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Abstract

This study uses Actor – Network Theory as a lens to present a case study of the process by which Indiska Magasinet, a large Swedish retailer, has defined and developed its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. Actor – Network Theory offers a valuable tool to examine the inter-actor negotiations that precede a conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. The study results are primarily based on interviews with two prominent Indiska personnel in decision-making positions. At the instigation of the writers, the Indiska personnel told stories about the company’s way of working with Corporate Social Responsibility. In doing so, they described four principle examples of how inter-actor negotiations resulted in significant developments in Indiska’s approach to Corporate Social Responsibility. Their stories also highlighted shared values and legitimacy as the main reasons that Indiska allows other actors to influence its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility.
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Layout of the thesis project

Our thesis project consists of eight sections; a very brief and general synopsis of each section is provided below.

**Section One:** Section One introduces the reader to the research field and case study topic, discusses the assumptions behind our research work, and presents the research area and questions, aim, delimitations, and target audience.

**Section Two:** Section Two presents previous research and theory on the subject of Corporate Social Responsibility. It concludes by presenting the theoretical framework applied in this thesis project.

**Section Three:** Section Three describes the research design, approach and strategy. It goes on to detail the approach we took to access, collect and analyze our research data.

**Section Four:** Section Four combines the empirical findings and data analysis of this research project. It presents the data gathered in the context of the theoretical framework.

**Section Five:** Section Five offers a discussion of our research findings and concluding statements related to our research questions.

**Section Six:** Section Six highlights opportunities for further research in our field of study.

**Section Seven:** Section Seven gives an account of the literature, journal articles, websites, and personal communications referenced in this thesis project.

**Section Eight:** Section Eight contains the appendices generated to complement our thesis work.
1.0 Introduction

Section One introduces the reader to the research field and case study topic, discusses the assumptions behind our research work, and presents the research area and questions, aim, delimitations, and target audience.

1.1. Introduction to the research field

The term Corporate Social Responsibility raises pressing social and ethical questions for corporations because of their reliance on human and environmental resources to turn a profit. The topic, while not new, started gaining increasing media attention during the 1990s. Sahlin-Andersson (2006) links this increased attention to the anti-globalization movement of the 1990s. She says:

*The recent trend... is often described as beginning with the protest movements in Seattle, with the publishing of Naomi Klein’s book, No Logo, and with corporate scandals related, for example, to environmental catastrophes and the use of child labour* (Sahlin-Andersson 2006, pg. 596).

She argues that Corporate Social Responsibility is a response to criticism that:

*...corporations are exploiting the world* (Sahlin-Andersson 2006, pg. 596).

Sahlin-Andersson (2006) goes further to say that companies rely heavily on brand image for their market strength and, as such, must show awareness of social, human and environmental issues to be successful.

One industry that is often heavily criticized for its focus on profits and lax approach to Corporate Social Responsibility is the garment industry. For example, more than 200 different organizations have come together for the sole purpose of putting pressure on companies in the garment industry to improve the working conditions and support the empowerment of workers in the global garment and sport shoe industries (Clean Clothes Campaign n.d.). These organizations form the Clean Clothes Campaign. The Campaign currently operates in eleven European countries, including Austria, Belgium (North and South), France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom (Clean Clothes Campaign n.d.).

In this study, we will examine a retail-based organization that has both been a target of the Clean Clothes Campaign and focuses, as part of its corporate policy, on improving social and environmental conditions in its suppliers’ factories and communities. Indiska Magasinet is a large Swedish retailer that sells garments, fashion accessories and interior decoration products and, like most large-scale retailers, buys most of its products from suppliers in lesser-developed nations (Indiska n.d.a). It does not own any manufacturing facilities; instead, Indiska purchases the majority of its products from suppliers in India and some products from suppliers in China, Turkey, Vietnam, Greece, Sweden and Denmark (Andersson 2007; Andersson 2008). While there are national environmental and human rights laws in effect in all of these countries, law enforcement is often lacking.
in India, China, Turkey, and Vietnam, nations considered to be lesser-developed countries, and, accordingly, Indiska’s suppliers often operate factories that do not meet the national laws (Andersson 2007; Andersson 2008). Lax environmental and human rights law enforcement could mean cheaper products for Indiska; however, the company has operationalized a process that requires its suppliers to continuously improve both environmental and social conditions in their factories. This process is based on Indiska’s Code of Conduct (Appendix A).

Indiska developed and implemented its Code of Conduct in 1998, and since that time has required all of its suppliers to sign and abide by it (Andersson 2007; Indiska n.d.a). In an effort to ensure compliance with the Code, Indiska has a well-resourced system in place to monitor its suppliers’ factory conditions (Andersson 2007; Andersson 2008). As part of the system, Indiska personnel visit and audit all of the company’s main suppliers (Andersson 2007; Andersson 2008). During the visits to inspect the factories, which are initially scheduled to take place every second month, Indiska personnel administer a 140-question survey about the factory operations and provide an overall rating of the factory (Andersson 2008). The overall rating is published in the Indiska buyers’ database. Indiska buyers may not purchase products from suppliers that are rated ‘unacceptable’, on an audit (Indiska n.d.b). Ms. Andersson (2008), Indiska’s Ethics and Environmental representative, notes:

... ‘unacceptable’, we don’t work with those. They have the opportunity to change but they must be willing to change, otherwise we don’t, we say, “goodbye, thank you”. And then we don’t put any orders for those that I find unacceptable.

While strict about their suppliers’ willingness to comply with its Code of Conduct, Indiska is also clear that its Code must not become a barrier to trading with developing countries. In its corporate pamphlet highlighting its trading philosophy, it notes:

Nothing can happen all at once, as this would make our Code of Conduct nothing more than a barrier for trading with developing countries. Change of attitudes are never made quickly, not in India and not in Sweden either. We have to be respectful, persistent and patient. Only then will we see changes for the better (Indiska n.d.c, pg. 6).

In this sense, Indiska sees its Code of Conduct as more than a way to enforce specific human and environmental standards in its factories; it also sees its Code as a tool for positive change.

In its efforts to achieve positive change, Indiska does more than provide its suppliers with evaluations. Indiska personnel also act as free consultants to help the company’s suppliers improve the social and environmental impacts of their operations (Andersson 2008). Indiska’s Code of Conduct, which is displayed as a large poster in all of the factories that supply Indiska with product, is just a set of general guidelines that the company provides to its suppliers (Indiska n.d.c). In addition, Indiska personnel provide suppliers with Corrective Action Plans that offer detailed descriptions of how suppliers can, and are expected to, improve the social and environmental conditions in their
factories (Andersson 2008). The Corrective Action Plans include set timelines. The timelines for action can be immediate, one month, three months, and longer if the supplier is tasked with implementing substantial changes. The Correction Action Plans represent bi-lateral agreements between Indiska and its suppliers, and are only designed to include mutual goals agreed upon by both factory owners and Indiska personnel. According to Ms. Andersson (2008), these plans are achieved through:

...careful and respective dialogue with suppliers.

By providing its suppliers with individual plans, Indiska aims to learn about each supplier’s unique situation and, accordingly, set specific goals that are meaningful within the context of the factory and local community (Andersson 2008).

In addition to its goal of improving conditions within its suppliers’ factories, Indiska also aims to improve the lives of the people living in the communities where its suppliers operate. Mrs. Christina Baines, Vice Chairman and Owner of Indiska, describes Indiska’s projects in these communities as “self-help” (Baines 2008). Indiska’s pamphlet outlining its trading philosophy describes a similar view:

‘Help for self-help’ means that instead of just donating money, we try to ensure that the village, or in many cases a women’s collective, sets up a functioning production system which creates work” (Indiska n.d.a, pg. 20).

Indiska’s ‘self-help’ projects include building schools, sponsoring children to attend schools, building water wells, providing hospital supplies, and organizing social networks for women (Baines 2008; Indiska n.d.a).

Indiska’s decision to develop a conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility that applies to its suppliers raises some interesting questions. The primary question that we are interested in is related to process. Specifically, how can we describe Indiska’s process of developing its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility?

A process question related to Corporate Social Responsibility offers significant opportunity to help fill a gap in existing literature. The bulk of modern Corporate Social Responsibility literature focuses on trying to define how this broad term ought to be defined. Carroll’s (1979; 1991) social performance model of Corporate Social Responsibility identifies four areas where firms may be held responsible by different members of society: economic; legal; ethical; and philanthropy. She argues that a corporation is socially responsible when all four of these areas are holistically and voluntarily accounted for, thereby transcending the traditional boundaries of business (Carroll 1999). Another definition came from Jones (1980), who argues for a focus on a broad base of actors and voluntary efforts:
Corporate Social Responsibility is the notion that corporations have an obligation to constituent groups in society other than stockholders and beyond that prescribed by law and union contract. Two facets of this definition are critical. First, the obligation must be voluntarily adopted; behavior influenced by the coercive forces of law or union contract is not voluntary. Second, the obligation is a broad one, extending beyond the traditional duty to shareholders to other societal groups such as customers, employees, suppliers, and neighboring communities (pg. 59-60).

A third definition comes from Ward (2004 as cited in SIDA 2005), who incorporates a broad base of actors and the profiteering nature of business:

…the commitment of business to contribute to sustainable economic development - working with employees, their families, the local community and society at large to improve their quality of life (pg. 7).

We suggest that these attempts by different authors to create a general definition or description of Corporate Social Responsibility may be in vain; the term always has, and will continue to, mean different things to different people. In 1972, Votaw argued that, while a genuinely valuable term, there was no consensus about the nature of Corporate Social Responsibility. He stated:

The term is a brilliant one; it means something, but not always the same thing, to everybody. To some it conveys the idea of legal responsibility or ability; to others, it means socially responsible behavior in an ethical sense; to still others, the meaning transmitted is that of "responsible for," in a causal mode; many simply equate it with a charitable contribution; some take it to mean socially conscious; many of those who embrace it most fervently see it as a mere synonym for "legitimacy," in the context of "belonging" or being proper or valid; a few see it as a sort of fiduciary duty imposing higher standards of behavior on businessmen than on citizens at large (Votaw 1972, pg. 25).

More than thirty years further down the line, Maignan and Ferrell (2004) argue that, given the variety of approaches and definitions, there is no dominant conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. Only two years ago, Sahlin-Andersson (2006) is on the record with a similar argument. She states:

It must be stressed that it is far from clear what CSR [Corporate Social Responsibility] stands for, what the trend really is, where it comes from, where it is heading and who the leading actors are (Sahlin-Andersson 2006, pg. 596).

In this thesis, we suggest that Indiska, from a practical perspective, offers just one more view on Corporate Social Responsibility. Therefore, rather than trying to describe how Corporate Social Responsibility ought to be defined or put into practice within a business context, we argue that there is more value in examining the process by which context-specific conceptualizations develop.
1.2 Background

Our thesis work is grounded in two assumptions. First, we believe that Indiska’s current process of working with its suppliers, as described in the introduction of this thesis project, qualifies as a conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. Second, we believe that the process of developing conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility is social in nature.

Our first assumption is supported by a comparison of Indiska’s processes associated with its Code of Conduct and a six-step approach that Cramer (2005) developed to help companies put Corporate Social Responsibility into practice. The six steps of Cramer’s (2005) approach include:

- formulating a preliminary vision and mission regarding corporate social responsibility and, if desired, a Code of Conduct;
- interacting with stakeholders about their expectations and demands and reformulating the preliminary vision and mission based on these interactions;
- developing short- and longer-term strategies regarding corporate social responsibility and using them to draft a plan of action;
- setting up a monitoring and reporting system;
- embedding the Corporate Social Responsibility process by establishing it within the company’s quality and management systems; and
- communicating internally and externally about the Corporate Social Responsibility program and the results obtained.

When we compare Indiska’s processes associated with its Code of Conduct and Cramer’s six-step approach to putting Corporate Social Responsibility into practice, we find a strong match:

- Indiska has developed a Code of Conduct describing its vision of Corporate Social Responsibility; this is explicitly written as the first step of Cramer’s (2005) six-step approach.
- Indiska audits its suppliers and works with them to develop Corrective Action Plans; this reflects Cramer’s (2005) suggestion for companies to interact with stakeholders about their expectations and demands.
- Indiska implemented its audit program to ensure its suppliers follow its Code of Conduct and the Corrective Action Plans; this reflects Cramer’s (2005) suggestion for companies to develop a Corporate Social Responsibility monitoring and reporting system.
- Ms. Andersson works closely with Indiska’s steering committee. They work together to develop the three-year plans that guide Indiska’s Ethics and Environment department, and Ms. Andersson reports to the committee about suppliers’ progress. The relationship between Ms. Andersson and Indiska’s...
steering committee reflects Cramer’s (2005) suggestion for companies to embed Corporate Social Responsibility in their management systems.

