refers to the deep structure of organizations, which is rooted in the values, beliefs, and assumptions held by organizational members”. Interactions between different groups within the workplace help building a strong and rooted culture (Denison, 1996).
Climate, on the other hand, can be observed through interactions and behaviours (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010). Climate, “portrays organizational environments as being rooted in the organization’s value system, but tends to present these social environments in relatively static terms, describing them in terms of a fixed (and broadly applicable) set of dimensions” (Denison, 1996:624). Climate is hence, considered to be more temporary and can be altered through direct control (Denison, 1996). Climate is the frequent patterns of behaviours and processes within an organisation (Schneider, 1987), which displays the underlying beliefs and values held by the corporation (Isaksen et al., 2001). Corporations can manipulate and alter the climate to make it fit their objectives (Ekvall, 1996).

To summarize, organizational culture is permanent shared beliefs and assumptions about the company’s core values and expectations. Hence, culture is hard to alter since it has been shaped by managers and employees over years. Organizational culture is how the employees perceive the company based on their personal attitudes, thoughts, feelings and perception. Climate can be changed by managers, by altering social systems and communicating new values to employees. Both culture and climate highly impact the corporate environment.

2.6.2. Ekvall’s Creative Climate

Ekvall (1996) identified 10 dimensions which impact an organization’s creative climate and used these to create a model and a questionnaire. The 10 dimensions which he acknowledged were; Dynamism/Liveliness, Playfulness/Humour, Debates, Trust/Openness, Risk-taking, Freedom, Idea Time, Challenge and Idea Support. The final dimension Conflicts was the only one which negatively correlate with a creative climate. These 10 dimensions will be further defined in the following section.

Dynamism/Liveliness – an eventful atmosphere with positive energy that creates opportunities for individuals to use alternative ways of thinking, enables individuals to be more creative. In an organization where problems are viewed as a chance for creativity, employees are more likely to be innovative. This dimension is similar to that of, Playfulness/Humour – if colleagues feel at ease with each other and the atmosphere is relaxed and spontaneous, the possibilities for innovation are greater. When employees feel like they can interact about personal aspects as well as professional, they are more inclined to try new things. Debates – knowledge and personal experiences can openly be expressed even if employees do not share each other’s opinions. People listen and different viewpoints are excepted and appreciated. Employees dare to engage in debates and have dialogues about changing old patterns and try new things. Conflicts – to have a good working climate, the amount of conflicts needs to be low. If tension arises at the office, it is raised, discussed and prevented. Emotional tension, gossip and back-stabbing need to be avoided to prevent it from affecting the creative climate of the organization.

Freedom – individuals feel that they can manage their own time and alter the way they do their job. Independence and autonomy are experienced throughout the entire company and people feel like they can work in a fashion which suits them. Idea Time – if individuals are provided time for their own ideas and initiatives, it creates possibilities for employees to test new concepts and ideas. Employees have time to explore outside of their day to day assignments.

Challenge – employees feel a personal commitment to their work and the company. They feel they are stimulated by the work they do and their work environment. Energy and time are invested in their task at hand and they feel like they are being challenged by their work. This enables the dimension of Idea Support – new ideas and suggestions are faced with curiosity and supported, the feedback is constructive and positive. Employees are encouraged and listened to by managers and colleagues.
Risk-taking – to have an organization that have a high tolerance of ambiguous situations and uncertainty, enable bold and creative initiatives. In a ‘everything is possible’ environment, employees dare to take risks that can lead to major break-throughs. If employees feel safe and not afraid of working ‘outside the box’, it is often due to trust. Trust/Openness – employees and manager can communicate openly and straightforward. When employees feel safe to express opinions, concerns and beliefs and trust management and colleagues, they dare to try things which are not sure to succeed. Since failure is not ridiculed or feared, they can communicate when they have failed and get support to turn it into a learning experience.

Ekvall (1996) 10 dimensions have been widely and frequently used, through the Creative Climate Questionnaire (CCQ) in both practice and research. The CCQ consists of 50 items based on Ekvall’s 10 dimensions model. The questionnaire has both strengths and shortcomings and can be used to distinguish between innovative and stagnated corporations (Dackert & Carlsson, 2007). The dimensions in Ekvall’s questionnaire showed positive significant correlations in Lauer’s (1994) study. However, Dackert and Carlsson (2007) found that the dimensions Dynamism and Playfulness were to similar and melted together. According to Dackert and Carlsson (2007) the questionnaire needed to be re-evaluated and reconstructed to consist of only nine dimensions. KEYS Environment Scales (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby & Herron, 1996) have been used similarly. Amabile et al.’s (1996) questionnaire consists of the dimensions; Sufficient Resources, Organizational Encouragement, Challenging Work, Freedom, Supervisory Encouragement and Work Group Support which simulate a creative environment and two which disturb; Workload Pressure and Organizational Impediments. However, since Ekvall’s model has more frequently been used in Sweden (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010) it will be used in this thesis. Ekvall’s 10 dimensions model has been used to formulate some of the interview questions in the study. The questions in the CCQ worked as inspiration, when building the interview questions for the study.

2.6.3. DARES Culture

Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) presents DARES, culture that fosters social innovation, in their article, Social intrapreneurs – An Extra Force for Sustainability. DARES is the acronym for; Dialogue, Autonomy, Risk-taking, Experimentation and Sustainability. DARES derived from their empirical research and the literature review they conducted.

Dialogue – for innovation to occur, different voices need to be heard. A culture that allows minorities voices room and that have both time and spaces for employees to openly discuss different subjects with one another, provides great opportunities for intrapreneurs. An environment where people are eager to listen to new ideas and discuss or consult on its different aspects, helps intrapreneurs moving forward with their initiatives.

Autonomy – for intrapreneurs to be able to innovate, they need to feel encouraged to develop and test their ideas. Corporations need to provide them with freedom and autonomy to take risks and oversee their own time and resources. Too much ‘looking over some one’s shoulder’ prevents people from being creative since it restrains their process.

Risk-taking – problem-solving does not always generate solutions. The environment and culture need to have tolerance for failure for intrapreneurs to be able to take risks and experiment with things that might fail. A culture that encourages risk-taking and provide opportunities for learning from prior mistakes, enable the work of intrapreneurs.

Experimentation – for ideas to be generated, intrapreneurs need time and resources to experiment and explore. Innovation can take time and a lot of trial and error, before it generates results. By providing employees with sufficient time and space for researching and experimenting enhance the possibilities of innovation.
Sustainability – by having a company culture that does not only strive towards financial goals, but also encourages ethics and sustainability, enhances the changes of employees’ innovative work. Management and leaders’ clear communication of the company’s social vision and values, help providing a direction for intrapreneurs. (Grayson et al., 2013; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011, 2014)

Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) compiled a questionnaire with these five items, but since it has recently been constructed, it appears to not have been used or tested. Since this is the first model created of culture, which stimulates social intrapreneurship, it will be used in the thesis. The DARES model has been used to create some of the interview questions and will be used to structure the empirical findings.
3. Method & Material

This chapter describes the chosen method and the process of data collection for the study. Under the first subheading Research Model, qualitative data collection and semi-structured interviews will be described in more depth. The study's reliability and validity will be assessed, and ethical aspects which were taken under consideration during the study will be discussed. The second subheading Data Collection describes how the empirical material was collected and provides the reader with the selected sample.

3.1. Research Model

3.1.1. Research Perspective

There are two main research perspectives, hermeneutics and positivism, used to interpret and understand the reality in which we live, through science (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1997). In hermeneutic studies the aim is to provide insight and conduct interpretations of people’s experiences and understanding. Subjective experiences are used in an attempt to unveil the world (Kafle, 2011). Hermeneutic phenomenology is often described through the hermeneutic spiral, where new insights of the researcher leads to further knowledge and understanding, this continuous process can be viewed in the form of a spiral. Positivism, on the other hand, is used to describe and explain the world, using experiments and quantitative measurements. By objectively describing reality, positivism aims at finding scientific knowledge that is stable and can be replicated. (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1997) A hermeneutic perspective is best suited for this study, due to it often being used when studying culture and since the aim of the thesis is to understand the practices and knowledge of the participants.

There are three inferences commonly used in research; induction, deduction and abduction. Inductive logic uses generalizations based on what is observed, in a sample or a smaller group (Foresman, 2017). The conclusions drawn are correct for the sample, and the probability is that it can be generalized (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2014). The empirical material collected through the study is used to build the theory (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1997). Deductive logic derives from accepted facts and general universal premises. Deductive research aims at finding data that support the arguments derived from general statements or established theories. The deductive inference is commonly used with a positivistic approach and qualitative study, while inductive is hermeneutic and qualitative (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1997). Abductive reasoning is the formation of a conclusion drawn from known information (Foresman, 2017). The aim is to find the best possible explanation, with the information at hand. By using an abductive method, one systematically combines the theoretical frame with the empirical material throughout the study, which enhance one’s comprehension of the material and the theories (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). The abductive approach was most suited for this study since limited studies have been conducted in social intrapreneurship and to re-visit and edit the theoretical material was crucial for the study.

3.1.2. Qualitative Data Collection

A qualitative research method aims at exploring and seeking new insights within a specific field. Qualitative methods provide non-numerical information and a holistic view of the research area, trying to describe and understand, rather than explain and prove. (Chadwick, Gill, Stewart & Treasure, 2008) Qualitative research methods often have fewer participants and a more in-depth approach, where the participants’ personal experiences, attitudes and opinions are examined. Through in-depth interviews, observations, case studies or focus groups, certain patterns and casual relationships are explored to add significant depth to the research area. This explorative approach enables the researcher to get a deeper understanding of an individual’s experiences and their perspective, hence it can be used to gather information which later can be
explored and generalized in a wider context. (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016) Quantitative research focus on gathering numerical data to describe the specific phenomena. It is useful when testing previously constructed theories or to gather large volume of information. Since quantitative studies often use standardized tests, replication is enabled. Hence validity and reliability can more easily be accomplished with quantitative studies. (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1997)

Since limited research exist on social intrapreneurship, an explorative approach will be used, rather than a descriptive or explanatory, in this study. The aim with the thesis is to explore what enables employees to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours, not to explain or describe their work. Since quantitative research methods fail to capture underlying reasons and the cause for motivation, it was not an option for this thesis. Qualitative studies are however highly subjective, since the participants’ individual experiences are not representative, this will make generalization difficult. Nevertheless, a lot of useful data can be gathered through a qualitative approach, compared with quantitative. To enhance the representability of the sample, the selected participants are from different companies, half of the companies are Swedish, and their number of employees varies from 100-400 000.

Out of the different approaches one can take when conducting a qualitative study, interviews was the chosen method. Observations demand comprehensive prerequisites from the researcher, to be able to recognise specific patterns of behaviours, something which exceeds the capability of a master student. Focus groups require the researcher to take the role of a moderator to enable the conversation, something which entail knowledge of this practice, hence this was not an option for this thesis. (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2013) A case study requires close collaboration with a company (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016), this approach was considered, however since I failed to receive a sufficient contact with a company, and its different offices, this method was excluded.

3.1.3. Semi-structured Interviews

Interviews yield highly detailed information and since the interviewer is precent during the interview, it reduces the risks of misunderstandings, due to unclear questions (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2013). Semi-structured interviews constitute of a list of questions that are covered, but the formulation of the questions can vary from interview to interview. The order of the questions can be altered to facilitate the flow of the conversation and supplementary questions can be asked to help the respondent with his/her reply. The questions used can be both closed and open-ended in a semi-structured interview and can be conducted both face-to-face or over telephone (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). The flexibility of the semi-structured interviews, instead of structured interviews, which allow no variation, alterations or follow-up questions (Chadwick et al., 2008), makes it more suitable for this study. Since semi-structured interviews allow follow-up questions it provide the interviewee with guidance, which was crucial in the study since culture, climate and social innovation are quite vague concepts. Since unstructured interviews makes the coding of the results difficult, are very time-consuming and significant information can be missed (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016), unstructured interviews were not a relevant option for this study.

3.1.4. Reliability & Validity

The reliability of a study refers to the consistency of the results, whether the same results will occur if the study is conducted under similar conditions by another researcher (Neuman, 2011). Reliability measure the stability of the study over time (Riege, 2003). External reliability helps distinguish whether the same phenomena will be detected if the study is duplicated and if it will show similar results when conducted again. Internal reliability, on the other hand, is if the study’s analysis of the empirical material can be accomplished in a similar fashion and generate
the same conclusions. When conducting a qualitative study, the relatability is hard to guarantee. (Goodwill & Goodwill, 2013) Since a qualitative method often is used to measure personal experiences, opinions and attitudes (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016), which are not permanent over time. Hence, it is difficult to attain the same results and reproduce the study (Riege, 2003). The internal reliability is reinforced by a clear description of the course of action during the analysis and when the empirical findings are supported with direct quotes. To strengthen the reliability of the study, the process behind the study will be described in detail. In Appendix II the interview questions used in the study are provided, to enable replication of the study. The empirical results contain several quotes, to support the implications drawn from the respondents’ answers.

Validity refers to whether the study succeed in measuring what it was set out to measure (Neuman, 2011). Validity measure to what extent the study captures the phenomena it expected and if it corresponds to the real world (Riege, 2003). If the questions adequately measure the construct in a valid way and the result can be generalized, it has external validity. Internal validity shows to what degree the test measures the reality. (Goodwill & Goodwill, 2013) By incorporating a well-known and used model of climate and a relatively new model of culture as inspiration for the interview questions, the study’s aim is to reach a high internal validity. To enhance the chance of external validity and generalization, the scope of the participants are 50 percent women, they are of varying ages, and the corporations are of different sizes. All the participants have worked for more than three years as a consultant and have hence broad knowledge about the work. They have been at their current employment for more than eight months, which ensure that they have a fundamental insight in the company and its culture.

