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Abstract

Background: Today’s global social and environmental issues are impacting the way of doing business around the world with an increased pressure on organizations to implement sustainability practices in a more strategic manner. Many organizations lack the practical knowledge to integrate sustainability efficiently. Scholars argue for the importance of organizational learning for the transition towards sustainable corporations. While the problem is evident across industries, dealing with the problem effectively is particularly important within the property sector since property development is a fundamental part of building a sustainable society, hence crucial for Sweden’s achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals 2030.

Purpose: To analyze the management of organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability in organizations within the Swedish property sector.

Method: By using a qualitative research methodology with a single-case study of a Swedish property management firm, in-depth empirics could be collected from semi-structured interviews conducted with members of the organization from various departments and positions, and across regions. An abductive approach was applied where we used and extended previous theory before presenting a final model where theory and findings were aligned.

Conclusion: Our model showed how organizational learning can be managed for the integration of corporate sustainability across different levels of an organization – individual and group, organizational, and societal where various practices where identified on each level – see Figure 7.
Sammanfattning


_Syfte:_ Att analysera hur organisatoriskt lärande kan hanteras för att integrera hållbarhet i organisationer inom den svenska fastighetsbranschen.


_Slutsats:_ Vår modell visar hur organisatoriskt lärande kan hanteras över olika organisatoriska nivåer av ett företag – individ och grupp, organisation, och samhälle – för att integrera hållbarhet genom olika tillämpningar, se figur 7.
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1. Introduction

The first chapter of this thesis begins by introducing the reader to contemporary sustainability issues faced by the world today followed by the current academic discussion on the topic of corporate sustainability. The academic discussion is focused on the integration of corporate sustainability with the use of organizational learning, before narrowing down to the emerging problem within the field before presenting the purpose of the thesis. In the final section, delimitations and key definitions are presented.

1.1 Background

The growing social and environmental issues such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and social inequalities have become too urgent to ignore (Ceballos, Ehrlich & Dirzo, 2017; Goldin & Mariathasan, 2014; World Wildlife Fund, 2018). These issues are intensely debated by world organizations and politicians, as well as frequently reported in the media (Avramova, 2018; Halkjaer, 2017; Howard, 2018; United Nations, 2019; World Wildlife Fund, 2018). In pace with a growing awareness, research within the management field becomes of great importance as it impacts the way of doing business around the world (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2015; United Nations Environment Program, 2013). Along with the increasing pressure for organizations to implement sustainability practices, emphasis has more recently been put to a more strategic integration of sustainability and the crucial role of organizational learning to avoid short-term quick fixes for sustainable development (Engert, Rauter & Baumgartner, 2016). A renown definition of the concept sustainable development was introduced by the World Commission on Environment Development (WCED) in 1987, where it is described as meeting the needs of today without compromising the ability to meet the needs of future generations. To be able to fully meet the growing demands of sustainable development and its role throughout supply chains, across stakeholders, and as part of the volatile external environment, organizational learning must be used for organizations to successfully and efficiently integrate corporate sustainability (Cramer, 2005; Engert et al., 2016).

Corporate sustainability has emerged as a concept from the origin of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a result of the increased focus on the strategic integration of
sustainability in organizations (Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017; Engert et al., 2016; Pellegrini, Rizzi & Frey, 2018). CSR dates back to the late 1800s and describes how companies take responsibility outside their core operations and is usually linked to the occasional sustainability initiatives used for marketing, branding, or philanthropic actions and behaviors (Crane, 2008; Kotler & Lee, 2005). Directly derived from the definition of sustainable development in the WCED’s report from 1987, Dyllick and Hockerts (2002) define corporate sustainability as “meeting the needs of a firm’s direct and indirect stakeholders [...], without compromising its ability to meet the needs of future stakeholders as well” (p. 13). In this sense, the definition of corporate sustainability implies that neither of the three aspects rooted in the triple bottom line framework by Elkington (1999) - economic, environmental, and social - should be ignored.

Many executives recognize the need for integrating sustainability in the organization (Lubin & Esty, 2010; McKinsey & Company, 2014). However, while it is found that a great number of organizations implement sustainability initiatives at an operational level (Bonn & Fisher, 2011), there is still an excessive lack of strategic integration of corporate sustainability in organizations (Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017; Engert et al., 2016; Galbreath, 2009; Hahn, 2013). Organizations need to enhance their ability to deal with the complexity of corporate sustainability according to Engert et al. (2016). Engert et al. (2016) presented several supporting and hindering factors for efficient integration in a literature review, including but not limited to manager attitude, organizational learning, and management control. Among these factors, organizational learning is emphasized by several scholars as the pathway to a successful integration of sustainability in an organization (e.g. Baumgartner, 2014; Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017; Carter, 2005; Cramer, 2005; Engert et al., 2016).

Organizational learning is defined as the process of achieving strategic renewal in an organization (Crossan, Maurer & White, 2011; Crossan, White & Lane, 1999). In Crossan et al.’s (1999) framework for organizational learning, strategic renewal is associated with for example new product development, increasing agility for changes occurring in the external environment, or creating sustainable competitive advantage. According to Cramer (2005), organizational learning can ease the process for an organization to integrate sustainability by implementing learning processes across different levels of an organization simultaneously.
1.2 Problem Discussion

The problem present today is not that organizations do not acknowledge the existence of current issues related to sustainability, but rather lack the adaptability to deal with the complexity of it in practice within an organization (Engert et al., 2016). Many organizations develop a habit of quick fixes by using superficial sustainability practices and disregard the importance of creating a learning culture within the organization to respond to the substantial demand of integrating corporate sustainability (Jamali, 2006; Zollo, Cennamo & Neumann, 2013). To deal with the complexity present, organizations need to systematically implement strategies and practices with a long-term vision of sustainable development by shifting from compliance-based to strategic-based view (Smith & Sharicz, 2011). As a result, researchers within the management field call for a shift from the “why” to the “how” of corporate sustainability, to increase the understanding of how an organization can manage the change in demand towards a more integrated use of sustainable practices (Engert et al., 2016; Zollo et al., 2013).

Considering the sustainability issues and the growing pressure on organizations, the United Nations (UN) is one of the prominent actors pushing for sustainable development. In January 2016, the UN’s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development came into force, which comprises of 17 Sustainability Development Goals adopted by world leaders as an attempt to tackle the great social and environmental issues, including actions such as the Paris Agreement on climate change (United Nations, 2015). Directly derived from this, the government of Sweden has developed an action plan in order to continue being the world leader for sustainability together with its neighboring countries (Government Offices of Sweden, 2018; Sachs, Schmidt-Traub, Kroll, Lafortune & Fuller, 2018). The action plan consists of six areas where ‘a strong business sector with corporate social responsibility’ and ‘a sustainable society’ represent two areas of primary focus (Government Offices of Sweden, 2018). Considering Sweden’s leading and proactive role for sustainable development in the world, a Swedish organization’s sustainable practices may serve as a compass for the development of future sustainable societies. To reach the goals of the action plan, organizations within the property sector are particularly of importance since they are a fundamental part of building a sustainable society (Jones, Hillier & Comfort, 2015). The property sector can be defined as the buying, selling, and renting of land and buildings (Gorringe, 2011). Some argue the financial markets and asset managers will have to increase their focus on sustainable
investments and climate-smart solutions to reduce risks linked to sustainability in the property sector (The Property Barometer, 2015).

Several authors call for further research within the field of corporate sustainability and its strategic integration in an organization’s management across various sectors (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017; Engert et al., 2016). There is still a limited discussion based on organizational learning and how it can be used in practice to deal with the complexity of corporate sustainability and thus the transition towards a sustainable society (Baumgartner, 2014; Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017; Carter, 2005; Cramer, 2005; Engert et al., 2016).

1.3 Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the management of organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability in organizations within the Swedish property sector. Based on the problem discussion and to fulfill this purpose, this thesis will provide answers to the following research questions:

- **RQ 1. How can organizations in the property sector in Sweden manage organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability?**

- **RQ 2. What role can managers and employees have in practice for the learning process towards the integration of corporate sustainability in an organization within the Swedish property sector?**

Keywords: corporate sustainability; management; organizational learning; property sector.

1.4 Delimitations

To effectively contextualize the most relevant theory and use of practical case, a few delimitations have been determined for this thesis.

The concept of corporate sustainability has been chosen as of most relevance for this thesis due to its foundation in strategic management, where researchers stress the need for further research (e.g. Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017; Engert et al., 2016). Deliberatively, the authors
argue for the omittance of the other multiple concepts of CSR and definitions of sustainability within organizations. This includes, but not limited to, concepts such as corporate social performance, corporate social responsiveness, corporate environmentalism, and creating shared value (Crane, 2008).

The authors are aware of the multiple different definitions present for organizational learning but has delimited to Crossan et. al’s (1999) definition of organizational learning as the strategic renewal of an organization. A closely correlated concept is knowledge management and while there are certain scholars arguing for the two being interlinked (Engert et al., 2016), the authors have made a deliberate choice of focusing on organizational learning as a sole concept for the purpose of this thesis.

The specific industrial-context choice of property sector is another delimitation. Hence, other industries are not discussed based on the context of choice for the study. Additionally, the organization of interest is an established for-profit corporation, where other business forms such as social entrepreneurship and social startups have been dismissed in order to focus solely on how already established organizations can manage organizational learning towards corporate sustainability.

The study is further delimited to the Swedish context due to the country’s leading role in sustainability aspects, having set clear goals derived from the Sustainable Development Goals by UN and measures on how these should be reached.

The authors have applied an organizational perspective for this thesis, where both managers and employees within different regions and departments are involved with the interest of understanding how the organizational learning is managed for the integration of sustainability within the organization.

1.5 Definitions

*Corporate Sustainability*: When a corporation meets the need of a firm’s stakeholders, both direct and indirect, without compromising the ability to meet the needs of those future stakeholders (Dyllick & Hockerts, 2002)
**Employee**: An individual employed in a non-managerial position and below executive-level (McQuerrey, 2018).

**Manager**: An individual who oversees the job functions of a designated group of people or coordinates the mechanics of a specific activity within an organization (McQuerrey, 2018).

**Organizational Learning [OL]**: The process of achieving strategic renewal in an organization (Crossan et al., 1999).

**Organizational Levels**: An organizational system in made up of organizational, group, and individual levels where each level has different approaches and disciplines (Kozlowski and Klein, 2000).

**Property Sector**: The buying, selling, and renting of land and property. Includes the planning, construction, design, development and management of properties and real estate. Properties can be divided into commercial properties, such as offices and malls, and residential properties (Gorringe, 2011).

**Stakeholders**: Individuals, groups or organizations who possess any interest in the organization and can be either internal or external. Internal stakeholders include but are not limited to employees, managers, and owners, while external include for instance customers, governments and community organizations (Freeman, 1984).
2. Frame of Reference

This chapter starts with a review on the existing research of organizational learning, including various definitions followed by deeper exploration of the 4I model by Crossan et al. (1999) and additional contributions. Thereafter, the concept of organizational learning in the academic discussion of corporate sustainability is presented, followed by industry-specific information about sustainability in the property sector. Lastly, the chapter is concluded with a summarized theoretical model developed by the authors.

2.1 Organizational Learning

The concept of organizational learning within the field of management dates back several decades but got recognized extensively during the 80s and 90s with contributions by multiple scholars arguing for different perspectives and definitions (Easterby-Smith, Burgoyne & Araujo, 1999). According to early scholars Fiol and Lyles (1985), organizational learning is the process of “improving actions through better knowledge and understanding” (p.1) while Argyris and Schön (1995) argue organizational learning “occurs when individuals within an organization experience a problematic situation and inquire into it on the organization’s behalf” (p. 16). Argyris and Schön’s process of learning has extensively been used throughout research and has set a foundation of organizational learning (Easterby-Smith et al., 1999).

One widely popular contribution to organizational learning is Crossan et al. (1999), where the authors take a more strategic approach to organizational learning and describes the concept as a “principal means of achieving the strategic renewal of an enterprise” (p.1). Crossan et al. (1999) introduced the 4I framework (Figure 1) to visualize the dynamic process towards the strategic renewal of an organization. Along with the four sub-processes of intuiting, interpreting, integrating, and institutionalizing, the authors also introduced the three levels where learning occur in an organization’s structure – individual, group, and organization. A strategic renewal of an organization is based on the entire organization (Crossan et al., 1999), and is the variable balancing “the tension between exploration (learning new ways) and exploitation (exploiting what already has been learned)” (Crossan et al., 2011, p. 5). The framework puts emphasis on the interrelationship between cognition, which is the knowledge, understanding, and beliefs, and action, which is the behaviors. In practice, the framework has
been used by both researchers and managers for the recognition of facilitating learning within an organization to sustain competitive advantage (Crossan et al., 2011). Crossan et al. (2011) argue the achievement of strategic renewal is based upon organizations’ ability to change or alter for example information systems, resource allocation procedures, organizational structure, or social processes and group dynamics to ease the flow of learning.

![Figure 1 The 4I Model](Source: Crossan et al., 1999, p. 11)

Ever since Crossan et al. (1999) introduced the 4I model, various scholars have extended and implemented the framework across sectors to examine the phenomena of organizational learning throughout the years (Crossan et al., 2011). More recently, Versiani, Loureiro Rezende, Novaes Magalhaes and Vaz (2016) extended the model by further exploring the multilevel aspects, thus the relationship between the learning processes and the different organizational levels. A set of different actions and practices, such as strategic planning, action plans, and use of external consultants, for the learning processes across the
organizational levels was identified as well as the role of internal and external practitioners affecting the process of learning for organizational change (Versiani et al., 2016).

**Exploration and Exploitation**

Crossan et al. (1999) discuss how the process across the different sub-processes is based on exploring new learning and exploiting what the organization already know. March (1991) introduced the concepts of exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. Exploitation occurs by routine and implementation and is based on the idea of selecting, choosing, and executing action to learn with the knowledge existing. Exploration creates the variety in experiences and includes concepts such as searching for new knowledge and experimenting to learn and innovating with a certain level of risk-taking.

According to Crossan et al. (1999), exploration learning occurs with feed-forward loops to move the process as a whole from individual to organizational level, while exploitation learning occur with feedback loops from the organizational level back to individual and group during the subprocess of institutionalizing. The process of creating loops of learning by exploration and exploitation is a way for organizations to keep its current focus and reproduce stable behavior (Holmqvist, 2009). With a focus on “how” organizations explore and exploit knowledge based on Crossan et. al’s 4I model, Holmqvist (2009) further concludes that exploitation can be the cause of exploration and vice versa. Exploitation generates exploration with the process of opening up to new sources of experience, and exploration generates exploitation with the process of focusing to create reliability in experience. With a critical application of Crossan et al.’s 4I model, recent scholars such as Nielsen, Mathiassen, and Hansen (2018) contradict the idea of how exploration and exploitation learning unfold differently across the organizational levels and instead suggest how the processes unfold similarly from individual to the organizational and vice versa with constant feedback loops. The authors explain how the feedback loops on the different levels were left unlabeled in the original 4I model and how research today still lacks descriptive details of the dynamics of exploration and exploitation between the organizational levels and learning processes.

**Key Learning Processes Across Organizational Levels**

The 4 I’s of Crossan et al.’s model comprise of intuiting, interpreting, integrating, and institutionalizing. Intuiting solely occurs within an individual and affects the actions and
interaction with others and is a realization of patterns from personal experiences (1999). The authors differ between expert intuition and entrepreneurial intuition where the former is related to exploitation learning whereas the latter supports exploration learning. Expert intuition is the process of pattern recognition while entrepreneurial intuition involves innovation, finding new opportunities, and making connections between current and possible learning (Crossan et al., 1999).

Interpreting is the process of explaining an idea to the individual itself and to others in form of some type of language while integrating is the creation of shared understanding among individuals with coordinated action of a group (Crossan et al., 1999). Versiani et al. (2016) grouped interpreting together with integrating as ongoing activities, such as different meeting practices and workshop groups with free discussion opportunities (Jarzobkowski & Seidl, 2008) and tools to use interactively based on language, meaning, and intention (Belmondo & Sargis-Roussel, 2015).

Finally, the stage of institutionalizing learning is the process of embedding the learning by individuals and groups to the organizational level (Crossan et al., 1999). For already established organizations, the final step is crucial for strategic renewal as the organizational memory is already embedded deeply in the organization (Crossan et al., 1999). The process of institutionalizing triggers feedback loops since the emphasized actions are recurrent and reemergent, based of values and social practices (Crossan et al., 1999; Versiani et al., 2016).

The four processes presented in the 4I model is closely linked to the multilevel nature of the framework which introduced how intuiting and interpreting occur amongst individuals, interpreting and integrating occur in groups, and integrating and institutionalizing take place as an organization as a whole (Crossan et al., 1999). Accordingly, by implementing actions and influencing behaviors on all organizational levels, the balance between feed-forward and feedback loops will facilitate integrated and institutionalized learning. As a result, organizational learning takes a crucial role for the development of - for example - corporate sustainability by involving all levels of the organization (Zollo et al., 2013).