- Indiska personnel engage in dialogue about the company’s Corporate Social Responsibility work, both internally and externally. The company uses tools such as management meetings and the company Intranet for internal communication, and meetings, public lectures and the ‘press’ section of its website to communicate with its external stakeholders (Indiska n.d.; Andersson 2007). These communication efforts correspond with Cramer’s (2005) suggestion that companies communicate internally and externally about their Corporate Social Responsibility programs and the results obtained.

Based on the fact that Indiska’s actions fulfill all six suggestions outlined in Cramer’s (2005) approach for putting Corporate Social Responsibility into practice, we accept that Indiska’s process of working with its suppliers for environmental and human rights improvements is a defendable conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility.

Our second assumption, companies’ processes of developing conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility are social in nature, is based on our view of the firm. We believe that Corporate Social Responsibility develops as a result of the interactions between corporate actors and their stakeholders. Quite simply, Corporate Social Responsibility implicitly refers to corporations responding to its stakeholders in society. We believe that Freeman’s Stakeholder Theory, where companies oblige their moral and philosophical obligations to account for different actors in their practices, applies to companies that agree to invest in Corporate Social Responsibility (Freeman 1984). In 1984, Freeman argued that:

...current approaches to understanding the business environment fail to take account of a wide range of groups who can affect or are affected by the corporation, its stakeholders (pg. 1).

He put forward Stakeholder Theory as a way to manage this, proposing that businesses take into account the legitimate interests of actors that can affect (or be affected by) their activities (Freeman 1984). In this view, business is about making decisions that benefit as many stakeholders as possible. According to Wilson (2003), the basic premise of Stakeholder Theory is that businesses benefit from strong relationships with their stakeholders. By accepting Stakeholder Theory as a legitimate view of the firm, we accept that businesses, and in our study, Indiska, consider the interests of stakeholders when making decisions related to Corporate Social Responsibility.

1.3 Problem area and research questions

Our assumptions are an important foundation for our research about Corporate Social Responsibility. Our two assumptions, that Indiska offers just one more perspective of Corporate Social Responsibility and that stakeholders play an important role in defining and re-defining conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility, make it important to investigate how Indiska arrived at its particular conceptualization.
Therefore our research questions are as follows:

- How has Indiska come to accept its current conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility (as described in the introduction of this thesis project)?
- Which stakeholders does Indiska identify as playing a role in the development of its processes to define Corporate Social Responsibility, and why are they able to influence the process?

1.4 Aim

The aim of our study is two-fold. First, we intend to describe the process that resulted in Indiska’s current conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. Second, we plan to name the stakeholders that Indiska identifies as influential in the development of its processes to conceptualize Corporate Social Responsibility, and describe why they, as opposed to other actors, are able to influence the process.

1.5 Delimitations

This study is designed on the principle of validity. It is our goal to investigate and better understand the process for conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility within one firm, Indiska, at a specific point in time. It is not our intention to develop a study that is replicable within other contexts.

The focus on the process within one firm, as opposed to a broader spectrum of businesses, is partially influenced by our enrolment at Mälardalen University. As graduate students at Mälardalen University, we are given ten weeks to develop and complete our thesis project. In order to complete the project in these timelines, we have elected to focus on a narrow research problem that is of great interest to us. We believe this narrow focus will allow us to develop a thorough and well-researched thesis.

In addition, we believe that it is worthwhile to focus extensive time and resources on Indiska because it sets an example for companies operating in the textiles industry. We believe there is more value for us to gain significant insight into the process by which one organization currently conceptualizes Corporate Social Responsibility than general insight into several companies.

Our narrow timelines have also influenced our decision to investigate our research questions from an internal perspective. In this way, we are gathering information from within Indiska, and, as a part of this decision, are intentionally overlooking opportunities to collect information from the company’s stakeholders. We recognize that with more time and resources, we could have broadened our lens on Indiska’s process of conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility and considered the input of many different stakeholders.
1.6 Target group

This thesis will be of interest to a wide base of actors involved in the Corporate Social Responsibility debate. In particular, we believe it will have the greatest appeal to those who are working to influence Corporate Social Responsibility definitions on any level in society.
2.0 Theoretical framework

Section Two presents previous research and theory on the subject of Corporate Social Responsibility. In particular, it discusses the applicability of Stakeholder Theory and New Institutionalism to understanding conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility. The Section concludes by arguing that Actor – Network Theory is a relatively unexplored theory in relation to Corporate Social Responsibility and the best lens to answer our research questions.

2.1 The view of corporate stakeholders

In the background section of our thesis, we argued that Stakeholder Theory has a meaningful connection to Corporate Social Responsibility. There has been significant debate over this idea, and Stakeholder Theory has really only replaced Stockholder Theory as the dominant view in the last fifty years (Charron 2007). The debate over Stakeholder Theory is grounded in the view of the firm. Stockholder Theory, which is commonly referred to as the classical view of the firm, focuses on profit-making, where the role of business is to maximize profits for shareholders (McWilliams and Siegel 2001; Jensen 2001). The stakeholder view of the firm incorporates social conscience in its business activities (Lantos 2001; Freeman 1984).

While Stockholder Theory still has some supporters (i.e. Friedman, Levitt), Stakeholder Theory began to gain momentum and emerge as the dominant paradigm in the 1970s and 1980s (Branco & Rodrigues 2007). Charron (2007) describes the history of Stakeholder Theory in three waves, all which represent a growing demand for businesses to be viewed as ‘social institutions’. The first wave took place during the 1970s. The focus of the first wave was corporate revisionists, who included academics in sociology, business ethics, and organizational and managerial ‘sciences’, developing theories of collective responsibility (Charron 2007). They specifically started using terminology such as “corporate social responsibility” and “social audits”. One of these revisionists, Dahl (1975 as cited in Charron 2007), stated:

Today is it absurd to regard the corporation simply as an enterprise established for the sole purpose of allowing profit making. We the citizens give them special rights, power, and privileges, protection, and benefits on the understanding that their activities will fulfill our purposes. Corporations exist only as they continue to benefit us. . . . Every corporation should be thought of as a social enterprise whose existence and decisions can be justified only insofar as they serve public or social purposes (pg. 9).

In the second wave, which took place between the 1980s and the Millennium, several theory-of-the-firm economists and self-protecting corporate managers took action to more actively emancipate themselves from Stockholder Theory by arguing that stockholders are only investors, one stakeholder among many (Charron 2007). Kaplan (1983), who worked in the field of industrial administration, argued that:
The shareholder as an owner of property rights in the decision-making of the firm is an anachronism at this time. The long-term interests of the corporation are more likely to be vested de facto, but not legally, with the managers, workers, suppliers, customers, and the community of the firm (pg. 343).

Part of the second wave also included an international conference of more than 100 academics that defined the claims of stakeholders (Charron 2007). They argued that while the role of business is to create wealth, all stakeholders participate in this process by assuming risks. In order to uphold this idea, they established seven moral principles that call for broad, meaningful, regular and transparent communication with stakeholders, and commitments to balancing wealth and reducing risks to societal actors (Jonge 2006 as cited in Charron 2007).

The third wave of Stakeholder Theory, beginning in the new Millennium, has continued in the same spirit as the second wave, with a strong focus on gaining broad support. As Charron (2007) puts it, the corporate revisionists are:

...launching a campaign to bring the law of the land, the mind of the university, and the spirit of society closer to their way of thinking (pg. 12).

The three waves described by Charron (2007) illustrate that the view of the firm has social responsibilities interlinked with the view of the firm affecting (and being affected by) a broad base of societal actors. The connection between Stakeholder Theory and Corporate Social Responsibility has gained attention from a number of authors. Carroll (1991) describes the natural fit between the idea of Corporate Social Responsibility and an organization’s stakeholders. Wood (1991) argues that the basic idea of Corporate Social Responsibility is the interwoven approach to business and society. Branco and Rodrigues (2007) offer further support, stating that the concept of stakeholders personalizes social responsibility by specifying the actors companies should be responsible and responsive to.

While we agree that there is a natural link between Corporate Social Responsibility and Stakeholder Theory, we also feel this theory fails to account for many of the phenomena seen in the business world. For example, we agree that the development of Corporate Social Responsibility depends on business interactions with stakeholders but suggest that the business has an explicit right to determine who these stakeholders are. Egels (2005) also makes this argument, and suggests that Stakeholder Theory, while relevant to Corporate Social Responsibility, is more useful when combined with Actor – Network Theory, a theory that provides a means of understanding how companies shape their stakeholder environments. Egels (2005) applied a theoretical framework combining Stakeholder Theory and Actor-Netwrok Theory to a case study of the Swedish-Swiss multi-national company, ABB, and its rural electrification project in Tanzania. In his conclusions, Egels (2005) notes that ABB’s choice of stakeholders is no coincidence, and that the company actively chose the stakeholders to involve in its process of developing Corporate Social Responsibility.

Stakeholder Theory, as a lone theory, also has other shortcomings. While the theory can be considered the predominant paradigm in Corporate Social Responsibility, it stops short
of offering any explanation as to why companies engage in it and how a specific conceptualization becomes accepted in a business.

2.2 An alternative view of conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility

One theory that has been put forward as retaining the strengths of Stakeholder Theory, accounting for the principle weakness of Stakeholder Theory (i.e. the theory does not go as far as to argue that companies choose their stakeholders), and offering explanations as to why companies engage in Corporate Social Responsibility and how specific conceptualizations become accepted in a business is New Institutionalism. New Institutionalism argues that businesses accept conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility that become institutionalized by actors in their organizational field, a community of organizations that are part of a common meaning system, and whose participants interact more often and meaningfully with one another than with actors outside the field (Scott 1994). According to Bauxenbaum (2006):

A [Corporate Social Responsibility] CSR construct is an institution if it is taken for granted and perceived as a universal definition of [Corporate Social Responsibility] in a given societal context (pg. 47).

In this sense, New Institutionalism accepts the main principle of Stakeholder Theory, that businesses account for societal actors in their decision-making, and builds on the theory by arguing that businesses are particularly receptive to societal actors who have frequent and meaningful interactions with the businesses.

The key concept within New Institutionalism theory, and the concept that explains why businesses are keen to accept conceptualizations institutionalized by actors in their organizational field, is legitimacy. Egels-Zandén and Wahlqvist (2007) suggest that legitimacy represents an organization being accepted by its stakeholders. Companies strive to create legitimacy by accepting conceptualizations that gain the business acceptance in the eyes of their stakeholders. In this way, it is critical for companies, if they want to stay in business, to accept conceptualizations, such as Corporate Social Responsibility, that become institutionalized by their stakeholders (Egels-Zandén and Wahlqvist 2007).

From a general perspective, the concept of legitimacy offers of an explanation of why companies accept concepts, like Corporate Social Responsibility, that have gained broad acceptance among their stakeholders. However, Czarniawska-Joerges (1992 as cited in Schwartz 1997), DiMaggio and Powell (1991) and Schwartz (1997) have also expanded New Institutionalism to offer an explanation of how companies come to accept specific conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility. Czarniawska-Joerges (1992 as cited in Schwartz 1997) argues that organizations both influence and are influenced by what takes place in an organization field. She puts forward the idea that institutions are built around the interaction between different actors in an organizational field. DiMaggio and Powell (1991) also contribute to this idea, arguing that an organization reacts to its organizational field, which is composed of other organizations reacting to their organizational fields. Accordingly, an ongoing chain of interactions results in the development of institutions. DiMaggio and Powell (1991) acknowledge that institutions
are not stable; instead, they argue that they are extremely susceptible to the interactions taking place in the organization field. They suggest that companies react to the events taking place around them in their organization field, make decisions based on these events, and, in cyclical fashion, their decisions impact the views held by others in the organizational field. In her 1997 dissertation and a 2006 article, Schwartz examines how three different companies manage environmental issues related to their operations. She found that all three companies created strategies that, while different, attempted to manage both the demands coming from the companies’ organizational fields and their internal goals. In addition to this, Schwartz (2006; 1997) noted, in a similar vein to DiMaggio and Powell (1991), that institutions are unstable phenomena. More specifically, she states that:

...institutionalism in the organizational field legitimizes the things happening within the business, which, in turn, ensures that the institutionalism is further developed out in the organization field, further influencing the internal process, and so on (Schwartz 1997, pg. 317) [self-translation].

