Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

**Faculty of Natural Resources and
Agricultural Sciences**

Stakeholder dialogues in environmental management

Elin Haapaniemi

Stakeholder dialogues in environmental management

Elin Haapaniemi

Abstract

Issues of sustainability are complex and collaborative processes have become an increasingly popular method for confronting them. This is particularly noticeable within corporate environmental management, specifically within the widely adhered to environmental management system ISO 14001:2015 where the stakeholder perspective has been added. To gain this perspective some organizations conduct voluntary stakeholder dialogues concerning their environmental conduct. The aim of this study is to provide insight into this understudied area as well as develop our understanding of what quality can mean in these types of stakeholder dialogues. Using a case study approach, this was addressed by investigating the stakeholder dialogues performed by a Swedish corporate organization within the frames of their ISO 14001 system. The results show, that when evaluated based on their ability to create symmetrical two-way communications, it is possible to conduct qualitative stakeholder dialogues even in settings where stakeholders are not given final decision-making power. Furthermore, the study argues that the quality of the dialogues, especially in the context of CSR, are also contingent on the performance of the stakeholder analysis.

Keywords: stakeholder dialogue, stakeholder analysis, environmental management system, ISO 14001

Table of contents

Abbreviations

CSR – Corporate social responsibility

EMS – Enviromental management systems

ISO – International Organization for Standardization

1   Introduction

1.1   Introduction & background

Issues of sustainability in general, and environmental issues in particular, are complex and their cross-scale characteristics often require transdisciplinary solutions involving multiple actors. Collaborative processes have become an increasingly popular method for confronting sustainability issues due to their ability to enable a co-production of knowledge whilst also adhering to values such as democracy and inclusion (Joosse et al. 2020). The private sector, a sector that is central for sustainable development, has seen an increase in the adoption of collaborative processes. Within the private sector, collaborative processes can be understood through stakeholder theory, i.e. a way of managing an organization by including stakeholders' interests and claims (Johansen & Nielsen, 2011: 205f). The shift to more stakeholder inclusive processes has been particularly noticeable within corporate environmental management, specifically within the widely adhered to environmental management system (EMS) ISO 14001. An EMS is a common way for organizations to work with environmental issues and ISO 14001 is one of the most commonly adopted EMS in the world (ISO, 2020). ISO 14001 is a voluntary standard that organizations can certify to by fulfilling certain requirements (ISO, 2020). The standard was updated in 2015 and the new version included requirements stating that the organization must decide which stakeholders are relevant to the EMS and identify these stakeholders' relevant expectations and claims (SS-EN ISO 14001:2015). The standard does not specify how the requirements should be met. Organizations are therefore free to adopt different forms of stakeholder analysis and stakeholder engagement activities.

Some organizations certified to ISO 14001 choose to engage with their stakeholders through so-called stakeholder dialogues. Stakeholder dialogues, within the frames of ISO 14001, can be a way for organizations to understand stakeholders' expectations and claims in connections to their environmental practices and involve the stakeholders in these processes. The inclusion of the stakeholder perspective in such a widely used standard calls for a deeper understanding of how this requirement is met in practice. However, there is a lack of empirical material in relation to the practice of stakeholder dialogues and how they are understood (Golob & Podnar, 2014: 248). This is even more evident within the frames of ISO 14001, where I have found no studies specifically investigating stakeholder dialogues performed in an ISO 14001-system.

1.2   Problem discussion

Several previous studies aimed at understanding the practice of corporate stakeholder dialogues have evaluated them on the basis of the level of stakeholder participation (see for example Cummings, 2001 & Manetti, 2011). In these studies, the highest level of participation equals fully delegated decision-making power to the stakeholders (using Arnstein's (1969) 'Ladder of Citizen Participation'). These studies all reach similar conclusions, that few or no companies reach the higher levels of participation and it neither appears to be a desirable goal for the corporations to do so. Cummings (2001) concludes in their study that "...current methods of stakeholder engagement are not generally intended to give stakeholders control or even delegated power in decisions regarding corporate social responsibility" (49). This can be attributed to structural impediments preventing that sort of process, since to reach the highest level of the participation, (in these studies labelled as 'citizen control'), companies "would have to redefine their statutes, sometimes violating the principal that is commonly found in company law of safeguarding, as a priority, the investors and shareholders" (Manetti, 2011: 113).

It can, however, be questioned if participation, measured as level of delegation of power, is a fitting model to use when evaluating voluntary stakeholder dialogues within the private sector. It depends on how one views the stakeholder dialogue and its purpose. According to Perret (2003) many organizations shy away from stakeholder dialogues due to an unwillingness to give away power over decisions that affect how they conduct their business. Perret disagrees with this, stating that a "stakeholder dialogue is not necessarily about making decisions, more often it is used to inform decisions, to understand issues and to explore areas of common understanding" (385). Power over decisions is also connected to the issue of responsibility over those decisions. A company does not operate according to the same principles that characterize a representative democracy and needs to be able to be responsible for its own policy and conduct. As stated by Kaptein & Van Tulder (2003) a stakeholder dialogue "does not imply that stakeholders have the right to be involved in all decisions, that all stakeholder expectations have to be met, or that the company can hide behind the stakeholder dialogue" (211). Understood in this way, maximum levels of stakeholder control may not be a fitting evaluative tool or goal for voluntary stakeholder dialogues within a corporate setting. Furthermore, evaluative tools such as Arnstein's ladder assumes that more involvement of stakeholders is always positive and sought by the stakeholders themselves. Instead, it may be of greater interest to understand if the dialogues are able to serve a responsible treatment of stakeholders by evaluating the quality of the stakeholder dialogues and the selection of dialogue participants.

This may be done by understanding which type of stakeholder dialogue is being conducted and with which stakeholders. In this study, I will be examining voluntary stakeholder dialogues conducted by a private organization within the frames of its ISO 14001 system. The quality of the stakeholder dialogues will be evaluated according to Morsing & Schultz's (2006) division of three forms of company-stakeholder communications; informing, responding and involving. The latter form, involving (a two-way symmetrical form of communication), represents the most qualitative form of stakeholder dialogue that makes it possible for the company to act in a responsible manner towards its stakeholders. To complement the understanding of the practice of these dialogues, I will also investigate which stakeholders the company conducts stakeholder dialogues with and why. This will be analysed using theories of stakeholder analysis.

1.3   Aim & research questions

This study will address how a private company engaged in performing voluntary stakeholder dialogues as part of their environmental management:

- Defines and assesses its stakeholders?
- Defines what a stakeholder dialogue is?
- Performs stakeholder dialogues in practice and how the dialogues are perceived by the key actors involved (the company and its stakeholders)?

By addressing these questions, the thesis will provide insight to the understudied issues in the literature regarding the practice and practical understanding of stakeholder dialogues. The results will be discussed in relation to a framework on different dialogic practices and forms as well as a framework on different ways to assess stakeholders, making it possible to critically reflect on the moral and strategic characteristics of stakeholder dialogues. In doing so, the thesis aims to develop our understanding of what quality can mean in the context of voluntary stakeholder dialogues concerning corporate environmental management.

2   Theoretical framework

2.1   Stakeholder dialogues & CSR

Voluntary engagement of stakeholders in corporate environmental practice can be understood through stakeholder theory. Stakeholder theory builds on a critique of the assumption that the purpose of business is to only adhere to the interests and needs of shareholders or owners (typically in the form of maximizing profits). In contrast, stakeholder theory argues for the inclusion of interest and claims of other stakeholder groups (Johansen & Nielsen, 2011: 205f). This can be done in different ways but one, which is the focus of this study, is through stakeholder dialogues. The purpose of including stakeholder perspectives varies with different schools of thought, from ethical reasons to instrumental reasons concerning the achievement of economic objectives (Crane & Livesey, 2003: 39).

The ethical reasoning for stakeholder inclusion goes well with the concept of CSR (which includes environmental responsibility) and the practice of stakeholder dialogues. CSR can be defined as "...a stakeholder-oriented concept that extends beyond the organization's boundaries and is driven by an ethical understanding of the organization's responsibility for the impact of its business activities..." (Maon et al. 2008: 72). Since business ethics are largely focused on determining the objectives of business (Kaler, 2002: 95) a stakeholder dialogue concerning an organization's environmental practices can serve those ethical aims well. It is argued by several authors that CSR-related stakeholder dialogue has come to be seen as a key aspect of CSR or even a CSR-activity on its own (see for example O'Riordan & Fairbrass, 2008: 746; Pedersen, 2006: 140, & Kujala & Korhonen, 2017: 64).