2.2 Corporate Sustainability and Organizational Learning

Crossan et al.’s 4I model was applied by Cramer in 2005 in a study examining the transformation process of institutionalizing an organization’s sustainability efforts with others
within an organization. The author identified how the learning processes of intuiting, interpreting, and integrating learning occur at the individual level and occasionally at the group level. According to Cramer (2005), the majority of companies involved in the study was lacking the capability to institutionalize learning at organizational level. The author recognized the crucial need for active support and effective leadership from key persons of the organization for the ability to institutionalize sustainability in an organization. The importance of having individuals who lead the cause, so-called change agents or champions, was further discussed by Petts (1998) and Siebenhüner and Arnold (2007) who linked organizational learning practices to corporate sustainability. Other learning mechanisms affecting the integration of sustainability include elements such as the involvement and empowerment of employees, thus their influence on sustainable practices, and a positive attitude regarding the importance and benefits of implementing sustainable practices (Petts, 1998). Siebenhüner and Arnold’s (2007) identified practices of importance such as the use of goals-and guideline-oriented processes of learning, formalized instruments of communication, high level of adaptability of structures and procedures, participatory leadership style, and sustainability-related values and norms. The study showed how values and norms were diffused in a top-down manner but did not prevent a bottom-up approach of employees’ initiatives for sustainability. Internal networks were identified as important for the bottom-up approach which in turn lead to a higher-level learning. Additional early scholars argue that an organizational learning culture can foster sustainability and the change towards sustainable corporations (e.g. Altomare, Nattrass & Jennings, 2000; Senge & Carstedt, 2001; Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, Roth & Smith, 1999). Jamali (2006) puts emphasis on the role of exploitation and exploration of learning and corporate sustainability. The author claims organizations are better on exploiting rather than exploring learning and to avoid quick fixes and superficial sustainability practices, the openness to change is crucial in the transition and integration of sustainability. The dynamic process of learning is based on the intentional use of various learning processes “to move the organization in the desired sustainability directions and in ways that are increasingly satisfying to all concerned stakeholders” (Jamali, 2006, p. 12).

Baumgartner (2014) describes the complexity of balancing the interest of different stakeholders since they tend to move in different directions. Therefore, it becomes of great importance to anchor a mutual interest of sustainability in the minds of all stakeholders (Hörisch et al., 2014). Anchoring mutual interest among internal stakeholders can be done by
enhancing organizational learning within an organization and as a result, meet the growing demands of sustainability from external stakeholders sharing the same values (Smith, Wokutch, Harrington, Vernard & Dennis, 2001; Zollo et al., 2013). The engagement of stakeholders is important to implement and integrate sustainability throughout the learning process within an organization, including both external and internal stakeholders (Zollo et al., 2013). External stakeholder requirements for sustainability are particularly evident for the learning process for larger companies while internal stakeholders could work as catalysts for medium-sized companies to integrate sustainability within an organization (Siebenhüner & Arnold, 2007). The involvement of stakeholders has been stressed to improve better access to resources, stronger networking relationships, and access to valuable intangible assets together with dynamic capabilities (Freeman, 1984; Zollo et al., 2013). To coordinate and integrate sustainability and thus the knowledge related, organizations will have a continuous need to infuse knowledge from stakeholders to learn from and by others (Fortis, Maon, Frooman & Reiner, 2018). As a result, sustainability becomes the critical strategic focus and value communicated throughout the organization along with a stakeholder focus. When values of sustainability are the foundation of the actions and decisions taken by the organization, the long-term focus can guide organizations to take necessary shifts towards a more sustainable outlook (Parashiv, Nemoianu, Langa, Szabó, 2012; Smith & Sharicz, 2011).

Fortis et al. (2018) argue that by developing capabilities that are used to meet to demand of adaptability from the external environment, organizations will allow organizational learning to occur from the interrelationship between the two. The volatile and changing external environment of an organization can include eco-environmental factors, such as global warming and climate change (Worthington & Britton, 2015). Environmental factors are especially of importance for organizations within the property sector, where the external environment pushes for changes in material usage, energy efficiency, and green buildings (Jones, Hillier & Comfort, 2015).

2.3 Corporate Sustainability in the Swedish Property Sector

With the initiation of the Swedish action plan as a response to UN’s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the pressure on organizations in Sweden has increased to conduct responsible business, not the least for organizations within the property sector (Regeringskansliet, 2018). The property sector stands for a tremendous use of materials and possesses an influential role for the sustainable development of society, both socially and
environmentally (Jones, Hillier & Comfort, 2015; The Swedish Research Council Formas, 2011). In the strive to reach the goals presented in the Swedish action plan, many sustainability projects have been initiated among organizations where the interplay between municipalities, county councils, and the business sector are of huge importance for a successful implementation of the initiatives (Regeringskansliet, 2018).

Considering organizations within the property sector, sustainability accreditors and certifications serve not just as facilitators but as accelerators for sustainable development (Foerstl, Azadegan, Leppelt, & Hartmann, 2015; Global Real Estate Sustainability Benchmark [GRESB], 2018; U.S. Green Building Council, 2019). In Sweden, internationally renowned assessments and certifications are commonly used to ensure quality as well as enable comparison between organizations worldwide (Svensk Byggtjänst, 2016). There is a large number of sustainability accreditors with different levels of distinction, where Global Real Estate Sustainability Benchmark (GRESB) performs sustainability assessments on assets in property firms from all over the world (GRESB, 2018). According to GRESB, this enables comparison with others in the same industry and to conclude where they are in the process towards becoming sustainable corporations. For the concern of the environmental aspects within the property sector, the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) is a green building ranking system and is one of the most extensively used in the world (U.S. Green Building Council, 2019) where the Swedish property sector serves as no exception (Eliasson & Sander, 2018; Svensk Byggtjänst, 2016). For more industry-specific background information on the Swedish property sector, see Appendix 9.1

2.4 Summary: Frame of Reference

In summary, the balance between exploration and exploitation across all organizational levels can facilitate the learning processes to integrate corporate sustainability in an organization by implementing certain actions and influencing behaviors. The different organizational levels of Crossan et al.’s 4I model - individual, group, and organization, are visualized with an extension to a societal level in a summarized model of the previous discussed theory, see Figure 2 below.
The figure shows the extension to a societal level, which is based upon combining the theory of organizational learning with corporate sustainability as well as society’s crucial role, and thus the interplay with the property sector, for sustainable development. The thin arrows represent the process of exploring and exploiting knowledge, occurring with feedback and feedforward learning loops in similar patterns across different levels as suggested by Nielsen et al. (2018). The four learning processes are presented as they overlap across the different levels of the 4I model, further developed based upon Cramer’s (2005) illustration of how three of the four processes occur at individual and group level in relation to corporate sustainability. The summarized and guiding model will be used as a foundation for the thesis by organizing the empirical findings and analysis in the same presentation: individual and group, organization, and society.
3. Research Methodology

The third chapter describes the methodological choices of this thesis. The chapter will be closed with an elaboration on ethical issues and how the quality was ensured using the criteria by Guba (1981).

Research methodology is a widely debated topic with various definitions and opinions presented by different authors on the many elements of research methodology (e.g. Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018; Charmaz, 2014; Easterby-Smith, Thorpe & Jackson, 2015). For this thesis, a foundation of methodology according to Easterby-Smith et al. (2015) was used to elaborate on the different parts. Additional insights of other authors were applied, such as Alvesson and Sköldberg (2018) and Bryman (2012) in the research approach section, Yin (2014) when elaborating on the research method, and Guba (1981) when arguing for the quality of the research.

3.1 Research Philosophy

According to Easterby-Smith et al. (2015) researchers hold different perspectives and viewpoints on how they perceive the world, which is referred to research philosophy and is distinguished between ontology and epistemology. Ontology is described as the philosophical assumption of the nature of being and existing, meaning how one perceive reality while epistemology refers to theories of knowledge and facilitates for researchers to understand how one may acquire knowledge about the reality (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). The philosophical standpoint serves as an important foundation for the researcher to apply appropriate methods and designs in the research process (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015).

Within ontology there are several viewpoints where researchers in social science on the one side argue for one reality to exist, so called internal realism, while researchers on the other side argue for several realities to exist, having either a relativist or nominalist point of view (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). This thesis is built from a relativist perspective where we argue how realities varies from different perspectives and contexts, while not stretching as far as to nominalism which argues for how the language we use form our reality (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). The relativist viewpoint is evident in the purpose of the thesis which is to analyze how organizational learning can be managed to integrate corporate sustainability. By using
the term ‘can’, we acknowledge that there is not one single reality to be discovered but rather that exploring one of many realities, within the specific context of the Swedish property sector.

The epistemology of social constructionism is according to Easterby-Smith et al. (2015) in line with a relativist ontology. In contrast to positivism, which is about discovering the one reality existing, we consider different perspectives and meanings from various members in the organization because of our perception of how realities can vary and is created by people from different contexts (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). In this manner, we acknowledge that there is not one single truth for every organization to be applied, but how the findings from our thesis needs to be carefully considered by other organizations for their own conditions and context.

3.2 Research Approach

With the philosophical standpoint in mind, a decision on the research approach is considered for the understanding on how to move forward with the research design. When deciding on research approach, researchers usually distinguish between a deductive and inductive approach (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). A deductive approach means that the research process starts from theory where data is collected to test a theory rather than developing new, and thus more common in positivistic research and quantitative studies (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018; Bryman, 2012). Inductive approach, however, take the opposite direction by using the empirical data as the starting point of research with the end goal of developing theory (Bryman, 2012). In this way, existing theory is neglected (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). Inductive approach is more commonly used in constructivist research and qualitative studies (Bryman, 2012) and would thus be the more appropriate approach for this thesis.

However, as an offspring to these approaches, a more recent approach called abductive has emerged (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). In contrast to inductive, abductive does not ignore existing theory but rather use this to further develop and adjust it successively during the research process, which further separates from a deductive approach. In this sense, it enables a deeper level of understanding, in comparison to the other approaches (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). For this thesis, we conducted a literature review on existing theory within organizational learning and corporate sustainability, where the renowned model by Crossan et al. (1999), with additional scholarly contributions of Nielsen et al., (2018) and Cramer (2005) were used as a foundation for the summarized theoretical model, presented in the section ‘2.4 Summary: Frame of Reference’. The model is further developed throughout the research
process from new insights generated from the empirical data. Hence, an abductive research approach was applied. While an inductive approach is argued to be an appropriate approach for research with a constructionist view, to open up for patterns and broader themes of a phenomenon (Bryman, 2012), an abductive approach was chosen for this thesis as it enables greater connection to existing theory and provides greater structure to reduce the complexity of handling rich amount of data (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). Further, Alvesson and Sköldberg (2018) explain that an abductive approach to be commonly used approach in practice when it comes to case studies, which is the method used in this thesis and will be further explained in section ‘3.3.2 Research Method’.

Our research philosophical standpoint of relativism and constructivism and abductive research approach will serve as a foundation for the research design in the following section.

### 3.3 Research Design

Research design is about organizing the research by making choices of what will be observed and how (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015), including research strategy and method, unit of analysis, and data analysis among others. These will be presented and argued for throughout this section.

#### 3.3.1 Research Strategy

When conducting research, one may apply either a quantitative or a qualitative study, where depending on the philosophical standpoint and purpose of the research one is more relevant than the other (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). Qualitative research is usually performed by studying perspectives and experiences by people, and thus more common in constructionist research (Patton, 2015), which is the philosophical standpoint of this thesis. While quantitative studies are commonly used for positivistic research and usually enables greater generalization, a qualitative research design is used in research where the interest lay in understanding how things work (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). Considering the interest to analyze how the managing of organizational learning to integrating corporate sustainability work in practice, a qualitative case study is more appropriate for this study. The choice of a qualitative research design is according to Alvesson and Sköldberg (2018) further aligned with the abductive approach, where they argue for inductive or abductive, rather than deductive approach to be more appropriately applied to qualitative studies because of the end
goal to develop theory. This is what we aim to do by developing the model presented in section ‘2.3 Summary: Frame of Reference’ with the empirical findings.

3.3.2 Research Method

In a qualitative research with a constructionist perspective, several methods can be applied including action research, archival research, ethnography, and narrative method (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). Additionally, grounded theory and case studies are examples of methods within qualitative research but can be used from both a positivist and constructionist approach (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). As mentioned, a case study method is chosen for this thesis as it is found relevant considering the call for investigating real life cases within this research topic (e.g. Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017; Engert et al., 2016). The choice of case study method is supported by Eisenhardt (1989) who argue for these to be important for the development of business research as it can provides understanding of the characteristics and dynamics of organizations in real life. According to Yin (2014) one may apply either a single or a multiple case study. While a multiple case study would have improved the ability to generalize (Yin, 2014), we chose to investigate a single case to open for in-depth exploration on how organizational learning for integrating corporate sustainability can be managed in practice. The decision to use a single case study is in line with the research philosophy of the thesis, where Easterby-Smith et al. (2015) explain that the greater amount of cases, the more the research leans towards a positivistic approach. Hence, using a single case exploring in-depth within a specific context argues for social constructionism.

One of the most prominent criticism directed to case studies are the rich amount of data it implies, as there is an increased risk for own interpretations and difficulty to connect to existing theory (Yin, 2014). As a response to this, in addition to having an abductive approach for greater connection with theory, we had a clear design already set before collecting the empirical data, which is argued by Yin (2014) to assist in overcoming this issue.

3.3.3 Unit of Analysis

While unit of analysis is of greater importance in multiple case studies, it comes of great use in single case studies having a more constructionist perspective, as it facilitates to structure the rich amount of data and provide guidance for the analysis (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). The unit of analysis is explained as the main level to which data is aggregated and can for
instance be individuals, groups, organizations, or specific events (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). In this study, the unit of analysis is the specific event of organizational learning where we analyze how this can be managed for the integration of sustainability in the organization. Yin (2014) explains that it is important to adopt a similar unit of analysis as previous studies in the same research field. Considering that we use an abductive approach where the 4I model by Crossan et al. (1999) serve as great influence and guidance when collecting and analyzing the empirical findings, we adopt the same unit of analysis to enable appropriate comparison and conclusions. The unit of analysis was used as foundation for our sampling strategy when selecting both case and respondents, where the aim of creating a more holistic view of organizational learning could be achieved.

The data of this study is aggregated from individuals of both managers and employees from different departments and regions to analyze the organizational learning in the entire organization, rather than for the purpose of cross-comparison them between. In this sense, we are applying a holistic, rather than embedded view in accordance to Yin (2014). The sampling strategy to reach a holistic view is further described in the following section.

3.3.4 Sampling Strategy

According to Easterby-Smith et al. (2015), sampling design can be divided into probability- and non-probability sampling designs. In the former, the probability of being sampled is known for all units in the population, while in the latter the probability is unknown. The sampling strategies used for both selection of case and respondents in this study fall under non-probability sampling designs. While non-probability sampling design is in line with conducting qualitative research, we realize the increased risk of biased conclusions due to a higher probability of some units to be included over others, and thus negatively affect the ability to generalize to the population (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). The choices of non-probability sampling strategies are further discussed in the following sections of case selection and selection of respondents.

3.3.4.1 Case Selection

With a relativistic and social constructivist philosophical standpoint, we argue that different perspective and meanings vary in different contexts. Since we are aiming to provide learning opportunities rather than aiming to generalize with a single-case study, we argue for the use of
purposive sampling strategy for selection of case. Purposive sampling is a form of non-probability sampling design and is used when the researcher has a clear vision of what is needed from the sampling unit(s) (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). Accordingly, specific criteria decide whether the unit will be included or excluded where our set criteria (Table 1) enabled us to identify a suitable organization to examine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>We will examine a company operating in a sector identified as having a crucial role for sustainable development*, such as property or construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Location</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>We will examine a company operating in Sweden with a large presence in the main city areas of Stockholm, Gothenburg, and/or Malmö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>We will examine a larger organization of size where the access to both employees and managers is at a sufficient level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;250 employees **</td>
<td>We will examine a larger organization of size where the access to both employees and managers is at a sufficient level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Strategy</td>
<td>For-Profit</td>
<td>We will examine an established company using a for-profit business strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Corporate Sustainability Within the Company</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>We will examine a leading actor of corporate sustainability within the sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Jones et al. (2015) argues the importance of property sector for sustainable development.
**OECD defines large enterprises as those who employ 250 or more (OECD Data, 2019).

Table 1 Selection of Case Company

A first contact could be established with an eligible organization, Vasakronan, due to one of the authors’ previous connection to the organization resulting from a short-term internship at one of the regional offices. The personal connection to the organization enhanced the possibility to gain access. The authors’ extensive years of studies within business administration as well as relevant work experience made it possible to gain trust and assurance for the level of quality and professionalism for the proposed involvement with the organization.

Vasakronan

Vasakronan, Sweden’s largest and leading property management firm (Fastighetsvärd, 2018), was identified to meet the mentioned criteria. Vasakronan purchases, develops, manages, and sells properties around the country (Bloomberg, 2019). Properties include office and retail premises, shopping centers, and residential buildings and they are present in
Sweden’s three largest cities as well as additional other growth regions around the country (Vasakronan, 2019a). The organization employs around 350 employees and uses a for-profit business strategy, with a primary task to create a high and risk-averse yield of return to their owners of Första, Andra, Tredje, and Fjärde AP-fonden (Vasakronan, 2019a). Vasakronan has taken responsibility for the sustainable development of society by ensuring the financial, environmental, and social aspects of a vision to achieve future-proof cities with buildings where both individuals and companies can thrive (Vasakronan, 2019b). Vasakronan exhibits a high level of corporate sustainability based upon several accreditations, certifications, and initiatives. For example, Vasakronan was ranked number nine in the world as the most sustainable organization within the property sector and number one in Europe for the office segment for the 2018’s Global Real Estate Sustainability Benchmark (Fastighetstidningen, 2018; Vasakronan, 2018a). The sustainability efforts is further evident in the dedicated work for environmental certifications with a particular focus on the renowned LEED certifications. In their 2018 annual report, Vasakronan described how 85% of their properties were LEED-certified and planned to constantly work towards reaching higher certification standards (Vasakronan, 2019c). In addition to systematic energy saving efforts, Vasakronan takes a leading role in green financing as well (Anderberg, 2018). In 2013, Vasakronan issued the world’s first green corporate bond and the world’s first green commercial paper in 2018 (Vasakronan, 2018b). The company engages in numerous social and environmental initiatives and projects both on an international level, such as UN’s “Caring for Climate” (United Nations Global Compact, 2019) and at a national level. Vasakronan is founding and engaging in various projects with an interplay of councils and municipalities, such as ‘Purple flag’, ‘Byggvarubedömningen’ and ‘Sweden Green Building Council’ (Sweden Green Building Council, 2019; Vasakronan, 2019d; Byggvarubedömningen, 2015).