3.1.5. Ethical Aspects

When conducting the study, ethical aspects were taken under consideration to ensure that the principles of Good Research Practices were followed (Swedish Research Council, 2017). The core issues; informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity and risk (Wiles, 2013) were assessed in the study.

**Informed Consent** – involves providing the participants with the opportunity to decide if they want to partake in the study and provide them with clear information of the study’s aim (Wiles, 2013). By also having the participants debriefed after the study have been conducted and let them view the results, ensure consent (Goodwill & Goodwill, 2013). Informed consent was accomplished by informing all the participants, in the initial email and at the beginning of the interview, of the aim of the study and the general topics of the interview questions. The interview questions were sent to all participants a couple of days before the interview. At the beginning of the interview the participants were informed that they were under no obligation to partake in the study and that they at any time could end the interview or choose not to answer a question. The transcribed manuscripts were sent to the respondents for them to go through and make alterations to their response if misunderstandings or misinterpretations of their response had occurred.

**Confidentiality** – the researcher should, as far as possible, guarantee that personal information will not be disclosed. If the participant does not want their identity revealed, the researcher should at greatest possible extent prevent their exposure. (Swedish Research Council, 2017) Limited personal information was collected during the interviews. The recorded material from the interviews were deleted after they had been transcribed. The transcribed interviews were precluded from the published thesis, to guarantee that responses which could be linked to certain individuals or organizations were limited.

**Anonymity** – to protect the identity of the respondent, the researcher can present the participants with the opportunity to be anonymous, by shielding the identity of the company and their name.
(Wiley, 2013). All participants were offered to remain anonymous or to have the company’s name removed from the final publication. Some of the participants choose to be anonymous and hence all names of the participants were removed from the published publication and instead the pseudonyms; Alfa, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon and Zeta were used from the Greek alphabet. If specific answers in the participant’s response could identify the identity of the participant, it was removed from the transcript.

Risk – to ensure the safety and well-being of the research participants, potential risks should be assessed (Swedish Research Council, 2017). Due to the study being an interview, the participants were exposed to limited risks. By taking the precautions needed to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants, there are limited risks of their identity being exposed.

3.2. Data Collection

3.2.1. Literature Review

The literature used to provide the theoretical background were retrieved by searching in the university library and its scientific database, SöderScholar as well as JSTOR, nber, PsycINFO and GoogleScholar. A selection of the keywords used were; Corporate Social Responsibility, CSR, Social Innovation, Social Intrapreneurship, Social Intrapreneur and Corporate Social Entrepreneurship. The extensive reference lists found in many of the articles, were used to identify relevant literature. Only peer-reviewed scientific articles and published books were reviewed to build the theory for the thesis. The selected companies’ annual reports, websites and sustainability reports were used as a compliment to the interviewees’ response, to provide general information about the company and their work.

The prior studies which have been conducted about social intrapreneurship, have all had a limited scope. Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) and League of Intrapreneurs (2018) both studied 25 social intrapreneurs and the studies conducted by Kistruck and Beamish (2010) and Nandan, London and Bent-Goodley (2015) only consisted of 10 participants. Hence, generalization of the studies’ results should be done cautiously. Since the research revolves around personal experiences of the interviewed participants, the reliability of the results can be viewed as weak. However, similarities between the findings from the research frontier show that the results have reliability over time.

3.2.2. Empirical Study

3.2.2.1. Sample Selection

Selection process

Emails were sent out to the reception or info@mail of 15 consulting firms, with an office in Sweden and an international presence. Through snow-balling six respondents were found at six different corporations. Several corporations responded that they had general policies of not partaking in student research, while others did not have the time to partake. Three consulting agencies did not reply to the email.

In the email, they were informed of the aim of the study and provided with the general scope of the interview questions. Over email, all interviews were scheduled, two over telephone and four face-to-face in Stockholm. The interviews were booked for 60 minutes, but took an average of 40 minutes, varying between 30-50 minutes. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. The transcribed material was sent to the respondents for them to review the material and make alterations to prevent misinterpretations.
Selected respondents

Sweden, and the Nordic countries in general, are ranked highly on entrepreneurial activity and intrapreneurship (Stam & Stenkula, 2017). The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM, 2018) have since 1999 surveyed several of the world’s economies on their extent of independent entrepreneurship and from 2011 intrapreneurship as well (Stam & Stenkula, 2017). Sweden, and the Nordic countries rank highly on global innovation, which could be due to the increased work autonomy and trust, which exist in welfare states, according to Stam and Stenkula’s (2017) study. Due to these results, it is of interest to get a more in-depth view of the intrapreneurial behaviours in companies in Sweden. The sample of corporations chosen for the study are quite representative in size. Two of the firms have less than, or approximately, 500 employees, two corporations have more than 1000 employees and the final two have more than 100 000 employees. All corporations have a presence abroad and in the Nordic countries and two are multinational with businesses in more than 100 countries.

This study explores the work environment of consultants in international firms. The cause behind this limitation of a specific profession, is due to the characteristics of intrapreneurs and consultants are similar in many aspects. Some of the characteristics identified in social intrapreneurs were; creative, proactive, need for autonomy, inner lotus of control, clear purpose and a willingness to take risks (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzack, 2014; Nandan, London & Bent-Goodeley, 2015; Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012). Innovative, leading thinker, collaborative, honest, care about client, analytical and a facilitator, were some of the variables found in consultants (Chelliah, D'Netto, & Georges, 2015). These characteristics were confirmed by the study, where the participants were asked to describe certain characteristics which they thought were appreciated and crucial in a consultant. The participants mentioned; communicative, flexible, problem-solver, humble, inner drive, initiative, costumer oriented and a leader. For social intrapreneurs to be able to succeed in their role, they need to possess some of these characteristics. To partake in the study, the participants had to have worked as a consultant for more than 6 months at the company. All participants were situated in Stockholm and had worked at the company between eight months and up to 10 years. Three of the participants were women and three of them were men, at varying ages. The following section will provide a short description of the individual companies.

Company A

Company A is a consulting firm with less than 200 employees within IT and operational development. Company A was founded in Sweden in the beginning of the 21st century and has offices across Scandinavia. Their curiosity and entrepreneurial spirit have them constantly challenging the boundaries of their business. They are active within several business sectors, reaching from energy, finance, media, steel, paper and automotive industry. The respondent, Alfa, who partook in the study has worked as a consultant at the company for ten years.

Company B

With its headquarter in Copenhagen, Company B, have for almost 20 years delivered analytical thinking and intuitive understanding to create change. They have 550 consultants in Scandinavia and Western Europe. By innovating Company B transform and restructure businesses within multiple fields, they are engaged with; Leadership Development, Finance and Risk Management, Supply Chain Management, HR and Organisation, Commercial Excellence, IT Management and Operations Strategy, among others. Their broad market know-how and resources have been applied to thousands of projects in both public and private sectors across the world. The interviewee, Delta, has worked as a consultant for the company for more than three years.
Company C

Company C is a consulting group founded in the middle of the 21st century with a strong presence in Sweden and have two offices abroad. With more than 1000 employees and continually growing, they are in the process of being listed on the stock market. They are providing smart solutions within the fields of construction, architecture, installation, industry and energy. Their engaged employees are focused on creating value, by being entrepreneurial and constantly evolving new processes. With an ambition to change the business, they provide sustainable solutions creating social benefits for society. The respondent, Beta, has been at the company for almost four years.

Company D

Company D was founded in Stockholm 1999 and has several offices in Western Europe. With approximately 1000 consultants, they implement new solutions within finance, Internet of Things, games and gambling, e-commerce and media. They are passionate about growing talent through extensive knowledge sharing and exploring the field with creativity and competence. Through their services they assist companies through the digital era. The respondent, Gamma, has been a consultant at the company for four years.

Company E

Company E was founded in United States 1975 and is today a multinational world leader in services, software, devices and solutions. They have subsidiaries all over the world and more than 126 000 employees. Company E offers 23,100 consultants, digital advisors, engineers and support professionals across 191 countries. Their focus is on creating unique business value and help companies integrate digital solutions across their company. The consultant, Zeta, who partook in the interview has worked for eight months at the company.

Company F

Company F have more than 420 000 employees and are active in over 100 countries across the globe. Company F is an American multinational corporation, with a focus on consultation, with expertise from 40 industries, operating within digitization, information technology and optimization of business operations. With 1000 employees in Sweden they help companies reinvent themselves. The respondent, Epsilon, who participated in the study, has worked for almost four years as a consultant at the company.

3.2.2.2. Development of Interview Guide

The interview questions were influenced and built around Ekvall’s (1996) 10 dimensions of creative climate and his Creative Climate Questionnaire and Grayson, McLaren and Spitzceck’s (2011) DARES culture. A total of 24 questions were asked (see Appendix II). Four questions gathered general information, about the participants period of employment, their role at the company and whether they or the company wanted to remain anonymous throughout the study. Ten questions were based on Ekvall’s dimensions and since three of Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck’s (2011) five dimensions correlated, they were combined. Freedom and Autonomy, Debate and Dialogue and finally Risk-taking, were the dimensions which were merged, to prevent repetition. Hence, ten questions concerned; Dynamism/Liveliness, Trust/Openness, Playfulness/Humour, Conflicts, Challenge, Idea Time, Idea Support, Debates/Dialogue, Freedom/Autonomy and Risk-taking. Due to the organizational climate being highly impacted by the culture of the corporation, they can smoothly be grouped together. One question explored the dimension of Experimentation from Grayson, McLaren and Spitzceck (2011).

Since the aim with the thesis is to explore what enables employees to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours, seven questions aimed at getting a better understanding of the
company’s CSR work and the conditions for employees to engage with social innovation. The last two questions concerned the role of a consultant, typical characteristics and whether they believed that they, in their role as a consultant, could influence their clients’ engagement in CSR or social innovation. All questions have been translated, since all the interviews were held in Swedish. When presenting the empirical results, the interview questions will be structured after the DARES culture by Grayson, McLaren and Spitzcek (2011).

Pilot study

To ensure that the interview questions used made sense and produced a relevant response for the study (Rowley, 2012), they were pilot tested. The interview questions were pilot tested by a former consultant and currently Head of Engineering Shafts, Synchro and Shot Peening at Scania, Carl Björklund. Some alterations of the questions were made, to make them more comprehensible to the respondents and ensure that they were answered correctly. The questions altered were; question (Q) 4 which explored the concept Experimentation, Q9 with the dimension Challenge, Q10 about Risk-taking was reformulated to prevent the respondent from talking about personal risk, and finally Q16 which explored the possibilities of social intrapreneurship. Due to the concept being new, social innovation was used instead of social intrapreneurship since it is a more familiar construct (see Appendix III).

3.2.2.3. Method for Analysis & Interpretation

The data gathered from the interviews, the corporations’ annual reports, webpages and sustainability reports were analysed in search of patterns, relationships and differences. For a qualitative study to yield useful and meaningful results the material need to be sufficiently analysed, according to Attride-Stirling (2001) the available methods and tools are unfortunately lacking. This was recognized by Braun and Clarke (2006) as well, “Thematic analysis is a poorly demarcated, rarely acknowledged, yet widely used qualitative analytic method within psychology” (2006:77). A thematic analysis is the process where themes and specific codes, transform qualitative information into useful data (Boyatzis, 1998). “Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006:79). To interpret the material, a code and themes are developed in three specific phases: 1) deciding sampling and design issues, 2) developing themes and a code, 3) validating and using the code. When developing the themes and code for the analysis one can use three different approaches, the code can be theory driven, driven by prior data from own research or driven from the raw data collected. (Boyatzis, 1998) The themes used in the analysis of the empirical material in this thesis will be developed from theory, due to it being most frequently used and to enhance the reliability of the study.

3.3. Limitations & Critique

3.3.1. The Study’s Limitations

Since social intrapreneurship recently has been coined, limited research explores the phenomena. The studies which have been conducted, have used qualitative methods, mostly interviews with social intrapreneurs or case studies. By exploring the organizational aspects of culture and climate’s impact on employees, something which few studies have done, the results will fill a gap within the field. The concept of social intrapreneurship has been less explored and is not well known. Due to interviews providing rich data they are commonly used when examining organizational culture (King, 2004), which made it a natural choice for the study.

The weakness of qualitative methods and semi-structured interviews, in particular, are that replication can be close to impossible. Social interactions are hard to duplicate since the responses are extremely subjective. Interviews are in general also very expensive (due to travel)
and time consuming (rich amount of material gathered), in comparison to questionnaires (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2013). Since all interviews in the study were conducted in Stockholm or over phone, these aspects did not have a major impact on the study. When conducting interviews, you also face the problem with interviewer bias, were the interviewer impact the interviewees’ response by asking leading questions or showing certain emotions, which impact the way the interviewee respond. There is also the case of subject bias, were the interviewee feels oblige to answer in a certain manner to appear favourable (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2013). To prevent bias, the interviewer avoided in tonating certain responses and value the interviewees’ response or comment on the content of their reply. Two of the interviews were conducted over telephone, while the majority were face-to-face. There are some indications of crucial information being lost over the telephone, but it can reduce the risk of bias (Rowley, 2012). Since the interviewees had received the questions before the interviews, they were prepared, and the telephone interviews had a similar length to the ones conducted face-to-face, however lacked some richness. There are some limitations of the study’s sample. None of the participants came from corporations with approximately 10 000 employees, this should be taken under consideration when viewing the results. Hence, the results might not be representative, and generalization will be difficult.