Here, Schwartz is arguing that institutions are constantly evolving as a result of organizations making internal decisions to react to their external environments. Every time a company makes an internal decision, its actions contribute to evolution of the institution in the organization field. The evolution of the institution creates cause for companies to further react to the field. The ongoing evolutions in both the institution and company create a spiral effect (Diagram One).

Diagram One: The process of institutionalism (adapted from Schwartz 2006; 1997)
One aspect of Schwartz’s (2006; 1997) research in the field of New Institutionalism that is particularly interesting is her recognition that companies must balance their internal goals with external demands. In her research, Schwartz (2006; 1997) acknowledges that companies have a significant amount of power to decide if and how to react to their external environments. She talks in depth about three different strategies that three multinational companies employed to manage environmental concerns stemming from actors in their external environments, noting that each company employed a different strategy dependent on its context and goals. The work of Söderbaum (2000) is also relevant here; Söderbaum introduces a similar argument from a different perspective. He puts forth the concepts of the Political Economic Person (PEP) and Political Economic Organization (PEO); both are seen as entities that make decisions based on their ideological orientations. Söderbaum (2000) argues that ideological orientation is a starting point for decision-making; however, a Political Economic Person (PEP) and Political Economic Organization (PEO) can also be persuaded by other actors to change their ideological orientation. In the same vein as Schwartz (2006; 1997), Söderbaum (2000) is arguing that both individuals and organizations have the power to decide whose views matter to them. In other words, actors have the power to decide who their stakeholders should be and whether to support the viewpoints of their stakeholders. According to the arguments of Schwartz (2006; 1997) and Söderbaum (2000), it makes sense that conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility at the company-level are dependent on both a company’s interactions with other actors and its decisions about whether to subscribe to any of the different views held by those actors. Based on the work of Schwartz (2006; 1997) and Söderbaum (2000), we see reason to argue that a theory to explain how Corporate Social Responsibility becomes conceptualized within a business must put a greater focus on micro-level actors. In other words, we feel that it is important to account for the different viewpoints held by actors trying to influence how Corporate Social Responsibility is conceptualized within a company, and try to make sense of how these actors, in negotiations with other actors, are able (or unable) to gain acceptance for their ideas. In our view, we want to peel away another layer on the New Institutionalism concept of legitimacy. Instead of simply accepting legitimacy as the reason that companies accept ideas, we want to go one layer deeper to look at the processes that result in ideas gaining acceptance. By examining these processes, we can account for the types of interactions that result in networks forming around an accepted idea (e.g. an institution). In order to understand how actors gain acceptance for their ideas, we suggest there is significant opportunity to increase the focus on power relations between actors. One of the ongoing criticisms of New Institutionalism is its failure to account for the way actors develop and use power in their relationships with other actors. The development and use of power is particularly important in relation to the idea of actors convincing others to support their conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. In simple terms, all actors are not created equally. Egels-Zandén and Wahlqvist (2007) summarize this argument by stating that:

"While legitimacy is conferred by stakeholder acceptance, not all stakeholders are equally capable of conferring legitimacy (pg. 5)."

By examining the power relations between different actors, it becomes possible to understand which stakeholders play (and do not play) a role in the process of developing conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility. Going one step further, by
exploring how power is created through negotiations between actors, we can determine why certain actors are able to gain power, and accordingly, the ability to confer legitimacy.

2.3 Choice of framework

Actor - Network Theory provides a valuable lens to examine the inter-actor negotiations that precede a conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. It is also a theory that is considered complimentary to the Stakeholder Theory and New Institutionalism views of Corporate Social Responsibility (Ahlström and Egels-Zandén 2006). It supports the view of Stakeholder Theory, where a company considers other actors in its decision-making, and New Institutionalism, where a specific conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility is the result of the interactions between a company and its stakeholders. Actor - Network Theory builds on these ideas by asserting that a specific conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility is the result of an actor enrolling other actors to support its preferred viewpoint. It emphasizes the self-interests of actors and the power struggles that take place between actors with differing viewpoints, as each works to gain support for its preferred viewpoint. The constant interaction between actors with different viewpoints means that conceptualizations, like Corporate Social Responsibility, are continuously developed and dismantled; although, a certain definition may become more stable if an actor is able to persuade a wide base of other actors to support its viewpoint and keep the support over time.

Using Actor - Network Theory as a lens to understand how Indiska has reached its current conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility also offers a second advantage. Actor - Network Theory extends the view of the actor to include artefacts, such as technologies and documents, rather than just humans. Latour (1996) argues that artefacts can act as intermediaries that help define the relationships and interactions between human actors. In this view, artefacts, in addition to humans, can be granted power and play an important role in persuading other actors to accept one actor’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility.

2.3.1 An overview of Actor - Network Theory

Actor - Network Theory is generally considered to be both a theory and a methodology combined because it provides a way of looking at the world while prescribing which elements need to be traced in empirical work (Somerville 1999). The most common approach to explaining an analytical framework is to present its key concepts. However, Actor - Network Theory has a dense language that is most often, even in the case of its original authors, described in context (Latour 1988; Callon 1991).

The primary authors of Actor - Network Theory are Latour, Callon and Law. Stanforth (2007) describes the development of the theory by noting:
…[the] concept was developed by Michel Callon, Bruno Latour, and John Law during the course of the 1980s as a recognition that actors build networks combining technical and social elements and that the elements of these networks, including those entrepreneurs who have engineered the network, are, at the same time, both constituted and shaped within those networks (pg. 38).

One important aspect of Actor – Network Theory is its emphasis on actors in networks. By focusing on actors in networks, Actor – Network Theory does not differentiate between macro-level and micro-level actors. Callon (1991) states that macro-actors are simply assemblages of micro-actors, where some of the micro-actors gain the power to represent the others. Another way to explain this is to say that networks form when micro-level actors are able to convince other actors to support their way of thinking. This happens through ongoing negotiations between actors. Networks grow and shrink as micro-level actors join or leave them.

Another important aspect of Actor – Network Theory is that it considers inanimate objects as actors in the network. To further explain this, Latour (1996) gives the example of a traffic speed bump. According to Latour (1996), human actors are responsible for designing and creating the speed bump. Once the speed bump is in place, its design influences how other actors interpret it. The speed bump has specific features to achieve an outcome, as set out by the original actors. Even after the actors who design it and create the speed bump leave, it continues to be embedded with design features: in this case, to help make drivers slow down their vehicles. Under this view, where actors can be both living and non-living, actors’ relationships are defined by intermediaries, which can take the form of things like ideas, texts, technology, money, and human skills (Stanforth 2006; Callon 1991).

Ählström & Egels-Zandén (2006) explain that Actor- Network Theory deals with the processes of establishing facts and definitions. While it is primarily used in the fields of scientific study, economics and information systems, it is starting to gain some attention in the areas of sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility (Ählström & Egels-Zandén 2006). In order to make sense of this process-oriented approach, we will look at one of the first studies that led to the development of Actor - Network Theory. Although not explicitly identified as Actor - Network Theory, an early study by Latour and Woolgar (1979) offers an important contextual view to explain its origins. In 1979, Latour and Woolgar looked at the way that results of scientific study develop in the laboratory and argued that they are embedded in the process, the actions of particular scientists in particular locations. In other words, they suggested that facts, such as the results of a scientific study, are the result of interactions between building and changing networks of actors (living and non-living). According to this view, there is significant value in looking at and understanding the ongoing interactions between actors that develop the facts because they, on their own, are simply outcomes of a period of negotiations and, to arrive at a fact, agreements between particular actors.

2.3.2 Power and Translation

In our brief overview of Actor - Network Theory, we established that actors, both living and non-living, interact to create facts. The terminology Actor - Network Theory uses to
describe facts that, as the result of a series of interactions between actors, become generally accepted as “black-boxed facts” (Callon and Latour 1981). A term is “black-boxed” when different actors no longer question its conceptualization. Rather than looking at these “facts”, Actor - Network Theory looks at the process that takes place between the actors to create them. The process, generally referred to as the most central concept of Actor - Network Theory, is called “translation” (Callon 1986). Callon and Latour (1981) describe ‘translation’ as the acts of negotiation and persuasion by which an actor gains the authority to speak and act on behalf of other actors. They state that translation is:

...all the negotiations, intrigues, calculations, acts of persuasion and violence thanks to which an actor or force takes, or causes to be conferred on itself, authority to speak or act on behalf of another actor or force (Callon and Latour 1981, pg. 279).

The outcome of translation is that the persuading actor is able to influence another actor to accept a specific conceptualization of an idea or object (Callon 1986).

Table One: Actor- Network Theory concepts and descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Humans and artefacts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor-Network</td>
<td>A network of actors with aligned interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-boxed fact</td>
<td>A conceptualization taken for granted within an Actor-Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>The acts of negotiation and persuasion by which an actor gains support for its specific conceptualization of an idea or object.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Callon (1986) describes “translation” in Actor – Network Theory as taking place in four stages:

1. Problematization: an actor defines a fact by proposing roles for other actors and proposing links between the roles. The goal being to define the roles and links so that the original actor becomes indispensable.

2. Intressement: The original actor tries, through a number of processes, to lock other actors into specific roles. The original actor relies on both living and non-living actors as resources to persuade the other actors to accept the problematization.

3. Enrolment: The other actors accept their specific roles. If this does not happen, the original actor returns to the problematization stage.

4. Mobilize: All the actors play their specific roles. This creates a network of actors, which is the reference to Actor-Network, around a specific conceptualization. The development of the Actor-Network completes the process of translation.

Both the name Actor - Network Theory and the concept of translation refer to the power relations between different actors. Actor - Network Theory is grounded in social
constructivism at the micro-level, where power comes from the original actor’s ability to align other actors with its interests (Callon 1986). The Actor - Network keeps the original actor’s preferred conceptualization stable. However, keeping this conceptualization stable is an ongoing and political process in itself. According to Clegg (1989), the actors within the Actor - Network must keep their alliances and ensure members do not support competing conceptualizations, those other than the Actor - Network’s “black-boxed fact”. In this sense, there are always political interactions, or power plays, occurring between three parties of actors. Actor A, who supports the “black-boxed fact”, is keeping Actor B from enrolling in Actor C’s alternative conceptualization. The Actor - Network is particularly vulnerable as it first forms, and several translation processes can occur before a conceptualization reaches a relatively stable state (Clegg 1989).
3.0 Methodology

Section Three describes the research design, approach and strategy. It goes on to detail the approach we took to access, collect and analyze our research data.

3.1 Research design

Research can involve a broad array of activities and many different paths. As described in the previous section, Latour and Woolgar (1979) argued that the results of scientific study develop in the laboratory and are embedded in the scientific process. Latour and Woolgar (1979) were suggesting that the outcome of scientific research is dependent on the interactions in the process to reach the results. This argument is relevant here and makes describing the research process imperative to understanding the results of this thesis project.

Yin (2003) notes that research can be classified as exploratory, descriptive or explanatory. Exploratory research aims to clarify ambiguous problems and offer a better understanding of a problem (Zikmund 2000). Descriptive research aims to provide a descriptive account of a phenomenon or population (Zikmund 2000). Explanatory research aims to illustrate cause and effect relationships between different variables (Zikmund 2000). In the case of our study, we believe that explanatory research is the most meaningful approach to investigate the process by which Indiska has defined Corporate Social Responsibility. Explanatory research is generally undertaken to answer how or why questions. The information obtained in explanatory research helps to create context and a historical perspective on how or why the topic under study has evolved (Yin 2003). Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility is not up for debate in this thesis project; instead, the primary focus of our research is to understand how its conceptualization was reached. The research will look for cause and effect events, expressed as interactions and negotiations between different actors, as a means of explaining how Indiska reached its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility.

3.2 Research approach

The research approach generally includes a basic description of the theoretical and methodological focus. According to Zikmund (2000), the theoretical approach, at the meta-level, can be categorized as inductive and deductive, and the methodological approach, at the meta-level, as qualitative or quantitative.

The analytical framework that we outlined in Section 2.3, Actor - Network Theory, can be broadly described as taking an inductive approach to research. Zikmund (2000) describes inductive research as:

...the logical process of establishing a general proposition on the basis of observation of particular facts (pg. 43).