3.3.4.2 Selection of Respondents

Sampling of respondents within the company was made with the use of a non-probability sampling strategy as well, where the chosen organizational perspective of the study could be examined by including both managers and employees as respondents. Our interest of examining two different types of respondents is in line with our philosophical standpoint of relativism and social constructivism where the interest lies in capturing different perspectives to explore the phenomena of organizational learning for corporate sustainability. We established certain criteria for inclusion of respondents (Table 2 and 3), where an initial
contact with a manager in the organization was identified to be eligible to take part of the study. The person in turn led us to connect with other individuals of eligibility at the regional office and the head office. This strategy is called snowball sampling, which is the strategy of identifying someone who meets the criteria for inclusion of the study and thereafter asked to name other individuals suitable to take part as respondents (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). Due to our limited access to contact details, and thus the ability to reach a larger population of the organization, the snowball sampling strategy was fitting for our situation. However, we acknowledge that our choice of snowball sampling leads to a lack of having full confidence that our claims in this study can be applicable to the larger group where we sampled from, as Easterby-Smith et al. argues (2015). We argue for the suitable representation of the population with our chosen sample, based on our comprehensively set criteria for inclusion of respondents which is further explained in Tables 2 and 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>We will interview individuals with a position, title, or role as a manager with responsibility for staff or sustainability practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>We will interview managers with full-time employment contracts for ensuring respondents having strong ties with the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>We will interview managers from different departments for a more holistic perspective of the organization where both top management team (TMT) and non-TMT members are included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Stockholm, Gothenburg</td>
<td>We will interview managers from the head office and a regional office to achieve a fairer representation of data in case of any discrepancies and for a more holistic view of the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 Criteria of Inclusion: Managers*
Respondents | Criteria | Selection | Definition
---|---|---|---
*Employees* | Title/Position | Employee | We will interview individuals in various roles. They have **no** formal main tasks involving responsibility of staff or sustainability practices

| Employment | Full-Time | Employee | We will interview employees with a full-time employment contract for ensuring respondents having strong ties with the organization

| Length of Employment | Various | Employee | We will interview employees with different lengths of employment

| Departments | > 3 | Employee | We will interview employees from various departments, of at least 3 represented, for a more holistic perspective of the organization

| Region | Stockholm, Gothenburg | Employee | We will interview employees from the head office and a regional office to achieve a fairer representation of data in case of any discrepancies and for a more holistic view of the organization

*Table 3 Criteria of Inclusion: Employees*

3.3.5 Data Collection

According to Easterby-Smith et al. (2015) one may apply a variety of techniques for collecting data. These include but are not limited to interviews, focus groups and documents, where the researcher can choose to use only one or a combination of several. In this research, several techniques have been used where interviews and focus groups compose the primary data, and as a complement, secondary data has been collected in form of internal and external sources for the purpose of triangulation. This type of triangulation is described as triangulation of sources and has the purpose to examining the consistency of data across multiple sources (Patton, 1999).

3.3.5.1 Primary Data

Primary data is the data directly conducted by researchers and is explained as a data collection technique which can provide new understandings and greater confidence when it comes to the outcomes of the research (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). As mentioned, we used interviews as
one form of primary data collection techniques, which is a powerful technique to gain in-depth understanding of a specific concept or experience as well as perspective of the interviewee (Charmaz, 2014). Therefore, we found interviews to be an appropriate technique for collecting data from managers to gain understanding about their experiences of how organizational learning was managed in practice as well as how the integration of sustainability was perceived from the top. When collecting data from employees we made use of focus groups, which are interviews with a group of people at the same time (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). We realize the greater risk of biased responses because of the possibilities of respondents not feeling entirely comfortable with sharing their thoughts openly as well as being influenced by other respondents (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). However, we argue for focus groups to be appropriate for our research as they open up for greater discussion opportunities, which is found to improve the quality to a greater extent than it is reduced (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). For both interviews and focus groups, risk of subjectivity is present due to the involvement of the researcher which may cause own interpretation and judgement. Nevertheless, these techniques provide the opportunity to interpret not only words, but also body language and facial expression (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). In the end, it improves the quality of the qualitative research considering the richer data provided for the researcher to analyze. Using interviews and focus groups for collecting primary data from employees and managers from different departments and regions enabled us to investigate the different levels of individual and group, organization and society as discussed in the summarized theoretical model of organizational learning for corporate sustainability.

For the empirical data collection, a total amount of 9 interviews were conducted. These were held in form of both individual interviews and focus groups involving 12 respondents, including six employees and six managers from different departments of the organization. A summary of respondents can be found in Table 4 and 5 below. The focus groups were planned to consist of three employees each. Due to scheduling difficulties, the second focus group was divided into one individual face-to-face interview with one employee and one focus group over Skype with two employees. Respondents were represented by two offices - the head office and one regional office - due to the criteria of inclusion set for the purpose of getting a more holistic view of the organization. Our initial intention was to visit a second regional office to collect data in the same way as the others, but after planning and conducting interviews in Stockholm and Gothenburg we perceived that additional data could decrease the quality of our findings. Considering that one of the main criticisms directed to single case
studies is the amount of rich data it provides, we found that additional data could negatively affect our ability to analyze our findings in a high-quality manner based on the limited timeframe. However, from the interviews conducted, we perceived data saturation could be met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Type of Interview</th>
<th>Interview Form</th>
<th>Length of Interview</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager 1</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>53 min</td>
<td>12/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>61 min</td>
<td>13/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager 3</td>
<td>Project Development</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>58 min</td>
<td>13/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager 4</td>
<td>Business Development</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>54 min</td>
<td>21/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager 5</td>
<td>Property Management</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>53 min</td>
<td>22/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager 6</td>
<td>Business Development</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>22/3-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4 Summary of Respondents for Individual Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Type of Interview</th>
<th>Interview Form</th>
<th>Length of Interview</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee 1</td>
<td>Property Tech. Development</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>54 min</td>
<td>14/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee 2</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>54 min</td>
<td>14/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee 3</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>54 min</td>
<td>14/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee 4</td>
<td>Property Administration</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>47 min</td>
<td>21/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee 5</td>
<td>Property Management</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>56 min</td>
<td>26/3-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee 6</td>
<td>Property Management</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>56 min</td>
<td>26/3-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5 Summary of Respondents for Focus Groups*
Interviews and focus groups can be either structured, semi-structured or unstructured, where the different formats are suitable for different research methods (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). In qualitative studies, the number of respondents is generally smaller compared to quantitative studies and therefore these interviews commonly have a looser structure (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). In line with the application of a qualitative study, we argue for having a semi-structured approach, making use of both topics and questions of interest which possess no specific order but enable different directions and topics to emerge (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). This opens up for deeper insights on how organizational learning is managed within the organization of the study, from the various perspectives of the respondents. Two interview guides, with questions based upon theory and topics of interest, were drafted to cover a manager-focused and employee-focused approach for the interviews, see Appendix 9.3. The questions were mainly open-ended, and the techniques of probing and laddering were applied, asking for examples and follow up questions of ‘why’, ‘what else’, which according to Easterby-Smith et al. (2015) creates a more extensive narrative from the respondents. The topics of the interviews followed the structure of the proposed model, moving from an individual level, to group level and lastly organizational level.

The interviews were conducted in Swedish and later translated by us into English. We acknowledge the issues of subjectivity and biasness of the findings due to the risk of own interpretations in the translation, as well as differences in meanings in the Swedish and English language. However, we argue for the importance of the respondents to feel comfortable and their ability to freely discuss around the topics without any language barriers, and thereby increase the quality of the findings. To avoid risks of incorrect interpretations in the translations, member checks in accordance to Guba’s (1981) criteria were made with the respondents, further explained in section ‘3.5 Research Quality’.

3.3.5.2 Secondary Data

According to Easterby-Smith et al. (2015) secondary data is already existing sources of information, which are not made for the purpose of the research but still serves of relevance. Secondary data can come from various of sources, such as reports, newspapers and articles. For this thesis, secondary data is collected from both internal and external reports such as the organization’s annual report, including the sustainability report, and the GRESB report, to
serve as a complement to the primary data. For the purpose of triangulating the findings, newspapers such as Aktuell Hållbarhet and the Global Green Business Certification Inc., reports from the International Organization for Standardization for the ISO 14001 environmental certifications, and the organization’s LinkedIn profile for any press releases and articles related to the organization, were used as additional secondary sources. In addition, secondary data was used for providing industry-and case specific information in section ‘2.3 Corporate Sustainability in the Swedish Property Sector’, ‘3.3.4.1 Case Selection’, and ‘9.1 Appendix 1: The Swedish Property Sector’. Both primary and secondary data was used for the data analysis.

3.3.6 Data Analysis

The data collection and data analysis were made simultaneously, meaning that we analyzed the data during the process of gathering the data. This can be referred to the research process being cyclical rather than linear, which according to Easterby-Smith et al. (2015) is how a research process should be performed in a qualitative research with a constructionist view. A well-used data analysis approach among researchers in social science having a constructionist view is grounded analysis (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). In a grounded analysis, the theory is built from a systematic analysis of the data and excludes external structure in form concepts or preexisting ideas (Charmaz, 2014). As a grounded analysis is explained to be an open analysis approach one may argue for this to be suitable for this research considering the interest in exploring in-depth. However, as previously explained an abductive approach was taken to provide more structure for the analysis and thus a grounded analysis approach was not found appropriate. Instead, a thematic analysis approach according to Braun and Clarke (2006) was found suitable, following the phases of 1) familiarization, 2) initial coding, 3) searching for themes, 4) reviewing themes, 5) defining and naming themes and lastly 6) producing the report. Thematic analysis is described as a flexible approach where there is not a strict way of how it should be applied. However, Braun and Clarke (2006) provide some clarity by arguing for thematic analysis to be either inductive, so called data driven, or theoretical, so called analyst driven. By taking on an abductive approach, we applied a theoretical thematic analysis where we analyzed the empirical findings from the foundation of existing theory on organizational learning and corporate sustainability. A thematic analysis approach may be argued to have many similarities with a content analysis, however, we believe the former is more relevant because of the latter being an underlying positivistic
framework (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015), and that the former is perceived to enable new themes to emerge to a greater extent.

**The Theoretical Thematic Analysis Process**

To begin the thematic analysis, we began by familiarizing ourselves with the data by transcribing the verbal content from the interviews immediately after every interview. To provide a deeper familiarization, the whole material was read through until the depth and breadth of it was clear, where we made some initial notes on interesting aspects. Following, to make sense of the data, we started coding more in depth, both based upon the concepts previously identified in the summarized theoretical model presented in section ‘2.4 Summary: Frame of Reference’, as well as new interesting findings. The codes were divided in the different levels of individual and group, organization as well as society. An example of the initial coding is found in Table 6, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual and Group Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Our Head of Sustainability is brilliant when she talks about it [sustainability] and is really passionate about these questions [...] She is very good at persuading people and getting people on the track to get them to understand the purpose and points why we work with these issues</em>”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intuiting – entrepreneurial, expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Passionate, communicative Head of Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Important for the organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It is very important that the top management team set the direction to where the organization is heading regarding sustainability. There needs to be a great belief in the matter and that they set clear objectives, both short- and long-term goals”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear direction by setting clear goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strong belief in sustainability initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We try to inspire as much as possible because we want to get people onboard. It is not that we want to clap our chest and say &quot;we are the best&quot; but instead we want to bring everyone together because we cannot do everything on our own throughout the chain”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Inspire and bring everyone together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Integrating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6 Examples of Initial Coding at Different Levels*
The initial coding was done independently to ensure greater credibility of the findings (Guba, 1981). The codes were later compared by both of us to find common themes, which represent phase three - searching for themes - of the thematic analysis approach. In alignment with a theoretical thematic analysis we tried to fit the themes into frames based on the model presented in section ‘2.4 Summary: Frame of Reference’ including the different levels of individual and group, organization as well as society, and the influences by Crossan et al. (1999) of the learning processes of intuiting, interpreting, integrating and institutionalizing. The existing theory are evident in the structure and content of the topics and questions discussed with the respondents, see Appendix 9.3, and are thus influencing the final themes of the thesis which supports the application of the thematic analysis chosen (Braun & Clarke, 2006). However, by applying a qualitative single case study for the interest of analyzing how organizational learning can be managed for the integration of corporate sustainability in practice, we were open for new themes to emerge. This is in line with the philosophical standpoint of relativism with a constructionist point of view, which according to Braun and Clarke (2006), are not to be ignored, where we are not aiming to find evidence for one truth but open up for new perspectives and thus new themes to emerge.

In order to organize the codes into different themes and sub-themes, we created a mind-map (Appendix 9.4) which can be referred to as a ‘thematic map’, in alignment phase four - reviewing themes - of a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). During the research and theory building process, an ongoing analysis of the empirical data and emerging theory was made where the themes were reviewed and re-directed into different sub-themes to lastly end up in defining and naming the final themes. At the last phase of producing the report, the most prominent examples from the findings were compiled, which can be found in the sections within ‘Chapter 4 Empirical Findings’, as well as in the final analysis of the empirical data when relating back to literature and research questions, making up ‘Chapter 5 Analysis’. See summary of the thematic analysis process in Table 7 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Our process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarizing</td>
<td>Transcribing, thorough reading and making small notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Initial coding</td>
<td>Independently making initial codes and dividing these into the different levels from the conceptual model in sector ‘2.4 Summary: Frame of Reference’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes</td>
<td>Find common themes and making a list of potential themes and subthemes. Gathered all data relevant to these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes</td>
<td>Creating a thematic map to review themes and sub-themes from previous phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes</td>
<td>Applying theory and own interpretations to a greater extent. To develop themes in from the findings to name the final themes for the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report</td>
<td>Use the themes from previous phase to produce the analysis section where we related back to research questions and literature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Summary of the Thematic Analysis Process

3.3.7 Presenting Results

According to Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007) single case studies provide rich amount of data whereas a challenge emerges in presenting a complete description of the gathered information, hence providing the reader with the whole story within the text. This challenge could be dealt with by providing a summarized theoretical model (Figure 2) and use it for the structure of how the results are presented. The model displays how the findings are intertwined with theory, which according to Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007) is important for demonstrating the close connection between the two. The findings were then presented using a narrative approach with the use of supporting quotations from the empirical data, which is further explained by Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007) to bring clarity to the reader. The findings are thereafter summarized in Table 7 to provide a foundation for the analysis.

3.4 Summary of Methodology Choices

As a summary, a visualization of the methodological choices made is presented in Figure 3 below, before discussing the quality of the research in more depth.
3.5 Research Quality

3.5.1 Ethical Considerations

There are several key principles in research ethics to protect the research participants and the integrity of research community, including to avoid harm and do good, informed consent, and confidentiality (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). The ethical principles are of utmost importance to create trustworthiness and transparency of the research to avoid any misleading or false findings.

We are aware of the ethical issues that may arise when involving a host organization for data collection and research. To avoid the potential ethical problems throughout the project,
several actions and responses to these issues have been taken on the various stages of determining the direction, gaining access, gathering and interpreting data, and lastly writing-up and dissemination (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015).

The first step, determining the direction of research, was based on a proposed brief to the company clearly stating the theme and expectations. The direction of the thesis evolved from a sustainability focus and our fit with the educational field, thus business administration and management. The host organization accepted the first proposed brief, which included a statement of expectations for the organization to give the authors the time and transparency regarding their sustainability initiatives.

The second stage, gaining access, can lead to ethical issues such as confidentiality, privacy, and deception of research (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). To deal with such issues, we identified prior relationship with the host organization as important to gain trust and access. Together with informed consent and the proposed brief regarding transparency, we ensured professional and ethical responses to the issues possible to arise. Informed consent is a way of avoiding doing harm and respecting the dignity of participants and is the knowing consent of an individual to exercise free power of choice without any element of force, deceit, or any kind of coercion (Glantz, Annas & Katz, 1977). Before beginning with the interviews, informed consent was established in the form of a signed document clearly stating the topic, the purpose, the given consent to use the data collected for the thesis, and the respondents right to withdraw at any time. To deal with the confidentiality of data and anonymity of respondents, all names and personal information about respondents were made anonymous which was clearly stated at the informed consent document as well. The informed consent forms were then collected by the researchers. Due to the very public role of the host organization’s Head of Sustainability in media and her position as a key person for sustainability both within and outside the organization, some of the quotes are directly quoted by her in this report and are not anonymous. The Head of Sustainability has given consent for this, both orally at the time of interview as well as through email later. However, since the authors have translated the quotes from Swedish to English, we recognize and put further emphasis with the use of footnote on how the choice of words and expressions used may differ from the original quotes collected from the interviews.
During the third stage, gathering and interpreting data, ethical problems such as organizational politics and conflicts may occur. Respondents may withhold certain information and certain information can lead to biased conclusions (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). Due to the sensitivity of working with a named organization, conflicts of interest may arise. To deal with this issue, we looked out for specific areas of disagreement or agreement across the organization as discussed by Easterby-Smith et al. (2015). We did not perceive that any faulty accounts were made throughout the gathering of data, which was cross-checked with the triangulation of external sources as well as with the author who had previously interned at the organization. Due to the areas not being of sensitive nature for the company, we do not deem there is a high risk of the respondents withholding any certain information that could have changed the interpretation of the data.