This assumption is questioned by Greenwood (2007) who argues that engaging stakeholders is not necessarily an act of corporate responsibility. Such an assumption "does not account for the propensity of the organisation to act in self-interest, particularly where there is a large power imbalance in the favour of the organisation" (316f). It is therefore of interest to understand the different ways stakeholder dialogues can be constructed. This can be done by studying on which grounds stakeholders are included or excluded, as well as what 'type' of communication the dialogue assumes.

2.2   Stakeholder analysis

In order to conduct stakeholder dialogues, an organization needs to decide who they should talk to, meaning they need to determine who their stakeholders are. The process of identifying, and often prioritizing, stakeholders is labelled stakeholder analysis and can be performed in different ways with different levels of stakeholder participation (Reed et al. 2009). In order to conduct a stakeholder analysis, one needs to have a definition of who or what a stakeholder is. Even in academic circles there is countless definitions of what a "stakeholder" is without any particular one gaining consensus (Wagner et al. 2011). Many current definitions of "stakeholder" do, however, build on Freeman's (1984) seminal work on stakeholder theory (Reed et al. 2009: 1938). Freemans broad definition of a stakeholder is "any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives" (Freeman, 1984: 46).

This definition has come to be questioned in regard to business ethics. According to Greenwood (2007), "definitions of stakeholders as having an influence on the organisation, as being influenced by the organisation, or as mutually influential, hold only strategic considerations and thus are seen as morally neutral" (321). Instead of Freemans definition, the moral duties of an organization can be clarified by definitions depicting stakeholders as either moral or strategic (Ibid: 321). One such definition is proposed by Kaler

(2002), who categorizes stakeholders as either ''claimant'' or ''influencer'' stakeholders. Using the terminology in Mitchell et al.'s salience model (Mitchell et al., 1997), stakeholders that are high on attributes of legitimacy (so called claimant stakeholder) are more clearly stakeholders to whom an organization holds moral obligations. Whereas stakeholder high on attributes of power and/or urgency (so called influencer stakeholders) are stakeholders to whom an organization holds strategic obligations. Definitions, such as Freeman's, can therefore be labelled influencer definitions (Greenwood, 2007: 321).

The process of stakeholder analysis is of interest in this study since it is the organizations perception that determines which stakeholder merits consideration over others (Ferrón Vilchez et al. 2017: 3371). And since stakeholder analysis can be carried out in numerous ways, the method and definition chosen reflect particular views of the stakeholder conception. Having this in mind, it is also important to remember that due to practical restraints it may not be possible to include all stakeholder in a stakeholder dialogue (Reed et al. 2009: 1937f).

2.3 Different forms of stakeholder dialogues

There are different understandings in both theory and practice concerning what constitutes a stakeholder dialogue, with definitions ranging from information dissemination to participatory dialogues. Most scholars' definitions do, however, tend to be towards the latter end of the scale, arguing that a stakeholder dialogue is a form of two-way symmetrical communication, sometimes labelled 'genuine' dialogue (Crane & Livesey, 2003: 46f). In practice a stakeholder dialogue usually takes on a broader meaning, where "any kind of involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making processes is often labelled dialogue" (Golob & Podnar, 2014). When studying the practical performance of stakeholder dialogues, a broader understanding of the term may, therefore, be necessary whilst simultaneously being able to differentiate between different dialogic practices and forms.

Based on Grunig and Hunt's (1984) characterization of models of public relations, Morsing and Schultz (2006) outline three CSR communication strategies regarding how companies strategically interact with stakeholder groups. The first strategy is informing, which is a one-way form of communication, the second is responding, which is a two-way asymmetrical form of communication, and the third is involving, which is a two-way symmetrical form of communication. The three different forms of communication are elaborated below and will be used to analyse the stakeholder dialogues under investigation.

2.3.1 Informing – one-way communication

Information dissemination about environmental practice is a common communication strategy employed by companies (Burchell & Cook, 2012: 506). This strategy consists of a one-way communication initiated and controlled by the organisation with the intent of informing their stakeholders about the organization's environmental conduct. This strategy is based on the organization's perception that they are doing the right thing and just needs to inform stakeholders about their practices to maintain stakeholder support (Morsing & Schultz, 2006: 326f). Few scholars label this form of communication as 'dialogue' but some acknowledge that information dissemination is a necessary part of a stakeholder dialogue process (Ibid: 328). It is also mentioned since this is a form of communication that is performed in practice and by these practitioners often labelled as a form of stakeholder dialogue (Golob & Podnar, 2014: 251). The strategy has been criticised due to its lack of interaction and involvement of stakeholders. Critics have argued that in this form of communication organizations decide which information stakeholders require, rather than listening to the expectations and claims raised by the stakeholders themselves (Burchell & Cook, 2006: 211).

2.3.2   Responding – two-way asymmetrical communication

A two-way asymmetrical communication represents a somewhat superficial application of a stakeholder dialogue process. This communication strategy gathers information from the stakeholders in order to identify messages that will produce the attitudes and behaviours desired by the organisation (Crane & Livesey, 2003: 44). This form of communication can, therefore, be described as "feedback in terms of finding out what the public will accept and tolerate" (Morsing & Schultz, 2006: 327). Furthermore, an asymmetrical two-way communication has persuasive intentions where the self-interest of the organisation remains the main motive (Golob & Podnar, 2014: 249). This assumes an imbalance from the effects of the stakeholder dialogues that is in favour of the organisation, as the organisation does not change as a result of the dialogue (Morsing & Schultz, 2006: 327). Even though stakeholders can be listened to in this strategy, responding to stakeholders is a sender-oriented activity that "runs the risk of only hearing its own voice being reflected back; the company asks its stakeholders questions within a framework" (Ibid: 327). An asymmetrical communication only allows stakeholders to respond to corporate action as opposed to suggest or participate in their creation (Ibid: 326).

2.3.3   Involving – two-way symmetrical communication

The final communication strategy is the form many scholars argue to represent a 'genuine' stakeholder dialogue (Crane & Livesey, 2003: 48f). In this form of communication persuasion can still occur, but it differs from asymmetrical persuasion in the sense that the party's interests need to be represented in such a way that both persuade and allow the other to persuade. This means that parties to a symmetrical dialogue should be open to transformative effects of their communication. In extension, this can potentially bring stakeholders into decision-making processes of the organization (Ibid: 47f). In a symmetrical stakeholder dialogue centring around environmental issues and corporate environmental conduct, stakeholders are not only able to respond to corporate action, instead they are able to negotiate and co-create corporate environmental practice (Morsing & Schultz, 2006: 326). This type of stakeholder dialogue can be defined as "a process in which parties with different interests and values at stake in a particular issue work together towards mutually acceptable solutions" (Perret 2003: 385).

A stakeholder dialogue is, however, not necessarily about making decisions. It can also centre around understanding specific issues and exploring areas of mutual understanding (Ibid: 385). In this sense, the ability to persuade and be persuaded can be part of a sense making process where the parties come to understand the situation from each other's perspective (Foster & Junker, 2005: 52f). A stakeholder dialogue can, then, be both a tool for understanding and answering stakeholders' interest as well as a means for communicating an organisation needs and expectations. By doing so, it is possible to co-create mutual understanding between the organization and its stakeholders (Signori, 2017: 167). The transformative effects of the stakeholder dialogue can, then, be understood by "conceptualising the communicative process not as involving *exchange* of information but rather the constitution of meaning itself" (Crane & Livesey, 2003: 48). A stakeholder dialogue can, therefore, be about the construction of meaning in pursuit of mutual understanding (Golob & Podnar, 2014: 250).

Morsing and Schultz (2006), like many other scholars writing about stakeholder dialogues (see for example Foster & Jonker, 2005), draw on Habermas and his 'discourse ethic' when studying and justifying the performance of stakeholder dialogues. In doing so, they aim for a dialogue that is non-hierarchical and power-free (Morsing & Schultz, 2006). The possibility of a non-hierarchical dialogue can be questioned in general and can specifically be questioned in regard to voluntarily conducted stakeholder dialogues controlled and initiated by one dialogue party. Crane & Livesey (2003) argues instead that a symmetrical two-way communication often occurs, not where power is absent, but where stakeholders are regarded as having significant degrees of power and influence (48). An

organization's perception of a stakeholder's relative power can then be a possible explanatory factor as to why a stakeholder dialogue was or was not able to be conducted by two-way symmetrical communication.

3 Method

3.1 Case study design

A case study design is typically adopted within qualitative research and aims to give a detailed analysis of, often, a single case (Bryman 2012: 66). The case study as a research design has been criticised for its inability to produce generalizable data (Flyvbjerg, 2006). This criticism is, however, not necessarily relevant since the objective of case studies are rather to "expand and generalise theories (analytic generalization)" then to "extrapolate probabilities (statistical generalizations)" (Yin, 2014: 21). Using a case study design, it is possible to get an in-depth understanding of the understudied aspects of stakeholder dialogues.