This is opposed to deductive reasoning, which Zikmund (2000) notes as generating a conclusion from known facts or premises. The association between Actor - Network Theory and inductive research is strong because it, as an analytical framework and
methodological approach, encourages researchers to look at specific elements that can be viewed in empirical work to generate an understanding of an overall process (Somerville 1999). In this particular study, we are looking at actors and the nature of their interactions to develop a general understanding of the overall process that resulted in Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. In this case, the actors and their interactions are the observations of particular facts that will be analyzed and aggregated to develop a general description of the process by which Indiska has conceptualized Corporate Social Responsibility.

The methodological approach to research depends on the type of research data that is collected. According to Zikmund (2000), research data can be qualitative and quantitative in nature. These two methodological approaches are not mutually exclusive; they can, and often are, used to complement each other (Miles & Huberman 1994). Qualitative research is primarily concerned with process, as opposed to outcomes or products, and focuses on descriptive accounts of how people make sense of their lives, experiences and structures in the world (Creswell 1994; Miles & Huberman 1994; Zikmund 2000). Quantitative research is generally focused on measuring and explaining, and thus looks for answers that can be measured, calculated or revised with statistical methods by focusing on numbers and figures (Zikmund 2000). Our research has a very strong qualitative focus, and in fact, without dismissing some of the strengths of quantitative data, relies almost solely on words and language to provide a vivid picture of the process by which Indiska has conceptualized Corporate Social Responsibility.

3.3 Research strategy

The research strategy explains more specifically the nature of the research work conducted under the umbrella of the research approach. According to Yin (2003), the research strategy, whether the research approach is qualitative or quantitative, can include experiments, surveys, archival analyses, histories and case studies. Yin (2003) notes that the choice of research strategy is dependent on the type of research question, the control that the researchers are able to extend on behavioural events and the focus on current events, as compared to historical events (Table Two).

Table Two: Relevant situations for five research strategies (Yin 2003, pg. 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Form of research question</th>
<th>Requires control of behavioural events</th>
<th>Focuses on contemporary events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>How, why?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival analysis</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>How, why?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>How, why?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to select the most appropriate research strategy, we reviewed the strengths of the five research strategies presented by Yin (2003) and compared their attributes to our research questions and context. After reviewing Yin’s (2003) presentation of the research strategies, we elected to take a case study approach to our work. The case study approach is particularly relevant to our research work because our primary focus is on a how question. Yin (2003) notes that how questions:

...deal with operational links needing to be traced over time, rather than mere frequencies or incidence (pg. 6).

In this scenario, he recommends a case study approach. Yin (2003) defines the case study approach as an empirical study that looks at contemporary phenomenon in a real-life environment. He notes that multiple sources of information become relevant to develop a clear picture of the phenomenon under study in its real-life context. The mention of real-life fits particularly well with our analytical framework, Actor- Network Theory, because the theory itself is almost always described in context (Latour 1988; Callon 1991). In this sense, it will be easier to bring our analytical framework to life by focusing on a contextual scenario. In addition, Yin (2003) notes that case studies:

...benefit from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide the data collection and analysis (pg. 14).

Again, this fits particularly well with our focus on Actor- Network Theory, which offers both a lens and a methodological guide for both data collection and analysis.

3.4 Data collection

Case studies have developed as a broad methodological instrument that can be developed using several different types of data (Yin 2003). Yin (2003) introduces six main sources of information that can contribute to the case study research strategy: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant-observation and physical artefacts (e.g. physical evidence gathered in the field). Yin (2003), Miles and Huberman (1994), and Wiedersheim-Paul and Eriksson (1991) argue that it is important to use many sources of evidence to create a full picture of the case under study. However, it is not always feasible or valuable to incorporate all of the six sources noted by Yin (2003). As he argues, there are strengths and weaknesses associated with each source. Some of the weaknesses, such as high cost and heavy time commitments associated with direct observations and participant-observation, make the sources impractical for every case study project (Appendix B).

In our study, the main focus is interviews with Indiska staff. We have selected interviews as our primary data source because they allow researchers to target information directly related to the research topic (Yin 2003). In addition to interviews, we also consider documents that our interview participants identify as further describing the company’s process of conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility. As Yin (2003) notes, documents are helpful to both augment and corroborate information from other sources.
We have chosen to exclude archival records, direct observations, participant-observation and physical artefacts as data sources in our research. Archival records, considered by Yin (2003) to have a historical focus, have little relevance to this study because of its contemporary nature. The relevant information does not exist in archival form but rather as tacit knowledge held by company employees and explicit knowledge captured in company documents (Andersson 2007). We have excluded direct observations and participant-observation because of the cost and time that must be invested into visiting and spending time at the case study site (Yin 2003). These activities are not practical given our timelines, the scope of this project, and the limited availability of our research participants. Lastly, we have excluded physical artefacts from our study. There is simply no indication that cultural or physical artefacts from the case study site will lead to a better understanding of Indiska’s process of conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility.

3.5 Gaining access to information

To gather information to answer our research questions, we approached Ms. Renee Andersson, Indiska’s representative for its Ethics and Environment department, via email and asked her to participate in a one-hour open-ended interview to provide information about Indiska’s process of conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility. On November 23, 2007, we attended a lecture about Corporate Social Responsibility that Ms. Andersson delivered at Mälardalen University. During this lecture, we became familiar with Ms. Andersson’s extensive knowledge of Indiska’s Code of Conduct and processes for working with its suppliers. Our decision to approach Ms. Andersson for an interview aligns with Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) argument that research participants should be selected for their knowledge and experiences. When we sent the email to Ms. Andersson, we also asked her to identify two or three colleagues to complement her input. We specifically asked her to identify individuals with extensive knowledge and a long history working in a decision-making position within Indiska. The nature of our request is known as snowball (or chain) sampling (Miles and Huberman 1994). Snowball sampling involves requesting well-informed people to identify other sources able to provide valuable information about a phenomenon (Miles & Huberman 1994).

We contacted Ms. Andersson via email in early March 2008 and received an email response within a week. Ms. Andersson confirmed that she and Mrs. Christina Baines, Vice Chairman and Owner of Indiska, would be the only individuals with the in-depth knowledge and availability to participate in our research. We felt that the extensive knowledge and experience of these two individuals was more important than the number of individuals we could interview, and that interviewing them would be enough to provide us with the information necessary to adequately explore our research questions.

Our process of snowball sampling was not limited to identifying interview participants. We also extended this technique to identify documentation to complement the interview responses and provide additional information to help answer our research questions. In our email correspondence to Ms. Andersson, we requested that she and Ms. Baines be prepared during our interview session to recommend any documents, internal and external, that they thought would be helpful to answer our research questions.
3.6 Data collection process

When we contacted Ms. Andersson, we immediately described our intentions to ask her open-ended questions in a face-to-face interview setting. In our initial email to Ms. Andersson, we described the interviews in the context of storytelling by stating:

*We are interested to hear stories from people within your organization about how Indiska developed its way of working with Corporate Social Responsibility.*

We also indicated that we would follow-up any stories with direct questions related to our research questions. Finally, we noted, specifically, that one of the follow-up questions would be:

*Can you recommend or provide us with any company or external documents that would help us gain a better understanding of the process by which Indiska has adopted its view of Corporate Social Responsibility?*

We felt it was important to provide this question to the interview subjects well in advance to be respectful of their time and have a better chance of gaining access to any materials.

Our decision to rely on open-ended questions in a face-to-face setting was influenced by Yin (2003). Yin (2003) provided support for the open-ended approach to interviewing participants, noting that case study interviews are most often open-ended questions where respondents can be asked about:

*…the facts of a matter as well as their opinions about events* (pg. 90).

We also made a conscious effort to conduct face-to-face interviews with our respondents. Support for conducting face-to-face interviews also came from Gillham (2000), who argues that face-to-face interviews are the best option if:

- there are small numbers of people involved in the research;
- the interview subjects are accessible;
- most of the interview questions are open-ended and will benefit from probes and prompts;
- it is important to have all of the participants engaged;
- there is trust involved in collecting the research data;
- anonymity is not an issue;
- the depth of the information is central to answering the research questions;
- the goal of the research is to generate a better understanding of a phenomenon.

In the case of our research, all of these conditions apply. Accordingly, we believed there to be significant benefit to be obtained from making the effort to travel to Stockholm to ask our interview questions in the presence of our research respondents.

The interviews took place back-to-back in one-hour time slots on the morning of April 16, 2008 at Indiska’s corporate location in Stockholm. The first interview was scheduled with Mrs. Baines and the second with Ms. Andersson. We began each interview session
by introducing ourselves and providing information about our professional and educational backgrounds. We also provided a short overview of our research project and our commitment to protecting the interests of our research subjects. For the latter, we confirmed that it would be appropriate to publish the names of our research subjects in this report. We also offered our research subjects the opportunity to review the empirical data before publication. We believe it is in the best interest of our research to have our research participants confirm that the information we are collecting and reporting is deemed to be an accurate reflection of the information they provided to us. After addressing these formalities, we began by asking our research subjects to tell us, in their own words, the story behind Indiska’s approach to Corporate Social Responsibility. We emphasized the word ‘story’ as a means to express our interest in the events leading up to Indiska’s approach to Corporate Social Responsibility. Abbott (2002) describes stories simply as an event or a sequence of events. Egan (1998) argues that stories:

... reflect a basic and powerful form in which we can make sense of the world and experiences (pg. 2).

In our research, we were looking for our interview participants to emphasize the series of events, those most salient to them, that led to Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. We felt that asking our respondents to tell us a story would be an appropriate way to begin our interview process. Both of the interview participants responded extremely favourably to this approach, and it resulted in very fluid and conversational interviews. Our interview participants spoke freely and in-depth about the different actors and events that contributed to Indiska’s present day practices, and we guided the interview process with several probe and open-ended questions (Appendix C). The first interview was one hour and eight minutes in length and the second interview was two minutes short of an hour. We recorded the interviews, with the permission of our respondents, on a digital audio recorder and transferred the files to a computer. We also took notes throughout the interviews to capture key thoughts from the participants; this was important in case of an audio recorder failure. In addition to taking direct notes, we jotted down observations (researcher memos) and personal thoughts about the interview content and processes.

At the conclusion of our first interview with Mrs. Christina Baines, Ms. Renee Andersson joined us. At this point in time, we asked both research subjects to direct us to any additional documents that would be helpful to better understanding Indiska’s process of conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility. The two women pointed us to three documents that they suggested would add to our research and corroborate their information: a pamphlet entitled ‘Indiska’s Trading Philosophy’ (Indiska, n.d.a), the Code of Conduct document posted on Indiska’s corporate website (Indiska, n.d.c), and a book entitled ‘Mitt liv med Indiska’ (My Life with Indiska), written by Mrs. Baines’ father and the former owner of Indiska, Åke Thambert (1995). These documents were used to elaborate on the information about Indiska that was presented in the introduction of this thesis project, and contributed to the information presented as empirical data.
3.7 Data analysis

Yin (2003) describes data analysis as the most important part of case studies. He outlines data analysis as examining, categorizing, tabulating or recombining evidence. Yin (2003) argues that there are three general strategies to analyze case study data. The first, he suggests, is to analyze data using the research questions and theoretical framework as a foundation. The second involves developing and testing a variety of explanations against the case study data; this can be helpful in the absence of a strong theoretical proposition. Lastly, the researcher can develop a descriptive framework to organize the case study data. For our research, we employ the first strategy, as our research questions and theoretical framework, Actor - Network Theory, have a strong theoretical foundation to draw from.

Our approach to analyzing our data is drawn from Miles and Huberman (2004), who present Carney’s (1990 as cited in Miles and Huberman 2004) “ladder of analytical abstraction” (Appendix D). Miles and Huberman (2004) suggest that a researcher’s progression through analysis begins with trying out coding categories on a text, then identifying themes and trends in the text, and then to testing hunches and findings. In the testing hunches and findings stage, they suggest that researchers first aim to delineate the “deep structure” and then to integrate the data into an explanatory framework. While we recognize that it is absurd to suggest that our analysis was a clear and linear process, as opposed to a complex and iterative one, we believe that the “ladder of analytical abstraction” provides a relatively accurate picture of our general process.

The first step we took with our interview data was to transcribe it. Between April 17 and April 19, we played back the interview recordings and transcribed each interview verbatim into a Microsoft Word document. In order to become thoroughly familiar with our data, we each went through the process of transcribing both interviews. While this was a time consuming process, it was a valuable way for both of us to familiarize ourselves with the data and a good opportunity to begin our coding process. By both taking the time to transcribe the interviews, we became extremely familiar with our pool of data. This made it easier for us to think about, discuss and compare our ideas during the analysis process.