During the final stage of writing-up and dissemination has one major potential ethical problem – the accidental publishing of any information that could harm either the company or the respondents (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). To make sure this did not occur, we made sure to follow the ethical principles such as ensuring confidentiality when presenting and analyzing the findings. By controlling and using the data obtained, the researcher must take ethical responsibility to ensure that no data or information can be linked to harm or negatively affect any individual participants (Easterby-Smith et al., 2015). We recognize the importance of handling sensitive information regarding the host organization as well as the recognition of dealing with the anonymity of respondents. To ensure anonymity of respondents, they were instead labeled as “Manager 1, Employee 1…” throughout the thesis. The role or position of the respondents were not mentioned either while any information about such details were removed from the data before presenting it, apart from using with consent a small segment based upon the Head of Sustainability’s contributions. Throughout the written drafts, we double checked for any data that could reveal any personal information about the respondents. Before sending in the final draft for publication, we sent the thesis in its entirely to all respondents.

3.5.2 Guba’s Criteria

We are aware of certain concerns arising when ensuring trustworthiness of this study. To establish trustworthiness of the research, we established Guba’s criteria to ensure dependability, credibility, transferability, and confirmability of the study (Guba, 1981). While we are aware of such issues, the choices made throughout the study were based on critically
examining different perspectives and decisions to make ethically and trustworthy choices. The choice of purposive sampling is linked to our philosophical standpoint of relativism and social constructionism - arguing for a qualitative single case study to explore a phenomenon. We are aware of the risk of subjectivity due to numerous reasons: one of the authors having previously worked for the organization, the authors deliberately identifying an organization as a successful example of sustainability initiatives as well as the basic notion of subjectivity when using a well-known established organization for data collection due to differences in interests. As a result, the following actions and responses were taken to avoid issues regarding establishing trustworthiness of the study.

Dependability is the concept of showing consistency of findings and thus the ability for them to be repeated (Guba, 1981). External audits of the research process and findings can lead to increased accuracy and validity of the research and is based on an external researcher examining the process and outcome of the study (Guba, 1981). By receiving feedback from two external researchers and a thesis supervisor throughout the process via mandatory and regular seminar discussions based on the JU’s thesis guideline, the authors received continuous audit of the process and interpretations made.

The credibility of a research study can be established by various techniques, such as triangulation, prolonged engagement, peer debriefing, and member-checking (Guba, 1981). To ensure credibility of the research, the researchers triangulated the findings, with a so-called triangulation of sources (Patton, 1999), by collecting data from both internal sources, such as the host organization’s annual report and social media platforms, and from external sources, such as GRESB and press-releases. Before the main data collection effort, the researchers conducted an interview with an informant who held significant experience of integrating corporate sustainability, to provide insights to the topic. The informant had extensive knowledge and expertise within the field and could assist with a foundation to the field and any contemporary issues to be discussed. Peer debriefing is similar to external audit (Guba, 1981), where the authors continuously throughout the research process received feedback from independent peers to get valuable insights contributing to the quality of the thesis. Prolonged engagement is the idea of spending time enough to be able to observe and understand the culture and setting on the phenomena of interest in the organization (Guba, 1981). Previous internship experience at the host organization of one of the authors enabled this and as a result, the authors could easier identify or detect any distortions. Finally, member
checks were conducted by sending individual summaries of quotes to the respondents for the purpose of increasing accuracy and validity of our data. The member checks were of great importance due to the authors’ translation of the content gathered through the data collection.

Transferability is commonly associated with generalization, where improved quality is given to studies opening up for generalization (Guba, 1981). The aim of this thesis is not to generalize, but to analyze on the depth on how sustainability can be integrated in organizations with the use of organizational learning. In this sense, this investigation of the single case rather opens for learning opportunities for other organizations where considerations for own contexts should not be ignored. According to Guba (1981), providing a rich description as well as collecting rich data of the context in which the research is made, improves its quality. We could achieve this by providing the reader with a thorough description of the industry and case company, presented in section ‘2.3 Corporate Sustainability in the Swedish Property Sector’, ‘3.3.4.1 Case Selection’ as well as in ‘9.1 Appendix 1: The Swedish Property Sector’. The transferability of the study is further emphasized with our choice of research design and method, where argue that our study can still be transferred to other contexts without the applicability to generalize based on our philosophical standpoint of relativism and constructivism.

Confirmability is about preconceptions of the researcher and the risk of the research being biased (Guba 1981). To limit the biasedness, researcher can establish confirmability audit, same notion of external audit for dependability of the study, an audit trail, triangulation of sources, and reflexivity (Guba, 1981). The audit trail includes the authors’ choice of research design and data collection where the reader can follow the steps taken throughout the research process, from sampling strategy to reporting of findings. The authors also ensured confirmability by triangulating the sources, with the use of both internal and external sources. Reflexivity referred to how ontological, epistemological and theoretical preconception influence the data and analysis (Guba, 1981). To practice reflexivity, we clearly state our philosophical standpoint of relativism and constructionism in the early stages of the thesis so that the reader is made aware of any risk of subjectivity and biasedness it may cause. Further, we are aware that the abductive approach chosen implies that theory on organizational learning and corporate sustainability has influenced the direction and structure of the data collection and analysis but not determined the results.
4. Empirical Findings

This chapter will narratively present the main findings of the conducted interviews together with supporting data from secondary sources for triangulation. The findings will serve as a foundation for the analysis in the following chapter.

The empirical findings show there are several ways an organization can integrate corporate sustainability by managing organizational learning effectively. The findings will be presented using the structure of the summarized theoretical model (Figure 2), moving from individual and group level to organizational level and lastly societal level.

First, a brief introduction to the case company’s current level of integrated corporate sustainability is presented in connection to primary and secondary data. The findings have been triangulated with internal and external sources.

4.1 Case Introduction - Current Level of Integration

The initial findings showed a high level of sustainability integrated in the organization in accordance to the secondary data. All respondents discussed how sustainability is the very core of Vasakronan’s operations and business. A manager and employee particularly discussed the awareness of the large environmental footprint the property sector has and as a result, thinking and acting sustainable in every way possible.

“Sustainability is truly integrated in this organization. It is part of our core. It is not a separated issue where we say, ‘on Thursday I will work with sustainability for two hours.’ It’s so integrated in our culture” - Manager 1

“I would say that it is probably included in all parts in one way or another. All we do is a foundation for sustainability” - Employee 1

“Sustainability means everything. It is a question that permeates our work […] In the work we do, we unfortunately have a rather big negative footprint if you think about the construction industry. Project development are the ones who use the most material in the entire organization, so it really is a matter of intentionally always thinking about it. Both in line of what we build should be able to be used for a
"long time, many times and by many and that we reduce the footprint as much as it ever goes when we work with our projects" - Manager 6

"The property industry has a fairly large environmental impact throughout its lifetime, both new buildings and remodeling, producing waste, consuming energy and so on. So, you must have the idea of sustainability in everything you do" - Employee 6

Both managers and employees discussed sustainability from a broad perspective, including the social, economic, and environmental aspects and as part of the organization’s core operations. Moving forward, the findings show how sustainability is diffused and taught across the organization’s different levels, by managing organizational learning across individuals and groups, the organization and society - which are all part of integrating corporate sustainability in the organization.

4.2 Individual and Group Level

The findings at the individual and group level show how initiating self-leadership for the employees’ ability to learn and teach peers about sustainability, a communicative and leading Head of Sustainability who brings knowledge both in and out from the organization, and the use of internal movement and networks, can facilitate the management of organizational learning for corporate sustainability.

4.2.1 Self-Leadership

Managers and employees both explained the great amount of freedom offered with the approach of initiating self-leadership for all members of the organization. The concept of self-leadership is described as being responsible for your own time, tasks, and development (Vasakronan, 2019e). The managers connect this back to their leadership style where they describe this as giving trust to employees, establishing trust between themselves, and giving up the control to create creativity, passion, and engagement. One manager described it as,

“Generally, we rely on trust. Very little control and a lot of trust. It’s about setting clear goals but not being strict on the details. It is like we [managers] set up the ski piste with moral and legal restrictions and everything that creates the actual piste, but as an employee you are rather free to choose the best way to get to the finish line. We try to inject courage and decisiveness among our employees so that they can dare to stretch outside the common way of doing things” - Manager 4
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One employee described self-leadership as having full responsibility for your own projects, which could lead to employees feeling more passionate for his or her work tasks. One manager connects self-leadership to increased employee engagement and valued contribution as it increases the well-being of the employees.

“With self-leadership, you’re able to run your own projects and it’s the idea of doing something good that you’re passionate about. There are not a lot of fingers pointing” - Employee 4

“Self-leadership contributes to engagement and as a result it can be enough to just plant a seed in that direction and let it grow pretty well on its own. An aspect within sustainability is employees’ well-being and I believe that people will feel better if they are able to work with things they think are fun and allowed to take responsibility within those areas as well” - Manager 6

The employees believe a reason for sustainability being a natural part of their everyday tasks is their presence and involvement at every meeting, both within and outside the organization. The employees are constantly engaged in discussions about sustainability and this type of involvement is said to increase inspiration, knowledge, and bringing forth own ideas.

“If you’re involved in discussions both internally and externally, and part of the agreement of a common perspective or goal, it’s much easier to continue and be passionate about it in your everyday tasks. It would be difficult if my manager would come back from a meeting and try to inspire me in the same way” - Employee 6

“The business planning takes place on regional and management level, but also within every business area. Then in a smaller group, about 10 people, you set your own goals and objectives but also within that specific area” - Employee 5

However, some concerns were brought into light by one manager who, in agreement with the other respondents, is positive to the self-leadership approach but expressed how it depends on the individuals and their ability to take initiatives:

“By working a lot with the approach of self-leadership we step away from the handbook and instead try to make people come up with solutions themselves. I believe this is good because it challenges employees to be creative. However, sometimes this approach can have a negative effect, where in
some cases people might not know how to move forward when there is not a clear way of doing things. In this manner, the approach depends on the individual”. - Manager 3

In addition to encourage employees to take sustainability initiatives themselves through the approach of self-leadership at an individual and group level, organizational learning for the integration of sustainability was also found to be managed in particular by one specific important person - the Head of Sustainability.

4.2.2 Head of Sustainability

The findings showed that all managers and employees highlighted the Head of Sustainability as an important factor for learning about and integrating sustainability. They describe her as highly knowledgeable, dedicated and inspiring.

“We have a very good sustainability manager. She is also a great distributor of information and thoughts. She is an inspirer. She is good at it and has a good ability to capture information from the outside and pinpoint certain specifics that are important and linked to Vasakronan at a general level” - Manager 6

“Our Head of Sustainability is brilliant when she talks about it [sustainability] and is really passionate about these questions […] She is very good at persuading people and getting people on track to get them to understand the purpose and points why we work with these issues. She is needed and I think many companies need someone to steer sustainability in that way” - Manager 3

“She has the ability to make everything very clear and easy to understand. She has the ability to choose her message depending on who she’s talking to. She’s a very inspiring person, nice to listen to and she makes it very interesting” - Employee 6

As a response to this, the Head of Sustainability\(^1\) herself acknowledges the importance of understanding the business and its logic in order to be successful as a leader. She further describes the importance to communicate this clearly and make complicated information sensible for others, as well as to induce emotions to the matter.

“Firstly, to be successful as a leader you have to understand the business and the logic within the business. Secondly, it is important to reach people partly from an informational aspect, where it is

\(^1\) The authors have translated the direct quotes from Swedish to English, sentences and words may therefor differ from original quotes due to grammatical and formulating reasons.
useful to be pedagogic, to make people understand and not lose interest. But it is also important to reach people at an emotional level. That will result in people doing the work on their own” - The Head of Sustainability

The findings also showed the Head of Sustainability has an important role outside the organization as well, which include interactions and learning opportunities with external stakeholders. There is a two-way direction of learning as the Head of Sustainability described how she explores new knowledge and provides learning opportunities to and from external parties:

“Partly I follow some newsletters to ensure that I don’t miss anything important. I also follow interesting people on Twitter from which I learn new things about sustainability. LinkedIn is also a great tool if you connect with interesting people. I also read different articles on sustainability. I could easily put all my time on external environment analysis. Further, when I am out to hold sustainability lectures a have the privilege to get to listen to other persons, as well as being part of panel discussion.” - Head of Sustainability

In addition to the words from the Head of Sustainability herself, other managers described how she is working externally and in addition, receiving awards. One manager explained:

“Our Head of Sustainability is often out in various occasions such as conferences to inform and educate about sustainability and how we integrate it in the organization [...] She has received numerous awards for her work.” - Manager 1

Evidence of the Head of Sustainability being an important factor for the learning and integration of sustainability can be further found in external sources. She has been noted for her dedicated work within sustainability, both on a national and international level. For instance, last year she received the award “Greenbuild Europe Leadership Award” from Green Business Certification Inc. (Stanley, 2018) and most recently the Head of Sustainability received the national award “The Sustainability Manager of the Year”, which is an award designated by ‘Aktuell Hållbarhet’ in Sweden (Boman, 2019).

The sustainability initiatives and advancements made by the Head of Sustainability as well as other members across the organization is communicated both externally and internally.
Internally, findings show that learning about sustainability takes place through internal movement across regions and through different forums.

4.2.3 Internal Movement and Networks

For the purpose of learning from each other, internal movement across regions and departments with the involvement of both managers and employees, is present in the organization and occurs on an ongoing basis. One manager explains how even though there is a tendency to get stuck in their own regions, the use of peer reviews and theme days opens up for people to move between regions where an exchange of knowledge can occur.

“*I'm around quite a lot but sometimes we get stuck in region, absolutely. But I still think we manage to spread knowledge across regions. For example, the idea of peer review, is absolutely something that we plan and do continuously. We also have these theme days that are very important that are done once a year in different groups where there is a lot of experience feedback sporadically. I find it more and more often occurring between regions*” - Manager 6

A manager and employee further describe gatherings on a regular basis to promote learning across regions:

“*Every 2nd year, we gather the whole organization with a specific topic in focus […] More frequently we gather the different departments across regions with a specific topic for that particular field.*” - Manager 2

“*Every two years we all meet up at the head office with a program consisting of training and education. Then the other occupational groups meet once a year where you take the opportunity to exchange experiences*” – Employee 6

A further emphasized finding in relation to internal movement is the environmental audits of which Vasakronan performs regularly. Vasakronan is ISO 14001 certified, which is an international standard used to measure an organization’s environmental management system (ISO, 2015). The criteria for the ISO 14001 maps a framework for an organization to improve their environmental performance by using resources more efficiently and reducing waste. Auditing is conducted both internally by Vasakronan themselves and externally by ISO auditors. For the internal auditing, managers and employees from Vasakronan travel to other
offices as auditors to discuss sustainability related issues and collect feedback from the regions and departments.

“Since we are ISO 14001 certified we make internal audits and the important thing with these is not to see what people did or did not do but to open up for discussion. The internal auditors come from different parts of the organizations where an auditor from one department make an audit on another. [...] People go across regions” - Manager 2

“During the internal audits I do every year together with a group of colleagues, certain questions such as “this system is not working” or “we want to develop this more”. I make sure to collect everything and bring it back to the top management team to discuss what’s been brought up in the rest of the organization” - Manager 3

To enhance communication across regions and learning more efficiently about sustainability, both managers and employees repeatedly brought up the internal network ‘Yammer’ into the discussion. Yammer is an ‘Enterprise Social Network’ developed by Microsoft and is used for the internal communication in organizations (Microsoft, 2019). The usefulness of the internal network was highlighted by all respondents except for one employee who did not perceive the tool as particularly useful. Two managers explain how Yammer is used by the members of the organization to post project ideas and articles, exchange experiences, and join specialist groups of interest.

“We have something called ‘Yammer’ which is like our internal Facebook, where we post different things, for instance what the initiative ‘Glad Stad’ have done recently or how they manage waste in Malmö” - Manager 1

“We have Yammer which I think is a great platform for exchanges about experiences and it’s only getting better and better. The most difficult part is to make sure to spread knowledge, so it’s not stuck in your own box. There are a few specialists’ groups on Yammer based on specific areas, such as wood specialist groups or electricity for example. They are able to bring out bits of information but that’s usually based on when they have finished a project and they show off certain things from it” - Manager 6

Findings at the individual and group level emphasize the importance of involving the members of the organization on a personal level as well part of a group. By establishing
opportunities for learning about sustainability at the level of individuals and groups, the organization creates room for further integrating sustainability at an organizational level.

4.3 Organizational Level

To further integrate sustainability with organizational learning, findings at the organizational level showed the importance to incorporate sustainability in vision and goals, create an open culture and a flat structure to establish easy platforms to communicate about sustainability, and use stakeholder dialogues to learn with and by employees, tenants, external consultants, and students.

4.3.1 Sustainability in Vision and Goals

As previously mentioned, Vasakronan is owned by Första, Andra, Tredje, and Fjärde AP-fonderna, which manage the capital for Sweden’s national income pension system (Vasakronan, 2019f). Since the organization’s ownership puts emphasis on the retirees of Sweden, it creates a more long-term societal and environmental focus within the organization. Two managers discussed the owners’ interest in sustainability aspects for the importance of learning others and thinking long-term for the integration of corporate sustainability.