3.3.2. Critique of the Study

3.3.2.1. Critical Review of References

To ensure that the research revised in a study is accurate, reviewing the references is crucial according to Thurén (2013). Four principles are in general used when revising a study’s references, namely; authenticity, time framework, independence and tendency freedom (Thurén, 2013). Authenticity refers to the legitimacy of the source, whether the author is an expert within the field and can provide an accurate description of the research area (Thurén, 2013). The theoretical framework used in the study came from Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011), mainly engaged in research in the field of social intrapreneurship and Ekvall (1996) who have studied organizational culture and climate for several years. Remaining literature used in the theory came from peer-reviewed articles and published books, which provide legitimacy to the sources. The webpages of organizations like, SustainAbility, League of Intrapreneurs and Circle of Young Intrapreneurs, were used, since these organizations operate within the field, they have vital knowledge about the subject.

Time framework provide relevant critique on the durability of the material or research over time. By using research conducted several years ago, their results might no longer apply to society today. (Thurén, 2013) Few of the references used in the thesis are older than 20 years and those that are, have been reinforced with more recent literature that support the statements made.

Independence discuss whether the research can stand by itself or if it refers to secondary sources or another researchers’ work and if these are relevant and trustworthy (Thurén, 2013). All studies used to build the research frontier, except one (Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012), have based their research on studies which they conducted themselves. Similarly, the researchers, whose studies were used to create the theoretical framework for the study, all used their own studies to build their theories. In the literature review, the origin of the source, have as far as possible been located and used.

Tendency freedom raises the question of the references could be biased or have a hidden agenda, hence information and results could have been excluded or altered to support the researchers’ preconceived theory (Thurén, 2013). Since mainly peer-reviewed articles have been used, this aspect has been assessed. However, some bias might always influence researchers’ studies. In regard to this study, quotes from the participants have been used to support the claims that have
been made and by analysing the material using thematic analysis with themes and a code from previous literature, help prevent eventual bias and own interpretations.

3.3.2.2. Critical Review of the Study and its Sample

Culture and climate are hard to study, since individuals’ experiences of the concepts are extremely subjective and rarely permanent (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010). Since reliability regards the consistency of the findings (Neuman, 2011) and this study revolves around the participants’ experiences, the study’s reliability is weak. However, similar studies in the field have had a comparable approach and came up with results that corresponds with those found in the study. An important question to ask, is whether an interview, of less than 60 minutes, can capture something as comprehensive as a company’s culture and climate. A longitudinal study or more participants from each corporation would have reinforced the findings validity.

The participants in the study were of varying ages, 50 percent were women, and all had worked as a consultant for more than three years. All participants worked in Stockholm, Sweden, this demographic delimitation weakens the validity of the study, and generalization to other cities and countries are limited. Due to the email being sent to the reception, it is hard to tell whether the respondents are representative for their corporation. Recipients who felt engaged to partake in a study about social intrapreneurship, might rise to the challenge, while those who might not value social initiatives, could have chosen not to respond. However, since all participants in the study held a senior position or had worked for more than eight months at the company, they had extensive knowledge, both about the company and the role of a consultant. Hence, the participants were well suited for the study. The corporations differed in size, however a company with approximately 10 000 employees were not represented in the study, this also makes generalization of the findings difficult.
4. Empirical Results

In this chapter the empirical findings will be presented. The chapter is structured under six subheadings based on the five cultural dimensions identified by Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) and the final is about social innovation. The interview questions have been divided under the subheadings and the empirical findings will be supported by selected quotes from the interviews.

4.1. Dialogue

Under the subheading Dialogue the interview questions which explored Ekvall’s four dimension; Debate, Conflicts, Dynamism/Liveliness and Playfulness/Humour will be presented. Question (Q) 8 which explored the dimension Debate and Dialogue was; Under what circumstances can employees make their voices heard? For example, group/individual meetings and workshops. Q11 examined how the company worked to prevent conflicts; What types of initiatives are there at the company, to enhance collaboration and diminish risks of conflicts between colleagues? Q12 and Q13 examined the dimensions Dynamism/Liveliness and Playfulness/Humour; Q12, How does your company work to promote a relaxed and open environment? and Q13, Are there events or does your company actively work to facilitate team-building? Under each subheading the empirical findings from the interviews are presented under each respondents’ company name.

4.1.1. Company A

At Company A there are several opportunities for employees to communicate, both their ideas, opinions and needs. They have several department meetings and individual meetings where personal development can be discussed. Management and leadership is close to the organization and one can easily book meetings with management, which enables a relaxed corporate environment. “(There is) close leadership, if I have a question for the CEO, I can take it up with the CEO. It is very personal!” This made Alfa feel like it was a natural thing to have a meeting with higher management.

Company A had several conferences, with the entire firm, were the vision and the way forward for the company could be discussed. These events built a community within the company and created a good opportunity for people to get to know one another. There were however no initiatives to prevent conflicts or enhance collaboration, and Alfa felt like it could be a crucial success factor in the future, since the company would restructure its offices.

4.1.2. Company B

Company B has monthly meetings and touch-points every week, with a leader each employee chose themselves, which enable communication through-out the company. “We have distributed leadership, so you get to choose which leader you feel inspires you.” Delta describes these individual touch-points as crucial for the corporation. “You talk about your development, about relationships, your needs, wishes, challenges and so on. It’s a place where you can raise things you have been thinking about. I believe a lot happens during these touch-points.” During projects, members also get the opportunity to reflect together and raise certain aspects which they feel need to be discussed. Company B arrange several culture-building events and conferences with the different offices. “Most consulting agencies work hard to create a strong culture that mean something and stand for something.” Due to consulting firms not having a specific product, they need to feel proud about their company’s culture. Twice a year, the company gathers the entire firm, to helping build relations and strengthen the company culture. “We believe, that if we have a strong culture, a strong unity and people who are passionate about learning and development, they will both stay longer and in turn it will make us more
relevant towards our clients. It is hence a strategic investment.” What Delta feels is unique about his company is that they invest between 12-15% of their financial returns on these trips, initiatives and educations. When asked about conflicts Delta answered, “Of course, we have conflicts, it is natural and very good. But good conflicts, where they shake hands and then they are done with it.”

4.1.3. Company C

Beta’s firm provide several occasions for employees to express their ideas and opinions, through both individual- and group meetings. There are short and informal ways of communicating and “it’s possible to communicate with whomever, however you like”. Company C offers leadership courses and forums to enable communication through-out the organisation, as well as strengthen relationships. Social events are dispersed over the year and employees from the entire organization gather annually. The culture encourages employees to collaborate and due to the company offering a wide range of solutions it is important that the company’s different businesses can be welded together smoothly. “Our CEO have an open-door policy and especially for those of us who sit in the Stockholm office, we can just drop by. It doesn’t mean everyone dares to do it, but it is encouraged.” Both the former and current CEO have encouraged an open and relaxed environment, which enable people within the firm to reach out to one another.

4.1.4. Company D

Company D arrange summits, conferences, trips and they have an online-platform where employees can meet and discuss the development of the company. “We have a culture that promotes networking [...] It’s a nice environment. It’s not hierarchal or unwieldy. If I want to talk to someone, I talk to someone. There are no barriers, but at the same time there is room for deeper reflection.” This is something which Gamma truly appreciates. Company D work hard to build a strong culture, due to consultants often working with their clients, they do not sit next to each other. “It’s hard to maintain a corporate culture when you are not at the same office”. Through workshops, evening events and courses, the company enables team-building and knowledge sharing. “Collaboration is encouraged to a great extent and it contributes to the conflict-free environment that we have.” Company D also use feedback as a mean for personal development, “we have a feedback-culture [...] where we talk about a person’s development, their strengths and improvement areas. It’s a very rewarding process.”

4.1.5. Company E

“We have hackathons where new ideas can be tested.” Weekly the company arranges open-mic sessions, which are perfect for discussion according to Zeta. Company E also have several social groups and organize social events for leisure. A few times peer year there are team-building activities for the office’s employees. However, the thing that Zeta expressed to have had the most impact on the company was the leadership. “Our current CEO has brought his values with him to the company and changed the company [...] how we work, how we are measured and how we act. [...] An important part is that we are measured on collaboration rather than delivery results. We are encouraged to collaborate in a whole new way and it has changed the attitude of the company.”

4.1.6. Company F

At Company F they have community meetings where they can brief each other on their current projects, but also raise new ideas. “We have a career counsellor, someone other than your manager and project leader, where you can ventilate things you might not want to take up with your manager. They provide support in your career.” Company F provides several social
events, conferences, education opportunities and trips abroad. “We try new activities, which is a good way of getting to know everyone you work with. They’re very good people and a very good culture, where you feel relaxed and have fun together […] blood, sweat and tears unite us.” Each week there is some sort of event or gathering, both with colleagues in Sweden, the Nordics and abroad, which strengthen the culture within the company, according to Epsilon. “Collaboration becomes natural, all our work is in teams […] you become close friends with your colleagues, which reduce the risk of conflicts.”

4.2. Autonomy

The subheading Autonomy explores two of Ekvall’s dimensions; Freedom and Idea Time. Question (Q) 6, Can you independently plan your time and structure your work? examined the extent employees felt they could independently structure their work. Q7 discussed the dimension Idea Time; To what extent can you dispose time to work on/develop individual ideas or projects?

4.2.1. Company A

As a consultant it is challenging to structure your work, due to the work with a client differentiates a lot, according to Alfa. There need to be an open conversation with the client and their opinion always needs to be a priority. “There need to be space, or more to the point, you need to create space, without jeopardizing what you have promised.” Alfa experienced that the different client projects impacted to what extent she could dispose of her time. When asked if the respondent could dispose time to work on individual projects she responded, “It depends a lot. Right now, not so much! It ends up on my spare time.” Due to consultants sometimes having to be physically at the client’s office, it largely impacts if there is time for other initiatives.

4.2.2. Company B

“100 percent free, again. It is both an advantage and a challenge. Because, with freedom comes an enormous responsibility. We have very high goals, so one need to be good at planning.” Company B allows employees to engage in things which they find to be valuable, but nothing is coordinated from the top-down. “If you want to spend one day a week or a few per month, on something you feel is valuable, where you develop and make a different. That is fantastic!” However, Delta experiences that the challenge, in general, especially in Stockholm and as a consultant, is to find the time. “People do not work 100%, most people work 100% + X%.”

4.2.3. Company C

Beta experienced that his department was one of the most autonomous at the firm. “If we deliver value to our clients and deliver on our results, we are free to do it however we want.” They had no fixed office hours, but tried to coincide a few days a week, to maintain and strengthen collaboration within the group. When asked if they could dispose time to work on individual project, he said it varied. “It all depends on if we reach our key figures, or not. If we do, we can do whatever we like. […] if not, you have to squeeze it in on your offcuts of time.” If, however a larger and possibly expensive project was to be initiated, he would need to reach out to his manager or CEO.

4.2.4. Company D

“As a consultant, it is a bit tricky.” Depending on the client who Gamma works with at the time, she has more or less flexibility. Between commissions Gamma experiences a lot of possibilities and freedom on what initiatives to be involved in, however most of the time she works closely with different clients. “There is a lot of autonomy, what I want to do and when I
can do it. But I am locked eight hours a day with my client. So, it ends up on my spare time if I want to do something beyond that.”

4.2.5. Company E

When it comes to time management, Zeta feels like he can impact a lot, but that it occurs together with the client. Company E has 70% scheduled time and then time for administration. “That is, If I have an idea I would like to develop. For example, an idea about how to prevent bullying on the internet, through technology development. Then I could work on it during those 30%.” If the employee uses those 30%, they will receive their full bonus. “Some of the time you have a lot to do, and then you end up working 130% instead, but over time it usually evens out.”

4.2.6. Company F

“The client work always comes first, and the internal work second [...] If you have a client project, it usually takes up the majority of your time.” Epsilon still believes that they do have a lot of flexibility, when it comes to structing their work and how they reach their results. “I have always received support, when I have wanted to initiate an internal project.”

4.3. Risk-taking

Under the subheading Risk-taking the dimensions Risk-taking and Trust/Openness were explored, through two interview questions. Question (Q) 10, How does your company handle risks and uncertain situations, for example are you encouraged to take risks? Q14 asked the respondent about the openness of the company culture and if they experienced trust; Is there trust between colleagues/managers, do you feel that you can turn to someone with issues or ideas?

4.3.1. Company A

Alfa experienced trust within Company A and felt like there was always someone to turn to. “I work as a project leader, there are always more or less challenging missions [...] but you always have the support of the firm.” In uncertain situations, the respondent felt like, she received the right support and was backed up, which helped her accomplish her work.

4.3.2. Company B

Company B’s current CEO works hard to eliminate stale structures and hierarchies, to enable employees to act more freely and choose how they operate. “We are encouraged to take risks, definitely. [...] In part, we are expected to deliver a bit more. To do that, we need to challenge ourselves, as well as the situation.” An important aspect is to challenge the client and what they feel is the best solution and bring something different to the table. Company B challenge employees to take risks in a smart way and use the touch-points to express concerns. “When you work in a knowledge intense organization, one need to be good at solving knots quickly, otherwise they spread.” Delta would be surprised if someone left the company due to having little trust in the company or not being able to solve a problem with a colleague. Company B have not fired someone for a long time and those who choose to leave, usually do it for a new exiting role or because they no longer want to work as a consultant.

4.3.3. Company C

“Whether we can take risks, or not. I would have to say no, not right now. We have premiere nerves before the stock market. It is all about getting nice quarterly reports.” The corporation’s approach towards risks was influenced by the fact that the company were having their initial public offering. “If there is a time to stick out one’s neck and do something super strange, so
we lose millions, this is not the time.” However, there were a lot of trust and respect in the corporation, employees had both freedom and responsibility, according to Beta.

4.3.4. Company D

“Definitely, I would say. We are encouraged to take large steps and challenging steps. [...] We always try to be in the forefront of knowledge. One learns very little doing the same thing and doing what you are comfortable with, over and over again.” Gamma experienced a great level of trust and Company D challenged employees to take risks and put themselves outside of their comfort zone. “It sounds a bit idyllic, but it is idyllic! There is an enormous trust.” Due to Company D’s feedback-culture people dared to share their experiences and it helped building solidarity, in Gamma’s opinion.