3.1.1 Selection of specific case

The phenomenon this study aims to investigate is voluntarily conducted stakeholder dialogues concerning environmental practises or issues within a private company that is certified to ISO 14001: 2015. The specific case for this study, then, is a privately owned organization that conducts stakeholder dialogues concerning environmental practices or issues and are a) certified in accordance to ISO 14001:2015, and b) performing them voluntarily, meaning they are neither regulated by law (such as consultation processes demanded by law), or any voluntarily adhered to standard (such as GRI) to conduct stakeholder dialogues. These requirements, along with an interest in participating in the study, were fulfilled by the stakeholder dialogues conducted by the Swedish textile service company Textilia and was, therefore, chosen for this study. Textilia is the biggest supplier of textile services within the healthcare sector in Sweden, but they also have clients within other sectors. Textilia has operations in eight places in Sweden and employs around 650 people (Textilia, 2020).

3.2 Method

To get an in-depth understanding of these specific stakeholder dialogues a mixture of qualitative methods for the data collection were used. The specific methods employed were semi-structured interviews, questionnaires and document analysis. The use of different methods corresponds well with the case study design, a research design where it is common and fitting to use more than one method (Creswell, 2014: 43). It is also a part of strengthening the credibility of the research by so-called data triangulation (Ibid: 201). Furthermore, by using different sources and methods, the study aims to capture different dimensions of the phenomenon under investigation.

Data	Sources
Semi-structured interviews	Textilia (3), stakeholders (4)
Questionnaires	Stakeholders (4)
Documents	Documents that mention, regulates or are used by Textilia in relation to their stakeholder dialogues (6)

Table 1. Overview of collected data and sources

3.2.1 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews are a method for obtaining nuanced descriptions of specific situations and aspects of the subject's life worlds (Kvale, 1996: 30). They are often employed

in order to highlight a specific phenomenon and the meaning people ascribe to that phenomenon (Esaiasson et al. 2012: 252). This type of method is suited for answering the research questions posed in this study since they aim to find out 1) what the interviewees mean by dialogue and stakeholder, i.e. their understanding of the concepts, and 2) how the stakeholder analysis and stakeholder dialogues where performed and perceived, i.e. descriptions of these specific situations as well as the interviewees experiences of and interpretations about them.

The interviews followed an interview guide, one for personnel at Textilia (see Appendix 1) and another for stakeholders (see Appendix 2). Due to the semi-structured nature of the interviews, all of the questions in the guide were not necessarily asked nor posed in that specific order. During the interviews, interpreting questions were also posed to try and clarify and verify the answers throughout the interview (Kvale, 1996: 143). This type of question was formulated based on the responses during the interviews and are, therefore, not part of the interview guide.

Due to the travel restrictions and recommendations concerning social distancing put in effect in regard to the covid-19 pandemic (Folkhälsomyndigheten, 2020), the interviews were conducted over the phone. There are studies that suggest that phone interviews tend to be shorter and less in-depth than those performed face-to-face (Irvine, 2011) and there are studies suggesting small or no differences between the two methods regarding data quality (Sturges & Hanrahan, 2004). It is not possible to determine how this affected this study, but all interviews lasted between 30 and 60 minutes and provided data that was used for the analysis. Phone interviews can be more practically attainable for both the interviewee and the interviewer and the choice of this method may, therefore, have increased the number of interviews for this study.

3.2.2 Questionnaire

To increase the amount of observations and inputs, stakeholders contacted at a later stage of the data collection period were offered the possibility to participate either via a phone interview or by answering questions via email. The questionnaire consisted of four questions (see Appendix 3).

A questionnaire is a method that is generally not equivalent to interviews in regard of receiving lengthy answers to open ended questions (Esaiasson et al. 2012: 236). This was also evident in this study where similar questions posed in the phone interviews received lengthier and more in-depth answers. These differences will be reflected in the usage of each source in the result section.

3.2.3 Document analysis

When in contact with Textilia, it was evident that there were documents that regulated the process of their stakeholder dialogues as well as documents containing information concerning the practical performance of the stakeholder dialogues. To get a fuller picture of the stakeholder dialogues some central documents to the process were chosen for analysis.

3.2.4 Alternative research design

The research questions of this study could also be addressed using other types of qualitative research methods. One method that could have produced complementary data material is an observation of Textilia's stakeholder dialogues. For this study, observations could have provided complementary data specifically in regard to the research question of how the stakeholder dialogues are performed. An observation would have provided first-hand data of the process and would, perhaps, generate information about things that were not mentioned by the interviewees.

An observation was, however, not possible to conduct since Textilia did not perform any stakeholder dialogues during the period of the research process. Furthermore,

observations do not provide data concerning people's intentions in regard to their actions nor their perceptions of certain situations (Esaiasson et al. 2012: 305). The other research questions are, therefore, better suited to be addressed with the used methods.

3.3   Actor and data selection

3.3.1   Interviewees - Textilia

When choosing interviewees from Textilia, the principle of centrality was employed. This means that interviewees were chosen based on their involvement and knowledge of the phenomena under study (Esaiasson et al. 2012: 258), in this case the stakeholder dialogues. At Textilia there were three people who were directly involved in the process of conducting the stakeholder dialogues. The first one was Jonas Olaison who is the Sustainability manager. He initiated the processes regarding the stakeholder dialogues and has the main responsibility over them. He has also created and been a part of several of their stakeholder dialogues (Jonas, Sustainability manager). The second interviewee was Anna Hallberg who is the Communication manager. She constructed their routine for the stakeholder dialogues and has been a part of creating and partaking in several stakeholder dialogues (Anna, Communication manager). The third interview was conducted with Textilia's CEO Fredrik Lagerkvist. As CEO, Fredrik is ultimately responsible for the stakeholder dialogues. He has been part of some of the stakeholder dialogues and conducts one of them himself (Fredrik, CEO). All of them are also part of the management team, which conducts both the stakeholder analysis and the treatment of the information gathered from the stakeholder dialogues (Jonas, Sustainability manager).

3.3.2   Interviewees - stakeholders

The selection of stakeholder participants was done in two ways. First, Textilia provided contact information to four stakeholders whom had partaken in one or more of their stakeholder dialogues. All of them were contacted and two agreed to an interview. Second, the company provided a participation list from one specific stakeholder dialogue. Out of the 30 stakeholders on the list, contact information to 15 of them were found (by searching on Google). Out of these 15, 6 agreed to participate in the study. Four of them answered questions via email and two agreed to an interview.

The eight stakeholders who participated in the study can be sorted into the following groups; customers (4), suppliers (3), NGO's (1). The spread in stakeholder groups are deemed positive in relation to getting different perspectives on the stakeholder dialogues. However, due to the small sample of each group the study will not draw conclusions in relation to them.

Stakeholder	Stakeholder group	Method of data collection
Stakeholder 1	Customer	Phone-interview
Stakeholder 2	Supplier	Questionnaire
Stakeholder 3	Supplier	Phone-interview
Stakeholder 4	NGO	Phone-interview
Stakeholder 5	Supplier	Phone-interview
Stakeholder 6	Customer	Questionnaire
Stakeholder 7	Customer	Questionnaire
Stakeholder 8	Customer	Questionnaire

Table 2 Overview of stakeholder respondents

3.3.3 Documents

The selection of documents was done in two ways. First, by searching for documents published on Textilia's website that mentioned stakeholder dialogues. Second, by gaining access to internal documents chosen by Jonas based on his perception of their relevance for Textilia's stakeholder dialogues and this study. During the interviews with Textilia, no other documents relevant for their stakeholder dialogues were referred to. All of the documents are produced by Textilia.

Title	Description of document	Published on Textilia's website	Number of pages
Assessment of stakeholders	An excel-file containing the identification and assessment of Textilia's stakeholders	No	Not applicable
Summary stakeholder dialogue 2016	A summary from a stakeholder dialogue in 2016	Yes	5
Sustainability report 2018	Textilia's first sustainability report[1]	Yes	27
Stakeholder dialogue – routine	An internal routine for the process of Textilia's stakeholder analysis and stakeholder dialogues	No	3
Stakeholder dialogue 2016	A power-point presentation used during a stakeholder dialogue in 2016	No	11
Workshop stakeholder dialogue	A power-point presentation describing and containing the process of one type of stakeholder dialogue	No	15

---

[1] Textilia's sustainability report for 2019 was not part of the data sources due to it being published late in the thesis process. A brief analysis of the document rendered its content similar to the sustainability report from 2018 and the demarcation of this document is, therefore, not believed to have an effect on the results of this study.

Table 3 Overview of documents used for the analysis.