“We are supposed to constantly deliver a value to our owner, AP-fonderna. It’s a way of thinking long-term and I believe that permeates Vasakronan. We make investments in solar panels because we’re not going to sell our properties tomorrow. We don’t care if people think that’s bad or good right now” - Employee 2

“Our four owners are genuinely interested in sustainability and they make that very clear. They often use us as example in their dialogues with stakeholders, where they highlight what we do in practice to take responsibility” – Head of Sustainability

“Our owners want to make a lot of money which will go into the pension system but at the same time they want it to be done in a responsible manner. They don’t want us to be careless or make money in a non-sustainable way” - Manager 1

In addition to the owners’ interest in sustainability, the top management team also has strong values and a genuine interest in the issue. The top management team consists of representatives from all different regions in Sweden and every department is present in the group. This is further supported by other managers and employees, who argued for the
importance of the top management team to set clear goals as well as being active, supportive, and communicative for the integration of sustainability.

"Today, everyone on the board is clear about the great value integrated sustainability implies and everyone is genuinely interested. [...] - Manager 2

“I believe that an important factor for the integration of sustainability in our organization is that our CEO and top management team talk about it all the time” - Manager 4

“It is essential that the top management team believes as well as communicates that it is important and if you don’t start there, it will never happen. It is further important that they set goals and have a strong belief in ‘this is the way to go’ “. - Manager 5

“I believe that it is very important that the top management team set the direction to where the organization is heading regarding sustainability. There needs to be a great belief in the matter and that they set clear objectives, both short-and long-term goals. [...] There must be clear given path from the management team on how to integrate sustainability successfully.” - Employee 6

Using a long-term vision and goals with established strong core values about sustainability, is in line with additional findings at the organizational level, where an open culture and flat organizational structure was found present.

4.3.2 Open Culture and Flat Structure

Throughout the interviews, one theme was constant and recurring – Vasakronan’s organizational culture and its part for learning and integrating sustainability within the organization. The findings showed a flat organizational structure with a culture of high ambitions and openness to try new things. Both employees and managers discussed the non-hierarchical organizational structure where the open climate and activity-based offices promote communication and learning across departments and positions:

“It’s a very open and clear culture, not hierarchical. It’s very easy to go and talk to the managers. It’s a very flat organization” - Employee 6

“I perceive that we have an open culture where one can go to anyone and ask. I believe that this has a lot to do with that we do not have our own offices or places which opens for greater interaction in a
natural way. A colleague from Stockholm said that “I sat next to Fredrik, our CEO yesterday, and he was just a ‘normal’ guy” - Manager 4

In addition to a flat structure and easy communication opportunities, many of the managers also emphasized the openness to try new things. The supportive culture was said to create a safety net for trying something new and daring to make mistakes to learn something from it instead.

“We’ve started to think a bit ‘just do it’, because you have to dare and even though we fail we will learn something from it. [...] The majority of companies might be afraid of failure, but I feel like Vasakronan has an entirely other approach. Instead, we learn from it and it doesn’t matter if it goes badly, which is good to know” - Manager 3

“The culture at Vasakronan is dedicated. It is a place where many have high ambitions and want to achieve a lot. We care about each other and I perceive that it is okay to dare to try new things” - Manager 4

In connection to the concern of how there might be some personal barriers for the use of self-leadership at an individual level, some respondents also discussed some limitations to the open culture. One manager explained:

“I perceive there is an open culture, however sometimes I believe people create barriers for themselves where they do not dare to ask because then it might seem as they lack knowledge. So that part we could improve, to become better at making people to dare to ask. - Manager 1

The open and transparent culture goes hand in hand with the involvement of stakeholders in the organization. The organization engages both internal and external stakeholders to create a dialogue of learning for the integration of sustainability.

4.3.3 Stakeholder Dialogue

In Vasakronan’s 2018 Annual Report, the organization describes the importance of mapping the relevant stakeholders for the achievement of goals and creation of sustainable values (Vasakronan, 2019c). In the report, a full summary of the stakeholders’ expectations and opportunities for dialogue was presented, offering a triangulation of the thesis’ empirical findings related to stakeholder dialogue for learning. Stakeholders identified in the report
included tenants, suppliers, creditors, employees, society and owners. The empirical findings related to stakeholders’ dialogue for sustainability matters and platforms for learning have been identified as internal stakeholders such as owners, managers, and employees which was previously touched upon, and external stakeholders such as tenants, students, and external consultants.

One manager explained how they gathered all stakeholders in a workshop in 2017 where groups such as tenants, suppliers, creditors, and employees all participated to discuss sustainability related issues together – a dialogue which was greatly appreciated:

“During the stakeholder dialogues you can really see the different perspectives and capture them, which was greatly appreciated. We documented everything and tried to compile it, and you can find that on our website – our essential sustainability aspects - which is based on our stakeholders and what they think is important. As a result, we involve them in our work and it is also appreciated, because then they get their voices heard too. “– Manager 3

Employees
A specific platform for dialogue and learning with employees is the weekly Friday meetings that take place at every office. The Friday breakfasts were communicated to be of great importance to share ideas, knowledge, and information to other departments. It is a platform to discuss regional matters but occasionally also cross-regional information.

“We use our Friday meetings to share knowledge and information where we meet everyone at the office. It can be about sustainability sometimes; it can be customer breakfasts or an exciting project. […] We always go around the table if there’s anyone who wants to bounce some ideas. If you’ve travelled to a different regional office, you can present an idea you saw there that could be implemented here in the region “– Employee 6

“Sometimes we stream the Friday-meetings to the other regions”– Manager 1

“We have Friday breakfasts where the entire office gathers, and different subjects are presented. For example, it could be the yearly financial results, the new Paris Agreement and how we can work with compensating for the climate or our green bonds for external stakeholders” – Manager 3
The Friday meetings is also a time to invite external parties to share knowledge related to the business or industry which indirectly or directly affects the organization’s operations. As one manager described, the purpose for inviting external people to the Friday meetings is to, for example, raise awareness about climate change to the employees.

“We have Friday Meetings where different people, both internally and externally inform about different things” - Employee 1

“We usually invite external parties to come and share knowledge. There was a meteorologist here and talked about the weather changes. We always try to raise awareness of our employees” - Manager 3

In addition to having a stakeholder dialogue with the employees at Friday meetings, the organization uses stakeholder dialogue with several external stakeholders as well. For the purpose of creating a dialogue about sustainability, the organization creates platforms and opportunities for discussions with stakeholders such as tenants, external consultants, and students.

Tenants
Throughout all interviews, both managers and employee mentioned tenants as a very important group of stakeholders for a two-way direction of learning. The organization as a whole puts great emphasis on the relationship with their tenants and the goal of building a common understanding for sustainability matters to get the entire chain involved. The tenants are invited to so-called focus meetings annually, or more often, to become more educated and knowledgeable on Vasakronan’s current sustainability initiatives and how they themselves is part of the work.

“During all our focus meetings, which we have at least once a year, we always bring up what we do for the environment. Both what Vasakronan does but what we do in the specific area. During the focus meetings we meet contact persons from the companies who rent from us where we go through how it goes for them and Vasakronan, what the idea is and what we can help them with. We help them with so much we can with their questions to make good and sustainable choices together, for example during maintenance or remodeling” - Employee 4

“We try to meet all tenants once a year during something called a focus meeting where we discuss both what happens with Vasakronan, things going on around the properties but also a lot about what
the tenant is currently doing, any challenges and problems. If there’s anything specifically they want to invest or initiate, we try to find opportunities for collaboration. If they want to look at any alternative waste solution, we’ll talk about it and try to find a way to work together with the waste supply partner connected to the property. We will work together in order to engage a suitable collaboration to minimize the tenant’s waste and achieve good sorting habits.” - Employee 5

Additionally, there is a great amount of emphasis put on different ways of communicating effectively with tenants to teach them more about the consequences of climate changes, energy saving options. According to both employees and managers, it is important to communicate clearly and to find a platform of mutual agreement to create understanding for the changes that take place in the properties where the tenants sit.

“You teach our tenants in our properties that they don’t need to use so much energy and how to make the smartest choices. For example, you say “put on a shirt or stand up” instead of increasing the indoor temperature and in that way try to get them onboard. If you teach them, they will come along. [...] Many are good at their offices and stores with what they do there, but they don’t know everything about those types of sustainability related issues we know about here. Then we get to help them. It turns into enthusiasm. They are so proud when you get back to their office and they say, “it was a bit cold, but I stood up to get the 2 degrees for free”. Like our Head of Sustainability says: “together we can do it. [...] I think for every tenant you learn, in turn learns a few others” - Employee 4

“Some stakeholders may not be super interested about sustainability. Now I’m not that much out meeting customers but we work a lot with communication there. It is very much about argumentation about motives. For example, regarding temperature, we have “seasonal cards” and other material for the tenants. [...] There are many signs and mutual concerns you can talk about with the tenants to get them onboard” - Manager 6

**External Consultants**

Considering the particular sector in which Vasakronan operates, external consultants are commonly used as it enables broader knowledge and expertise. The relatively small number of employees in relation to revenue creates a need for bringing in external consultants when not mastering a certain area, as two managers described:

“Of course, we get help from consultants if we do not master some areas. We have a great system where you can find general agreements with suppliers and consultants [...] So, we do not do
“Everything ourselves, but secure a lot externally to make sure the end product will be as good as possible where we lack that specific competency” - Manager 3

“We are a pretty small company when you look at the numbers of employees - we’re 309 people in the company and a rather large one if you look at revenue. That idea builds a lot on us taking in a lot of external competence. In my area which is more project oriented we are almost all external. It’s like that due to the large size of our projects which is very resource demanded. We almost work as a guiding star, where we establish some kind of idea of what we want to accomplish and then we staff the project after that. As a result, we end up with a lot of consultants” - Manager 6

**Students**

Findings showed that the organization also takes the opportunity to have dialogues with students, foremost from universities. Various members of the organization are involved with students in different matters, for example by having presentations, inviting students to the offices or by initiating projects for school credits:

“I am going to have a presentation in two weeks for university students, PhD students and startups about how Vasakronan work with sustainability” - Employee 3

“When we get the opportunity to invite students it can really make a difference. It is exciting to inform about what we are doing in our offices” - Manager 1

“We have a collaboration with Chalmers University on different levels. It’s both within CMB [Centre for Management of the Build Environment] but we also had a group of students involved in the “Lilla Bommen” project where they followed the project during a year where they worked on some of their own questions which extended outwards. It’s very fun and in the end, we hope both us and them get something out of it” - Manager 6

A transparent and constant dialogue with stakeholders such as tenants, external consultants, and students, is with the use of sustainability in vision and goals and the open culture and flat structure, similar in nature. Evident from the findings at the organizational level is how the organization creates openness and transparency across the organization - and beyond to society - to learn and integrate sustainability.
4.4 Societal Level

As secondary data showed, Vasakronan initiates and takes part of several projects for sustainable city development by working closely with municipalities and other property owners (Sweden Green Building Council, 2019; Byggvarubedömningen, 2015), for example by certifying city areas with ‘Purple Flag’ to increase safety and availability during the night (Vasakronan, 2019d). Vasakronan’s vision “for the good city” is based upon the idea of creating a city where both people and businesses can develop in a sustainable manner (Vasakronan, 2019b). The vision of the good city is described with a sustainability map (Appendix 9.2), covering all aspects of sustainable city development. One manager described it as:

“We have a map you can unfold, which displays what we can do for sustainable development of a city. Everything from transport to green roofs to safe working environments... It is also a way of spreading the information within and outside the organization. I find that it is used regularly” - Manager 4

Another manager explained how the vision of “for the good city”, which was initiated a few years back, impacts the organization’s way of working at a societal level:

“It guides us out of the buildings so to speak. When I first started here there was a lot of focus on the buildings, while now we have expanded outside the buildings, to the city” - Manager 1

The empirical findings showed ambitions for the organization to contribute to sustainable city development, where two main findings were identified in relation to the achievement of integrating corporate sustainability based upon learning - joint projects and partnership as well as aiming to influence.

4.4.1 Joint Projects and Partnerships

The organization works closely with vertical and horizontal parties, such as competitors and suppliers, for joint projects and establishes partnerships with municipalities and other actors in society. Vasakronan is part of the development for safe neighborhoods, more accommodating transportation options, as well as art and culture within the city as one manager and employee explained:
“Our work with the development of the city is also a big part of the work we do in the social spectrum of sustainability. The prospective tenants should complement the tenants that are already on the street. It may be that we need to add some cultural aspects, meet another target group, design an environment or a courtyard... There should be something that appeals to more people instead of a narrower group. We think very socially in urban development issues” - Employee 6

“We are very involved in projects with the municipality. “Citysamverkan” is the latest project where we together with other property owners and the municipality take action. It’s everything from security aspects to investments in streets and squares. [...] The mobility question is also one where we are pushing quite hard where we’ve worked with “Parkeringsbolaget” and the project drive-me, which is Volvo’s project where you look at digital travels” - Manager 6

In relation to other property owners, one employee explains the cooperation in terms of learning opportunities and the importance to find common ground for sustainability. The manager argued all organizations have different expertise and can learn from each other:

“Sometimes we develop buildings together with other property owners within a specific area and then it is all about cooperating and unite, which is really exciting. You may think that we do not have that different perspectives among us property owners, but in a lot of cases these are very different. There are opportunities to learn from others as well to provide learnings, an exchange of knowledge. Every organization has different expertise” - Manager 5

By collaborating with external parties, Vasakronan is able to create a deeper understanding about the importance of sustainability among several different actors in society. As findings showed, Vasakronan is able to teach peers across industries about sustainability while at the same time learn in an efficient manner about other aspects of sustainability from other property owners and their specific expertise within the field. The purpose of collaborating in such manner is based upon the idea of aiming to influence for the development of a sustainability society.

4.4.2 Aim to influence

Being a leading actor when it comes to corporate sustainability, the respondents emphasized how Vasakronan is willing to take on the leader role by initiating projects and spreading knowledge about sustainability matters in society. By aiming to influence, findings showed
how Vasakronan leads by example, creates knowledge spillover, and communicates economic value to interested parties.

“We have an attitude which I believe was initiated by Fredrik, our CEO “If you’re big you have to be kind”, like Bamse. And that is a philosophy which permeates the whole organization. We want to be perceived this way.” - Head of Sustainability

“We have a large focus on sustainability and we often put the leader shirt on when it’s about finding long-term collaborations and positioning the city areas where we need to work very strategically” - Employee 6

“We may be at the level of details and some industries may not even have started to think about the issues we are working with. For example, in our projects, we want it to be renewable transports, but then perhaps the transport industry is not mature yet where they have switched to renewable fuels. [...] We try to inspire as much as possible because we want to get people onboard. It is not like we want to clap our chest and say “we are the best” but instead we want to bring everyone together because we cannot do everything in the chain on our own” - Manager 3

One employee and the Head of Sustainability further stressed the organization’s willingness to stay in the forefront of sustainability where they see an opportunity to influence and inspire other parties to push for change.

“We are far ahead, so we try to get the ball rolling and try to get different partners onboard with this. There might be people interested but who are waiting for someone else to take the first step instead of doing it themselves. There are many smaller companies who are generally very positive, but they usually have a harder time influencing the industry and must wait for the larger dragons to push for these issues [...] We are sitting on the influencer and ordering line, so we can push for the changes” - Employee 2

“For us, making the world a better place is fundamental, and not just making money, so if we can inspire others and if they would come further than us then that brings a lot of value. But I am very confident in that we will always be ahead since we constantly work towards new issues and areas of sustainability” - Head of Sustainability

In relation to this, communicating the economic value which the integration corporate sustainability implies was further emphasized, where they not only lifted examples of the obvious cost efficiencies, but also benefits of better and cheaper loans which green buildings
generates. By using LEED-certifications and GRESB-rankings, such benefits can be further effectively communicated outwards and argued for.

“When I am out and talk about corporate sustainability, I always bring up examples such as the lower risk a green building provides in comparison to buildings which are not, which implies better conditions for loans.” - Head of Sustainability

“When you talked about sustainability in traditional terms, we discussed it as a good investment to decrease our costs. Then we realized that by doing different sustainability investments, it led to tenants actively seeking to rent environmentally certified properties by Vasakronan. Our long-term goal is to have 100% green financing and we will achieve that by always offer a good portfolio of properties to our tenants and communicate our ranking at GRESB for example. As a result, we’re able to get greener and better loans” - Employee 2

“Sustainability is pretty easy to communicate about and is something that is interesting. We’re able to reach through the noise of all the information we’re daily fed with, and we can communicate with something more substantial than money. It’s an easy way to show and something to be proud of. Instead of communicating how much money you make or how good business deals you do, this feels more like 2019. I also think it’s a way for other companies to respect the company as well” - Employee 6

Findings at the societal level emphasized the close cooperation with parties such as municipalities and other property owners for the development of sustainable cities. By establishing joint projects and partnerships for the purpose of collaborating as well as aiming to influence by creating knowledge spillover at a societal level, learning becomes a foundation for the integration of sustainability within the organization by leveraging on knowledge both within and outside the organization.