4.3.5. Company E

“You are encouraged to try new things and develop.” Zeta expressed a strong sense of trust. If something goes wrong, one can turn to a manager and colleagues to discuss it. “If a mistake happens, and it does. Sometimes you screw up, then it is important that you view it as a way of learning. [...] we view it as a way to improve processes and develop.” Every other week Company E provides one-on-one sessions with all consultants, a continuous follow-up between manager and employee, something which Zeta appreciates.

4.3.6. Company F

Company F take risks in promoting employees and letting them try new roles, even if they might not yet have proven they can handle it, according to Epsilon. Hence, allowing the employees to push themselves and try their limits. “They believe in the potential of the employees.” Company F also initiative new collaboration with start-ups and schools to venture into new territories. The system where the employees, have a manager, a project leader and a career counsellor strengthen Epsilon’s trust towards the organization. “There are many natural and informal ways of communicating and reaching out to the right person.”

4.4. Experimentation

In this section Ekvall’s two dimension; Challenge and Idea Support will be examined, as well as Experimentation from Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck’s DARES, through three questions. Question (Q) 4 examined whether the respondent felt like they were encouraged to experiment, To what extent can you experiment and/or generate/Company B new ideas? Q5 explored Idea Support, Are you encouraged to face challenges in a new way, for example, do you feel supported in new or innovative processes? The final question, Q9 looked at the dimension Challenge, To what extent can you impact what types of projects you are assigned? For example, are you offered chances of education, can you start external collaborations and develop your competences?

4.4.1. Company A

“There are no boundaries, if you have an idea, Go for it!” Alfa felt like they were encouraged to experiment, especially in the sense of business development. However, when it came to CSR or innovation, it was not as clear if it was encouraged. Whether or not, they were encouraged to face challenges in a new way she responded; “Indirectly, but not clearly. You receive support from leaders once you have initiated the work.” On Q9 she answered that it depended largely on the market, what they requested in terms of competences and that it always occurred in coordination with the manager.
4.4.2. Company B

“As a consultant you are expected to think new, to think different, not to be restrained by structures. We want to be in the forefront when it comes to science and development.” Company B offers great space to explore and try new things. They are involved with NGOs and Delta lectures in schools, to engage and inspire students. These initiatives do not need to be approved and the possibilities to choose what projects you are involved in are good. The company has processes to ensure that employees have at least two projects simultaneously and get assigned a new project after 6 months. “We want to have rotation. We believe it creates an advantage, for the client to not have the same consultant and the consultant, who develops and learns new things.” There are also several online and physical courses for the consultants and they are encouraged to change and try a new practice within Company B.

4.4.3. Company C

“We are free to do what we want, as long as we deliver.” However Beta felt, due to their plans on entering the stock markets, that the rules had become stricter and that they did a lot of reporting. Company C have a goal to renew the business they act in and hence experimentation is encouraged to enable that. By providing useful and valuable solutions they help their clients reach their goals. Beta believes this can only be accomplished if the consultants challenge their identity and how they package their services. When it came to the question if they received challenging projects the answer was, “there are great possibilities, you just need to pitch it right.”

4.4.4. Company D

“It is only when the employees of the company evolve, that the company itself evolves. [...] there is a large focus on development, both private and personally, as well as professional, in one’s role at the firm.” Company D is a very flat and non-hierarchical organization, with a constant focus on development. They have an on-going dialogue about personal development and each employee has a senior mentor who supports and recommends new routes towards individual progress. They have a large say in what types of mission they want to work with and they get the opportunity to deepen their expertise in certain areas and become more specialized. This was something which Gamma was in the process of doing. On Q5 she answered, “Absolutely, we are encouraged to face challenges together.”

4.4.5. Company E

“We have three days every year, to develop and work by ourselves. [...] It is three days that we can choose to use, how and whenever we want. [...] Some use it a lot, and there is huge engagement, while others don’t.” Zeta experiences that it is a personality question, whether one would like to challenge oneself and experiment, but the possibilities are there. Company E offers a lot of courses, employees are encouraged to look for another position within the firm after two years and they are asked if they would like to do something different. “We are encouraged to try, and to view failure as a way of learning.”

4.4.6. Company F

“I like innovation and have a lot of ideas. And if you can communicate the value, it is easy to get the initiatives through. [...] If you have good ideas, in my experience, there are really great opportunities to make them come true.” Challenging oneself is an important part of the process according to Epsilon. “It is rewarded to carry through your own ideas. It’s all about finding the right leader who shares your passion and likes the initiative.” When it comes to what projects and initiatives one has, it has become easier over the years for Epsilon to choose what type of
work she gets and what education she receives. “The conditions are good, in dialogue with your career counsellor, you talk about talent management and what type of projects you would like to work with.”

4.5. Sustainability

Under this subheading, questions about their CSR work and sustainability initiatives were explored through four questions. The first three questions (Q1-Q3) asked about the on-going CSR work at the company, whether it was clearly communicated and if they noticed the initiatives in their day-to-day activities. This section is also based on the corporations’ CSR-, sustainability-, and annual reports. Q15 is also covered in this section, Are employees, who engage socially or innovative, noticed or rewarded for these behaviours/initiatives?

4.5.1. Company A

“Right now, I do not believe we have something CSR related on-going.” At Company A there are no clear guidelines and CSR is not mentioned on their webpage or in any reports. They have engaged in pro-bono projects and have had CSR programs, but as Alfa mentioned, there appears to be nothing initiated by the firm. “We are free to drive a question. But we have no clear guidelines, no. It depends on you and that you raise it.” The initiatives which can be read about, appears to have been initiative by consultants at the firm, rather than by the company. “When something is initiated, it is communicated. But pushing, each employee, ‘you probably have a lot of great CSR ideas’ and ‘We truly promote you, as an employer’. In my opinion we could be much clearer in that regard. […] I suspect a lot of my colleagues have great ideas.” Alfa has initiated some projects herself and believes that only those who are truly enthusiastic about social change feel like they must do something. “If we (humanity) are to continue, in the future, CSR cannot be something we do next to our work. CSR need to be the cornerstone for successful enterprises.”

4.5.2. Company B

“There is a plan for our CSR work. I can’t say it is communicated, though.” Since 2008 Company B has had a CSR strategy, which has mainly focused on sustainable development, good management practices and support in changing the world. Their strategy consists of two parts; large scale support of projects with free consultation and financial support, and consultants are provided three days to engage with CSR. These projects are to be in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Company B has several collaborations with NGOs and want to build a culture of social innovation and accountability. “We do things to improve the society. But we are a commercial company, we need to make money. But that does not necessarily mean that we must exclude working with social projects in different ways […] As long as you are a profitable consultant, you can do what you like with your time.” Company B allows consultants to dedicate up to three days annually to individual CSR projects, this was however something which the respondent did not mention or was not aware of. “I believe we could do much more […] we could talk more, internally, about the good work people do, other than the fun initiatives coordinated by the company.” According to Delta, several of his colleagues have been engaged in projects with NGOs or have on-going social projects which they have initiated themselves. Delta believes the company could work more with sustainability and become better at communicating the social work conducted by many of the employees in the corporation.

4.5.3. Company C

“The overall picture I have, is that it (CSR) is quite absent. But, with that said, we have a sustainability manager and have had for two years.” Company C’s sustainability work follows
the standards provided by ISO, they have a network for women with more than 400 members and use the UN’s SDGs when planning their work. They have a few collaborations with NGOs both in Sweden and abroad. Out of the 17 SDGs provided by the UN, Company C selected nine which they feel are closely related to their business practice. “There is little that trickles down in the corporation. [...] Everything is run by the marketing department. So, it is more of a marketing initiative, than real CSR work.” According to Beta, most of the initiatives are more of employer branding and marketing, rather than something which impact the way the consultants work. “Innovation and social engagement is not something we are good at rewarding here. We have to much dollar-signs in our eyes. Engagement, however, is something we encourage, regardless if it is social innovation or something else.”

4.5.4. Company D

“Many of us feel like it is interesting to give back to society, to some extent [...] we try to give back as much as possible.” Company D do not mention CSR in their annual report from 2016 and it is not visible on their webpage. However, they have founded an initiative to integrate refugees, have two initiatives working towards making the IT business more equal, through a woman’s network they have founded with more than 2000 members and an equality initiative together with 90 other tech-companies. Company D also compensate for their environmental impact, avoid flying, use vegetarian conference food, as well as a few other sustainability initiatives. “There probably is a clear vision and target, but I cannot come up with it right now.” Their online platform allows them to share information smoothly and the company have great ways of reaching out to employees. “The company is good at raising initiatives and the person who was behind it.” Gamma feels like the company is good at showing appreciation and admiration and that there are several opportunities where people are acknowledged for their work.

4.5.5. Company E

Company E has an impressive CSR report and the company are engaged in several areas with a focus on; strengthening communities, empowering people and protecting the planet. They use the GRI to report their work and their CSR initiatives emanate from UN’s SDGs. “There are a lot of initiatives from the company’s side, a lot aimed at students.” There are multiple alternatives for employees who want to engage socially or sustainably. They have a widely used program which allow employees, to take three days annually, to work on a social project of their own. “Whatever you want to do, that is good for society. It’s very appreciated!” Social initiatives initiated by the company are communicated weekly on their online platform as well as through emails and employees’ initiatives are raised on their monthly meetings.

4.5.6. Company F

“Personally, I see a lot of our CSR initiatives. The company offers a lot of fantastic opportunities. [...] But you have to look for it yourself to find them.” Company F has a clear focus on CSR and follows the UN’s SDGs. They have great transparency and communicates their CSR initiatives on their webpage and through their report, which follow GRI directives. Different initiatives happen in different countries and one of their larger projects is helping people through CV-workshops, to get a job. A lot of their internal communication happen on their online platform. “To reach all of those who want to be engaged, is hard.” Epsilon feels that the company fail to reach everyone, due to Company F’s size it is complicated to get all initiatives visible. Innovation and sustainability in general are rewarded and if employees initiate projects and are engaged, it shows in both promotions and their salary. Epsilon believes it is important that a company work with these types of initiatives, since it helps when recruiting. “Many want to work for a company that creates value.” Epsilon experiences that Company F’s
structured and focused CSR agenda, create great opportunities since they work with what they are good at and do not have a too broad focus.

4.6. Social Innovation

The questions at the end of the interviews explored the possibilities of engaging in social innovation and what the company could do differently. Q16, What are the conditions like for employees who want to work with social innovation? and Q17, What could your company do different to facilitate and enhance the possibilities for employees to engage with social innovation? Q18 asked the respondent about their own ideas and if they currently had any initiatives they wanted to explore, Are there any social initiatives you have wanted to develop or initiate at your company? If so, what prevents you from doing it? and Q20 if they believed that consultants could impact the work of their clients when it came to CSR or social innovation, As a consultant, do you feel like you can impact, influence or motivate your clients to work socially?

4.6.1. Company A

“There is no one to tell you, ‘you can’t do that’. But it all depends on you as a person, to step forward and say, ‘you know what, this is really important to me’. [...] It is up to each and every one of us, to do it.” Alfa experiences that a lot of issues are being raised, but that it rarely is followed up and turned into something bigger. “The problem is that it depends on me. I need to take a deep breath and ‘let’s do this!’ It all depends on my ability to persuade, to push through and ensure that the right conditions are created.” Alfa feels like Company A could become better at encouraging employees, remind the employees of the different initiatives they could be engaged in and create a setting where employees can meet and collaborate on social issues. “I need support, to take what I have seen and package it and structure it into something that can be done. And that is the challenge. Then there need to be time. [...] I would have liked to have a partner.” During a conference about innovation, last year, Company A had a discussion about the concept companies like Google have, where employees have a few days or hours per week to work on their own ideas. Alfa however questions this and wonder if “Just because I have a couple of hours a week, does it mean I become innovative?!” She believes that innovation always need to be encouraged and not something that only occurs in a close setting, a few days per year when you are sitting by yourself in your office.

Alfa would like to be able to address CSR when working with clients, but the situation does not always allow it. “Every problem can be solved in a sustainable manner [...] but the step to sustainability is sometimes too far.”

4.6.2. Company B

“I believe, to raise the ambition, and even if the ambition is there, communicate it more. To make it less complicated, in a sense.” Delta is however a bit torn, he experiences that a lot of companies use CSR as a mean of marketing themselves, and questions if it is a real thing. “I am allergic to people who... companies that donate money and write about it on LinkedIn.” Hence, he does not know how Company B should operate, if they should reward and communicate about the people who engage socially or let them go about their business. “I believe there is a lot of good will (in this firm). I believe there is a lot of good will in general. We need to talk about it more, encourage people to do more and provide more freedom. [...] The conditions are there, it is all about communicating it more.” However, in the end, Delta believes time constraints are experienced by most people. “It is just time, I believe most of us experience there is not enough time, to do other things than what you already do. To add one more thing, it is impossible. But time and time again, after three months it becomes part of the routine.” In Sweden people are more inclined to donate money than time, people are very
individualistic in Delta’s opinion. He does not experience time to be the constraint, rather people’s attitudes about their time.

When it comes to inspiring clients to act more socially, Delta often talks about their own initiatives when first meeting with clients. Most of the time he experiences that they are impressed and even interested in partaking. To what extent it impacts on the client’s own engagement, he does not know.