Once the transcription process was complete, our next goal was to review the interview data and organize it into key concepts. Miles and Huberman (1994) refer to this process as open coding. In addition to our original copies of the transcribed interview data, we created four additional copies of each interview. The copies provided us with canvases to re-organize and code the data without losing our original transcriptions. In the first copy of each interview, we reviewed the data and coded it for actors. We classified actors according to Actor - Network Theory and looked for examples of both living and non-living actors, including individuals, groups, entities, and objects. In the second copy of each interview, we reviewed the data and coded it for Corporate Social Responsibility, taken as instances when the Indiska respondents described examples of how they work with and account for the interests of their stakeholders. In the third copy of each interview, we coded for instances where the Indiska respondents described interactions between the actors, which we labelled as events. In addition, we used memos, short notes in the margin of the document that aim to identify relationships between interview data,
to label the position of each organization relative to the event (Miles and Huberman 1994). In the fourth copy of each interview, we reviewed the data and coded it for instances of translation. To be clear, when we were coding for events, we were looking for examples of interactions between actors. When we were coding for translation, we were looking for interactions between actors that resulted in one actor gaining authority to speak and act on behalf of others. In other words, we coded instances where one of the actors agreed to accept the position put forward by another actor.

Once the coding was complete, our primary focus was on seeking out and identifying relationships in the data. Coding was an important step for us to reduce our data and focus our attention on particular concepts related to Actor - Network Theory. In order to identify relationships in our data, we extracted data related to our codes and worked to reassemble it in chronological order on a new canvas, a blank Microsoft Word document. The focus on chronology was directly related to Actor - Network Theory, where the goal is to examine the interactions between actors, as they take place over time, which make up processes of translation and result in “black-boxed facts”. By coding for actors, Corporate Social Responsibility, events and translation, we were able to reduce the data to four significant processes of translation that led to four significant developments in Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility between the 1950s and the date of the interviews. In order to establish an accurate chronology, we relied on both references to dates from the transcribed interview data and the three documents recommended by Mrs. Baines and Ms. Andersson: Indiska’s Trading Philosophy pamphlet (Indiska n.d.a), Indiska’s website (Indiska n.d.c), and the book ‘Mitt liv med Indiska’ (Thambert 1995).

The chronology served as the foundation for the case description. It represents the actors that interacted with Indiska during the company’s process to develop its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility, and examines the nature of the interactions. The chronology also helps to establish the process of interactions that belong to the four separate processes of translation, and, accordingly, four significant developments in Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. In addition, the chronology was used to develop the description of Indiska’s current conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility, as described in the Section 1.1 of this thesis project, and the structure of our case description.
4.0 Conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility

Section Four combines the empirical findings and data analysis of this research project. It presents the data gathered from interviews with two Indiska representatives, Mrs. Christina Baines and Ms. Renee Andersson in the context of Actor-Network Theory. More specifically, this section highlights four processes of translation that resulted in advances in Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility.

4.1 Setting the scene: Shaping Corporate Social Responsibility with family values

While the modern profile of Indiska Magasin, a family-owned Swedish company in its third generation, can be linked to the 1950s, the company’s origin dates back to the beginning of the 20th century. In 1901, Mathilda Hamilton, a Swedish woman who lived in the Himalayas in North India, started a small shop in Stockholm (Indiska, n.d.e). The original store, which was named Indiska Utställningen (roughly translated as Indiska Exhibition) sold gifts and assorted artifacts from India (Baines 2008). From the very beginning, Indiska has had a strong link to India. As Mrs. Christina Baines (2008) explains it:

...our name is Indiska, we don’t go to India because it is cheap. That is where our soul is.

The modern profile of Indiska, which places great emphasis on its Indian roots, begins with Åke Thambert.

Mr. Thambert purchased Indiska Utställningen when it was put up for sale in 1951 (Thambert 1995). He changed the name of the business to Indiska Magasin and, within a couple of years, added garments to the wares for sale in the shop. One of the unique things about Mr. Thambert was his commitment to integrating social welfare into his business practices. While we noted in Section 2.1 of this paper that Stakeholder Theory gained in popularity during the 1970s and 1980s, Mr. Thambert is an example of a business owner who already held a stakeholder view in the 1950s. Mrs. Christina Baines, Mr. Thambert’s eldest daughter, describes her father as the individual that initiated the process of creating what, after several adaptations, can now be defined as Indiska’s current conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. She notes:

...and it actually comes from my father. It has always been there. It has been like it sits in the walls here. ... It is the way my father is. He always said that humans are number one on the agenda in all business and ethics so it started really from the beginning (Baines 2008).

In a book Mr. Thambert wrote on his life and experiences as the owner of Indiska, he describes being part of a family that always, despite their own challenges, was conscious of the need to support the less fortunate. Early in the book, he states that every Christmas his family would butcher a pig to share with the poor people in their community (Thambert 1995). He appears to carry this spirit into his career as a businessman. Shortly after purchasing Indiska, Mr Thambert describes one of the company’s early
successes, the sales of a Cairo-style purse in the 1960s, as the result of a business agreement with socially conscience undertones:

The bag came to be under strange circumstances when I was in Beirut at a Lion’s meeting to hold a speech about my business activities in the Orient. Afterwards, a young doctor came up to me. His name was Nadim and he was involved in trying to find work for handicapped workers. He, himself, had a small business with five or six people employed. They sat in a room and made leather pillows, that kind that sit in front of the fireplace, that he wanted me to import. I wanted to help this unusual doctor but I had my own ideas and proposed that we should meet the next day. That night I drew a version of the camel-bag that I took home from Cairo. ... Dr. Nadim’s activities to help the handicapped in Beirut developed very well with the help of the profits. Eighty-two people with handicaps worked at the Al Kafat factory with different products. ... Some of the profits also went to helping parentless girls (Thambert 1995, pg. 42 – 43) [self-translation].

Mrs. Baines (2008) describes this interaction as an example of her father’s commitment to operating a socially responsible business:

… in retrospect it was not much profit on these things because he chose to do it that way and to sponsor the girls. The social reward was more important in this. It is in my father. It is part of his personality.

She notes that her father established Indiska as a company with a social conscience, and made certain it was operated in this way.

In relation to Actor - Network Theory (Callon 1991), Mr. Thambert can be viewed as an actor, who, by purchasing and developing Indiska, had the power to create a business reflective of his values. However, to have a successful business, Mr. Thambert could not just make uni-lateral decisions without consequence. In order to build Indiska into a successful company, he also needed to gain the support of his company stakeholders. It is particularly worth noting that Mr. Thambert, as a father and businessman, enacted his immediate family in a process of translation (Callon 1986; Callon and Latour 1981), where they came to accept that business decisions should balance profit-making opportunities and benefits to society. This view of business became a ‘black-boxed fact’ (Callon and Latour 1981) in the family, where the Thambert family members who were involved in Indiska saw their business responsibilities as a balance between making money and creating positive opportunities for people less fortunate than themselves.

The process of translation that created an Actor -Network around Mr. Thambert’s values is described as happening quite smoothly. Mr. Thambert appears to have earned the respect and attention of his children and early employees. Mrs. Baines (2008) mentions no instances of conflict or uprising against her father’s business views. She describes his way of working as an ever-present way of life that is part of her family, and, as a family company, a part of Indiska. She says:

...and then, we have it, it is there is in the family, and it has been like a natural way, we haven’t looked at it so much as it has been natural (Baines 2008).
Mrs. Baines goes on to note that she and her brother, who became co-owners of Indiska once their father stepped into an honorary position with the company, were greatly influenced by their father’s values and business practices. She describes traveling with her father to India in the 1970s and seeking opportunities to work directly with local people. The opportunities, she notes, were beneficial to both Indian labourers, those working as suppliers to Indiska, and Indiska. Mrs. Baines (2008) states:

_We went to the southern part of India where all the weavers are and we realized that the knowledge and the weavers were down there. They are very poor and all the profit went to the big exporters in Delhi and they were just sort of producers down there. So actually, very early, we organized a couple of weaving villages and we found a person, a son, to one of the head weavers, who had studied a bit and we trained him to do exports. ...we kept out the middleman and this is the way we have worked since the seventies. All the time we go to the source and to the people who produce and that is, you can call it, humanitarian work or not. It is just that we feel that the income should come to the people who produce the product. Not cut down prices there. And also in this way, we believe we improve quality. We can develop more things together and it is a win-win situation for those people as well as for us._

In this way, Mrs. Baines describes Indiska as a company built and run on the values taught by her father. The values of her father were passed down to her and her brother, and, according to Mrs. Baines, are still very much present in the way that they operate the company. Mrs. Baines explains that Indiska’s current president and CEO is her daughter, the third-generation of the Thambert family (Baines 2008). She notes that her daughter is carrying forward the Thambert family values in her way of running the company as well (Baines 2008).

In addition to early examples of Åka Thambert and his family making socially conscience business agreements, Mrs. Baines also gives examples of Indiska undertaking philanthropic work in the communities where its suppliers operate. She makes note of educational projects, environmental projects, infrastructure projects and health projects that Indiska has funded (Baines 2008).

4.2 Expanding the Actor-Network: Working with suppliers

While still carrying no label of Corporate Social Responsibility, Mrs. Baines describes the 1960s, 70s, and 80s as the era when Indiska began working extremely hard to persuade its suppliers to give greater consideration to human rights and environmental laws in their business practices. This can also be viewed as a time where Indiska worked to further stabilize its view of Corporate Social Responsibility, based on the family values of the Thambert family, by engaging its suppliers in a process of translation (Callon 1986). By persuading its suppliers to accept Indiska’s view of business, the company created a larger Actor - Network around its views and further stabilized its approach to doing business (Clegg 1989).
Ms. Baines (2008) describes, in detail, one specific case where Indiska persuaded one of its suppliers in India to stop using child labour. She notes that this description exemplifies one of the many projects that Indiska has been involved in to institute its views of human rights, environmental protection, and, more generally, socially responsible business practices among its suppliers. The case described by Ms. Baines will be analyzed using Callon’s (1986) four-step description of the process of translation as a way to illustrate how Indiska was able to persuade its supplier to accept its views of child labour.

The first step of Callon’s (1986) four-step process refers to problematization, where an actor defines a “fact” by proposing roles for other actors and proposing links between the roles. In the early 1980s, Indiska started working with a community of handicraft workers in northern India. Mrs. Baines (2008) describes a community with many families that relied heavily on children to bring home a wage. She states:

*There are big families, thirteen children, twelve children, and so we started. ... We realized they sent their children to work because they didn’t have enough income.* (Baines 2008).

She goes on to note that her family, as the owners of Indiska, view child labour as unacceptable and felt a responsibility to curb the practice of child labour in the community (Baines 2008). In addition to this, they wanted to give the child workers working for their supplier the opportunity to be educated. Mrs. Baines (2008) notes that it was Indiska that identified child labour as a problem, and that its supplier and the families of the children working in the factories did not immediately see a problem. She states:

*We did it together with our supplier because we couldn’t stand that all these children were working* (Baines 2008).

She goes on to say that it was difficult to convince both the supplier and families of the benefits of sending the children to school. She notes:

*That is the difficult part. Because they don’t see that* (Baines 2008).

Mrs. Baines (2008) describes Indiska’s motivation to stop child labour as a moral obligation. She says that the members of her family, and therefore, Indiska, had strong relationships with the people in the weaving village. When we asked Mrs. Baines why Indiska wanted to stop the child labour practices and send the children to school, she said:

*Because they are our friends, I mean, we were in a team together. We were like a family. We see it like that. It was just in us. We worked with them. We cared for them. We knew them by name, all of them, and this is the grandchild of... and, you know, you became like a family* (Baines 2008).

She described feeling a responsibility to take care of the children in the weaving village. In this way, Indiska was acting as a caretaker for the families, persuading them to view the development of their community through the eyes of Indiska.
The main challenge that Indiska faced in the problematization stage of the translation process (Callon 1986) was that neither the supplier nor the workers saw the benefits of releasing the children from their work duties and sending them to school. Indiska’s response was to seek ways to persuade the supplier to eliminate child labour in its production line and the families working for the supplier to send their children to school. These efforts correspond with the second step in Callon’s (1986) four-step process, interressement. In this step, the actor tries, through a number of processes, to lock other actors into specific roles. In Indiska’s case, it relied on research and its business experience to persuade its supplier to eliminate the use of child labour in its production line and support the young workers in getting educated (Baines 2008). According to Mrs. Baines (2008), Indiska convinced its supplier of two things. First, the supplier’s workers would be more loyal if they received support for their families. Second, the educated youth would help the supplier become more prosperous. Mrs. Baines (2008) explained that Indiska was able to successfully convince the supplier to stop relying on child labour and to support youth education. She also noted that the workers were more loyal to the supplier:

And they come to him, and in this respect, he gets very faithful workers. They stay with him. And I have seen little boys, especially he has a ceramic factory, and I’ve seen these little boys, they were child workers with their fathers from the beginning, grow up. Today, they are bosses and one boy, he is a young man of course, 26, he is the boss of the ceramic factory. He is driving a nice car, has all these children, a good home, and it is through work (Baines 2008).