4.5 Summary of Findings

Findings on how to manage organizational learning for integrating corporate sustainability became evident at the different levels of individual and group, organization as well as society. Here, a summary of the managing aspects emerging at the different levels is presented in Table 8 below as a foundation for the analysis where these categories will be analyzed in different themes connected to existing theory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual &amp; Group</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Leadership</td>
<td>Long-Term Vision and Goals</td>
<td>Joint Projects and Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Initiatives and decision-making supported</em></td>
<td><em>Owners’ interest and TMT’s support</em></td>
<td><em>Within and across sectors for the city</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Sustainability</td>
<td>Open Culture and Flat Structure</td>
<td>Aim to Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Communicates and Inspires</em></td>
<td><em>Accepting and non-hierarchical</em></td>
<td><em>Leading the way, communicating economic value and knowledge spillover</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Movements and Networks</td>
<td>Stakeholder Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Activities across offices and Yammer</em></td>
<td><em>Communicating internally and externally</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8 Summary of Findings*
5. Analysis

With the use of a previously presented model summarizing the theoretical framework, the authors present the analysis in the same arrangement. The analysis is divided into three parts where the management of organizational learning is discussed on an individual and group level, organizational, and societal level. The chapter is concluded with a proposed model of organizational learning for integrating corporate sustainability as a way of summarizing the analysis.

Conducting a single case study of an organization with a high level of integrated sustainability allowed us to collect unique data to fulfill our purpose of analyzing the management of organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability in organizations within the Swedish property sector. The empirical findings and theoretical framework are analyzed by using the same structure evident in the summarized theoretical model below (Figure 2).

![Summarized Theoretical Model of Organizational Learning](image)

*Figure 2 Summarized Theoretical Model of Organizational Learning (Source: The Authors)*

Throughout the analysis, the summarized theoretical model of organizational learning will be further developed and extended by aligning the empirical findings and theory at the individual and group, organizational, and societal level. The main findings have been analyzed and
connected to different themes, which are presented in the beginning of the three different parts of the analysis.

5.1 Managing Organizational Learning at Individual and Group Level

Table 9 shows the themes of which the main findings at an individual and group level have been connected to based on the authors’ interpretations with existing theory in mind, where self-leadership is linked to ‘Autonomy’, Head of Sustainability to ‘Champion’ and Internal Movement and Network to ‘Cross-Regional Interactions’. The main findings will be analyzed in-depth under the mentioned themes in the following section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Leadership</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Sustainability</td>
<td>Champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Movement and Networks</td>
<td>Cross-Regional Interactions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9 Main Findings to Themes at Individual & Group Level*

5.1.1 Autonomy

One of the main findings at this level was the use of self-leadership, where autonomy given to the individual and group was evident. Employee 4 explained: “With self-leadership, you’re able to run your own projects and it’s the idea of doing something good that you’re passionate about. There are not a lot of fingers pointing“. Given this, it seems that by implementing approaches to enable a high degree of autonomy to employees in their roles and decision-making may promote exploration of new learnings about sustainability. Referring back to the intuiting stage of the model by Crossan et al. (1999), exploration was interlinked with entrepreneurial intuition, which involves innovation, finding new opportunities, and making connections between current and possible knowledge. Hence, when approaches such as self-leadership are applied, entrepreneurial intuition can bloom which further triggers forward loops to push the organization forward in the integration process. As Holmqvist (2009) argues, exploitation can be the cause of exploration, which in this manner may be interpreted as when individuals have the freedom to explore learnings, these learnings can further be exploited by the organization. These learnings can come from within but also outside the organization. Employee 6 explained: “If you’re involved in discussions both internally and externally, and part of the agreement of a common perspective or goal, it’s
much easier to continue and be passionate about it in your everyday tasks.” By giving autonomy to employees to explore new knowledge both internally and externally and then spread this to the rest of the organization, may not only increase passion and motivation from the employees but also foster a learning environment. As a result, innovation and new opportunities can be exploited and thus increase the probability of a successful integration of sustainability initiatives.

Concerns about differences among individuals affecting the effectiveness and impact of self-leadership was brought up by Manager 3 who explained: “[...] sometimes this approach can have a negative effect, where in some cases people might not know how to move forward when there is not a clear way of doing things. In this manner, the approach depends on the individual.” In this sense, one may argue that personality and traits may clash with the concept of self-leadership where challenges can arise if certain individuals are not well with making own decisions regardless of the acknowledgment of self-leadership within an organization. If certain employees lack an ability to explore knowledge about sustainability due to the contrast between specific personality traits and a high level of autonomy, one can instead argue the importance to increase their ability to exploit knowledge for the learning processes of interpreting and integrating. Interpreting was described as the process of explaining an idea to the individual while integrating was described as the creation of shared understanding (Crossan et al., 1999), where the person or group on the other side can be argued to play a just as important role for exploiting the knowledge which has been explored by someone else. In this sense, autonomy can be argued for enhancing the transfer and receiving of knowledge about sustainability at individual and group level and by so promoting the integration of corporate sustainability in the organization.

In relation to employees’ ability to transfer and receive knowledge with the use of autonomy for integrating sustainability, managers’ role for dealing with differences among employees can be argued to be of great importance. When explaining the managers’ role in establishing autonomy in the organization, the metaphor of a ski piste explained by manager 4 may be of high value: “It is like we [managers] set up the ski piste with moral and legal restrictions and everything that creates the actual piste, but as an employee you are rather free to choose the best way to get to the finish line. We try to inject courage and decisiveness among our employees so that they can dare to stretch outside the common way of doing things”. Hence, one can assume that managers should set clear objectives and then leave room for employees
to make decisions on how to get there, but still providing support and encouragement. The involvement and empowerment of employees through opportunities to influence their work is supported by Petts (1998) to be one important element for corporate sustainability performance.

5.1.2 Cross-Regional Interactions

For exploring and exploiting knowledge internally, the findings of internal movement and networks served as an interesting aspect to enable cross-regional interactions for the integration of sustainability. These may be argued to be applied in the interpreting and integrating stage by Crossan et al. (1999), which was grouped together by Versiani et al. (2016) as ongoing activities. In congruence with Jarzobkowski & Seidl (2008), the findings showed how peer reviews, theme days, and internal audits can be implemented as ongoing activities on a regular basis which opens up for free discussion opportunities. By managing organizational learning through these activities, the members of the organization can exchange ideas (interpreting learning) and create a shared understanding (integrating learning) of sustainability. This may be argued to create loops of both exploitation and exploring learning across the organization, which was emphasized by Holmqvist (2009) in order to reproduce a stable behavior, where the individual and group open up to new experiences by participating in activities and creates reliability in the experiences by discussing them openly. On the other hand, the findings also showed that there are room for improvements considering internal movements where Manager 6 explained there to be a tendency to be stuck in the region. However, one may argue that this further stresses the importance of establishing cross-regional activities such as the ones mentioned. If there is a tendency to get stuck in the region, it can be assumed that the establishment of these activities can push for exploration and exploitation learning to effectively occur on an ongoing basis to reproduce a stable behavior amongst individuals and groups for the integration of corporate sustainability. Considering the regular activity of internal audits, these may be argued to open up for individuals and groups from different parts of the organization to both explore learnings from other departments and exploit these learnings within their own department. Supported by Crossan et al. (1999), cross-regional interactions can therefore be argued to stimulate entrepreneurial intuition amongst individuals and interpretation amongst groups, which promotes feedforward loops. In addition, we argue with support by Nielsen et al. (2018), how feedback loops occur at the same time where exploitation of knowledge brings the learning process forward as well. Manager 3 described: “During the internal audits I do every year together with other
colleagues, certain questions such as “this system is not working” or “we want to develop this more”. I make sure to collect everything and bring it back to the top management team to discuss what’s been brought up in the rest of the organization”. This may further imply that the managers serve as an important intermediary for the dynamic learning process to occur from individual to organization and the other way around, where feedback and forward loops occur in similar patterns at the individual and group level (Nielsen et al., 2018).

The findings showed how the internal network ‘Yammer’ is used as a tool for continuous updates on initiatives taken as well as spreading of news or updated matters about sustainability. This is in line with Belmondo and Sargis-Roussel (2015) who argued for interactive tools to be a part of the ongoing activities at the interpreting and integrating stage (Versiani et al., 2016). By using an internal network as a tool for continuous learning, it seems that Vasakronan opens up for a bottom-up approach, which according to Sibenhüner and Arnold (2007) lead to higher-level learning. However, even though the internal network was brought up by most of the respondents as a great tool for communicating sustainability initiatives and learnings, one employee mentioned this tool as not being particularly useful. This may indicate that while internal networks can be an effective tool for the organizational learning on sustainability, organizations may need to put effort on creating excitement and understanding of the opportunities it implies, both on an individual as well as group level. Hence, in line with Belmondo and Sargis-Roussel (2015), being clear on the meaning and intention of the usage of a particular tool is important for the process of learning and thus arguable for the integration of sustainability within an organization.

5.1.3 Champion

The Head of Sustainability was highlighted by all of the respondents as an important factor for the integration of sustainability in the organization. These are interesting findings considering that Petts (1998) argue for individuals, or champions to be an important element for corporate sustainability. Both employees and managers emphasized how they get constantly inspired by the Head of Sustainability and stressed her importance for the learning and understanding of sustainability issues. As Manager 3 described “The Head of Sustainability is brilliant when she talks about it [sustainability] and is really passionate about these questions [...] She is very good at persuading people and getting people on the track to get them to understand the purpose and points why we work with these issues. She is needed and I think many companies need someone to steer in that way”. One may argue that
having a champion such as the Head of Sustainability who inspires on an regular basis, both in person but also through achievements such as participating in important events and receiving awards as well as conducting external environmental analysis, promotes continuous learning on sustainability in the organization. In this sense, she explores new learnings to a great extent, and thus stimulate entrepreneurial intuition (Crossan et al., 1999). One may further argue for the Head of Sustainability to have strong expert intuition as well, which is explained as the process of pattern recognition and relates a lot to experiences (Crossan et al., 1999). Feedback loops are created at the stage of integrating learning when the individuals and groups can be explained as exploiting the champion’s expertise, as the Head of Sustainability discussed: “... to be successful as a leader you first of all have to understand the business and the logic within the business”. The Head of Sustainability being knowledgeable and understanding this logic was lifted by Manager 6: “She is good at it and has a good ability to capture information from the outside and pinpoint certain specifics that are important and linked to Vasakronan on the overall level”. Hence, it is not only the passion for sustainability but also the ability to inspire and educate that becomes important for a sustainability champion to be successful in the role. One can conclude that an important capability of a champion, whether it is a Head of Sustainability or someone with a similar position, is to recognize the connection between sustainability facts and business implications for the successful integration of corporate sustainability.

5.1.4 Summary: Individual and Group Level

The analysis showed three themes of important managing aspects at the individual and group level for the integration of sustainability with organizational learning - offering autonomy with self-leadership, establishing cross-regional interactions between regions, and using a champion such as a Head of Sustainability, see Figure 4 below. The thin arrows describe the exploration and exploitation learning with feedforward and feedback loops occurring iteratively in similar patterns. The learning processes of intuiting, interpreting, and integrating take place at the individual and group level, where autonomy, cross-regional interactions, and champion can be managed with a dynamic process to integrate corporate sustainability within the organization.
5.2 Managing Organizational learning at Organizational Level

Table 10 shows the themes of which the main findings at organizational level have been connected to based on the authors’ interpretations with existing theory in mind, where Sustainability in Vision & Goals is linked to ‘Sustainability Values’, Open Culture & Flat Structure to ‘Organizational Characteristics’ and Stakeholder Dialogue to ‘Constant Communication’. The main findings will be analyzed in-depth under the mentioned themes in the following section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability in Vision &amp; Goals</td>
<td>→ Sustainability Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Culture &amp; Flat Structure</td>
<td>→ Organizational Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Dialogue</td>
<td>→ Constant Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10 Main Findings to Themes at Organizational Level*
5.2.1 Sustainability Values

The owners’ and top management team’s sustainability values play an important role at the organizational level of learning, where the incorporation of sustainability in the vision and goals were emphasized. As previously mentioned, the type of ownership of Vasakronan is based on a long-term perspective of the organization and is built upon sustainable measures for the future. The large interest and strong values about sustainability of the owners and top management team can be assumed to establish preconditions for the organization to integrate sustainability across the different organizational levels. As Cramer (2005) discusses, there must be active support and effective leadership from key persons to institutionalize learning at the organizational level. The owners’ support of sustainability initiatives correlates to the top management’s role in the integration of such initiatives. The clear communication about sustainability and its importance is continually discussed and diffused by the top management team, as Manager 4 said: “… An important factor for the integration of sustainability in our organization is that our CEO and top management team talks about it all the time”. One can argue how the top management team creates shared understanding (integrating learning) about sustainability by coordinating specific actions plans with goals and objectives, where exploitation creates feedback loops to the individual and group level.

In connection to Siebenhüner and Arnold’s (2007) study showing how successful implementation of sustainability can be managed by goal-and guideline-oriented processes of learning and formalized instruments of communication, findings showed how the top management team creates clear and concise short- and long-term goals for sustainability as Employee 6 shared: “...It is very important that the top management team set the direction to where the organization is heading regarding sustainability. There needs to be a great belief in the matter and that they set clear objectives, both short-and long-term goals”. In relation to the integrating process of learning by communicating and implementing sustainability goals, the values diffused from the owners and top management team is aligned to Crossan et al.’s stage of institutionalizing. The stage of institutionalizing learning occurs by the process of embedding the learning of individuals and groups to the organizational level (Crossan et al., 1999) and is based upon the recurrent and reemergent actions. Actions based on values are triggered with feedback loops, which is correlated to the exploitation of the knowledge possessed by the organization (Crossan et al., 1999). In Vasakronan’s case, the recurrent and reemergent actions of implementing sustainability initiatives across the organization such as
communicating sustainability goals, having long-term ownership focus, and directing short-term objectives, can be argued to be based on values of sustainability within the organization. As a result, feedback loops occur from the organization back to the individual and groups, further institutionalizing sustainability in the organization. By exploiting knowledge about sustainability which already exist on the individual and group level in Vasakronan, the learning may be diffused top-down again and embedded across the organizational levels. Siebenhüner and Arnold (2007) also discussed how sustainability-related values and norms can be used as learning mechanism to implement sustainability initiatives in an organization at the stage of integrating. These initiatives may be emergent from the individual and group level when exploiting for example expertise knowledge from a champion or by cross-regional interactions.

5.2.2 Organizational Characteristics

The values of sustainability diffused from the owners and the supportive and active top management team to integrate sustainability seem to correlate to organizational characteristics such as the open culture and flat structure. The findings are in line with early scholars such as Altomare et al. (1999), Senge and Carstedt (2001), and Senge et al. (1999) discussing how an organizational learning culture can foster sustainability. By establishing an open discussion climate across the organization and a flat organizational structure, learning about sustainability seems to be facilitated among individuals and groups. In congruence with Siebenhüner and Arnold (2007) a higher level of adaptability of a set structure or procedures can facilitate the implementation of sustainability initiatives in an organization. Vasakronan’s flat structure discussed by Manager 4 in connection to their use of activity-based offices may be seen as evidence for facilitating the integration of sustainability by managing organizational learning mechanisms in an effective way: “I perceive that we have an open culture where one can go to anyone and ask. I believe that this has a lot to do with that we do not have our own offices or places which opens for greater interaction in a natural way”. The organizational characteristics of an open culture and flat structure of Vasakronan create opportunities to explore and exploit new knowledge about sustainability, triggering feed-forward and feedback loops to institutionalizing learning to fully integrate sustainability in the organization. As manager 3 expressed: “We’ve started to think a bit ‘just do it’, because you have to dare and even though we fail we will learn something from it”, the accepting culture of making mistakes and trying new things correlate to the process of exploration where employees are allowed to explore, search, and experiment to learn new things. As a result, the
risk-taking of Vasakronan at individual and group level is emphasized further at the organizational level by creating variety in the experiences to explore sustainability further. As a result, one may argue the process of learning and thus integrating sustainability, is moved forward with both feedforward and feedback loops based on the culture and structure present at the organizational level. On the other hand, Manager 1 brought up concerns about some people who may create barriers for the exploration of knowledge to take place on the organizational level, when restricting themselves to dare to ask questions to colleagues. This may imply that even though an open culture and a flat organizational structure may open up for the possibility for members of the organization to explore learnings and thus bring creativity and innovation to the organization, individual differences among individuals and groups should not be ignored for the learning process as a whole. However, one can argue that organizational characteristics such as an open culture and flat structure nevertheless seem to enhance the exploration and exploitation, where the entire organization can further institutionalize learning.