4.6.3. Company C

“Where there is a will, there is always possibilities.” Beta does however not know whether there is an interest among the employees to engage socially. In his opinion there is no disinclination from the company if employees would like to engage in social innovation. “I’m too busy with other things. Even if it would be appreciated here, I do not have the time.” Beta experiences that he is too busy with other aspects of his work, to have the time to work with social innovation. When it came to what the firm could do different to enable employees’ work with social innovation he answered; “Since we are consultants, we believe we can do everything ourselves. [...] So that is something I believe we could become better at, bringing in professional help.” Beta believes that if Company C becomes better at integrating CSR into their core business and have more employees engaged in social innovation, they need to hire or have someone on a consultant basis, that assists them in the matter.

In their role as consultants, they can inspire their clients into working more socially. By “selling your world view [...] the possibilities are there, but we are not encouraged to do it.”

4.6.4. Company D

“As a consultant, we are often in a situation where we have to take from our spare time. It is encouraged and there are no boundaries and we could even get financial support from the company if it was needed. But there is no time, and if there is no time, it inhibits (social innovation).” Gamma used to work at Spotify, where they allowed their employees a few days a year to work with social initiatives and innovation. She would appreciate to have a similar opportunity at her current job. “They are free to work with what they are passionate about. I think it is a very nice model.” According to her it would remove blockers and make it clearer that it is encouraged, and the time constraints would not be as pressing. However, she points out that it might cause financial issues for the company. “It would be extremely expensive if consultants would sit and work with CSR.”

Gamma truly appreciates the role as a consultant, “You get to be like Mary Poppins, you come in, change things and when everything works, you leave.” She thinks that consultants have a great platform to impact the client in their social work. “To be the catalyst and accentuate questions or just point things out to managers. [...] If one comes from the outside, you bring in new perspectives and it enables you to make small comments. [...] There are good possibilities I would say, and fun possibilities.” A colleague of hers has recently made her client, from a very male-dominated business, more aware of the use of females in advertising and assisted them in taking the lead towards a more equal business approach.

4.6.5. Company E

Company E’s new CEO, has according to Zeta, had a great impact on their work environment. Zeta’s colleagues experience that the culture has become much better and people who used to work at Company E earlier, are now returning. Due to Company E having a lot of CSR initiatives Zeta believes, “It’s hard to see that we could do more, without jeopardizing the company’s survival.” He is relatively new at Company E and has no ideas now that he would like to initiate, but the opportunities to do so are great.
When it comes to inspiring the work of their clients, he feels like it depends a lot on each mission. He works mainly with cyber security and they frequently try to have their clients become more transparent about their work. “To share with their colleagues in the field, generally what they have faced, what the problem was and how they solved it. So that other can learn and build upon their ideas.” Company E is open about the progress they make and publish reports to enhance the security online. Zeta says that the engagement is much wider than it has been at previous employers, where it has been more of a marketing initiative, and believes that the attitude of management impact a lot.

4.6.6. Company F

“There are a lot of programs you can engage in. Still, you can also come up with, and initiate your own ideas. The prerequisites are good, you don’t need to come up with something from scratch.” Epsilon appreciates the many initiatives that are at her disposal at the company. There are several ways to engage socially and one can always find a program that one is passionate about, in her opinion. “It’s cool to work for such a large corporation, with a lot of power. There is always someone who is an expert in that field and it is easy to mobilize a team.” However, she feels like they could become better at coordinating collaborations between their clients and NGOs or start-ups. “We work with a lot of the major corporations and could work more as a bridge between them and NGOs or start-ups. If it was possible, there would be great opportunities for social innovation.” She also experiences the communication within the company to be faulty. “If they became better at communicating all the possibilities, it would enhance and facilitate the work.” She also believes Company F could be more proactive, daring and think ‘outside the box’ when it comes to initiating collaboration with new partners, like universities and start-ups. Epsilon is passionate about the diversity and the equality agenda and has been part of many initiatives at Company F, but she feels like they are far from done. “I have a lot of engagements right now. I have a hard time, finding time to do something new.”

“The consultant’s role, in some situations, is to add the right filter. The client might not realize it could be a sustainability question. For example, the supply chain, if you add a sustainability-filter and apply it to the situation and raise the question, you can include the sustainability perspective.” Epsilon feels like consultants have a great opportunity to influence their clients, but that it depends a lot on the situation.
5. Analysis

This chapter aims to analyse the empirical results and theoretical background. The text is structured under six subheadings in the same manner as previous chapter. Given the aim of the thesis a major focus is placed on the empirical findings around sustainability and social innovation, hence these two subheadings are accentuated.

5.1. Dialogue

Innovation can be found in organizational environments where people feel like their opinions are valued and where employees engage in positive interactions (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010). All participants in the study described their corporate environment to be relaxed and positive. They expressed that there were several social activities and events which enabled communication and collaboration between colleagues. “They’re very good people and a very good culture, where you feel relaxed and have fun together […] blood, sweat and tears unite us.” – Epsilon, Company F. Ekvall (1996) stated that a positive atmosphere where colleagues feel at ease with one another, creates opportunities for individual thinking and innovation. The corporations represented by the participants in the study, all had multiple platforms where employees could communicate with each other, both in larger groups or individually, about their work, personal development, the company or their personal life. According to Ekvall’s (1996) study, interactions about personal and professional aspects are important and make employees more inclined to try new things. Gamma from Company D and Delta at Company B, both expressed the importance of a strong culture for consulting firms. “Most consulting agencies work hard to create a strong culture that mean something and stand for something.” – Delta, Company B. Due to consultants not sharing the same office regularly, the importance of consulting firms having a culture that their employees feel proud of. At Company B they invest a high percentage of their income on social events and educations. “We believe, that if we have a strong culture, a strong unity and people who are passionate about learning and development, they will both stay longer and in turn it will make us more relevant towards our clients. It is hence a strategic investment.” – Delta, Company B.

For social innovation to occur within a company all voices, especially minority voices, need to be heard (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). Open communication is crucial for employees to be able to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours (Brunäker & Kurvinen, 2006; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004; Mantere, 2005). “It’s possible to communicate with whomever, however you like.” – Beta, Company C. All respondents felt like they could openly communicate with everyone throughout their company. At Company D and Company B they actively worked to remove hierarchies, something which according to Christensen (2005) is important to enhance innovation and communication. “It’s a nice environment. It’s not hierarchal or unwieldy.” – Gamma, Company D. Employees at all the firms were able to discuss personal development and individual ideas, most were offered a personal coach or leader for individual sessions. “You talk about your development, about relationships, your needs, wishes, challenges and so on. It’s a place where you can raise things you have been thinking about. I believe a lot happens during these touch-points.” – Delta, Company B. An environment where people listen to each other’s ideas and have a dialogue on how to approach new ideas, is found to help intrapreneurs in their innovative process (Ekvall, 1996; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). All the participants in the study felt like their company offered an opened environment that enabled communication.

An important aspect raised by several of the participants were leadership. “(There is) close leadership. If I have a question for the CEO, I can take it up with the CEO. It is very personal!” – Alfa, Company A. Many of the respondents felt like their corporate culture highly was impacted by management and leadership. At Company C the CEO had an open-door policy and
Zeta at Company E felt that their new CEO had a great impact on the company’s culture. “Our current CEO has brought his values with him to the company and changed the company [...] how we work, how we are measured and how we act.” – Zeta, Company E. Management highly impact a company’s climate (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010) and management support is an important aspect when encouraging employees and their engagement (Hornsby et al., 2002; Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby, 1990).

Conflicts is the dimension found in Ekvall’s (1996) model that hinders innovation. None of the participants expressed conflicts to be a problem in their company. “Collaboration becomes natural, all our work is in teams [...] you become close friends with your colleagues, which reduce the risk of conflicts.” – Epsilon, Company F. Emotional tension and conflicts prevent employees from collaborating sufficiently and to engage creatively, due to them being afraid of being ridiculed (Ekvall, 1996). “Collaboration is encouraged to a great extent and it contributes to the conflict-free environment that we have.” – Gamma, Company D. The only participant who acknowledged conflicts was Delta at Company B. “Of course, we have conflicts, it is natural and very good. But good conflicts, where they shake hands and then they are done with it.” – Delta, Company B. According to Delta it is important that you can solve conflicts quickly, to prevent them from spreading, hence people at his company were good at solving personal problems and conflicts.

All participants in the study had a corporate culture which had the dimensions Debates, Playfulness/Humour and Dynamism/Liveliness (Ekvall, 1996). None of them experienced Conflicts, due to collaboration being an important aspect in their work. Hence, the consultants’ corporate culture enabled creativity and innovation, since it consisted of fun and positive interactions, the employees felt like their opinions were valued (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010) and the atmosphere allowed relaxed conversations.

5.2. Autonomy

Autonomy has been found by several researchers to enable innovative behaviours of intrapreneurs (Alpkan et al., 2010; Antoncic, 2007; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011; Hornsby, Kuratko & Zahra, 2002; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004; Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby, 1990). Ekvall (1996) describes it in terms of freedom and that employees need to be able to manage their time and how they do their job, to be able to become more creative. All participants expressed some degree of autonomy, but it differed a lot depending on their clients. The level of flexibility varied and if they were situated at their client’s office Epsilon, Zeta, Gamma and Alfa felt like they in some sense were prevented from planning their time and working on individual projects. Beta experienced that they in general, at Company C, were able to be autonomous and engage in individual projects, but that “It all depends on if we reach our key figures, or not. If we do, we can do whatever we like. [...] if not, you have to squeeze it in on your offcuts of time.” – Beta, Company C. Delta was the only one who did not feel limited and expressed a lot of freedom. “100 percent free, again. It is both an advantage and a challenge. Because, with freedom comes an enormous responsibility. We have very high goals, so one need to be good at planning.” – Delta, Company B. High surveillance (Amabile, 1997) and control, restrain employees from engaging in social intrapreunerial behaviours (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). This was something the participants could experience when they were working with their clients, but rarely when they were at their own office. “There is a lot of autonomy, what I want to do and when I can do it. But I am locked eight hours a day with my client. So, it ends up on my spare time if I want to do something beyond that.” – Gamma, Company D.

“The client work always comes first, and the internal work second [...] If you have a client project, it usually takes up the majority of your time.” – Epsilon, Company F. Regarding time,
most participants experienced that they did not have enough, to be able to engage with social innovation. Idea time was found to be crucial for employees to be able to explore outside of their day to day work (Ekvall, 1996). Time constraints were also found in Nandan, London and Bent-Goodley’s (2015) study to prevent people from engaging in social intrapreneurial behaviours. “There need to be space, or more to the point, you need to create space, without jeopardizing what you have promised.” – Alfa, Company A. Most of the consultants believed time constraints prevented them from developing their own ideas. Due to them having their clients as their main priority it took away time from other initiatives, but again it differed from week to week. “Some of the time you have a lot to do, and then you end up working 130% instead, but over time it usually evens out.” – Zeta, Company E. Several of the participants acknowledged that they had to work on their spare time sometimes. “People do not work 100%, most people work 100% + X%.” – Delta, Company B.

Time availability and autonomy is an important aspect for intrapreneurs (Alpkan et al., 2010; Antonicic, 2007; Hornsby, Kuratko & Zahra, 2002). The participants experienced autonomy, especially in their in-house work. However, due to consultants conducting a lot of their work deployed at their client’s office, it decreased their experienced autonomy. The client was always the priority and most participants experienced that they could not work on individual projects and disposed time when engaged with clients. Hence, a lot of their individual projects ended up on their spare time.

5.3. Risk-taking

All participants in the study felt trust towards their company, colleagues and management. They experienced that their company had an open environment, Gamma at Company D even described it as idyllic. “It sounds a bit idyllic, but it is idyllic! There is an enormous trust.” Ekvall (1996) describes the dimension of Trust/Openness as essential due to it providing the employees with an environment that allows them to express concerns, opinions and beliefs. An open environment where people dare to fail, knowing they will not be ridiculed, helps in personal development (Ekvall, 1996). Mutual trust also enables innovation and intrapreneurial behaviours (Kuratko, Montagno, & Hornsby, 1990; Monnavarian & Ashena, 2009).

Innovation demands an environment and culture that have great tolerance for failure, where one can take risks and experiment even if it might lead to failure. By encouraging risk-taking, employees can learn from their mistakes and evolve. (Ekvall, 1996; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzcek, 2011) “We are encouraged to take risks, definitely. [...] In part, we are expected to deliver a bit more. To do that, we need to challenge ourselves, as well as the situation.” – Delta, Company B. A similar response was provided by Gamma at Company D; “Definitely, I would say. We are encouraged to take large steps and challenging steps.” At Company E the culture clearly expressed that failure always should be viewed as an opportunity for learning. “If a mistake happens, and it does. Sometimes you screw up. Then it is important that you view it as a way of learning, [...] we view it as a way to improve processes and develop.” – Zeta, Company E. According to Amabile, Hennessey and Grossman (1986) risk-taking is a key component of creativity, together with experimentation. Most participants felt like risk-taking was encouraged. Beta, however, clearly stated that they at Company C were not, at the moment, able to take any chances. “Whether we can take risks, or not. I would have to say no, not right now. We have premiere nerves before the stock market. It is all about getting nice quarterly reports.” He was the only participant whose company did not encourage risk-taking, due to the eventual financial risks.

The participants’ corporate culture was founded on trust, both the companies trusting the employees and the employees feeling like the company provided a safe and relaxed environment for them. All, but one, felt like they were able to take risks and challenge
themselves in their corporate role. Hence, the dimensions of Risk-taking and Trust/Openness (Ekvall, 1996) were present in the participants’ corporate culture and climate.