3.4   Data analysis

All interviews were transcribed in verbatim but did not include descriptions of pauses or emotional tone etc. that might be important for other types of analyses (such as psychological interpretations, Kvale, 1996: 171). After the interviews were transcribed, they were read in their entirety and then sorted under themes according to the interview guide and then into subcategories that corresponded with the theoretical framework. The questionnaires and documents were handled in the same manner. All data material was in Swedish. Quotes and citations from the interviews, questionaries and documents are therefore transcribed to English in the result section. Original quotes and citations can be found in appendix 4.

   The data presented in the result section have not been sorted based on what was said the most times or by the greatest number of interviewees. Instead all different aspects of the phenomenon that were mentioned are presented. This is due to the aim of the study, where the focus lies in the study's ability to showcase different actors' perceptions of the investigated phenomena and exemplify its practical application, not to produce a result that is necessarily generalizable to other stakeholder dialogues. Furthermore, the aim is neither to conduct an assessment of the stakeholder analysis and stakeholder dialogues under investigation, but to increase understanding of their practical application. However, this does not hinder a critical discussion and reflection of the results.

3.5   Operationalization of key concepts

3.5.1 Stakeholder analysis

For the analysis of Textilia's stakeholder analysis, special attention was paid to the concepts of power, urgency and legitimacy in defining and assessing stakeholders. The definitions for the three concepts are from Mitchell et al's (1997) salience model but will be analysed from the perspective of Kaler's (2002) definition of 'claimant' and 'influencer' stakeholders.

   Mitchell et al. (1997) uses the definition presented in Pfeffer (1981:3), where power is defined as "a relationship among social actors in which one social actor, A, can get another social actor, B, to do something that B would not have otherwise done". Using power as a way to define and assess stakeholders will be deemed to have happened if the organization demarcates stakeholders based on their perception of the ability of a stakeholder to influence the organization's environmental practices.

   Mitchell et al. (1997) uses the definition presented in Suchman (1995: 574), where legitimacy is defined as "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, definitions". Using legitimacy as a way to define and assess stakeholders will be deemed to have happened if the organization demarcates stakeholders based on their perception of how desirable, proper, or appropriate it is for the stakeholder to have claims on their environmental practices.

   Urgency is defined as "the degree to which stakeholder claims call for immediate attention" (Mitchell et al, 1997: 867). The degree of urgency is based on how time sensitive and how critical, i.e. how important, the claim is to the stakeholder (ibid). Using urgency as a way to define and assess stakeholders will be deemed to have happened if the organization demarcates stakeholders based on their perception of how time sensitive and important the organization's environmental conduct is to a stakeholder.

3.5.2 Stakeholder dialogues – one way or two-way communication

For the analysis of Textilia's definition of stakeholder dialogue as well as the performance and perception of the dialogues, the focus laid in finding which style of communication (informing, responding or involving) that the whole or aspects of the process best would be described as. To do this, attention was paid to firstly determine if the stakeholder dialogue was a one-way or a two-way communication.

A one-way communication is defined as information dissemination initiated and controlled by the organization (Morsing & Schultz, 2006: 326f). In relation to environmental practices, a one-way communication can, for example, be in the form of a sustainability report or information of environmental conduct on the organization's webpage.

A two-way communication can instead be identified as an interaction where the organization as well as the stakeholders partake in the communication. In relation to stakeholder dialogues concerning environmental practices, this can, for example, be in the form of interactions where stakeholders are asked to give input regarding the organization's environmental management and practices.

3.5.3 Stakeholder dialogues – symmetrical or asymmetrical communication

When the dialogue was identified as a two-way communication, the focus laid in determining if it was an asymmetrical or symmetrical communication. This was determined by looking at the following theoretical concepts: mutual understanding, persuasion, openness to change, mutually acceptable solutions and openness of the agenda.

Mutual understanding: To investigate this aspect of the stakeholder dialogues, the analysis will firstly determine if the organization's stakeholder dialogues practically allow for the sharing of different parties' perspectives. This is important since it is not possible to reach or create a mutual understanding between different parties if not all parties' perspectives are raised and heard. Secondly, it is relevant to understand the participants perception of the dialogues ability to create mutual understanding. Mutual understanding can be understood to have happened if the parties express that they have been able to share theirs as well as understand other parties perspectives and if they perceive there to be any mutual understanding in the form of overlap of understanding between parties (based on the definition of mutual understanding presented by Rogers and Kincaid (1981: 64)).

Persuasion: To investigate this, the focus will lie in firstly determining if the dialogue practically allow for the sharing of different parties' perspectives (based on the understanding of persuasion presented by Foster & Jonker, 2005: 52f). Secondly, the analysis will focus on the dialogue parties' expressions of a) wanting to persuade and change the other party, and b) if they, themselves, were open to be persuaded and change as a result of the dialogue[2].

Openness to change & mutually acceptable solutions: In this context, change refers to the organization's openness to alter their environmental conduct in accordance to stakeholders' perspectives. To investigate this, the analysis will firstly focus on determining if the organization has a process that incorporates stakeholders' perspectives when formulating their environmental practices. If such a process exists, the analysis will investigate if this process is structured in a way that aims for mutually acceptable solutions i.e. solutions that reflect the opinions of both the stakeholders and the organization. Furthermore, it is of interest to explore how the stakeholder perceive Textilia's openness to change and their ability to influence, and thereby change, Textilia's environmental practices[3].

---

[2] Change and openness to change is defined and operationalized below.

[3] It could also be possible to explore this by determining if there actually has occurred a change in the organization's environmental practices in accordance to stakeholders' expectations and claims. However, to make that assessment would require a different type of study and data collection. Furthermore, a process that is open to changes is not necessarily the same as actually changing since there can be other obstacles (such as time, money, legal obligations) that can hinder change to occur.

Openness of the agenda: To investigate this aspect of the stakeholder dialogues, the analysis will focus on which party (or parties) set the agenda. In a situation where the agenda is set by the organization, the analysis will focus on the type of questions asked. An asymmetrical approach could, for example, be in the form of stakeholders only being able to provide the company with feedback concerning certain, already decided, environmental practices (or being able to decide between which of issue x and y they think that the company should focus on). A symmetrical approach would instead allow for stakeholders to more freely state environmental issues they want the company to work with.

3.6   Ethical considerations

3.6.1   Volontary participation & informed consent

In regard to the research being conducted in line with ethical standards, it is important to collect informed consent from the participants and that their participation is on a voluntary basis (Kvale, 1996: 112). All of the participants were contacted via email asking them to participate in the study and the email stated the purpose of the study. All participation was, therefore, voluntary and conducted after consent was collected. The purpose of the study and the possibility to withdraw their participation was stated again in the beginning of each interview. For the interviews, consent was also collected for the use of a tape recorder, which all participants agreed to.

3.6.2   Confidentiality

If a study is to publish identifiable information about the subjects, it is important to collect consent regarding this (Kvale, 1996: 114). All participants were given the opportunity to be anonymous and it was stated that they could decide this both before and after the interview was conducted. Textilia as an organization was also given the opportunity to read the finished thesis before deciding if they wanted to be anonymous or not. Some of the stakeholder interviewees asked to be anonymous. To ensure their anonymity, all participating stakeholders were made anonymous.

3.6.3   Use of data material

Lastly, ethical guidelines have to be considered for the usage of the collected material. This entails a secure storage of recordings and transcripts and that recordings are deleted when they are no longer in use (Kvale, 1996: 172). For this study, the recordings, transcriptions, questionnaire answers and documents were only handled by the thesis writer and no one else had access to the material.

3.7   Credibility

In addition to the employed techniques of data triangulation, interpreting interview questions and transparency in regard to the data collection and analysis, the credibility of a qualitative research study can be strengthened by a discussion of reflexivity (Creswell, 2014: 186f).

For this study, my personal opinions and experiences in regard to sustainable development as well as stakeholder dialogues can be of interest for the evaluation of potential researcher bias. Sustainable development is, according to me, a pressing issue and the involvement of private organizations is vital for its creation. In my limited professional experience as an environmental consultant I have come across different definitions and

---

Meaning that measuring actual change may not be a true measurement of whether the way the stakeholder dialogue process is performed actually is open to change or not.

practices of stakeholder dialogues but have myself never participated in or organized a stakeholder dialogue. As a master student in environmental communication, I believe communication between different actors in society to be an important tool for sustainable development. Stakeholder dialogues as a method, therefore, interested me. With this study I have a personal interest in understanding the practical applicability as well as theoretical possibility of stakeholder dialogues. I do not have a personal interest in reaching a result that is favourable or not in regard to stakeholder dialogues as a method. Finally, outside of this study, I have no relation to Textilia.