5.2.3 Constant Communication

Further evident from the findings was the importance of constant communication with the use of stakeholder dialogues for the purpose of both learning from and teaching peers about sustainability. Vasakronan puts great emphasis of having an open communication and learning with and by stakeholders such as tenants, external consultants, and students. The process of learning is emphasized with a two-way direction of communication, aligned with the idea of feedback and feedforward loops occurring as exploration and exploitation takes place between the stakeholders and the organization. The findings regarding stakeholder dialogue are supported by Fortis et al. (2018), Zollo et al. (2013), and Siebenhüner and Arnold (2007), where they stress the great importance of engaging stakeholder to integrate sustainability by learning from and by other stakeholders outside and inside the organization. By inviting and involving both internal and external stakeholders to various forums such as biennial stakeholder meetings, Friday breakfasts for the employees, and focus meetings for tenants to discuss various subjects of interest, sustainability emerge in all dialogues. During the different dialogues with stakeholders, the organization infuses knowledge about sustainability from internal stakeholders such as employees and external stakeholders such as consultants, tenants, and students. This correlates to the exploration of new knowledge at the level of integrating and institutionalizing of Crossan et al.’s 4I model. At the same time, the organization diffuses knowledge about sustainability to the same parties for a two-way
direction of learning, aligned with the notion of exploiting knowledge to further integrate sustainability into the organization. The stakeholder dialogue offers platforms of communication to educate various stakeholders about sustainability by exploiting the knowledge they have, as discussed by Manager 6: “We work a lot with communication with tenants. It is very much about argumentation about motives. For example, regarding temperature, we have “seasonal cards” and other material for the tenants”. In the other way around, Vasakronan uses a lot of external consultants to explore new knowledge if they are lacking in one area for development projects or sustainability related issues for specific properties, as explained by Manager 3: “We get help from consultants if we do not master some areas. [...] We do not do everything ourselves but secure a lot externally to make sure the end product will be as good as possible where we lack that specific competency”. By exploiting and exploring knowledge about sustainability in dialogue with tenants, consultants, and students, feedback loops occur back to the organization from the stakeholders while feedforward loops occur when employees bring the knowledge back into the organization. The stakeholder dialogues occur constantly in various forms across the organization, where the communication and open discussion with internal and external parties are of importance to set social practices as recurrent and reemergent as explained by Crossan et al.’s final stage of institutionalizing. As a result, sustainability is integrated in the organization at the organizational level by embedding the knowledge to and from the stakeholders in a dynamic and constant way of communicating. Further, the dynamic learning is extended outwards from the organization to the society by establishing learning opportunities across external actors.

5.2.4 Summary: Organizational Level

The analysis showed an additional three themes of important managing aspects at the organizational level for the integration of sustainability with organizational learning - infusing sustainability values based on a long-term vision, developing organizational characteristics such as open culture and flat structure, and initiating constant communication with stakeholders, see Figure 5 below.
In the figure, the thin arrows describe the exploration and exploitation learning with feedforward and feedback loops occurring iteratively in similar patterns for all three managing aspects. The learning processes of integrating and institutionalizing take place at the organizational level, where sustainability values, organizational characteristics, and constant communication can be managed with a dynamic process to integrate corporate sustainability within the organization.

### 5.3 Managing Organizational Learning at Societal Level

Table 11 shows the themes of which the main findings at a societal level have been connected to, based on the authors’ interpretations with existing theory in mind, where ‘Joint Projects and Partnerships’ is linked to ‘Collaborations’ and ‘Aim to Influence’ to ‘Anchoring Mutual Interests’. The main findings will be analyzed in-depth under the mentioned themes in the following section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Project &amp; Partnerships</td>
<td>Collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim to Influence</td>
<td>Anchoring Mutual Interests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11 Main Findings to Themes at Societal Level*
5.3.1 Collaborations

The last two stages of integrating and institutionalizing presented in the extended model of Crossan et al. (1999) is explained to occur at the societal level in addition to the organizational level. The learning process of integrating was previously described as creating shared understanding while institutionalizing as embedding the learning from individual and groups to the organizational level. However, for the purpose of integrating corporate sustainability by managing organizational learning at the societal level, one can argue that these occur by the collaborations and anchoring mutual interests in society. The findings indicate that joint projects and partnerships with parties in the society may serve as an important part when it comes to managing organizational learning for the purpose of integrating corporate sustainability. Manager 6 explained: “We are very involved in projects with the municipality. “Citysamverkan” is the latest project where we together with other property owners and the municipality take action. It’s everything from security aspects to investments in streets and squares. [...] The mobility question is also one where we are pushing quite hard where we’ve worked with “Parkeringsbolaget” and the project drive-me, which is Volvo's project where you look at digital travels”. With support from Fortis et al. (2018) who emphasize the need to continuously learn to and from others, collaboration seems to provide invaluable learning opportunities on sustainability. Meaning, by lifting the eye gaze from the sole operations of the organization to instead see how these connects with the operations in the society, an organization may exploit great advantages in terms of the own organizational learning. Further, Zollo et al. (2013), argue for stakeholder involvement to result in better access to resources and stronger networking relationships among other benefits. Hence, it appears that by making collaborations with external parties an important part of the organization, capabilities can be developed to meet the demands from a volatile environment (Fortis et al., 2018). As a result this may lead to avoidance of quick fixes and foster a more dynamic process of learning, where learnings can be explored and exploited not just for the success of the organization, but more importantly for the process towards a sustainable society, which was emphasized by Smith and Sharicz (2011).

5.3.2 Anchoring Mutual Interests

According to Jamali (2006) it is important for organizations to be open to the change for integrated corporate sustainability. In this sense, an important aspect from the findings is the large emphasis that Vasakronan puts on anchoring mutual interest for sustainability not just
within the organization, but in society. From the findings, it became evident that anchoring mutual interests may be achieved if the organization truly aim to influence, with the idea of leading by example and communicating the economic value corporate sustainability implies. By aiming to influence, one can argue for this to enhance the openness to a sustainable change in society. Manager 3 shared: *We try to inspire as much as possible because we want to get people onboard. It is not that we want to clap our chest and say "we are the best" but instead we want to bring everyone together because we cannot do everything on our own throughout the chain*. In this sense, when leading by example as well as inspiring others, it may result in a dynamic learning and open up for opportunities for all organizations involved, again referring to the advantages described by Zollo et al. (2013) such as better access to resources and strong network relationships. Further, the Head of Sustainability explained: “*For us, making the world a better place is fundamental, and not just making money, so if we can inspire others and if they would come further than us than that brings a lot of value. But I am very confident in that we will always be ahead since we constantly work towards new issues and areas of sustainability*”. Considering this, one may conclude that organizations should not be scared of knowledge spillover when it comes to sustainability questions, but rather that focus should lay in a continuous process of exploring and exploiting new learnings for the sake of stimulating feedforward and feedback loops to constantly move forward in the process.

In the same manner, communicating economic value is further an emphasized aspect of managing organizational learning. Findings showed that Vasakronan uses different forums such as lectures to not only spread knowledge but to communicate their advancements on sustainability matters as well as the economic value of sustainability integration. An example of this is provided by the Head of Sustainability: “*When I am out and talk about corporate sustainability, I always bring examples such as the lower risk a green building provides in comparison to buildings which are not, which implies better conditions for loans.*” By effectively exploring knowledge to stay in the forefront and leading the way as well as exploiting knowledge to find common ground among societal actors, one can argue how Vasakronan constantly works towards anchoring mutual interest in the minds of all relevant stakeholders which was further stressed by Hörisch et al. (2014). By anchoring mutual interests at a societal level, sustainability seems to be further integrated in the organization by managing such practices.
The last stage of learning in the model by Crossan et al. (1999) is as mentioned institutionalization, which is explained to be crucial for the strategic renewal of an organization. By extending the model to a societal level, one can argue for institutionalizing to be vital for the strategic renewal towards a sustainable society. Versiani et al. (2016) discussed how the actions based on values and social practices are institutionalized in the organizations. For this reason, anchoring a mutual interest, and thus strong values for sustainability, can be argued to become of great importance for the purpose of managing organizational learning to integrate of corporate sustainability. When everyone is striving for the same end-state, hence a sustainable society, collaborations can foster and open up for learnings to be explored and exploited, accelerating the process towards sustainable corporations.

5.3.3 Summary: Societal Level

The empirical findings from this research brought to light the dynamic learning with society as an essential aspect in terms of integrating corporate sustainability. At societal level, the analysis showed collaborations both within and across sectors and anchoring mutual interests by aiming to influence as important managing aspects for organizational learning to integrate sustainability, see Figure 6.
In the figure, the thin arrows describe the exploration and exploitation learning with feedforward and feedback loops occurring iteratively in similar patterns for the two managing aspects. The learning processes of integrating and institutionalizing take place at the societal level, where collaborations and anchoring mutual interest can be managed with a dynamic process to integrate corporate sustainability within the organization.

5.4 Proposed Framework

Throughout the analysis, management aspects of organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability have been discussed at the different levels by intertwining the empirical findings with the existing theory. As a concluding remark, the authors present the final proposed model in Figure 7. The practical roles of employees and managers for the integration of corporate sustainability are further discussed based on the identified differences between the two in Table 12.

5.4.1 Proposed Model for Integrating Corporate Sustainability with Organizational Learning

The summarized theoretical framework (Figure 2) described how the learning processes of intuiting, interpreting, and integrating occurred at the individual and group level while integrating and institutionalizing occurred at organizational level. The overlap of the boxes describing the learning process in the model explained how intuiting, interpreting, integrating, and institutionalizing were complex processes and not solely belonging to one level. The extension to a societal level was based on the authors’ combination of organizational learning and corporate sustainability as well as the role of society for sustainable development to fully integrating corporate sustainability in an organization. Exploration and exploitation were explained as occurring dynamically as an iterative process, represented by the thin arrows. The original theoretical framework had closed borders between the different levels. See the final proposed model for integrating corporate sustainability with organizational learning below in Figure 7 below.
Figure 7 Proposed Model for Integrating Corporate Sustainability with Organizational Learning (Source: The Authors)

Added to the model at the individual and group level is the three managing aspects of organizational learning such as offering autonomy, establishing cross-regional interactions, and using a champion, which serve as the core of the proposed model for integrating corporate sustainability with organizational learning. The added dotted lines at the borders between the levels represent how organizations should open for learnings about sustainability more transparently. The thick arrows are the transfer of knowledge occurring between as well as across all the different levels of individual and group, organization, and society. Added at the organizational level are the three managing aspects of sustainability values, organizational characteristics, and constant communication whereas collaborations and anchoring mutual interest are the two aspects added to the societal level, with the learning processes of integrating and institutionalizing occurring. The proposed model serves as a framework for the push towards strategic renewal of organizations within the Swedish property sector for the integration of corporate sustainability with a dynamic process of learning.

5.4.2 Role of Managers and Employees

Within each eight managing aspects found at the different organizational level based on the proposed model, the managers’ and employees’ role for the integration of corporate sustainability differ in practice. Their different roles have emerged from analyzing the findings as well as throughout the development of the proposed model, which are discussed in Table 12 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Managing Aspects</th>
<th>Employees’ Role</th>
<th>Managers’ Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual &amp; Group</strong></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Responsible for taking on sustainability initiatives and actively explore new learnings based on self-leadership</td>
<td>Adopt an open and involving leadership style to support and encourage employees and exploit sustainability initiatives taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-Regional Interactions</td>
<td>Participating actively on internal networks by discussing projects ‘publicly’ to enhance opportunities to exploit learnings within groups</td>
<td>Conduct peer-reviews on other projects and environmental audits if possible. Arrange theme days for departments, offices, or entire organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Champion</td>
<td>Could work as a green champion for more sustainable projects or taking initiative in their everyday tasks, big or small</td>
<td>Either as Head of Sustainability or at another position, managers can actively explore new learnings on sustainability and strive to inspire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Sustainability Values</td>
<td>Share the core sustainability values with the rest of the organization to proactively work towards specific goals</td>
<td>‘Live as you learn’ and set ambitious sustainability goals, short-term and long-term with clear objectives for employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Characteristics</td>
<td>Be open for questions from anyone about anything and dare to do the same</td>
<td>Acknowledge, accept, and sustain the non-hierarchical structure and open culture and serve as an intermediary between TMT and employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constant Communication</td>
<td>Participate actively on meetings, both internally and externally, and constantly discuss the sustainability aspect with everyone</td>
<td>Plan and lead recurring meetings and create feeds of communication with relevant stakeholders. Invite and let employees have dialogues with external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society</strong></td>
<td>Collaborations</td>
<td>Build and maintain relationship with partners and societal actors on the ground</td>
<td>Establish channels and platforms for the long-term commitment for sustainability of projects and partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchoring Mutual Interest</td>
<td>Actively share knowledge to other parties and communicate the practical importance and value of certifications and such</td>
<td>Share a vision of “aim to influence” with employees to create a safe space for them to spread knowledge and learnings about sustainability benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12 The Role of Employees and Managers*
6. Conclusion

Considering the complexity of dealing with corporate sustainability in practice, the purpose of this thesis was to analyze the management of organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability in organizations within the Swedish property sector. The main conclusion of this thesis is the proposed framework, which consists of a comprehensive model presenting identified managing aspects for the process of learning to integrate sustainability and a summarizing table showing the practical role employees and managers can have in this learning process. The purpose of this thesis was fulfilled by answering the research questions below.

RQ 1. How can organizations in the property sector in Sweden manage organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability?

Figure 7 shows a proposed model of how organizations in the property sector in Sweden can manage organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability. Eight main aspects on how organizational learning can be managed at the different levels of individual and group, organization, and society, is concluded below.

At an individual and group level, organizational learning for the integration of sustainability in the Swedish property sector can be managed by; pursuing high level of autonomy through self-leadership; having a dedicated and knowledgeable champion, as well as implementing activities and networks for cross-regional interactions. At an organizational level, the research provides evidence of the importance of having strong sustainability values; having organizational characteristics of open culture and flat structure as well as constant communication with stakeholders. In the model developed by the authors, a third level of society was introduced. Here, the essential aspects of collaborations and anchoring a mutual interest were found as the main aspects.

RQ 2. What role can managers and employees have in practice for the learning process towards the integration of corporate sustainability in an organization within the Swedish property sector?

Both employees and managers have an important and vital role in the learning process for integrating sustainability in practice in an organization. While their roles may differ, both are
concluded as equally critical for the entire learning process to take place dynamically across all organizational levels. See Table 12 for a detailed description of the different roles of managers and employees.
7. Discussion

As concluding remarks, implications will be discussed in terms of theoretical, practical, managerial, and ethical. Limitations and future research will be further discussed before concluding the chapter with additional thoughts.

7.1 Implications

7.1.1 Theoretical Implications

Previous research about corporate sustainability has been limited to identifying why the implementation of sustainability initiatives is of importance, while there is a lack of research regarding the strategic integration of sustainability in an organization’s management (Baumgartner & Rauter, 2017; Engert et al., 2016). Scholars such as Baumgartner and Rauter (2017), Baumgartner (2014), and Cramer (2005), argued for the need of additional research about the role of organizational learning for a successful integration of sustainability in an organization. With in-depth and qualitative material gathered through a single case study of an established for-profit organization, we contribute with empirical evidence on the management of organizational learning for the integration of sustainability from the Swedish property sector to the mentioned research gap. The study focused on understanding how organizational learning can be managed within an organization to be able to fully grasp the importance of the learning processes and practices taking place across different organizational levels. With an abductive research approach, we examined an organization’s use of organizational learning based on Crossan et al.’s 4I model (1999) and extended the model by introducing an additional level of society and proposed management aspects an organization can consider integrating corporate sustainability (Figure 7). Our research contribute to the theoretical field of organizational learning, based on our extension of Crossan et al.’s 4I model (1999) to a societal level and thus the interactions of learning present in an organization with society, and corporate sustainability, based on our combination of theory and findings for a presented proposed model of integrating sustainability with the management of organizational learning.
7.1.2 Practical Implications

Aligned with previous call for research examining the practical nature of corporate sustainability (Engert et al., 2016), there are several practical implications evident from our study. The concluding model brings forth practical implications on for example an organization’s structure, communication channels, and systems set in place. Based on the managing aspects found for integrating corporate sustainability with organizational learning, these implications may include a change or improvement of: the organizational structure, where our conclusion showed a flat and non-hierarchical structure to be of impact for the learning processes; communication channels, where there is a need for both offline dialogues such as meetings and online platforms such as social networks; and systems and thus policies of ensuring sustainable practices amongst suppliers, sub-contractors, and contract employers when partnering with other actors in society. While we believe the practical implications from our research is first and foremost most applicable for established for-profit and larger organizations in the property sector, we believe our research brings learning opportunities for those organizations with less resources and power of contribution as well. Managers within organizations of different sizes can find our proposed model of use for the integration of corporate sustainability with organizational learning.

7.1.3 Managerial Implications

To meet the demand of a more strategic and integrated use of sustainable practices of a business (Engert et al., 2016), instead of using superficial quick fixes (Jamali, 2006; Zollo et al., 2013), organizations can deal with the complexity by managing organizational learning aspects identified through our research. By offering a more dynamic view of organizational learning and corporate sustainability, the internal and external demand of more sustainable business practices (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2015; Engert et al., 2016) can be met in practice by organizations. Organizations within the property sector can learn how to manage various aspects for the purpose of integrating sustainability, including pursuing autonomy to all employees, leveraging on sustainability values for long-term vision and goals, and collaborating with municipalities and other property owners. Table 12 shows further practical guidance for managers and their role for integrating sustainability.

The proposed model (Figure 7) may be used by an organization’s owners, top management team, managers, employees, and other members of an organization of various positions and
titles, for the purpose of understanding every individual’s and group’s, organization’s, and society’s role in the processes of organizational learning for corporate sustainability in the property sector. Since the model covers learning processes taking place across different organizational levels, it can be used with both a broad and narrow view of an organization’s objectives of integrating sustainability. Based on our analysis and conclusion, the broad view of the model may be of most practical interest and usage of individuals of the management team in an organization for the long-term strategic vision of sustainable development. A narrower view of the model based upon Table 12, can be of interest and usage to any members of an organization having a specific interest to take a more proactive approach to the implementation of sustainable practices.