5.4. Experimentation

Creativity and innovation are found in environments where employees feel valued and are encouraged to use creative behaviours for problem solving (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010). Employees need to feel challenged in their work and feel like they have the means to develop and grow in their profession, to be able to become more innovative (Ekvall, 1996). “As a consultant you are expected to think new, to think different, not to be restrained by structures.” – Delta, Company B. Consultants are expected to be leading thinkers and innovative (Chelliah, D'Netto, & Georges, 2015), which could explain why none of the participants felt like they were constrained from experimenting and always were encouraged to challenge themselves in their role at the company. Possibilities created for employees to develop and receive education during their employment, can enhance innovation (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014; Mantere, 2005; Parker, 2011). All participants felt like there were no boundaries and that they were offered great opportunities for talent management and could find initiatives within the firm that challenged them. “There are no boundaries, if you have an idea. Go for it!” – Alfa, Company A.

Idea support in form of positive constructive feedback and that ideas are faced with curiosity, is an important aspect if a company want to enable creativity (Ekvall, 1996). The participants in the study experienced some level of idea support from leaders. “Indirectly, but not clearly. You receive support from leaders once you have initiated the work.” – Alfa, Company A. However, they expressed a need for the idea to have a clear purpose and that they were required to communicate the value of the idea, to get the needed support from management. “There are great possibilities, you just need to pitch it right.” – Beta, Company C.

For innovation and intrapreneurship to occur, the corporate culture needs to challenge the employees and provide them with chances to experiment (League of Intrapreneurs, 2018b). All the participants received opportunities for talent management and had some sort of counsellor or mentor to ventilate ideas and career opportunities. Personal development (Mantere, 2005; Parker, 2011) has been found to be an important aspect for intrapreneurial behaviours, something which all participants felt was encouraged at their company. Hence the dimensions of Challenge (Ekvall, 1996) and Experimentation (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011) were clearly a part of their culture and climate. However, when it came to Idea support (Ekvall, 1996) it was less clear. Few of the participants felt they were encouraged enough and even if they would receive support, they needed to pitch the idea right to be able to get it.

5.5. Sustainability

Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) found in their study that to enable the work of social intrapreneurs the company need to have a culture that value sustainability and social engagements. A clear corporate vision of a company’s CSR work helps providing a clear direction and motivates the work of intrapreneurs (Grayson et al., 2013; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014). Many corporations have due to the enhanced interest from stakeholders started to communicate social initiatives which they are engaged in (Hillman & Keim, 2001). Four out of the six participants’ companies had a clear strategy for their CSR work. Company C, Company B, Company F and Company E use the directives provided by the UN Global Compact and their SDGs. Some of them use the reporting system provided by GRI, while others used the ISO. Company A and Company D, do not have a clear communication of their CSR strategy. However, both companies have engaged in work with different NGOs and Company D have networks engaged in equality and integration.
When it came to the actual CSR work, which was noticed by the employees, there were huge differences. Company C has a Sustainability Report which originates from nine of the 17 SDGs provided by the UN. “The overall picture I have, is that it (CSR) is quite absent [...] There is little that trickles down in the corporation.” – Beta, Company C. In Beta’s opinion their CSR work is more of employer branding and marketing, even if they have a network for women and policies regarding their environmental work. They have had a sustainability manager for two years, which could be due to them planning on entering the stock market, and hence stakeholders will have a larger impact on their work (Sprinkle & Maines, 2010) as well as them falling under the new EU directive (CSR Europe, 2011). This was not something that was mentioned by Beta, who experienced there was no clear CSR vision, he could represent. At Company A, they do some pro-bono work and they have been engaged in CSR projects, but they do not have a strategy or clear vision for their work. “Right now, I do not believe we have something CSR related on-going.” – Alfa, Company A. Alfa experienced that the social initiatives in the company were often initiated by individuals at the firm, that have a passion for social work, rather than it being coordinated by the company or by management.

Both Company D and Company B have no sustainability report, but their initiatives can be found on their webpages or in their annual report, mentioned briefly. Company D do not mention CSR, but they communicate their integration initiative on their webpage, as well as their community for women in IT. According to Gamma they have a clear work when it comes to sustainability and the environment, where they try to compensate for their environmental impact when they are flying. “There probably is a clear vision and target, but I cannot come up with it right now.” – Gamma, Company D. Due to the definition of CSR not being clear and used differently by different firms, not all companies use CSR to describe their work (Freeman & Hasnaoui, 2010). At Company B they have several pro-bono projects, both initiated by the company and by individual consultants. These projects are in line with the 2030 Agenda provided by the UN and consultants are allowed three days per year to work on individual projects. However, these three days, were not mentioned by Delta, who also mentioned that “There is a plan for our CSR work. I can’t say it is communicated, though.” – Delta, Company B. Delta talked a lot about the many initiatives some of his colleagues were engaged in, the ones he was working on and those coordinated by the company. Nevertheless, he believed the company could become better at talking about these projects and encourage the employees who are engaged.

Company E and Company F are large multinational corporation, with several initiatives and projects within CSR. They have clear strategies and reports that communicate the work they are doing. “There are a lot of initiatives from the company’s side.” – Zeta, Company E. Company E is a sponsor of the NGO, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI, 2018), and Company F use GRI in their reporting. Having a clear CSR vision and using UN’s SDG help encouraging the work of social intrapreneurs (League of Intrapreneurs, 2018b). Both Zeta and Epsilon, experienced that their companies have a lot of projects to choose from and that there are great possibilities to work socially. They feel like their colleagues appreciate to have the opportunities to work socially and that people are noticed for their work and encouraged. “Personally, I see a lot of our CSR initiatives. The company offers a lot of fantastic opportunities. […] but you have to look for it yourself to find them.” – Epsilon, Company F. Epsilon expressed the problem in larger companies is to get the information out, and she experienced that it is hard for the company to reach everyone who is interested to engage socially. Epsilon felt like CSR is important for companies due to the growing interest of employees to work for a responsible company, which is supported by several studies (Epstein-Reeves, 2010; Grayson et al., 2013; Heath & Waymer, 2017; Heldrich, Zukin & Szeltner, 2012). Due to the companies being global
In the study, the participating companies are under increased pressure to engage in CSR (Kotchen & Jungbien Moon, 2011), compared to the other companies in the study, which are of Nordic origin and of lesser size.

The CSR and sustainability work at the participants’ companies varied, both in amount and in actual engagement. The League of Intrapreneurs (2018b) describes Purpose to be essential since an articulated vision enabled the work of intrapreneurs. Some of the companies were engaged in CSR, but failed to communicate the initiatives they conducted. While others did not have a clear strategy and the work was carried out by individual employees. Four out of the six participants were engaged in the projects arranged by the company or had initiated a project themselves. To have a culture that promote Sustainability has been found to enable the work of intrapreneurs (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzbeck, 2011). Even if the participants did not feel like a CSR initiative would be disliked or confronted, they did not express that it was encouraged enough.

5.6. Social Innovation

5.6.1. Time & Network

Four out of the six respondents expressed that time was a significant constraint, preventing them from engaging in social work. Time availability was found in several studies to hinder the work of social intrapreneurs and intrapreneurs (Christensen, 2005; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzbeck, 2014; Nandan, London & Bent-Goodley, 2015). Idea time was also essential in Ekvall’s (1996) model of an innovative corporate climate. “I’m too busy with other things. Even if it would be appreciated here, I do not have the time.” – Beta, Company C. Due to consultants spending a lot of their office time out with clients, many of the participants felt like it had a negative impact on their ability to work with social initiatives. “As a consultant, we are often in a situation where we have to take from our spare time. It is encouraged and there are no boundaries and we could even get financial support from the company if it was needed. But there is no time, and if there is no time, it inhibits (the social innovation).” – Gamma, Company D. At Company F they offered a wide range of CSR initiatives, which caused Epsilon to feel like she did not have time to start a project within social innovation, even if the corporate conditions were good. “I have a lot of engagements right now. I have a hard time, finding time to do something new.” – Epsilon, Company F.

Two of the participants did not experience time to be a constraint. “Some of the time you have a lot to do, and then you end up working 130% instead, but over time it usually evens out.” – Zeta, Company E. However, at Company E employees are offered three days to engage in individual projects, hence Zeta can allocate time to work with social innovation if wanted. Delta, at Company B also expressed that time often is viewed as a constraint, but that it most commonly is the attitude an individual has about their time, rather than actual lack of time. “It is just time, I believe most of us experience there is not enough time, to do other things than what you already do. To add one more thing, it is impossible. But time and time again, after three months it becomes part of the routine.” – Delta, Company B. Company B does however allow employees to allocate three days a year to work with CSR or pro-bono work, which could have had an impact on the respondent’s answer.

A second aspect the respondents brought up, was the need for support, in form of a partner, a network or getting assistance from someone with additional knowledge about social innovation. Network and support was found by Çağrı Gündoğdu (2012), Grayson et al. (2013) and Venn and Berg (2013) to be important for individuals who want to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours. “I need support, to take what I have seen and package it and structure it into something that can be done. And that is the challenge. Then there need to be time. [...] I would have liked to have a partner.” – Alfa, Company A. Nandan, London and Bent-Goodley (2015)
found in their study that many social intrapreneurs have problem juggle the different roles and that they, like social entrepreneurs, need support in their innovative process (Berzin & Pitt-Catsouphes, 2015). Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2014) discussed the use of group brainstorming, as a way of bringing people from different corporate divisions together.

Epsilon experienced that Company F enabled her innovative work, since they provided great opportunities of collaboration. “It’s cool to work for such a large corporation, with a lot of power. There is always someone who is an expert in that field and it is easy to mobilize a team.” – Epsilon, Company F. Hence, this is an important aspect, especially since it is one of many benefits social intrapreneurs have in comparison to social entrepreneurs (Nijhof, Kees Loose & de Leede, 2012). According to Beta, Company C could become better at bringing in consultants to help them incorporating social innovation into their work. “Since we are consultants, we believe we can do everything ourselves. [...] So that is something I believe we could become better at, bringing in professional help.” – Beta, Company C. Finding networks, both within and outside of the corporation are expressed by Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2014) to be crucial to help, inspire and motivate social intrapreneurs. This is something which organizations like SustainAbility (2018), League of Intrapreneurs (2018) and Circle of Young Intrapreneurs (2018) are engaged in and offers through courses and their communities.

5.6.2. Encouragement & Communication

To enable and enhance the possibilities of social innovation and social intrapreneurial behaviours Alfa, Beta, Gamma and Delta believed their corporations could become better at encouraging these behaviours in employees. The ‘tone at the top’ and for management to encourage the work of social intrapreneurs have been found to increase the chances of employees to engage in social innovation (Çağrı Gündoğdu, 2012; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). “But pushing, each employee, 'you probably have a lot of great CSR ideas’ and 'We truly promote you, as an employer'. In my opinion we could be much clearer in that regard. [...] I suspect a lot of my colleagues have great ideas.” – Alfa, Company A. If companies provide an organizational culture that encourage and support innovative initiatives, it enhances the chances and the occurrence of these behaviours (Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby, 1990). Even if Gamma experienced that social innovative initiatives would be well received at Company D, she felt like having a few days a year to engage with these behaviours would remove blockers and employees would feel more encouraged and be engaged to do more.

The importance of encouragement and clear communication have been found to enable the work of intrapreneurs, since it provides them with a vision and motivate them to become more innovative (Çağrı Gündoğdu, 2012; Christensen, 2005; Mantere, 2005). If management communicate the importance of innovation, more employees dare to experiment outside of their comfort zone (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004; Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011). “If they became better at communicating all the possibilities, it would enhance and facilitate the work.” – Epsilon, Company F. Epsilon and Delta both experienced that their companies could become better at accentuating the social and innovative work that is taking place in the company, as well as pushing employees to further engagement. “I believe, to raise the ambition, and even if the ambition is there, communicate it more. To make it less complicated, in a sense. [...] We need to talk about it more, encourage people to do more and provide more freedom.” – Delta, Company B. Alfa at Company A expressed a similar opinion, where she believed that her company could become better at pushing and actively motivating employees when it comes to CSR and innovation. At Company C there are a lot of initiatives coordinated by the marketing team and their sustainability manager, but it was according to Beta absent when it came to the rest of the firm. This appears to be a common issue, where CSR is not integrated in the business practices, but kept separate (Székely & Knirsch, 2005). Hence
the corporation has failed to share the on-going work and communicate how every employee can partake.

Zeta, at Company E, was the only participant who experienced no constraints or improvements areas when it came to the possibilities at Company E. They were provided freedom through their three days, which they annually could use to work on individual projects that do social good. The company used several platforms to communicate the possibilities and Zeta especially felt encouraged and motivated due to their new CEO. He felt like Company E provided more opportunities and enabled a wider engagement than previous employers. Leadership has been found in studies both about successful implementation of CSR practices (Angus-Leppan, Metcalf & Benn, 2010) and social intrapreneurship initiatives (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014), to be an important aspect. The fact that both Company E’s founder and current CEO have a strong vision, have clearly enabled the work of the employees.

5.6.3. CSR vs Social Intrapreneurship

The advantages with engaging in CSR and social innovation; social entrepreneurship and social intrapreneurship, are similar in several aspects. CSR can enhance a company’s competitive advantages which in turn can result in increased financial performance (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; Hillman & Keim, 2001). Through social intrapreneurship corporations can create a diversified set of products and services which enhance their growth (Circle of Young Intrapreneurs, 2018; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011; Nijhof, Kees Looise & de Leede, 2012). CSR helps retain, recruit and motivate employees (ISO, 2018; Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Sprinkle & Maines, 2010) and similar results have been found if corporations work with social innovation (Circle of Young Intrapreneurs, 2018; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014). CSR has been found to build a company’s reputation and strengthen PR relationships (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; ISO, 2018). Similarly, social intrapreneurship helps enhance a company’s reputation (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011; Venn & Berg, 2013). CSR has however been found to have a positive impact on consumers’ purchase intentions and loyalty (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Park, Chidlow & Choi, 2014), this have not yet been studied when it comes to social intrapreneurship.