In a parallel process of translation, Indiska also had to persuade the families working for the suppliers to let their children go to school. As Mrs. Baines (2008) explains, Indiska had more credibility with its suppliers because of the business relationship. Indiska had credibility as a loyal and successful company that had given the supplier a good business opportunity. However, Indiska did not have the same relationship with the families working for the supplier. In order to gain support for its views of child labour, Indiska had to bring in intermediary actors that the families trusted to look out for their best interests. Indiska engaged social workers, individuals with knowledge of the local language and customs, to negotiate with the families. In addition to the communication through social workers, Indiska relied upon another well-established actor, money. Indiska offered to supplement the incomes the families lost when they sent their children to school. As Mrs. Baines (2008) put it:

... hunger talks. ...we sponsored the families with a lack of income. That was the only way.

By incorporating funding into its negotiations with the local families, Indiska employed a non-living actor, money, as an intermediary. Money, as a non-living actor, has strong symbolism and plays a long-recognized and important role in society. By involving this actor, Indiska offered the families a sense of security and, as a result, had a much stronger case to persuade the families to send their children to school.
When the supplier agreed to accept Indiska’s conceptualization of child labour, the supplier was engaging in enrolment. Callon (1986) notes that enrolment, the third step in the process of translation, signifies a power play between actors. In Actor - Network Theory, power is the result of interactions (Callon 1986). By persuading its supplier to stop using child labour and support youth education, Indiska gained power. The fourth step in the process of translation is mobilize (Callon 1986). Mobilize signals the end of the translation process. By agreeing to eliminate child labour and support youth education, Indiska’s supplier subscribed to the company’s view of child labour.

Indiska’s success in gaining support from its suppliers helped solidify its conceptualization of the way to incorporate human rights and environmental laws in business. Its view of child labour received even greater support when other companies began buying product from Indiska’s supplier. As Mrs. Baines (2008) describes:

*If you improve your factory, you become a role model and you attract new international customers so it is only a win-win situation.*

Here, Mrs. Baines was noting that Indiska’s work to eliminate child labour at one of its suppliers helped the supplier attract new customers. When the supplier attracted new customers, it further increased its support for Indiska’s conceptualization of child labour. According to Actor - Network Theory, the Actor - Network keeps the original actor’s accepted conceptualizations stable (Clegg 1989). In this case, Indiska was able to keep its conceptualization of child labour stable by persuading its supplier to support its view. Indiska was the main actor and its supplier originally constituted its Actor - Network. When new companies began to work with the suppliers because of their conceptualization of child labour, this grew, and further stabilized, Indiska’s Actor - Network.

### 4.3 Challenging Indiska: Formalizing Corporate Social Responsibility

While the Thambert family was able to maintain a relatively stable conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility, primarily limited to partnerships with its suppliers, between the 1950s and 1980s, things changed dramatically for the company in the 1990s. During the 1990s, Indiska’s stakeholder base broadened considerably. Interest in the company was no longer mainly limited to the family, employees, suppliers and customers (Baines 2008). In addition, the media, unions, and non-government organizations were taking a heavy, and often critical, interest in Indiska’s business practices (Andersson 2008; Baines 2008). As Mrs. Baines (2008) describes, Indiska’s connection to developing nations created a significant amount of controversy during the 1990s:

*...this was a part of our way of working and then during the nineties, all the debate came up, media. It was child workers. It was a worldwide debate. In Sweden it was very hot. The focus was on third world countries and child labour.*

With Indiska’s strong connection to India, including its name, products and suppliers, its operations became an immediate concern for the media, public and lobby groups. Ms. Andersson (2008) notes that people have a strong tendency to tie an assortment of Indian issues to Indiska:
...there are so many bad things happening in India. And everything that has to do with India, Indiska is blamed. Even if it has to do with chickens or sheep, we are not dealing with chickens or other things but if people see something that is very upsetting about India, sometimes they blame us (Andersson 2008).

The uproar over garment retailers operating in the developing nations started to gain attention in the mid-1990s, and the biggest issue for the companies was their informal approach to working with and reporting on its agreements with suppliers (Baines 2008). This issue gained significant attention as the Swedish Clean Clothes Campaign, a collective of consumer organizations, trade unions, human rights and women rights organizations, researchers, solidarity groups and activists, worked to raise awareness about the concerns it had with companies operating in developing nations (Clean Clothes Campaign n.d.). The Campaign focused significant attention on Indiska, among other Swedish garment retailers, calling for the company to change its approach to working with its suppliers (Andersson 2008).

The Clean Clothes Campaign, in itself, was a strong actor, built on a network of supporters. The Campaign represented a broad base of Indiska’s stakeholders, and together, an extremely powerful collective of stakeholders. The Campaign, which primarily generated attention through media, was working to develop broad support for its view of how companies, like Indiska, should be working with suppliers in developing countries (Clean Clothes Campaign n.d.). By doing this, the Clean Clothes Campaign was gaining power among stakeholders with the potential to affect Indiska’s business situation, and accordingly, destabilizing the support for Indiska’s approach to working with its suppliers.

In the latter part of the 1990s, the Swedish Clean Clothes Campaign called on Indiska, H&M, Lindex and KappAhl, which are all large Swedish garment retailers, to formally define their approach to working with suppliers in developing nations by creating and adhering to an industry-wide Code of Conduct (Andersson 2008). The Clean Clothes Campaign approached Indiska, and the other companies, much in the same manner that Indiska proposed its view of Corporate Social Responsibility to its suppliers. The Campaign put forward its view of Corporate Social Responsibility as an industry-wide Code of Conduct, and then employed a number of techniques to convince the companies to supports its view.

According to Ms. Andersson (2008), the Clean Clothes Campaign was particularly successful in persuading Indiska, and the other companies, to formalize their ways of working with suppliers in a Code of Conduct. In this way, the Clean Clothes Campaign offered Indiska an opportunity to partner on the issue, to create an even more powerful network of actors who supported the same vision of Corporate Social Responsibility. As the Clean Clothes Campaign worked to persuade Indiska, and the other companies, to adopt an industry-wide Code of Conduct, it relied on the power of other actors. In particular, the Campaign leveraged a non-living actor, the International Labour Organization’s Eight Core Conventions on Fundamental Human Rights (Stanforth 2006; Callon 1991). As Ms. Andersson (2008) states:
When Clean Clothes approached us, then they said, a proper Code must contain the eight core conventions of ILO... So these have to be in the code.

The Clean Clothes Campaign drew on a well-supported and highly stable conceptualization of human rights when it focused on the International Labour Organizations documents. In this sense, the Campaign leveraged the results of a previous process of translation, the process to achieve the International Labour Organization’s Eight Core Conventions on Fundamental Human Rights, as a way to persuade Indiska to prescribe to its view of Corporate Social Responsibility.

Despite the Clean Clothes Campaign’s ability to convince Indiska, and the other three companies, of the value of establishing a Code of Conduct, it was unable to convince the companies to adopt an industry-wide standard. As Ms. Andersson (2008) notes:

Clean Clothes Campaign pushed Indiska, Kappahl, Lindex and H&M in order to make them adopt Codes of Conduct. That was in 1996 and in 1997 – 1998, those four companies adopted Codes of Conduct, all of them. They all had a little different Codes at that time.

Part of the problem with Indiska completely accepting the conceptualization put forward by the Clean Clothes Campaign was a difference in values. Ms. Andersson notes that the Clean Clothes Campaign, along with some of the Swedish unions, was putting forward human rights ideas that were inconsistent with Indiska’s values. She states:

Clean Clothes campaign is talking about a living wage and now the unions have started talking about a living wage but nobody can define a living wage, what is a living wage? And then Clean Clothes Campaign says if you have a work in some factory then you should be able to fend for yourself, you should have proper food and proper living and you should have clothes and you should have medical care and you should be able to save and you should send your children to school and all this but if you have ten children and I have none, and we are both applying for work, who do you think they will employ?

In this sense, while the Clean Clothes Campaign was able to persuade Indiska to partially accept its view of how a Swedish garment retailer should work with its suppliers, Indiska was still able to exercise its own power to maintain some of its independent thinking within the company (Clegg 1989). The final result was that Indiska chose its own path, a compromise of its values and the ideas put forward by the Clean Clothes Campaign.

4.4 Round two with the Clean Clothes Campaign: The phoenix in the ashes

In 1999, after Indiska and the three other Swedish garment retailers accepted their own unique Codes of Conduct, which were different from the unified approach suggested by the Clean Clothes Campaign, the Campaign approached the companies again. It requested that the four companies work with it to develop a system to monitor and enforce the application of the Codes of Conduct among the companies’ suppliers. As Ms. Andersson (2008) states:
So at that time Clean Clothes Campaign asked the four companies, can we make the project together to find out a lead system or a system to how to make those controls and the companies were also interested because they had never worked with human rights or labour rights.

In this sense, the Clean Clothes Campaign re-approached the conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility within the garment industry and, in the language of Actor - Network Theory, proposed new roles for the companies. As Callon (1986) discusses in his process of translation, actors who fail to persuade other actors to accept specific roles often return to the problematization stage of translation.

In its first round of negotiations, where the Clean Clothes Campaign proposed an industry-wide Code of Conduct, the Campaign gained some credibility with Indiska. It offered Indiska a means to manage its reputation in a time when the company was under heavy scrutiny from many of its stakeholders. The Campaign helped Indiska to re-create a stable concept of Corporate Social Responsibility and renew the support among its stakeholders (Clegg 1989). In this sense, when the Clean Clothes Campaign offered Indiska additional support to further develop its work with Corporate Social Responsibility and accordingly, further build its Actor - Network, the offer was accepted (Callon 1986).

The Clean Clothes Campaign proposed that it work with Indiska and the three other companies to conduct a pilot study to verify that they, and more particularly, their suppliers, were complying with their Codes of Conduct (Andersson 2008). In addition to this, and perhaps more overtly related to re-conceptualizing the companies’ operationalized views of Corporate Social Responsibility, a pilot board, with representatives from four unions, four non-government organizations, the four companies participating in the project, an independent president and a secretary, was tasked with coming up with suggestions to improve conditions in the overseas factories that the four companies relied on for products (Clean Clothes Campaign n.d).

One important aspect of the project that would later become extremely relevant to Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility is that the pilot board recruited Ms. Renee Andersson to run it. For three years, which turned out to be the entire lifespan of the project, Ms. Andersson was the project lead. Between 1999 and 2001, Ms. Andersson organized studies and audits to learn more about the conditions in suppliers’ factories, generate a better understanding of how much information could be obtained about the factories operating conditions, and test how much the retail companies might be able to influence the business practices of their suppliers (Andersson 2008). Ms. Andersson (2008) notes:
And also, they did not know at the time, is it possible for us to go to China or to India to a supplier, to a company that we don’t own, even if he is a supplier of ours? Can I ask him to look in his books to see how much he is paying his workers, to see if he is paying the pension funds, to see if he is paying the social insurance, to see if he has appointment letters, to see if he has free trade unions, in China there are no free trade unions, but anyway, are there any kind of relationship to unions, and is it also possible to walk around in the factory? I did that for three years, to find out if it is possible, and I found out it is possible. So for three years, I did four pre-studies and four pilot studies for those four companies and for the Clean Clothes Campaign. I did it in co-operation with extremely skilled colleagues that I found in India, China and Bangladesh.

Throughout the three years, Ms. Andersson presented her findings and experiences back to the pilot study board. At the end of the three years, she presented a proposal for a common Code of Conduct and a management system to ensure that the Code was observed (Andersson 2008). As a part of this, Ms. Andersson suggested that the monitoring systems, based on factory audits, follow almost the same pattern as those conducted during the pilot studies.

As Ms. Andersson (2008) explains it, the proposal was never accepted because of disagreements among the non-government organizations and unions on the pilot board. As a result of ongoing disputes, the network of actors unraveled and the project disintegrated. In the end, the Clean Clothes Campaign was once again unable to develop a standard industry approach to Corporate Social Responsibility.