4   Result & analysis

4.1   Stakeholder analysis

Before performing a stakeholder dialogue, an organization needs to conduct some sort of stakeholder analysis i.e. identifying and assessing who their stakeholders are (Reed et al. 2009). Accordingly, Textilia starts their stakeholder dialogue process by performing a stakeholder analysis. They do this by defining what a stakeholder is and then identifies and assess their stakeholders (Stakeholder dialogue - routine). Textilia uses the following definition of what a stakeholder is

> "A stakeholder is a person or an organisation that can affect, be affected or consider themselves to be affected by a decision or a measure" (Stakeholder dialogue - routine, Appendix 4: 1.1).

This definition is very similar to Freemans broad definition, where the focus lies in the stakeholder's ability to affect or be affected by the individual organisation. As stated by Greenwood (2007), definitions focused on a stakeholder's ability to influence or being influenced are concerned with power and holds only strategic considerations (321). Textilia's definition can, therefore, be labelled an influencer definition. In relation to business ethics, such a definition is rendered morally neutral (Greenwood, 2007: 321). Using this definition, Textilia has identified 25 different stakeholders. Their stakeholders range from those who clearly can affect and be affected by Textilia's operations (such as customers and owners), to those where this connection is vaguer (such as NGOs and local neighbours) (Assessment of stakeholders).

After constructing a list of all their stakeholders, Textilia conducts an assessment in order to find out which of these are their 'most important stakeholders' (Anna, Communication manager; Assessment of stakeholders). This will determine which stakeholders they will engage in their stakeholder dialogues (Stakeholder dialogue - routine). The assessment is done by answering two questions about each stakeholder 1) "How important is it for us to conduct dialog/listen to this stakeholder's claim?" and 2) "How important is it to this stakeholder to conduct dialogue/listen to our claims?" (Assessment of stakeholders, Appendix 4: 1.2). The answers consist of a number of 1 to 3, where 1 represents "not important", 2 represents "fairly important" and 3 represents "invaluable" (Assessment of stakeholders, Appendix 4: 1.3). Each stakeholder then receives two numbers which are multiplied and if the product is 6 or higher, the stakeholder is regarded as one of their most important stakeholders (Stakeholder dialogue - routine). Out of the 25 listed stakeholders, Textilia identifies the following four as their most important; Region customers, suppliers of textiles, employees and owners (Assessment of stakeholders). Anna comments on this process stating that

> "a stakeholder is someone that put claims on us, but also has a big influence, as well as we put claims on or influence that stakeholder" (Anna, Communication manager; Appendix 4: 1.4).

It is then clear that the assessment is focused on aspects of power and that the "importance to conduct dialogue" lies in a stakeholder ability to affect Textilia as well as Textilia's level of influence on this stakeholder. Fredrik explains these questions by stating that the assessment also takes into consideration their perception of how important environmental issues are to different stakeholders "it reflects our perception of how much, how much emphasis they place on these issues themselves" (Fredrik, CEO; Appendix 4: 1.5). This can be understood as Textilia's perceived ranking of the level of urgency the stakeholders place on environmental issues. Demarcating stakeholders based on attributes of influence and urgency is in line with an influencer definition (Greenwood, 2007: 321).

The two questions can also be further analysed in light of the information provided by the interviews. The first question aims to assess how much this specific stakeholder can affect Textilia. The stakeholders who receive a 1 on the first question (meaning they will not be able to be classified as one of the most important stakeholders) are stakeholders who are low on attributes of influence. This question, then, excludes less influential stakeholders from Textilia's stakeholder dialogues. The second question does not fully assess how much Textilia can affect the specific stakeholder, more accurately it measures how much Textilia can *influence* the specific stakeholder. The stakeholder who receives a 1 on the second question (meaning they will not be able to be classified as one of the most important stakeholders) are stakeholders who do not have the type of relationship with Textilia where Textilia puts demands on them. Thus, this question excludes stakeholders who are affected by Textilia, not by a business relationship in terms of demands, but due to their operations and organizational practice.

Conducting their assessment by answering these two questions, Textilia identifies stakeholders to whom they have a rather symmetrical relationship in terms of being equally or similarly able to influence each other. As argued by Crane & Livesey (2003), a symmetrical two-way communication (a genuine stakeholder dialogue) often occurs where stakeholders are *regarded* as having significant degrees of power and influence (48). Textilia's stakeholder analysis reveals four stakeholders who they regard to have significant degrees of power and influence. Performing a stakeholder analysis in this way may increase the probability of their stakeholder dialogues to be perceived as a two-way symmetrical communication by these stakeholders.

4.2   Stakeholder dialogue – definition

According to Textilia's internal document "Stakeholder dialogue - routine", a stakeholder dialogue concerning environmental issues and practices is a process that is preceded by an identification and assessment of stakeholders, in order to then conduct stakeholder dialogues with their most important stakeholders. The dialogues have the intent of finding out the environmental issues these stakeholders find most important and use this information as a part of Textilia's risk assessment (Stakeholder dialogue - routine). This definition is also mentioned during the interviews when Textilia defines what a stakeholder dialogue is

> "When talking about stakeholder dialogues from a CSR or sustainability perspective (..) then that is the dialogue where we identify who is important and what do they find most important. And that gives us input regarding what we shall focus on" (Jonas, Sustainability manager; Appendix 4: 2.1).

From this definition, the stakeholder dialogue includes both the actual communicative interaction as well as processes preceding and following that instance. As Anna states

> "it is quite difficult to say if it has a beginning and an end, but it is not just those four hours when we meet up. There is a start-up period and a long period afterwards" (Anna, Communication manager; Appendix 4: 2.2).

From this definition, there seems to be a focus on information gathering concerning the expectations and claims of the stakeholders and not a sharing of the organizations own perspectives on the subject. It is a prerequisite for the creation of mutual understanding that both parties of a dialogue share their perspectives on the subject. This is an important aspect of a symmetrical two-way communication (Crane & Livesey, 2003: 48). Furthermore, it can also be an asymmetry in the sense that only one party (the stakeholders) is able to persuade instead of both parties trying to persuade as well as be open to being persuaded (Crane & Livesey, 2003: 47f). The focus on information gathering is also prevalent in the interviews. Anna states that their stakeholder dialogues are different from other forms of communication with their stakeholder in the sense that

24

"we listen to the stakeholders much more. Other forms of communication are generally mainly concerned with what we think or which issues we find important to push. In this case it is the other way around and we really want to, and put in effort to, let the stakeholders come with their input" (Anna, Communication manager; Appendix 4: 2.3).

The interviews do, however, portray a more complex picture of what a stakeholder dialogue is according to Textilia. When Fredrik answers the question of what a stakeholder dialogue is, he does mention that it is a method for information gathering but also highlights an aim of reaching mutually acceptable solutions

"a structured way to understand what is their opinions, input, comments, focus for, example, our environmental practices. So you could say it is a structured process to jointly open up a dialogue and reach objectives that reflects the interest of all parties" (Fredrik, CEO; Appendix 4: 2.4).

Aiming for mutually acceptable solutions is an important feature of a symmetrical two-way communication (Morsing & Schultz, 2006: 328). Furthermore, when Anna was asked what a successful stakeholder dialogue is, she highlights mutual understanding and consensus

"when you in some way are able to reach common insights (..) when you are able to reach consensus on important issues even though it might be inconvenient" (Anna, Communication manager; Appendix 4: 2.5).

Achieving mutual understanding as well as seeking consensus on an issue are also significant features of a symmetrical two-way communication (Morsing & Schultz, 2006: 328).
Finally, the stakeholder dialogues are also mentioned to be a forum for persuading stakeholders and being persuaded by stakeholders and that Textilia is open to potentially transformative effects. When asked if the stakeholder dialogues are used to try to change stakeholders' opinions regarding environmental practices, Anna answers

"yes well absolutely, absolutely. We continue to persistently push our issue, to let people know about the difference, to clarify, as much as we can help to influence" (Anna, Communication manager; Appendix 4: 2.6).

Fredrik also mentions this aspect of the dialogue when discussing limitations of what is possible to change in their environmental work, stating that the dialogue is a process of deliberation

"if someone says "but you need to have renewable fuel in all tanks of all of your trucks" and we say "but it is more important to work with the waste issue", well then you would have to argue for both of those positions in that dialogue" (Fredrik, CEO; Appendix 4: 2.7).