However, CSR has come under a lot of critique, due to corporations using it in an unethical manner (Kotchen & Jungbien Moon, 2011). CSR practices are not integrated in the actual business activities (Székely & Knirsch, 2005) and are commonly used for pure PR and marketing, as a way for companies to please stakeholders (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; Sprinkle & Maines, 2010; Öberseder et al., 2013). This was something Beta at Company C experienced. In his opinion their CSR reporting and work were mostly marketing, something which also Zeta had experienced at previous employers. “Everything is run by the marketing department. So, it is more of a marketing initiative, than real CSR work.” – Beta, Company C. The disbelief against CSR initiatives and companies giving money to charities were also expressed by Delta from Company B. “I am allergic to people who... companies that donate money and write about it on LinkedIn.” – Delta, Company B. He questioned if CSR is real or if it basically is pure marketing.

Some of the participants voiced the concern of social engagements and CSR to be costly and having a negative impact on the company’s financial resources. “It would be extremely expensive if consultants would sit and work with CSR.” – Gamma, Company D. Gamma raised the concern of the financial aspects twice in the interview, which builds on the belief that CSR do not create revenues. Zeta expressed a similar concern, where he, due to Company E having multiple CSR initiatives, providing three free days and having the Gates foundation, found “It’s hard to see that we could do more, without jeopardizing the company’s survival.” – Zeta, Company E. Few view social engagements as something which can enhance the company’s
performance as well as revenues. “Innovation and social engagement is not something we are
good at rewarding here. We have to much dollar-signs in our eyes.” – Beta, Company C.
Compared to CSR, social innovation’s aim is to create revenues through new sustainable social
social innovation exceeds the traditional CSR work and that it delivers more value. Since social
innovation within firms, social intrapreneurship, is based on a successful collaboration between
departments within the corporation, the resources remain within the firm and it is hence a
strategic investment. Compared to CSR work which can be pro-bono work outside of the firm,
social intrapreneurship generates products, services and processes within the firm that improve
the companies’ financial performance. (Mirvis et al., 2016) By improving the innovative
climate, social intrapreneurship creates long-lasting change and enhanced talent (Grayson,
McLaren & Spitzeck, 2014). All corporations are striving towards becoming more innovative
(Dess, Lumpkin & McGee, 1999), but the failure rates are found to be high (Foley, 2013). By
enabling social intrapreneurial behaviours within the company, less resources need to be placed
on CSR and the climate becomes more creative (Mirvis et al., 2016). At Company F, they have
a lot of CSR initiatives to engage in, but when asked, Are there any social initiatives you have
wanted to develop or initiate at your company? If so, what prevents you from doing it? Epsilon
expressed that she had to many CSR related projects to find the time. “I have a lot of
engagements right now. I have a hard time, finding time to do something new.” – Epsilon,
Company F. Hence, CSR might hinder employees from engaging in social intrapreneurial
behaviours, to some extent.

At Company E and Company B, the employees can dispose three days annually to work on
individual projects. “Whatever you want to do, that is good for society. It’s very appreciated!”
– Zeta, Company E. Gamma at Company D, had at a previous employer had a similar concept,
which she had appreciated. “They are free to work with what they are passionate about. I think
it is a very nice model.” – Gamma, Company D. In her opinion, having a few days to engage in
social innovation, would facilitate consultants’ social work. Alfa, at Company A, had a similar
discussion at her company, where they in conjunction with a conference, with innovation as a
theme, discussed if a few hours a week or days a year would boost innovation at Company A.
“Just because I have a couple of hours a week, does it mean I become innovative?!” – Alfa,
Company A. She was not sure, if it was a concept which would generate more innovation. In
Company B’s annual report, they write that employees are allowed three days per year to work
with individual projects. This was something which Delta did not mention or was unaware of,
but in his opinion, they were free to do whatever they liked with their time if they were
profitable. So, in a sense the culture at Company B allowed individual projects, which might be
due to their three-day-initiative. “If you want to spend one day a week or a few per month, on
something you feel is valuable, where you develop and make a different. That is fantastic!” –
Delta, Company B.

To summaries the aspects expressed by the participants, when it came to the possibilities for
the participants to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours, there were four things that
became salient; Time, a Network, Encouragement and Communication. Time constraints were
prominent in the study and found in prior studies as well (Christensen, 2005; Grayson, McLaren
aspect could be solved, by allowing employees a few days annually to work on individual
projects, which was something some of the participants received and others would have
appreciated. A network, was the second aspect mentioned by the participants. By having a
network and a setting where social ideas can be explored and developed, help employees in
their innovative and social work (Çağrı Gündoğdu, 2012; Grayson et al., 2013; Grayson,
McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011; League of Intrapreneurs, 2018b; Venn & Berg, 2013). Some of the
participants expressed a need for support in their engagements, something which an internal or external network could provide. Collaboration is an important aspect, since social intrapreneurs are less effective working in a vacuum (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011).

Most of the participants experienced that their company could become better at encouraging employees to engage in social intrapreneurial and innovative behaviours. By showing that the company and management encourage these types of initiatives, have a great impact on employees’ engagement (Hornsby et al., 2002; Isaksen & Ekvall, 2010; League of Intrapreneurs, 2018b; Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby, 1990). Likewise, communication, by management and leaders, has also been raised, in both prior studies (Christensen, 2005; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011; League of Intrapreneurs, 2018b; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004; Mantere, 2005; Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011) and by the participants of the study. According to the participants, their companies could become better at communicating the ongoing initiatives, the corporate vision and the work initiated by engaged employees. Only one of the participants experienced that there was nothing his company could do differently, he worked at Company E and was provided great opportunities and room to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours.
6. Discussion

In this chapter the empirical findings of the thesis will be discussed. The study’s contribution and prior research in this field will be compared and evaluated. Limitations and proposed further research will finally be presented in this chapter.

Corporations continuous exploitation of weak communities and our planet’s resources have wearied the patience of stakeholders, whose demands have intensified (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2011). Over the years an uprise of CSR has been seen across the world (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic & Zabkar, 2017; Ayuso et al., 2011; Hillman & Keim, 2001), but still few corporations take responsibility for their negative impact (Heath & Waymer, 2017; Kotchen & Jungbien Moon, 2011). CSR has failed to bring social sustainable change and the increased competitive landscape has caused a call for new solutions (Helmsing, 2015; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004; Phillips et al., 2015). Social intrapreneurship, the use of social innovation within a corporation (Mitchell, 2013), has been identified as one solution for reaching social change, however few know how to enable innovative and social behaviours within employees (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011, 2014; Kistruck & Beamish, 2010; Nandan, London & Bent-Goodeley, 2015; Wakkee, Elfring & Monaghan, 2010). Hence, the aim of this thesis was to examine what enables employees to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours. Through six in-depth interviews with consultants located in Stockholm, the empirical material was gathered.

The participants’ organizational culture and climate had several aspects which facilitated their engagement in social innovation. All participants experienced a sense of trust and openness which enabled them to take risks and challenge themselves in their role at the company. They were all provided great opportunities for talent management and could experiment in their work. The corporations in the study provided a relaxed and social environment, and all participants described several events and occasions where they were able to meet and socialize with colleagues. Few of the participants expressed problems with conflicts, getting projects funded or not feeling like they could voice their ideas. Nevertheless, there were some aspects which prevented them from engaging socially. Most of the participants experienced time to be a large constraint and few felt like they were autonomous, due to their clients always being the priority. To enable their social intrapreneurial behaviours the participants felt they needed; Encouragement, Communication, Time and a Network. If corporations clearly communicate their vision, it motivates and inspires employees to be engage socially, since it provides direction for employees who are passionate about social change. Management need to encourage employees to strive towards these goals and the company’s social mission, this would make employees’ engagement easier and more prioritized, according to the participants. Organizational structures that provide employees with time for idea generation and implementation, as well as having a network, where people within and outside of the firm can collaborate, would create great opportunities for social engagements.

These findings correlate with those found in prior studies. Top management’s ability to communicate a clear corporate vision regarding the company’s social and innovative work, have been found to be crucial for both intrapreneurs (Christensen, 2005) and social intrapreneurs (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). Several of the participants expressed communication to be essential, both communication of on-going initiatives and clearly stating the vision and corporate view, held about the company’s social engagements. Genuinely empowering employees to engage more (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011; League of Intrapreneurs, 2018b) was also insinuated by the participants. Alfa at Company A held the belief that most of her colleagues probably had a lot of social or CSR related ideas, but that she did not experience that the company clearly encouraged them to explore them.
Milton Friedman (1970) criticized CSR in his book *Capitalism and Freedom* claiming that the only responsibility businesses have, is to use its resources in a manner that increases their profits. Those who oppose CSR generally discusses it in terms of costs; resources used insufficiently, less profitability and a lacking interest from shareholders (Cimpoieru & Munteanu, 2015). Due to the belief that CSR and social engagements are costly, which two of the participants also expressed, the need for management to encourage these behaviours are even more crucial. If these engagements occur as ‘moonlighting’ or on employees’ spare time, it prevents the impact it can have on the company and the scalability and sustainability of the initiative (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzbeck, 2014). The consulting firms in the study all engaged in pro-bono initiatives, a way for them to offer their expertise for free. Even if these initiatives are altruistic and have a positive impact on society, they fail to create economic benefits for corporations. Instead having employees engage their time in social intrapreneurial behaviours, would benefit both the community and the corporation. This is something which was expressed by Bill Gates, during the World Economic Forum in 2008. “I hope corporations will dedicate a percentage of their top innovators’ time to issues that could help people left out of the global economy. This kind of contribution is even more powerful than giving cash or offering employees time off to volunteer. It is a focused use of what your company does best. It is a great form of creative capitalism, because it takes the brainpower and makes life better for the richest, and dedicates some of it to improving the lives of everyone else” (Grayson, McLaren, Spitzbeck, 2014). Most participants, in the study, did engage socially and were interested in the CSR work conducted by their company. Their engagement varied, from integration, equality, to sustainable fashion and recycling. To some degree, most participants were interested in social engagements and by turning this interest towards social intrapreneurial behaviours, their impact could be enhanced. “If we (humanity) are to continue, in the future, CSR cannot be something we do next to our work. CSR need to be the cornerstone for successful enterprises.” – Alfa, Company A.

The aspect which most of the participants voiced prevented their engagement was time constraints. This is in line with the study conducted by Nandan, London and Bent-Goodley (2015) where time constraints had a negative impact on their respondents’ innovative engagement. Innovation consists of a set of behaviours; 1) Opportunity exploration, 2) Idea generation, 3) Championing and 4) Application. The concept *Innovative Work Behaviour* is defined as “individuals’ behaviors directed towards the initiation and intentional introduction (within a work role, group or organization) of new and useful ideas, processes, products or procedures” (de Jong, 2007:19). It is a creative and time-consuming process, where *Opportunity exploration*, is brought forth by some sort of change; new technology or knowledge, an unexpected event, occurrence of a problem (Drucker, 1985) or an opportunity that arises, which cause a need for new innovations (de Jong & den Hartog, 2010). This change triggers corporations or individual employees to respond, by exploiting the opportunity as a mean of generating an idea for a new product, called *Idea generation* (Kanter, 1988). This process explores new angles and demands an innovative tactic where plausible and irrational solutions are mixed and combined (de Jong, 2007). *Championing* is the crucial part where the solution or product is promoted and presented to the right people, who legitimate the solution and help materialize it (de Jong & den Hartog, 2010). This dimension is difficult since ideas are often faced with a lot of uncertainty and the costs of development might cause resistance (Kanter, 1988). If the product is authorized, the final dimension is *Application*. Here the product is developed, tested, modified and completed. (de Jong & den Hartog, 2010). To enable innovative behaviours, corporations need to provide time and autonomy (Alpkan et al., 2010; Antonicic, 2007; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzbeck, 2011; Hornsby, Kuratko & Zahra, 2002; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004; Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby, 1990). de Jong (2007) found that time and resources were essential otherwise the employees felt to discouraged to even try.
Workload pressure had also a negative impact on employees’ creativity (Amabile et al., 1996), hence providing time or lessen employees tight schedule can enhance their innovative behaviours.

The two participants, who did not express time as a concern, were provided three days annually to work on individual projects. Companies can hence solve the problem with time constraints by allowing employees a percentage of worktime allocated for these initiatives, which was seen at Company B and Company E. This was also recommended by Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) who used the example of Google, where employees can pursue own projects on 20% of their time. Management strategies, like this, can help enable the innovative work of employees. Both, Alfa at Company A and Gamma from Company D, discussed this concept, but did not share the same belief on whether it would work. At Google, some state that it does not work, since few used it or ended up working 120%, because the workload stayed the same (D’Onofro, 2015). Regardless, Gamma stated that a concept like this would remove eventual blockers. By allowing employees to allocate time, would make people feel more inclined to work with social initiatives, according to her.

The final aspect, the participants expressed could enable their engagements, was support and a network. Interorganizational collaboration and cooperation have been found to be essential to enable employees’ innovative behaviours (Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011; Mulroy & Shay, 1997; Nandan, London & Bent-Goodley, 2015; Phillips et al., 2015). According to Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck (2011) social intrapreneurs cannot operate in a vacuum, they need to have a supportive eco-system, which surround them with expertise. Collaboration can facilitate social innovation (Mulroy & Shay, 1997) and the participants in Nandan, London and Bent-Goodley’s (2015) study had a broad network both within and outside of their companies, which facilitated their work. The consultants in this study, experienced that they could need a partner or hire someone with expertise to assist them with social innovative projects. The major advantages social intrapreneurs have, compared to social entrepreneurs, is the support, resources and expertise they can find within their company (Zurer, 2018). Sam Conniff, co-founder at Livity, believes social intrapreneurs “can affect far greater change than most social entrepreneurs can dream of” (Conniff, 2011). This is due to social entrepreneurs facing larger risks, have less financial resources (Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010; Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012) and must compete with for-profit corporations (Helmsing, 2015). Many entrepreneurs struggle, due to them often having to master all the different roles in their enterprise (Berzin & Pitt-Catsouphes, 2015). Social intrapreneurs are hence given the advantage of, corporate resources, less risks and a stable client base. It is hence, a shame that corporations fail to provide the support which employees require to act innovative, since so many advantages already exist.