Although the Clean Clothes Campaign project was not followed through, the work of Ms. Andersson emerged from this process. Ms. Andersson, having paid attention to Indiska’s warm reception to her pilot project findings, saw the opportunity, as one actor, to get involved in the company’s development of Corporate Social Responsibility. Shortly after the collapse of the pilot projects initiated by the Clean Clothes Campaign, Ms. Andersson was asked to lead the first Amnesty Business Group in Sweden. Just over a year later, she approached Indiska for a job (Baines 2008). Ms. Andersson describes this as the point in her career where she realized, after more than twenty years advocating from human rights with non-government organizations, that companies were in the strongest position to make changes. She states:

What I found out [from leading the pilot project] is that companies, they were the ones who were really interested in these issues. Nothing came out from the NGOs. Because companies, afterwards when I analyze it, companies have to be alert. They have to listen to pressure from outside from customers, they have to be curious, they have to find out new ways in order to survive... (Andersson 2008).

Indiska responded positively to Ms. Andersson’s proposal to work on further developing issues related to social responsibility within the company (Baines 2008). On one hand, the collapse of the pilot projects with the Clean Clothes Campaign left Indiska in an awkward position, the pilot projects were an important tool to help Indiska gain stakeholder support for its approach to Corporate Social Responsibility and the end of the
pilot projects left them without an organized means to continue this work. On the other hand, the collapse gave Indiska greater freedom to develop its own approach, one best suited to the company. The addition of Ms. Andersson to the company gave Indiska both a foundation to expand its formal approach to Corporate Social Responsibility and confidence that the family values, those cherished by the family owners of the company, could be maintained (Baines 2008).

Arguably, Ms. Andersson, on her own, represents the next major development, and translation process, in Indiska’s process to conceptualize Corporate Social Responsibility. Relying on her experience and the documentation that she developed and presented during the Clean Clothes Campaign pilot projects, Ms. Andersson was able to generate support from Indiska about her ideas surrounding the appropriate way for the company to approach Corporate Social Responsibility (Baines 2008). Similar to the description of Åke Thambert, this illustrates that the opportunity for one individual, as an actor, to gain power and build a powerful Actor-Network (Callon 1991). While discussing the importance of personal values in approaching Corporate Social Responsibility, Ms. Andersson (2008) provides a powerful description of the importance of individual actors in companies:

... you have companies that consist of human beings, like Christina, like myself, like everyone, we care, we are not monsters or robots who just want to gain. Of course our main issue is to earn money, otherwise we shouldn’t have a company but if you can make it in a human way also with lots of respect for environment and you can also change the situation in your production countries, then, of course, you should take that responsibility.

By bringing Ms. Andersson into Indiska, the company capitalized on the power that she had developed in relation to its stakeholders (Clegg 1989). Ms. Andersson, having worked and negotiated with the suppliers, competitors, unions, non-government organizations and media that represented a broad section of Indiska’s stakeholders, had already done significant work to develop a well-recognized and well-supported view of Corporate Social Responsibility. When Ms. Andersson joined Indiska, the company became associated with her conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility and benefited from the power she gained in negotiations with the company’s stakeholders.

4.5 The current view: Building a stable Actor - Network

Today, while Indiska is still no stranger to criticism over operating in developing nations, Indiska has employed Ms. Andersson to fill a dedicated role in the company. Her job, representing Indiska’s Ethics and Environment department, is to listen to, interact with, and learn from Indiska’s stakeholders to constantly improve and gain support for the company’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility (Andersson 2008). While Ms. Andersson and, accordingly, Indiska, are receptive to proposals and critical reviews from its various stakeholders, the company is also careful of the partnerships that it builds. Ms. Andersson (2008) notes that the Clean Clothes Campaign offered Indiska advice and opportunities at a time when the company was unaware of how to formally work with human rights issues; however, these days Indiska is more experienced and less
willing to dedicate its resources to responding to those who are only critical of the company. She states:

*Actually, we don’t want to have anything to do with Clean Clothes Campaign, because, actually, they made a report of Indiska that came out so good, just as good as the one of H&M, but they talk so bad about us in the media because they wanted lots of attention to these issues. ... We have been there for them when they want to make research for their reports and such but just picking, picking, picking on Indiska and H&M, we who really are doing something, then you will turn and say, ah, they don’t do enough, they don’t do enough, in the end, you as a consumer, all of us as consumers, think, it is no use to complain because nothing is happening, lots of things are happening so why don’t they sometimes give us credit also* (Andersson 2008).

Instead, Indiska is putting its time towards generating understanding among those who support its cause and are more likely to accept and support Indiska’s view of Corporate Social Responsibility.

*But all this you have to explain it to customers, you have to explain it in debates, and I’m in the radio, I’m in television debating these things. I go to universities, as you know. I go to high schools and buying schools. I talk to other companies that we want to start working with these issues. And ... even the government has asked me to come to tell about these issues...* (Andersson 2008).

In addition, Indiska continues to share information with other companies. As Ms. Andersson (2008) notes:

*There are not so many ideas. The ideas I can get is from other companies who are working very seriously with these issues, like H&M, Ikea, Kappahl, we have continuous discussions, and we are members of different networks, who are working with these issues and some of us are also pushing foreign aid, like SIDA, to involve companies more in foreign aid.*

Ms. Andersson describes a setting where Indiska makes a conscience effort to communicate with and be receptive to the work being done by other large Swedish retail organizations. In particular, Indiska maintains communication in a network with the companies that share some of its views of Corporate Social Responsibility and can help to further enhance and establish its work as valid among a broad base of stakeholders.

In the view of Actor- Network Theory, Indiska, is putting more effort into building networks with actors that share similar values, and accordingly are interested in pursuing a similar approach to Corporate Social Responsibility. In other words, while Indiska is still responsive to hearing different conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility put forward by other actors, it is currently showing more confidence in its internal approach, based on the values held by people within the company. Ms. Baines (2008) notes that while Indiska has a number of success stories about its work to improve the lives of people working in its suppliers’ factories, this work is never complete. Indiska’s work with Corporate Social Responsibility is a dynamic concept that is, and will always
be, changing, as is its work to gain the support of its stakeholders and grow its number of stakeholders.
5.0 Discussion and conclusions

Section Five offers a discussion of our research findings and conclusions. Sections 5.1 provides an overview of our research findings to explain how Indiska has come to accept its current conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility, and which actors were involved in the company’s process to conceptualize Corporate Social Responsibility. Section 5.2 offers some insight into why Indiska has chosen to involve certain stakeholders in its process to conceptualize Corporate Social Responsibility. Section 5.3 offers some comments on the results of applying Actor – Network Theory as the theoretical lens for this study.

5.1 The process of conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility

In this thesis project, we have used Actor – Network Theory as a framework to understand the process by which Indiska has come to accept its current conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. Actor – Network Theory argues that conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility, referred to as a ‘black-boxed fact’ in the theory’s terminology, develop through a process of translation (Callon and Latour 1981). In simplified terms, translation is a concept that examines the negotiations between different actors that result in a conceptualization, and, accordingly, a network of actors that support the conceptualization (Callon 1986).

Using Actor – Network Theory to examine the process by which Indiska has come to accept its current conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility, we can see that networks are unstable (Clegg 1989). As different actors successfully enact translation processes, networks can grow and shrink. The process of constructing networks, through the negotiations between different actors, is continuous, and the Actor – Network is always changing (Clegg 1989). In our case description of Indiska, we identified four different translation processes that resulted in significant developments in Indiska’s Actor – Network, and, accordingly, its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. To summarize our conclusions for our first research question, we will briefly reiterate the details of the four processes identified and discussed in Sections 4.1 through 4.4.

5.1.1 First process

In the first process, Indiska, as a macro-actor, was developed as the result of interactions between Åke Thambert and his family and employees. In Mr. Thambert’s interactions with his different family members and employees, he enrolled a network of individuals that supported his business ambitions and values. The network, described in Actor – Network Theory terminology as an Actor – Network, together can be taken as a macro – actor (Callon 1991); in this case, the macro-actor is labeled Indiska.

5.1.2 Second process

In the second process, Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility was extended to its suppliers. Indiska held a view that children should not work in factories and should be given the opportunity to attend school. In order to put this conceptualization into action, Indiska required the support of its suppliers. In one
specific example, Indiska approached one of its suppliers in India and persuaded the supplier to eradicate child labour from its production lines and support youth education. In addition, Indiska had to persuade the families working for its supplier to send their children to school. By gaining the support of its supplier and the families working for the supplier, Indiska was able to develop a network supportive of its views, and, effectively, instituted a new corporate approach to Corporate Social Responsibility.

5.1.3 Third process

In the third process, Indiska, responding to criticisms from new stakeholders, was persuaded to formalize its approach to working with its suppliers. The Swedish Clean Clothes Campaign tried to persuade Indiska, as one of four companies, to accept its view of a formal industry-wide approach to working with suppliers. Indiska did not completely accept the Clean Clothes Campaign’s view. It accepted the Clean Clothes Campaign’s recommendation to develop a Code of Conduct based on the International Labour Organizations’s Eight Core Conventions on Fundamental Human Rights but, like the other three companies, it created a unique Code of Conduct.

5.1.4 Fourth process

In the fourth process, the Clean Clothes Campaign, having been unsuccessful in its first attempt at translation, re-approaches Indiska, as one of four companies, to re-focus its approach to Corporate Social Responsibility. Indiska, still interested in the opportunity to regain a large and stable network of stakeholders who support their approach to working with suppliers, agrees to partner on a pilot project initiated by the Clean Clothes Campaign (Clegg 1989). The pilot board appointed to make decisions about the project has representation from four unions, four non-government organizations, the four companies participating in the project, an independent president and a secretary. In addition, the pilot board hires Ms. Andersson to run the project. After three years, the project comes to an early end after some of the unions and non-government organizations struggle with disagreement over the appropriate way for the four companies to work with their suppliers and enforce their Codes of Conduct. A year after the project ends, Ms. Andersson approaches Indiska for a job. Indiska sees an alignment in values, and Ms. Andersson becomes the lead for the company’s Ethics and Environment department. Ms. Andersson, with her experience and network of supporters, provides Indiska with a new means to re-establish support for its approach to Corporate Social Responsibility. She becomes a spokesperson to represent the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility within Indiska. Part of Ms. Andersson’s role, with her credibility working with human rights issues related to corporate activity, is to further grow and stabilize the network of stakeholders that support Indiska’s approach to Corporate Social Responsibility.

5.2 Indiska’s fortress: Limiting the infiltration of ideas

The application of Actor – Network Theory as a means to understand the process by which Indiska has conceptualized its current view of Corporate Social Responsibility provides several contributions about the micro-level interactions between actors (i.e. research question two) that contribute to defining and developing Corporate Social Responsibility at the business-level:
Defending the fortress: Managing competing views of Corporate Social Responsibility

Using Actor – Network Theory as a lens to view Indiska’s process of conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility illustrates that each actor identified in the process worked in its own way to impose its view of Corporate Social Responsibility on other actors. In other words, there are constant negotiations taking place to try and eliminate multiple views of Corporate Social Responsibility. The actors work to single-handedly dominate and lead the conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. The means to silencing other views of Corporate Social Responsibility is to persuade other actors to subscribe to one’s own view. Indiska identified numerous actors that approached it with ideas about how to re-conceptualize Corporate Social Responsibility within the company. Notably, very few of the actors reached the point of being able to engage Indiska into a process of translation; the ones that did were identified in our four processes of translation. In other words, the majority of the actors interested in proposing a new viewpoint of Corporate Social Responsibility did not make it past the first stage of Callon’s (1986) translation process- problematization.

Gatekeeping: Unilateral power to establish the internal view of Corporate Social Responsibility

One of the strengths of Actor – Network Theory is that it highlights the fact that the translation process (Callon 1986) rests on one actors ability to persuade other actors to support its idea. This focus on persuasion highlights the decision-making autonomy of each individual actor. In our case, we saw that conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility within Indiska does not occur as a democratic process. Indiska has the decision-making power to choose which stakeholders’ ideas affect its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. As the Indiska respondents noted, the company often receives unsolicited input into its business practices. Before responding, the company weighs the advantages of engaging the actor in a dialogue. Indiska retains the option of ending the dialogue at any time. Notably, this reinforces our initial criticism of Stakeholder Theory, where we argued that the theory should account for the fact that companies can choose their own stakeholders.