The dialogues are then, not only a forum for Textilia to try and persuade their stakeholders, but also a forum for the stakeholders to try and persuade Textilia and influence their environmental practices. Stakeholder influence is an important characteristic of the stakeholder dialogues according to Textilia, stating that "you have an opportunity to influence in the stakeholder dialogue, otherwise we would not have it" (Jonas, Sustainability manager; Appendix 4: 2.8). Persuasion is mentioned in both the categories "asymmetrical two-way communication" and "symmetrical two-way communication". The difference lies in the possibility for all parties, not just the company, to persuade as well as the openness of all parties to be persuaded (Crane & Livesey, 2003: 47f). In this regard, Textilia's reasoning around persuasion is in line with a symmetrical two-way communication approach where they want to persuade and be persuaded and are open to change as a result of the dialogue.
Textilia does, however, clarify that there are clear limitations to stakeholder influence "in the end, it is we as a company who decide how we run the business"(Jonas, Sustainability manager; Appendix 4: 1.9) and explains that the information gathered during the dialogues is best viewed as input.

"It is for us to interpret and, by ourselves, value this input and that is something one probably should be in the clear about (..) it does not mean that it will be as it has been said in this stakeholder dialogue" (Jonas, Sustainability manager; Appendix 4: 2.10).

Fredrik is of a similar opinion, stating that

> "the whole context for this is a dialogue. It is not like we start off by saying that "good, come with ideas and then we will make them happen". So that is, first of all, the whole context. It is a dialogue and an inspiration, and it is about finding good measures that we are able to implement. But we do not promise anything from the beginning" (Fredrik, CEO; Appendix 4: 2.11).

This quote clearly states that the stakeholder dialogues are a place for negotiation and inspiration, but not a forum for final decision-making. That is, instead, an internal process for the management group at Textilia (Jonas, Sustainability manager). This shows that, just like the results reached by Cummings (2001) and Manetti (2001), the stakeholder dialogues are not structured to give control or delegated power to their stakeholders, nor is it a goal for Textilia to do so.

Finally, it can be stated that Textilia does not include any activities strictly focusing on information dissemination in their definition of a stakeholder dialogue. This differs from other cases where companies do include these activities as a part of their stakeholder dialogues. This finding is in accordance with studies showing that companies are moving beyond information dissemination as their means to engage with stakeholders (Burchell & Cook, 2012: 35).

4.3 Stakeholder dialogues – performed & perceived

Since Textilia does not include any one-way forms of communication in their stakeholder dialogues, this part of the results will be analyzed trough the key concepts important for differentiating between symmetrical and asymmetrical two-way communications. When performing their stakeholder dialogues Textilia uses surveys, focus groups, board meetings and physical events as methods. These methods will be presented and analyzed in the following sections alongside the perceptions of the dialogue participants.

4.3.1 Mutual understanding

In regard to the practical possibility of reaching mutual understanding it differs with the different methods used by Textilia for their stakeholder dialogues. The surveys are sent to stakeholder via email and since they do not allow a direct two-way communication they are unable to produce mutual understanding. During the focus groups, a representative from Textilia conducts the session with the stakeholders. They, therefore, contain the possibility for two-way communication between Textilia and their stakeholders, meaning there is a possibility that mutual understanding will be achieved. However, the aim of that method is information gathering concerning the stakeholder's perspective and does not in their instructions include any element of information sharing from Textilia (Sustainability report 2018; Workshop stakeholder dialogue). This is also the case for the stakeholder dialogues with the owner during the board meetings, where the focus is getting the perspective of the owner (Fredrik, CEO). The physical events differ from the other methods in the sense that they, apart from the aim of information gathering, also aims to conduct dialogue and jointly educate all participants (including Textilia) on environmental issues (Sustainability report 2018). Furthermore, the events contain both sessions where Textilia shares information connected to them and their environmental practices, as well as roundtable-sessions where all participants (including personnel from Textilia) are asked to partake and share their perspective on certain sustainability related questions (Summary stakeholder dialogue 2016). Although some of the methods employed allows for mutual understanding to happen does not mean that it has happened. It is therefore of interest to understand the perceptions of the participants.

It is evident from the interviews that there are stakeholders who perceived the stakeholder dialogue, in the form of an event, as an opportunity to learn the other parties'

perspective as well as share their own perspective of the issue at hand. One stakeholder state this about a stakeholder dialogue in the form of an event during 2016

"it is great to talk about challenges and ways forward together (...) I suppose that the suppliers learn a little bit more about what our expectations are (...) yeah, we learn more about each other's perspectives" (Stakeholder 1, Appendix 4: 3.1).

Another state that the event in 2016 functioned as

"sort of a competitive intelligence. To see what is important according to our clients but also a chance for us to inform about ourselves and what we are working towards" (Stakeholder 2, Appendix 4: 3.2).

One stakeholder recipient also mention that they see these stakeholder dialogues as a way of finding common ground on these issue

"I think that is what is actually most important with stakeholder dialogues, that you are able to create a forum where you can find the smallest possible denominator so that you can understand that, okey, this is what matters to you and this is what you consider to be important" (Stakeholder 3, Appendix 4: 3.3).

This is an expression of viewing these stakeholder dialogues as an opportunity of understanding the others perspective with the intention of finding where there is an overlap of understanding.

One of the stakeholder recipients had a differing view on this, stating that they did not believe there was an opportunity to share one's own perspective of these issues, specifically not in regard to Textilia's environmental practices.

"No, that opportunity did not exist (..) it was no opportunity for that. If one had done it more in the shape of a workshop where you ask questions and where five people sit and actually submit their contributions and their opinions and that that actually influenced their strategy or something or was highlighted in reports, then I think that it would have been better or easier for me to raise those perspectives" (Stakeholder 4, Appendix 4: 3.4).

Stating further that, "the programme, to me, felt a lot like, okay, now I will learn about the things they are good at (..) it was not that much of a dialogue" (Stakeholder 4, Appendix 4: 3.5). This stakeholder, then, perceived this stakeholder dialogue more as a two-way asymmetrical communication. According to them, Textilia was able to share their perspective and try and persuade the stakeholders of "how good they were" and that it was not possible for them, as a stakeholder, to give their perspective of these issues.

According to Textilia their stakeholder dialogues contain the possibility to view an issue from different actors' perspectives

"for that is what is cool about gathering different, it is different if it is only the customers, but in this case it is also NGO's and staff representatives and so on. To be able to look at a specific issue but from different perspectives" (Anna, Communication manager; Appendix 4: 3.6).

This quote is referencing their physical events, meaning that they believe their events allows for mutual understanding to happen. According to Anna, mutual understanding occurred during their event in 2016 and that it is an aim for them to achieve that

"The one we had most recently, I think we called it "The price of sustainability" (...) when you in a forum like that, with customers, can agree that sustainability cannot be for free, then it is really successful " (Anna, Communication manager; Appendix 4: 3.7).

4.3.2 Openness to change & mutually acceptable solutions

It is already stated that Textilia stakeholder dialogues allows for stakeholder perspectives to be raised. Furthermore, it is already stated (under definition) that Textilia perceives themselves as open to change as a result of their stakeholder dialogues. In this section, the focus is on the questions that are posed and on the stakeholders perception.

During the different stakeholder dialogues, questions in relation to environmental issues and Textilia's environmental practices are posed to the stakeholders. Their answers to these questions are recorded and collected by Textilia. The information collected then provides input to two different internal processes. Firstly, the data is used to conduct a materiality analysis that helps Textila when they are constructing their Sustainability report (Jonas, Sustainability manager). The materiality analysis is used as a way to find focus areas for the Sustainability report so that the content is relevant for both Textilia and their stakeholders (Jonas, Sustainability manager). Utilising a stakeholder dialogue in this way has become common practice in the last decade (Manetti, 2011: 112). This usage of the stakeholder dialogue is not a direct change in environmental practices, but it is a way for stakeholders to influence Textilia's communication about their environmental practices. Secondly, the data is used as input in their risk assessment process which is a part in steering Textilia's environmental management (Jonas, Sustainability manager). The risk assessment file receives input from different internal processes as well as the stakeholder dialogues. The internal input is reviewed against the stakeholders' input and by doing so the result aims to reflect the most essential risks and opportunities from the perspective of both Textilia and their stakeholders

> "and the thought is then that we put the major risk assessment at Textilia against the opinions of the stakeholders. And then we see which [issues] are most important in our [assessment] and which [issues] are most important in the stakeholders [assessment]. And by doing so we get the risks that are most significant for Textilia" (Jonas, Sustainability manager; Appendix 4: 3.9).

From this it is evident that Textilia has a process aiming to incorporate stakeholder input in their environmental management. The process is structured in such a way that the input from the stakeholder dialogues are able to lead to a change in Textilia's environmental practices. The process also seems to aim at reaching mutually acceptable solutions by being structured in a way were Textilia's opinions are reviewed against the stakeholder's opinions.