Prior studies have discussed, to what extent the work of social intrapreneurs in fact could drive internal social engagements within the firm (Nijhof, Looise & de Leede, 2012; Venn & Berg, 2012). If social innovation incubators and the work conducted there, trickle down and impact the overall organization, what impact could it have on corporations’ engagement (Venn & Berg, 2012)? In this study, the participants were asked, As a consultant, do you feel like you can impact, influence or motivate your clients to work socially? Several experienced that they were able, to some extent, to inspire the work of their clients. Consultants, hence, have a unique opportunity, due to their role as an advisor, to influence and inspire clients to engage socially. Even if the participants expressed that their impact varied from client to client, they believed that they in fact could sell their world view. “The consultant’s role, in some situations, is to add the right filter. The client might not realize it could be a sustainability question.” – Epsilon, Company F. As an adviser they can propose or contribute with a social perspective or as Epsilon mentioned, filter. Consultants can hence be a catalyst for social engagement, to some extent. “You get to be like Mary Poppins, you come in, change things and when everything works, you
Since overtime and on their spare time. Few employers seem to engage, if they want to). It is study s, most of the r engagements, regardless how much they stress, within the same firm, to see to what extent the culture differsoise & de Leede, 2012. The study of other corporation between nations or offices. An interesting aspect for future studies could be to compare the organizational culture of today, employee engagement is highly obstructed. I have a hard time seeing employees to innovate. I believe, if companies want their employees to explore the notion of social intrapreneurship, more time and less workload will be crucial for them to succeed.

The study is not without limitations, one of the major concerns is the sample of the study. Out of the 15 corporations that were contacted, only six decided to partake in the study. The sample lacks participants from consulting firms with approximately 10,000 employees, this has made generalization more difficult. Since there also is no demographic diversity, due to all participants being in Stockholm, generalization to consultants and employees outside of this area is unachievable. Since the participants were reached through the reception or by recommendation from colleagues, only the ones who had some sort of interest in the study, could have chosen to partake. Hence, the participants might not be representative for the company and their colleagues might have different experiences, since culture is highly subjective. This have a negative impact on the study’s reliability, due to repetition of the results can be difficult and the results might not be consistent over time (Neuman, 2011). Further research is encouraged to corroborate the findings of this study. Two of the interviews were also conducted over phone, due to the consultants’ tight schedules, which had a negative impact on the fullness of their replies and could have resulted in possible knowledge loss (Chadwick et al., 2008). To prevent this, the respondents received the interview questions before hand and they got the opportunity to review the transcribed material to make alterations.

An interesting aspect for future studies could be to compare the organizational culture and climate in different countries, within the same firm, to see to what extent the culture differs between nations or offices. Since consultants have a great position to inspire and influence the work of other corporations, it is of value to study their engagements. In line with Grayson,
McLaren and Spitzeck’s (2014) suggestion for future research, it would be valuable to conduct a longitudinal study, to compare and examine the implementation of organizational systems or management practices and to examine its consequences on employees’ engagement. By redistributing the resources allocated for some of the CSR initiatives, towards enabling social intrapreneurial behaviours and measure if it impacts the employees’ performance and engagement, a longitudinal study would be appropriate.

Martin Luther King Jr. once said “Capitalism does not permit an even flow of economic resources. With this system, a small privileged few are rich beyond conscience, and almost all others are doomed to be poor at some level. That’s the way the system works. And since we know that the system will not change the rules, we are going to have to change the system”. Corporations have for a long time only viewed their responsibility towards society to be economic (Friedman, 1970) and as stated by King, the system sustains corporations, but strains communities. CSR has throughout the years been raised by governments, corporations and global organizations as the mean for social and environmental change (European Commission, 2011; United Nations Global Compact, 2015). The question is if CSR can deliver sustainable social change or if it needs to be complemented by other initiatives. Social innovation has, both through social entrepreneurs and social intrapreneurs, succeeded in creating positive social and environmental impact (Mirvis et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2015; Tracy & Stot, 2016). By finding what enables innovative behaviours within employees, corporations can channel a new form of social engagement. To accomplish this, management practices, that communicate and encourage these behaviours, and organizational systems need to be altered (Venn & Berg, 2012) to provide time and a setting where employees can network and engage socially.
7. Conclusion

The aim of the thesis was to examine what enables employees to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours. This final chapter will conclude the findings of the study and describe the major contributions this thesis established in the field of social intrapreneurship. This section will present inferences which can be drawn from the study.

The dissatisfaction with current corporate engagements with CSR and its inadequacy in solving social issues, inequalities and environmental problems, have created a growing pressure for corporations to do things differently (Heath & Waymer, 2017; Helmsing, 2015; Phillips et al., 2015). One approach, to drive this change has been found in corporate changemakers, social intrapreneurs (Circle of Young Intrapreneurs, 2018; Grayson, McLaren & Spitzeck, 2011). The aim of this thesis was to examine what enables employees to engage in social intrapreneurial behaviours. To achieve the purpose of the study, the research questions; How does the organizational culture and climate enable or disable the possibilities for employees to engage with social intrapreneurship? and How can corporations create an enabling environment that encourage employees’ social intrapreneurial behaviour? were asked. Six consultants were interviewed about the organizational culture and climate at their company, using a semi-structured interview guide inspired by Grayson, McLaren and Spitzeck’s (2011) DARES culture model and Ekvall’s (1996) 10 dimensions of a creative climate.

How can the organizational culture and climate enable the possibilities for employees to engage with social intrapreneurship? The participants experienced that they operated in corporate environments that were open, playful and enabled discussions. They all felt like they were provided the means to challenge themselves and experiment. All participants experienced trust and all, but one, felt they were encouraged to take risks. The aspects which they felt prevented them from engaging in social intrapreneurial behaviours were time constraints, most of the participants felt like they did not have the time to add on more work or engage in social initiatives. As well as lacking autonomy, due to their clients being a priority they experienced less freedom when they were deployed at their client’s office. To create an enabling environment that motivates employees to engage with social intrapreneurial behaviours, the participants needed; Encouragement, Communication, Time and a Network. The participants would feel more inclined to engage in intrapreneurial behaviours if it was clearly communicated by management and encouraged. By being allowed to take time to work on social initiatives would enable their engagement and to have a supportive network that facilitated collaboration. These findings were in line with prior studies.

The implications drawn from the study are, that in term of enabling social intrapreneurial behaviours within consultants, corporations need to encourage their employees and inspire them to be engaged. They need to clearly communicate that these behaviours are appraised by the company and valued. By providing employees with time, either through less workload or through free days, these behaviours can more easily be assessed. Finally, by creating internal and/or external networks, can help provide support and motivate employees’ social engagements. Even if resources for CSR are not misused, they might be put to better use if allocated to social innovation, since it builds a long-lasting impact in society and the company. Given that consultants have the mean to inspire clients in their work, their engagement can result in a comprehensive social impact.
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Appendices

Appendix I. Global Initiatives

Enterprise 2020 Manifesto

The Enterprise 2020 Manifesto is a collaboration, with over 10,000 European companies and 40 national partner organizations, to engage with CSR by:

1) Making inclusion and diversity a priority across value chains, boards and management.
2) Inspiring corporations to engage and commit to develop new sustainable methods of production and consumption, through the collaboration with communities and cities.
3) Having human rights as core of their business strategies while working continuously with transparency. (CSR Europe, 2018)

The International Organisation for Standardization (ISO)

The International Organisation for Standardization (ISO) is engaged with creating guidelines to facilitate corporations’ CSR work in their standardisation, ISO 26000 – Guidance on Social Responsibility (ISO, 2018). In the standardisation, ISO 26000, they divide CSR initiatives into seven core groups:

1) Organizational governance – implementation of strategies and making of business decisions in line with the triple bottom line.
2) Human rights – no discrimination, child labour or forced labour.
3) Community involvement and development – integration of disabled persons or refugees, fulfil tax responsibility and use of local suppliers.
4) Labour practices – gender equality, employee health, skill development and diversity.
5) Consumer issues – safe products, truthful labelling, protection of customer data and privacy.
6) Fair operating practices – anti-corruption and bribery, fair competition and responsible political involvement.
United Nations Global Compact's 10 principles

United Nations Global Compact is an initiative where more than 8,000 corporations and 4,000 non-business participants from 160 countries are engaged to help companies commit and operate responsibly. The ten principles are grouped in four areas; Human rights, Labour, Environment and Anti-corruption.

*Human rights* – have two principles namely; 1) that corporations are supportive and protect the internationally declared human rights and 2) ensures that human rights are not abused.

*Labour* – consisting of four principles; 3) companies should recognize the right to collective bargaining and uphold freedom of association, 4) eliminate enforced labour and compulsory labour, 5) immediate elimination of child labour, 6) removal of discrimination in respect to occupation and employment.

*Environment* – 7) Corporations should be caution towards environmental challenges, 8) promote and engage in initiatives pro-environmental responsibility, 9) development of environmentally friendly technologies or use of such technologies.

*Anti-Corruption* – the final principle is 10) that corporations should work against bribery, extortion and all other forms of corruption. (United Nations Global Compact, 2015)

Sustainable Development Goals

January 2016, the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) was created as a part of the United Nations’ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. 193 countries across the world have collaborated to produce the 17 goals, with 169 sub goals.

Goal 1: No Poverty
Goal 2: Zero Hunger
Goal 3: Good Health and Well-Being for people
Goal 4: Quality Education
Goal 5: Gender Equality
Goal 6: Clean Water and Sanitation
Goal 7: Affordable and Clean Energy
Goal 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth
Goal 9: Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure
Goal 10: Reduced Inequalities
Goal 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities
Goal 12: Responsible Consumption and Production
Goal 13: Climate Action
Goal 14: Life Below Water
Goal 15: Life on Land
Goal 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions
Goal 17: Partnerships for the Goals (United Nations, 2015)
Appendix II. The Interview Guide

Interview questions

Would you like the company name to be excluded in the study?
Would you like to stay anonymous through the study?
What is your position at the company?
For how long have you been working at the company?

1. What does the CSR work look like at your company?
2. Is there a clear vision, and/or guidelines for your company’s work with CSR and is it communicated internally?
3. To what extent do you notice your company’s work with CSR in your day-to-day activities?
4. To what extent can you experiment and/or generate/implement new ideas?
5. Are you encouraged to face challenges in a new way, for example, do you feel supported in new or innovative processes?
6. Can you independently plan your time and structure your work?
7. To what extent can you dispose time to work on/develop individual ideas or projects?
8. Under what circumstances can employees make their voices heard? For example, group/individual meetings and workshops.
9. To what extent can you impact what types of projects you are assigned? For example, are you offered chances of education, can you start external collaborations and develop your competences?
10. How does your company handle risks and uncertain situations, for example are you encouraged to take risks?
11. What types of initiatives are there at the company, to enhance collaboration and diminish risks of conflicts between colleagues?
12. How does your company work to promote a relaxed and open environment?
13. Are there events or does your company actively work to facilitate team-building?
14. Is there trust between colleagues/managers, do you feel that you can turn to someone with issues or ideas?
15. Are employees, who engage socially or innovative, noticed or rewarded for these behaviours/initiatives?
16. What are the conditions like for employees who want to work with social innovation?
17. What could your company do different to facilitate and enhance the possibilities for employees to engage with social innovation?
18. Are there any social initiatives you have wanted to develop or initiate at your company? (If so, what prevents you from doing it?)
19. What characteristics are appreciated in a consultant?
20. As a consultant, do you feel like you can impact, influence or motivate your client to work socially?
Appendix III. The Interview Drafts

Företag: (anonym?)
Namn: (anonym?)
Tid på företag och tjänst:

1. Hur ser CSR arbetet ut på ditt företag?
2. Finns en tydlig vision och/eller guidelines för ert CSR arbete och hur kommuniceras det internt?
3. På vilket sätt märker du av företagets CSR initiativ i ditt arbete?
4. I vilken utsträckning har ni möjlighet att experimentera med/generera/implementera nya idéer?
5. Uppmuntras du till att möta utmaningar på nya sätt? Får du stöd av ledare under innovativa processer?
6. Vilket utrymme finns för dig att lägga upp ditt arbete och planera din tid?
7. I vilken utsträckning kan ni avsätta tid för att arbeta med att utveckla egna idéer/projekt?
8. Under vilka omständigheter har anställda utrymme att göra sina åsikter hörda?
9. I vilken utsträckning kan du påverka vad för sorts åtagande du får? Erbjuds kompetensutveckling/utbildningar/externa samarbeten?
10. Uppmuntras risktagande? Hur bemöter företaget situationer där resultaten inte är självklara?
11. Vad finns för initiativ för att öka samarbetsförmågan/minska konflikter bland kollegor på företaget?
12. Hur arbetar företaget för att främja en lättar miljö?
15. Hur uppmärksammas och belönas anställda/kollegor för att de har arbetat innovativt eller socialt?
16. Finns förutsättningarna för att anställda ska kunna arbeta med socialt intraprenörskap?
17. Vad hade ditt företag kunnat göra annorlunda för att öka möjligheterna för innovativt socialt tänkande?
18. Finns det några sociala initiativ du hade velat lyfta/utveckla/driva igenom på ditt företag? (Om ja, vad hindrar dig från att genomföra det?)
19. Vilka egenskaper/karaktersdrag uppställas hos en konsult?
20. Som konsult, känner du att du kan påverka (inspirera/motivera) hur dina kunder arbetar socialt?