7.1.4 Ethical Implications

In the very introduction of this thesis, we discussed how the growing social and environmental issues such as climate change and biodiversity loss have become too urgent to ignore and led to increased pressure on organization to implement sustainability initiatives (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2015; World Wildlife Fund, 2018). While we have throughout this thesis broadened the idea of sustainability from superficial practices to sustainability being an integrated building brick of an organization, the reality of organizations in the property sector leaving large negative environmental footprint is still not diminished. The basis still lies in organizations’ difficulties to deal with the complexity of sustainability in practice, not only in the property sector but across various industries. As a result, we see our research having a positive contribution to organizations as they get the practical tools to integrate corporate sustainability by effectively managing organizational learning across the different organizational levels. In the end, our research contributes to society across all aspects of sustainability – economic, environmental, and social - as organizations can learn how to decrease their environmental footprint by integrating sustainability with a dynamic learning process and as a result, decreasing the impact on the environment and contributing to a more sustainable world. Additionally, our study brings forth the role of society for an organization’s integration of sustainability, resulting in societal implications by introducing the importance of collaborations with actors such as municipalities and competitors for property management firms. Our research puts emphasis on anchoring mutual interest across society by involving various economic actors for city development projects, which creates added contribution of our study for the further development of sustainable cities.
In addition, our research can contribute to the ability to achieve Sweden’s action plan for the 2030’s Sustainability Development Goals by UN for the areas of “a strong business sector with corporate social responsibility” and “a sustainable society” (Government Offices of Sweden, 2018). Our proposed model can, by creating an understanding of the importance of organizations’ relationships with societal actors such as municipalities, be used to take a step closer on tackling the social and environmental issues described by the Paris Agreement and implemented by the national agenda.

7.2 Limitations

While we believe our research has answered our purpose and research questions in a qualitative manner, there are certain limitations of the study to be discussed. Our chosen research method for our study comes with both strengths and weaknesses. A single case method brings in-depth and unique data for a more holistic perspective of the phenomena of organizational learning and corporate sustainability but transferring the findings outside of the case company and sector to a different context may be deemed difficult in comparison to the use of multiple case method. In addition, there are limitations specific to the chosen context including choice of property sector, the Swedish cultural and geographical context, and the case company’s size, finances, and position in the property market. The case company’s unique presence in the Swedish market brings great and invaluable knowledge for our study but creates limitations for the study to be generalized across other sectors and markets. Instead, our study shows the unique role a larger and leading organization can have to inspire other large players in the markets to do the same and assist smaller companies to integrate sustainability.

Another limitation is based upon our sampling strategy, where snowballing strategy was used for choosing the interviewee respondents, resulting in limited research scope. Our respondents were represented by several of the organization’s different departments, from different offices, and of various positions and roles, which created opportunities for unique and qualitative findings across the organization. Due to the nature of our sampling strategy, one could argue there is a risk of subjectivity arisen when identifying respondents from within the organization. We cannot deem it impossible the respondents were neither biased nor subjective in their responses. As the case company was not anonymous, we acknowledge the risk of subjectivity in our findings. While most interviews were held face-to-face to capture
nuances and reactions to questions for the purpose of grasping a full understanding of the different perspectives of our research, one focus group was held through Skype due to illness and schedule difficulties. While Skype is an appreciated tool for an alternative interview format, we acknowledge the difference of data quality between the two because of the mentioned advantages of face-to-face interviews.

Aligned to our limitations for choice of sampling strategy is the time constraint present for our study. Due to the limited time scope and being restrained to one single company for data collection, we had sufficient time to visit two of the case company’s offices and interview 12 respondents. While we believe our respondents gave high-quality and a large amount of data, a larger sample size and collection from other regional offices could have given additional data for further conclusions. As a result, we acknowledge future research possibilities based upon all of our limitations – examining organizational learning and corporate sustainability across other sectors, using a multiple-case study to examine our proposed model with the extension of a societal level, and gathering further qualitative data for the ability to reach further conclusions within the field.

7.3 Future Research

Our study and presented limitations indicate the need for further research in the field. The use of qualitative research strategy for our study aimed to analyze how organizations can manage organizational learning to integrate corporate sustainability. Since our research approach aimed to understand the phenomena of organizational learning for integrating corporate sustainability in a specific context, we acknowledge further need of research is different areas with other research strategies and approaches. While our study will fill a gap in the research field, the limitations recently described is aligned to future research needed. We believe there is additional research needed to transfer our study to other contexts, such as different sectors and industries, examining companies of various sizes and resources, and on a global scale as well. Our model of managing organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability (Figure 7) can be examined with a multiple-case study to examine the phenomena in other settings as well as explore other industry- or company- specific context that may vary. Our study brings further need for research within each of the eight individual aspects identified through our proposed model. Further research on how organizations in practice can for instance create an open culture, deal with personality clashes between self-
leadership and autonomy, and develop the role of a champion, for the further investigation of integrating corporate sustainability with managing aspects found in Table 12.

By analyzing the way organizations can manage organizational learning in the process of integrating corporate sustainability in different contexts, our extension to societal level can be further examined. Findings showed the importance of collaborations and anchoring mutual interests on societal level to effectively integrate sustainability in an organization and as a result, contribute to society’s sustainable development. We believe it would be very interesting to further explore the learning mechanisms of integrating and institutionalizing on the societal level, based upon our proposed model, to find further aspects of importance for the integration of corporate sustainability within an organization. Nielsen et al. (2018) argued for how feedback loops lacked description in Crossan et al.’s (1999) 4I model and instead discussed how exploiting and exploring learning unfold similarly with feedforward and feedback loops. The dynamics of exploration and exploitation is still of interest for future research where we see opportunities of further examining the two concepts on the societal level to bring further insights based on our proposed model.

The choice of examining a for-profit organization opened for interesting findings and potential future research could also include hybrid- and non-profit businesses to examine if there are any differences present depending on the entity form of an organization.

7.4 Additional Thoughts

There is an old saying we wanted to contradict with our thesis – “you can’t teach an old dog new tricks” - which is the belief that people who have been used to doing things in a certain way for a very long time will not abandon their habits. We believe this can be applicable for organizations as well, which is why we aimed to provide understanding about the role of organizational learning for the integration of corporate sustainability – a field called so complex it’s said that organizations have major difficulties to deal with it in practice. Our examination of a leading organization’s practices within sustainability has shown that it might not be as difficult as one may think. We found many interesting aspects about sustainability from our study which we identified to be outside our research scope, but nonetheless important to bring up for discussion.
The concept of relearning emerged throughout theory for organizational learning which we found immensely interesting. How can organizations relearn beliefs, myths, and preconceived thoughts about sustainability? If corporate sustainability is said to be so complex to integrate in practice, relearning the inaccurate thoughts among the members of an organization could be argued to be the first essential step towards more sustainable corporations. When discussing relearning previous set beliefs and attitudes about sustainability with our respondents, many could not set a clear time when they believed the organization changed to having a more sustainable outlook. From an outside perspective, we were puzzled about the difficulties for the respondents to describe a time before sustainability was at the core of the organization. Perhaps it has always been there – perhaps it has been a process of slowly integrating sustainability within the organization in ways they had not realized. Was it the green and nature-like interior design of the offices, the 10 different recycling bins in the kitchen, or the lamp that led real sunlight through fiber technology to the reception? How did Vasakronan relearn? Our study gives an indirect response to this question and provides insights to other organizations to get inspired to do the same.

The property sector was described to be a “slow” industry changing to the external demands of more sustainable corporations, where we agreed on the lack of attention the sector has been given throughout the years. With such an immense negative footprint on the environment, can the property sector be fully sustainable? During our research, our eyes opened up for the role of society in the process of integrating sustainability. The interplay of societal actors such as municipalities and counties was not an aspect we had previously thought of but during these past months we have realized one very crucial aspect for integrating sustainability – together we can be better. By coming together within and across sectors, we can make an entire chain of activities more sustainable for a better world. As said about the attitude at Vasakronan – “If you’re big you have to be kind. Like Bamse”.

---

2 Andréasson, 1988
8. References


9. Appendices

9.1 Appendix 1: The Swedish Property Sector

Sweden’s four largest property markets are Stockholm, Gothenburg, Malmö, and Lund who’s ranking is based upon a property index established for the comparison between the submarkets within the sector (Svefa, 2018). In Stockholm, some of the largest private actors in the residential and commercial property market include D. Carnegie & Co, Ikano, and SKB respectively. AMF Fastigheter, Klövern, and Vasakronan. In Gothenburg, large residential owners are among other Stena Fastigheter, Balder, and Wallenstam whereas commercial property actors include, for example, Platzer, Vasakronan, and Castellum (Svefa, 2017). The highest yield of return is found within the property segment of offices at 13% while residential properties have seen a continuous decline at 8%, where the total volume of transactions in the property market amounted to 180 billion SEK (Svefa, 2018). While the volume of transactions is declining and concern exists of the development of all submarkets, this is mostly concentrated towards the residential property segment due to an increased risk aversion among customers and a fall of residential prices. In Stockholm’s central parts, the rate of vacancy among offices and retail premises is at a record low point of about 2-3% while Gothenburg has seen an increasingly strong development of such commercial properties as well (Svefa, 2018).

9.2 Appendix 2: Sustainability Map

Source: Vasakronan (2019b)
## 9.3 Appendix 3: Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Level</th>
<th>Learning Process</th>
<th>Individual Interview (Managers)</th>
<th>Focus Group (Employees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intuiting</td>
<td>Briefly describe your role at Vasakronan today.</td>
<td>Briefly describe your role at Vasakronan today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before you started working at Vasakronan, do you have any work-related experiences within the field of sustainability? If yes, can you give any examples?</td>
<td>Before you started working at Vasakronan, do you have any work-related experiences within the field of sustainability? If yes, can you give any examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How would you describe sustainability?</td>
<td>How would you describe sustainability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How are you working with sustainability today? Do you perceive that sustainability is an integrated part of your everyday working life? Explain/Give examples</td>
<td>How are you working with sustainability today? Do you perceive that sustainability is an integrated part of your everyday working life? Explain/Give examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you perceive that being a part of Vasakronan affects your private life when it comes to sustainability? In what way? Can you give examples?</td>
<td>Do you perceive that being a part of Vasakronan affects your private life when it comes to sustainability? In what way? Can you give examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How would you describe your leadership? How do you believe that affects the integration of sustainability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you actively seek new learnings about sustainability? If yes, where and in what ways do you collect this information?</td>
<td>Do you actively seek new learnings about sustainability? If yes, where and in what ways do you collect this information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Interpreting</td>
<td>How do you create common understanding and learnings about sustainability is between groups and departments? Do you perceive that there are any specific tools or methods used to provide knowledge for employees? Any examples?</td>
<td>How do you perceive that common understanding and learnings about sustainability is created between groups and departments? Do you perceive that there are any specific tools or methods used to provide knowledge for employees? Any examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrating</td>
<td>How do you perceive the organization enables for employees to initiate sustainability projects or the like?</td>
<td>How do you perceive the organization enables for employees to initiate sustainability projects or the like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have any specific tools or methods for collecting knowledge and ideas about sustainability from employees? Explain/Give examples If yes, how often do these occur?</td>
<td>Do you have anywhere you can turn to, or any tools you can use to share your knowledge and ideas about sustainability? Explain/Give examples If yes, how often do these occur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How do you work with external parties to create a common understanding on sustainability matters?</td>
<td>How do you work with external parties to create a common understanding on sustainability matters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How do you perceive the sustainability work is managed? Are there a few individuals or jointly managed? How and why do you believe it is in that way?</td>
<td>How do you perceive the sustainability work is managed? Are there a few individuals or jointly managed? How and why do you believe it is in that way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you believe the Head of sustainability is important for the integration of sustainability in the organization? If yes, in what ways?</td>
<td>Do you believe the Head of sustainability is important for the integration of sustainability in the organization? If yes, in what ways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Institutionalizing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you perceive the communication about sustainability among colleagues around you?</td>
<td>How do you perceive the communication about sustainability among colleagues around you? Is there a specific aspect of sustainability which is more discussed? Have the focus shifted over time? Explain how.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a specific aspect of sustainability which is more discussed? Has the focus shifted over time? Explain how.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe Vasakronan and its culture?</td>
<td>How would you describe Vasakronan and its culture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the vision “För den Goda Staden”, how do you perceive that this is being used within the organization? Do you perceive that it affects the work within the organization? How? How is the vision and sustainability goals communicated to 1) employees 2) external stakeholders such as tenants and suppliers?</td>
<td>Considering the vision “För den Goda Staden”, how do you perceive that this is being used within the organization? Do you perceive that it affects the work within the organization? How? How is the vision and sustainability goals communicated to 1) employees 2) external stakeholders such as tenants and suppliers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you break down the long-term goals for sustainability different projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you perceive the importance of awards and other advancements for how employees as well as external stakeholders perceive Vasakronan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you perceive resistance or enthusiasm among colleagues when it comes to integration of sustainability? Do you see any differences over time?</td>
<td>Do you perceive resistance or enthusiasm among colleagues when it comes to integration of sustainability? Do you see any differences over time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are your strategies similar across regions or do you work independently within the different regions? Do you learn from each other? If yes, in what ways?</td>
<td>Do you have any contact with other offices? If yes, in what ways? Do you perceive that there is a clear cooperation between regions or do every office work mostly independently?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ needs have a tendency to go in different directions. Is it difficult to balance different stakeholders’ needs? How is this managed for the purpose of integrating sustainability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to you, how is sustainability important from a business perspective?</td>
<td>According to you, how is sustainability important from a business perspective?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lastly, what are according to you the main factors for successfully integrating sustainability in the organization?</td>
<td>Lastly, what are according to you the main factors for successfully integrating sustainability in the organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Initial Coding

#### Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual and Group Level</th>
<th>Coding Close to Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “If you’re involved in discussions both internally and externally, and part of the agreement of a common perspective or goal, it’s much easier to continue and be passionate about it in your everyday tasks. It would be difficult if my manager would come back from a meeting and try to inspire me in the same way.” | 1. Involved in discussions and setting goals, which fosters passion  
2. Exploration  
3. Intuiting |

| “Our Head of Sustainability is brilliant when she talks about it [sustainability] and is really passionate about these questions […] She is very good at persuading people and getting people on the track to get them to understand the purpose and points why we work with these issues. She is needed after all and I think many companies need someone to steer in that way” | 1. Intuiting – Entrepreneurial, expert  
2. Passionate, communicative, knowledgeable and clear Head of Sustainability  
3. Important for the organization |

| “Because we are ISO 14001 certified we make internal audits and the important thing with these is not to see what people did or did not do but to open up for discussion. The internal auditors come from different parts of the organizations where an auditor from one department make an audit on another. […] People go across regions” | 1. Exploration and exploitation  
2. Internal audits which opens up for exchange of knowledge internally, across regions and departments. |

| “We have something called ‘Yammer’ which is like our internal Facebook, where we post different things, for instance what the initiative ‘Glad Stad’ have done recently or how they manage waste in Malmö” | 1. Tools for sharing sustainability initiatives and other experiences within the whole organization, across regions and departments.  
2. Interpreting |

#### Organizational Level

| “It is very important that the top management team set the direction to where the organization is heading regarding sustainability. There needs to be a great belief in the matter and that they set clear objectives, both short-and long-term goals”. | 1. Clear direction by setting clear goals  
2. Strong belief in sustainability initiatives |

| “I perceive that we have an open culture where one can go to anyone and ask. I believe that this has a lot to do with that we do not have our own offices or places which opens for greater interaction in a natural way” | 1. Open culture for interactions to occur  
2. Exploration |

| “We work a lot with communication with tenants. It is very much about argumentation about motives. For example, regarding temperature, we have “seasonal cards” and other material for the tenants” | 1. Communicating with tenants  
2. Educate tenants on sustainability |

#### Societal Level

| “For us, making the world a better place is fundamental, and not just making money, so if we can inspire others and if they would come further than us than that brings a lot of value. But I am very confident in that we will always be ahead since we constantly work towards new issues and areas of sustainability.” | 1. Sustainability is fundamental  
2. Want to inspire others  
3. Not afraid of knowledge spill-over |
“We try to inspire as much as possible because we want to get people onboard. It is not that we want to clap our chest and say “we are the best” but instead we want to bring everyone together because we cannot do everything on our own throughout the chain”

1. Inspire and bring everyone together
2. Integrate

Searching for Themes

**Individual – Intuition**
- Passion for sustainability
- Strong understanding of Sustainability
- Head of sustainability as a champion - strong knowledge, inspirational, communicative, award

**Group – Interpreting, Integrating**
- Tools - internal networks such as Yammer, Sofia, Stella
- Autonomy/responsibility given to employees
- Self-Leadership
- Internal audits (ISO14001) - open discussion, learning, employee involvement
- Involving and supportive leadership styles

**Organization – Integrating, Institutionalizing**
- High degree of integration, included in everything they do
- Informal organization
- Open and supportive culture
- Flat organization
- Dynamic process
- Dialogue on a regular basis - for instance: Friday meetings
- Communicating the wins (awards and advancements)
- Communicating the value of sustainability
- Constant learning
- Sustainability integrated in long term vision and goals
- Owners having values for sustainability

**Society**
- Cooperate with competitors, municipalities and partners
- Vision “For the Good City” guiding them outside the buildings towards
- "If you're big you have to be kind"
- Head of Sustainability lecturing to external parties
- Communicate economic value
**Reviewing Themes**

**Defining and Naming Themes**

**Individual and Group level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Leadership</td>
<td>→ Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Sustainability</td>
<td>→ Champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Movement and Networks</td>
<td>→ Cross-Regional Interactions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational level

**Main Findings**

| Sustainability in Vision & Goals | Sustainability Values |
| Open Culture & Flat Structure | Organizational Characteristics |
| Stakeholder Dialogue | Constant Communication |

Societal level

**Main Findings**

| Joint Project & Partnerships | Collaborations |
| Aim to Influence | Anchoring Mutual Interests |