It is, however, worth noting that there could be some asymmetries in this part of the process. Not in relation to the openness to change in itself, but in relation to which stakeholders are able to bring about this change. The stakeholders' opinions may be plural and heterogenous and Textilia may then also need to review their opinions against each other before reviewing them against Textilia's. The process is argued to have a democratic aspect where what is mentioned as important by many receives a higher influence in the final risk assessment

> "If we say that all stakeholders have this on top of their list, then it receives a high point. One of our stakeholders thinks this is important, well then it is on the list but it is uncertain. We can probably not give it the highest point but maybe an intermediate point" (Jonas, Sustainability manager; Appendix 4: 3.11).

This is also mentioned by Anna who states that the sorting process is based on "what is general and becomes consistent" (Anna, Communication manager; Appendix 4: 3.12). This is, however, not the case concerning the owners as a stakeholder. That is the only stakeholder whose opinion has great importance regardless of whether it is concordant with the other stakeholders or not and whose opinion has to be abided even if it were to be different to that of Textilia's

> "in the end, it is we as a company who decide how we run the business (..) unless you are the owner, that is the only stakeholder who can say "no, we are going to do this" " (Jonas, Sustainability manager; Appendix 4: 3.13).

Fredrik also highlighted the Region customers as a stakeholder group who has greater opportunity to influence their environmental work and the reason for this is Textilia's dependency on their customers "because we have no business without our customers, that is just the way it is" (Fredrik, CEO; Appendix 4: 3.14). It was evident from the stakeholder analysis that there was a clear limitation to the four most important stakeholder as being able

to partake in the stakeholder dialogues and through them influence Textilia's environmental practises. From this it seems to show that even within this group there are some stakeholders with greater ability to influence Textilia's environmental practices than others. This difference is according to Textilia ascribed to a difference in the stakeholders' ability to influence and affect Textilia's operations in general.

Finally, it is of relevance to understand how the stakeholders perceived Textilia's openness to change and their ability to influence Textilia's environmental practices through the stakeholder dialogues. The stakeholder respondents had different perceptions about their ability to influence Textilia's environmental practices. First, some stakeholders stated that it has not been in their interest to influence Textilia's environmental practices. One stating that it is not their role as an organization or in their interest to influence individual companies (Stakeholder 5) and another stating that "we have not raised any environmental issues during our contract period with Textilia. That is not where our focus has been" (Stakeholder 6, Appendix 4: 3.15). Another argued that it is of less relevance for them to influence Textilia's environmental practices and instead they were more interested in the environmental practices of the end-customer

> "one can in fact think like this, that Textilia's environmental practises do really matter, but if one does not change the customers, or the behaviour of the customer (..) then it almost does not matter what Textilia does in regard to environmental practices if it doesn't matter to the end customer" (Stakeholder 3, Appendix 4: 3.16).

This stakeholder did, however, state that they believe that Textilia has changed their environmental practices based on what was raised during certain stakeholder dialogues (Stakeholder 3). The fact that some stakeholders are uninterested in their ability to influence Textilia's environmental practices give further reason to question the assumption that more power to stakeholders in decision-making processes is always sought by the stakeholders and a fitting way to measure the quality of a stakeholder dialogue. These results instead indicate that some stakeholders have other motivations for participating. Furthermore, this may also mean that in relation to their communication with Textilia, this indicator is of less relevance in determining if they perceived the dialogue as symmetrical or asymmetrical.

Some stakeholders expressed an interest in influencing Textilia's environmental practices but had different opinions regarding their ability to do so. One supplier stated that they want to influence Textilia's environmental practice by getting them to buy sustainable products but recognized that what Textilia buys is determined by the qualification criteria in the procurement set by the end customer. In this sense, they are of quite the same opinion as Stakeholder 3, but do argue for an interest in influencing Textilia (all the while knowing that the practice they want to influence is determined by actors other than Textilia). Another stakeholder stated that they believed that they mainly influenced Textilia's environmental practices through their procurements "well, we probably mostly do it with our qualification criteria and our contract management" (Stakeholder 1, Appendix 4: 3.17). At the same time, this stakeholder also acknowledged that the stakeholder dialogues play a part in the development of their qualification criteria

> "before a procurement, we need to know more about the specific sector so that we formulate qualification criteria in a way that makes sure we get tenders. They need to be challenging, but also realistic. Otherwise we won't get any tenders" (Stakeholder 1, Appendix 4: 3.18).

This seems to indicate that they use the stakeholder dialogue as a way to understand what feasible qualification criteria to put on this specific branch. This will then be used to create mutually acceptable solutions in the form of a procurement which, according to this stakeholder, is how they influence Textilia's environmental practices.

One stakeholder did argue that they wanted to influence Textilia's environmental practices but felt that the stakeholder dialogue in 2016 was not an opportunity for them to do so "I did not really experience that the reason for the stakeholder dialogue necessarily was to assimilate input" (Stakeholder 4, Appendix 4: 3.19). This stakeholder,

then, perceived the stakeholder dialogue as asymmetrical in this sense since they did not perceive Textilia as open to change.

4.3.3 Openness of the agenda

All of Textilia's stakeholder dialogues are arranged by Textilia themselves and they set the agenda and decide the format and questions (Jonas, Sustainability manager). In a situation where one party arranges and invites others to a stakeholder dialogue, there will always be a level of asymmetry in favour of the party arranging the stakeholder dialogue simply due to that fact. This, among many, is a practical impediment to the performance of fully symmetrical stakeholder dialogues arranged by companies.

During the surveys, focus groups and the board meetings stakeholders are asked to list environmental issues they find important as well as to assess them in accordance to importance. The surveys and focus groups provide the stakeholders with examples of different environmental issues such as "use of chemicals, water consumption, energy, pellets, oil, transportations, pollutants into the sewers, waste disposal, recycling of textiles" etc. (Workshop stakeholder dialogue; Appendix 4: 3.20). During the focus groups it is stated in the instructions that the person leading the stakeholder dialogue should "clarify that it is the group, by themselves, that is supposed to raise the issues they find most important at Textilia" (Workshop stakeholder dialogue; Appendix 4: 3.21) and that, in regard to the examples, the stakeholders should "not be limited by them, instead think big" (Workshop stakeholder dialogue; Appendix 4: 3. 22). It is then clearly stated that Textilia does not want to get input only within a certain framework. There are instances where stakeholders have raised issues during the focus groups and surveys that were not part of the examples (for example, the issue of microplastics) (Jonas, Sustainability manager). The fact that the stakeholder dialogues have been open enough that environmental issues that were not on Textilia's agenda (i.e. not part of their examples) were able to be raised in these dialogues could, then, be seen as an example of the dialogues being symmetrical in this sense.

During the physical events, the topic for the entire event as well as the questions for the roundtable-discussions are decided by Textilia (Fredrik, CEO). The choice of topic is based on their perception of what is relevant to discuss (Anna, Communication manager). For the event held in 2016, the topic was also based on what was lifted as an issue during their previous event, that all actors want to increase sustainability in their supply chain without increasing the price (Stakeholder dialogue 2016). The questions for the roundtable-discussions were broad in the sense that they did not solely focus on Textilia environmental work, one question for example being "what are all of us able to do to create a sustainable textile service and improve the social responsibility in the supply chain?" (Summary stakeholder dialogue 2016; Appendix 4: 3.24). They also had two questions focused on stakeholder influence on their own environmental practices the first being "how do you wish to develop your cooperation with Textilia regarding sustainability issues and CSR?" (Summary stakeholder dialogue 2016; Appendix 4: 3.25) and the second being, "what would you like Textilia to focus on in the near future?" (Summary stakeholder dialogue 2016; Appendix 4: 3.26). These kinds of questions are, again, more in line with a symmetrical form of communication due to their openness of allowing stakeholder to *suggest* corporate action and not just *respond* to it.

Most stakeholder respondents have provided positive feedback in regard to how they perceived the event in 2016 (Stakeholder 1; Stakeholder 2; Stakeholder 3; Stakeholder 5; Stakeholder 6; Stakeholder 7; Stakeholder 8). Some commented specifically on the agenda and questions posed, one stating that "it was very very good, the fact that you set an agenda for what you are supposed to talk about so that you stick to that subject"(Stakeholder 3, Appendix 4: 3.27) and another stating that the event was "very rewarding and the assignments and questions were well thought-out" (Stakeholder 5, Appendix 4: 3.28). One stakeholder did, however, perceived the event in 2016 differently stating that the agenda did not provide an opportunity to bring forth new perspectives

"it was of course possible to ask questions and discuss, but not really possible to, according to me, to raise new perspectives or other questions that were not in the schedule" (Stakeholder 4, Appendix 4: 3.29).

This stakeholder, then, perceived the agenda to be rather closed and not in line with a symmetrical form of communication.