Negotiating entry: The importance of values and power in influencing Indiska’s view of Corporate Social Responsibility

Our application of Actor – Network Theory also highlights that the actors who participated in processes of translation and, accordingly, contributed to Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility were selected by the company because they exhibited similar values, and power achieved through previous success with building Actor – Networks. This statement also applies to the non-living actors that operate as intermediaries in the process, such as money, which are embedded with values and power. We feel this is a particularly important conclusion in our research as it highlights the weakness of Stakeholder Theory and points to the fact that many of the actors affected by Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility are excluded from the process of developing it. There are two ideas that we wish to focus on in relation to this conclusion. First, we want to note that this approach to Corporate
Social Responsibility appears to assume the position that Indiska knows best. For example, Indiska worked hard to introduce and establish its views of child labour with its supplier in India. One must think critically about whether Indiska’s actions represented a global view of human rights or instituted western values in an eastern nation. In another way, we should be questioning whether Indiska’s approach to Corporate Social Responsibility is indeed socially responsibility, as in responding to the social population in any way, or simply an exertion of the company’s own value system. Secondly, and in the same line of thinking, it reduces the likelihood that Indiska will ever undergo a radical change in its approach to Corporate Social Responsibility. We can even point out that Indiska is now electing to go as far as to limit its interactions with critics (e.g. Indiska is now limiting its involvement with the Clean Clothes Campaign because it has been so critical of the company’s work).

Collectively, these three contributions bring us to the conclusion that Indiska has significant control over which actors affect its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. While our case study makes it clear that Indiska has adopted the views of different stakeholders on its path to reaching its current conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility, it also shows that the company has an authoritative approach to limiting these stakeholders.

5.3 Some comments about using Actor-Network Theory

In our theoretical framework, we argued that Actor – Network Theory was the appropriate choice for this study because of its attention to the micro-level negotiations between actors that precede a conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility, and its attention to non-living actors. Now that we have reached the conclusion of our study, we want to supplement this with the argument that there is significant advantage to approaching a study related to the conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility with knowledge of Stakeholder Theory and New Institutionalism.

In the beginning of our Theoretical Framework section, we introduced Stakeholder Theory as the platform for Corporate Social Responsibility. While we have pointed out weaknesses in relating Stakeholder Theory to the way that companies conceptualize Corporate Social Responsibility, we maintain the view that this is an accurate view of firms engaged in Corporate Social Responsibility. The case study of Indiska clearly shows that the company has greater interests than in creating profits for its owners. The company makes decisions that account for other parties, including its suppliers and the people working for its suppliers. The challenge is that we must be critical of how Stakeholder Theory is applied in relation to Corporate Social Responsibility. As we saw in our case study, Indiska has considered the people working for its suppliers as stakeholders in its approach to Corporate Social Responsibility. The problem is that Indiska is not asking these people to help it define an appropriate approach to Corporate Social Responsibility; instead, it is persuading these people to support its viewpoint. In other words, the people working for Indiska’s suppliers are simply on the receiving end of Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility.

We also believe that to create a full picture of the process of conceptualizing Corporate Social Responsibility in Indiska, there is room for a macro-view offered by New
Institutionalism. While Actor-Network Theory provided a valuable lens to understand the micro-level negotiations that resulted in advancements in Indiska’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility, we were lacking a big picture view of the stakeholder field. One of the catalysts for this statement is the similarity between the results of our study of Indiska and Schwartz’s (2006; 1997) study into the environmental strategies within Volvo, The Body Shop and Tarkett. Schwartz (2006; 1997) employed New Institutionalism as a theoretical lens to consider how these three companies tackle environmental demands from actors within their organizational fields, and why they act in the way that they do. Schwartz’s (2006) findings are similar to our own, indicating that companies balance external demands with their internal ways of working. In the voice of New Institutionalism, Schwartz (2006) introduces the idea of two aspects of the institutionalization process: one within the organizational field and one within the organizations that exist in the organizational field. We have discussed this phenomenon in the voice of Actor – Network Theory, taking a micro-level perspective we argue that Indiska engaged in a process of translation with the Clean Clothes Campaign (third process of translation) because it faced growing criticism from a new base of stakeholders. We talked about the Campaign’s ability to leverage the shrinking support of Indiska’s approach to Corporate Social Responsibility into a way to persuade the company to take an interest in its approach. Within our work, we look at the micro-level negotiations between Indiska and the Clean Clothes Campaign and describe Indiska’s partial acceptance of the Campaign’s conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. We noted specifically that Indiska was unwilling to completely accept the Clean Clothes Campaign’s full conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility because it wanted to maintain a focus on its values. Within Schwartz’s (2006) study, she refers to this strategy as automorphism, where companies refer to their own institutionalized ideas as a way to respond to demands from the organizational field. She goes on to note that this behaviour makes companies agents of the institutionalization process, which occurs in the organizational field. This macro-level description offers a lens to understand how ideas stabilize, both within the company and organization field. Using Actor – Network Theory, the focus is less on achieving stability of ideas and more on understanding the nature of the negotiations that actors use to gain support for their own ideas. When we consider the similarities of the results of our study and Schwartz’s study (2006; 1997), we feel that combining that knowledge of New Institutionalism provides an important way to consider the results of Actor – Network Theory in relation to the big picture. Actor – Network Theory offers a means to describe the nature of the micro-level negotiations that take place as a conceptualization develops, New Institutionalism can supplement this by offering a means to examine the way a conceptualization is viewed more generally within the organizational field.
6.0 Further research

Section Six highlights opportunities for further research in our field of study. The suggestions are for further research that is related to our current project but outside of its scope. We are interested in tackling some of these research opportunities in the future, and hope that other researchers will consider working with them as well.

6.1 Recommendations for further research

The conclusions from our research represent one view, provided by representatives from within Indiska, of the process by which Indiska has conceptualized its current view of Corporate Social Responsibility. It reveals some important examples where Indiska has, in negotiations with various stakeholders, adapted its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. It also opens the door to gather additional perspectives on Indiska’s process of developing Corporate Social Responsibility. In our interviews, the representatives from Indiska identified some of the actors that have successfully and unsuccessfully tried to influence its process of developing its conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibility. With more time and resources, it would be extremely interesting to supplement the case study description with information from these actors. By incorporating the views of other actors, it is likely that we would generate a better understanding of the translation processes involving Indiska and different actors, enriching the validity and depth of the case study. In addition to the case study, we also suggest that there is significantly more opportunity to explore Actor – Network Theory in relation to Corporate Social Responsibility. There have been very few empirical studies in the area of Corporate Social Responsibility that rely on Actor – Network Theory as a theoretical framework. Contributions in this area have been primarily limited to the work of Älhström and Egels-Zandén (2006), who examined the process of defining Corporate Social Responsibility related to the Swedish garment industry from a multi-stakeholder perspective, and Egels-Zandén and Wahlqvist (2007), who applied a framework combining Actor – Network Theory and New Institutionalism to understand how Corporate Social Responsibility definitions related to the Swedish garment industry are affected in post-partnership environments. We believe that additional empirical studies using Actor – Network Theory as a lens on Corporate Social Responsibility will help to further illuminate the nature of inter-actor negotiations and explain why and how specific conceptualizations of Corporate Social Responsibility have developed. Finally, we suggest there is significant opportunity to further consider Stakeholder Theory, New Institutionalism and Actor – Network Theory as complementary views to better understand Corporate Social Responsibility. While each of these theories have shortcomings, applied together they may result in a fuller and more useful understanding of the development of Corporate Social Responsibility conceptualizations.
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8.0 Appendices

Section Eight contains appendices that outline Indiska’s Code of Conduct, the six types of sources that can be used in case study research, the interview questions used in this thesis project, and the general approach we took to complete our data analysis.

Appendix A: Indiska’s Code of Conduct
(Indiska n.d.c, pg. 7)

This Code of Conduct also constitutes part of the purchasing conditions why apply to all of Indiska Magasinet’s suppliers and their subcontractors.

Indiska’s own representatives or an authorized organization approved by both parties have access to supplier of sub-contractor premises for inspection during all opening hours.

For some less critical demands, Indiska allows a certain amount of time for adaptation. However, repeated failure to comply with any part of the conditions laid down in the Code of Conduct can result in cancellation of current orders and termination of a business relationship.

1. Forced labour
   Any form of forced or punishment related labour is not acceptable. Workers must not be forced to lodge deposits or identity-papers.

2. Freedom of association
   The supplier must respect workers rights to form or become members of a trade union and the right to collective bargaining.

3. Working environment
   The supplier must provide a safe and healthy working environment for his staff. Conditions and equipment must comply with all the relevant laws and regulations applicable to safety and hygiene.

4. Child labour and minimum wage
   The supplier must comply with all national laws and regulations and ILO conventions 138 and 182, why apply to minimum wage and appropriate types of work. Where the use of child labour is identified in the production chain, the supplier and Indiska – working towards a collective goal and sharing responsibility – attempt to arrange and sponsor relevant alternative activities, including schools, uniforms, school equipment and lunch payments for a certain period which is decided in each individual case.

5. Minimum wage
   The supplier must comply with all national, regional and industrial regulations relating to wages and renumeration. Workers must be compensated for overtime in accordance with local regulations. Deductions from salaries as a disciplinary measure are not permitted.
6. Working hours
Working hours must not exceed 48 hours a week plus 12 hours of voluntary overtime. Overtime must not be demanded regularly. Workers must be given one day a week off.

7. Discrimination
Discrimination against staff due to their gender, religion, race, civil status, any disability, ethnic origin, sexual orientation or membership of a trade union is not acceptable.

8. Regular employment is provided
The supplier has a responsibility to offer permanent employment in the first instance, with the relevant social security specified by law, and must not forgo this responsibility in favour of other forms of employment.

9. Humane treatment
Physical abuse or punishment, threats of physical abuse, sexual or other harassment and verbal abuse are forbidden.

10. National laws
Suppliers are expected to comply with national and other relevant laws.
### Appendix B: Yin’s (2003) six sources of evidence: strengths and weaknesses (pg. 86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of evidence</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Documentation         | • Stable – can be reviewed repeatedly  
• Unobtrusive – not created as a result of the case study  
• Exact – contains exact names, references and details of an event  
• Broad coverage – long span of time, many events, and many settings | • Retrievability – can be low  
• Biased selectivity, if collection is incomplete  
• Reporting bias – reflects (unknown) bias of author  
• Access – may be deliberately blocked |
| Archival records      | • [same as above for documentation]  
• Precise and quantitative                                                                                                                  | • [same as above for documentation]  
• Accessibility due to privacy reasons                                                                                                          |
| Interviews            | • Targeted – focuses directly on case study topic  
• Insightful – provides perceived causal inferences                                                                                         | • Bias due to poorly constructed questions  
• Response bias  
• Inaccuracies due to poor recall  
• Reflexivity – interviewee given what interviewer wants to hear                                                                                     |
| Direct observations   | • Reality – covers events in real time  
• Contextual – covers context of event                                                                                                      | • Time-consuming  
• Selectivity – unless broad coverage  
• Reflexivity – event may proceed differently because it is observed  
• Cost – hours needed by human observers                                                                                                       |
| Participant-observation | • [same as above for direct observation]  
• Insightful into interpersonal behaviour and motives                                                                                       | • [same as above for direct observation]  
• Bias due to investigator’s manipulation of events                                                                                             |
| Physical artefacts    | • Insightful into cultural features  
• Insightful into technical operations                                                                                                      | • Selectivity  
• Availability                                                                                                                                       |
Appendix C: List of interview questions

This appendix includes the list of questions that we used to guide our interviews with Mrs. Baines and Ms. Andersson. Due to the interactive nature of the interviews, we also relied on conversational prompts to seek clarifications and additional information related to our questions, and to manage the pace of the interview. The conversational prompts are a natural part of interacting with research participants and, for this reason, have not been included in this appendix.

Introduction:

1. Please briefly introduce yourself and describe your role and responsibilities within the company.

2. We are interested in the story of how Indiska began working with Corporate Social Responsibility, and how its approach has changed over time. Can you tell us this story? We’re interested in the details such as: How were the decisions made? When were the decisions made? Who was involved? Where did the ideas come from?

3. Can you explain to us why Indiska works with Corporate Social Responsibility?

Semi-structured probe questions:

4. Sometimes companies make decisions because of the statements or actions of another company, group or individual, can you please think of and describe any examples where this might apply to Indiska’s work with Corporate Social Responsibility?

5. Please describe any individuals, companies, or groups that have played in part in defining how Indiska works with Corporate Social Responsibility.

6. Along the same line, how about documents, agreements or decisions that played a particularly important role?
Appendix D: The Ladder of Analytical Abstraction
(Carney 1990, as cited in Miles and Huberman 2004, pg. 92)