5 Discussion

5.1 Stakeholder analysis

Textilia's stakeholder analysis suggests the use of an influencer definition of stakeholder, which is made clear by the company's focus on power and urgency when demarcating stakeholders to include in their dialogues. Thus, the company identifies stakeholders to whom they hold the most strategic obligations[4]. How the stakeholder analysis is performed is paramount in the context of stakeholder dialogues as it determines which participants are included (or excluded) from the dialogues, which in turn determines who is able to influence the organizations environmental practices. There are potential risks for a company when applying an influencer definition. The legitimacy of the stakeholder dialogue can come into question since legitimate stakeholders may have been excluded. Due to this, the stakeholder dialogue may be unable to fulfil a CSR-function. By potentially excluding legitimate stakeholders due to them being non-influential, important issues of how the business impacts society may be overlooked.

5.2 Stakeholder dialogue – definition

The results show that the way Textilia defines a stakeholder dialogue in most aspects resembles a two-way symmetrical form of communication. This finding indicates that Textilia has high expectations of the performance of their own stakeholder dialogues. Furthermore, this indicates that there is an overlap of the concept's theoretical meaning as well as its practical usage. This differs from Golob & Podnar's (2014) observation of the concept's broad application in practice. Textilia's definition did, however, differ in the sense that they include a grander process in their definition (from stakeholder analysis to the actual use of the results from the dialogues) than most theoretical definitions which tend to limit the definition to the actual communicative interaction between the different dialogue parties.

5.3 Symmetrical aspects of the stakeholder dialogues

In many respects, Textilia's actual stakeholder dialogues in the form of an event live up to their ambitions of a two-way symmetrical dialogue. Several of the involved parties perceived the stakeholder dialogue as a place for them to express their claims and expectations as well as reaching mutual understanding. Textilia is open to change as a result of the dialogues and has implemented a process that utilise the result by aiming for mutually acceptable solutions. What the stakeholders are able to change are also outside of a 'set framework' in the sense that stakeholders are free to raise environmental issues they want Textilia to work with and not "just" be able to provide feedback in regard to already conducted corporate activity. In these respects, their stakeholder dialogues can be argued to fulfil an ethical treatment of the participating stakeholders.

   The study, then, reveals that it is possible to conduct a genuine stakeholder dialogue and that it is not contingent on giving final decision-making power to stakeholders. This is only proven in a situation where participating stakeholders are assessed due to their level of influence. From this study it is, therefore, not possible to state whether or not a genuine stakeholder dialogue could be performed with less powerful stakeholder or if

---

[4] It may be true that some of these stakeholders are simultaneously stakeholders to whom Textilia holds moral obligations. However, the analysis is not concerned with whether or not the specific stakeholders that are selected are in fact influencer or claimant stakeholders, or a mix of both. The analysis is concerned with which attributes are used to demarcate stakeholders in Textilia's stakeholder analysis.

stakeholder were assessed based on other objectives. This corresponds well with Crane & Livesey's (2003) argument that a symmetrical two-way communication often occurs with stakeholders who are regarded as having significant degrees of power and influence (48). However, it is not the aim nor within the scope of this study to draw verifiable conclusions regarding the casual connections between stakeholders' levels of power and the occurrence of genuine stakeholder dialogues.

5.4   Asymmetrical aspects of the stakeholder dialogues

Textilia's stakeholder dialogues also have some attributes of a two-way asymmetrical communication. Viewed separately, the stakeholder dialogues in the form of surveys and focus groups/workshops are not able or aimed at producing a two-way communication where both parties can give their perspectives. Instead the methods focus was limited to acquiring stakeholder perspectives. These methods, therefore, more clearly serve strategic objectives for Textilia, especially since the participating stakeholders are selected based on strategic attributes.

Including more asymmetrical methods of communication, such as surveys, is not necessarily something that should be avoided. As stated by Morsing & Schultz (2006), surveying can be a necessary part of a stakeholder communication strategy, but to reach a symmetrical two-way communication it is not a sufficient method on its own (328). When designing and performing a stakeholder dialogue process, it is therefore important to understand that different forms of communication serve different purposes.

Furthermore, there was also a stakeholder who perceived Textilia's stakeholder dialogues, in the form of a physical event, more as a two-way asymmetrical communication between them and Textilia. This differed from all other stakeholder respondent's perception of that dialogue. A plausible explanation for this difference in perception could be a mismatch of expectations regarding this stakeholder's role in the stakeholder dialogue. All of the other stakeholder respondents were either assessed to be "the most important stakeholders", i.e. the ones able to influence Textilia's environmental practices, or they expressed an uninterest in influencing Textilia's operations. Stakeholder respondent 4 was not assessed to be that kind of stakeholder but did express an interest as well as an expectation to be able to influence Textilia's environmental practices. Textilia on the other hand invited participants from the stakeholder group NGO mainly due to their expertise on the subject hoping this would contribute to enhance all participating stakeholders' knowledge on the issue (Jonas). This may not have been successfully communicated to Stakeholder respondent 4, resulting in a mismatch of expectations regarding this their participation. With this being said, it is not the aim nor within the scope of this study to draw verifiable conclusions regarding the reasoning behind different actors' perception of the stakeholder dialogues. The aim was limited to revealing their perception and analysing that perception from a theoretical framework of different dialogic practices and forms.

6   Conclusion

The results of this study question the assumption that the quality of a stakeholder dialogue is contingent on giving final decision-making power to stakeholders. If Textilia's stakeholder dialogues where to be assessed on these grounds, they would, just like many others' have in studies evaluating corporate stakeholder dialogues in that way, fall short. It is a reality for many organizations that it is not possible nor desirable to include stakeholders to a level where they obtain full managerial power but that they still (for different reasons) want to involve them in the development of their environmental practices. In such instances this study wanted to investigate the possibility to have qualitative stakeholder dialogues, i.e. where there exists an ethical treatment of the stakeholders and their claims. This study concludes that this is possible. To measure the quality in these kind of stakeholder dialogues, the concept of symmetrical and asymmetrical two-way communication can be used. These concepts allow a more nuanced understanding of what a genuine dialogue may be by looking at the meaning making processes in communication. The relevance for a different measurement of quality was further shown to be pertinent by the fact that some stakeholders participated in the dialogues for other reasons than to exert influence over Textlia's environmental practices.

The study also raises the importance of the performance of the stakeholder analysis. The performance of a genuine stakeholder dialogue is thought to be easier in a situation where stakeholders are regarded to have significant degrees of power, since that increases the incentives for the organization to hold them. Performing a genuine dialogue may then not only serve as an ethical treatment of the participating stakeholders, but simultaneously fulfil strategic objectives for the organization. In the context of CSR, it can be argued that the quality of stakeholder dialogues should be contingent on, not just the performance of a symmetrical communication, but also on the inclusion of legitimate stakeholders. For that reason, the performance of the stakeholder analysis is also of importance when determining the quality of stakeholder dialogues concerning environmental conduct. Future research could investigate the possibility to practically perform genuine stakeholder dialogues concerning corporate environmental conduct in instances where participating stakeholders have low degrees of power.

It is evident that stakeholder analysis as well as stakeholder dialogues can be performed in different ways and that this has implications regarding the ethical and strategic aspects of the practices. This means that the practices can fill different purposes in regard to corporate environmental management.

References

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35(4), 216–224.

Burchell, J. & Cook, J. 2012, "Sleeping with the Enemy? Strategic Transformations in Business– NGO Relationships Through Stakeholder Dialogue", Journal of business ethics, vol. 113, no. 3, pp. 505-518.

Burchell, J. & Cook, J. 2006, "Assessing the impact of stakeholder dialogue: changing relationships between NGOs and companies", *Journal of Public Affairs,* vol. 6, no. 3-4, pp. 210-227.

Bryman, A. (2012). Social research methods (4th ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crane, A. & Livesey, S. 2003, "Are You Talking to Me?: Stakeholder communication and the risks and rewards of dialogue" chapter in Stakeholder Thinking 2 : Relationships, Communication, Reporting and Performance, Routledge, 2003 p. 39-52

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (Fourth (International Student Edition)). Ch 1. London: SAGE Publications.

Cummings, J. 2001, "Engaging stakeholders in corporate accountability programmes: A cross-sectoral analysis of UK and transnational experience", Business Ethics, A European Review, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 45-52.

Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H. & Wängnerud, L. 2012, Metodpraktikan: konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad, 4., [rev.] uppl. edn, Norstedts juridik, Stockholm.

Ferrón Vilchez, V., Darnall, N. & Aragón Correa, J.A. 2017, "Stakeholder influences on the design of firms' environmental practices", Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 142, pp. 3370-3381

Flyvbjerg, B. 2006. "Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research", Qualitative inquiry, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 219-245.

Folkhälsomyndigheten. 2020. Folkhälsomyndighetens föreskrifter och allmänna råd om allas ansvar att förhindra smitta av covid-19. Attainable: https://www.folkhalsomyndigheten.se/contentassets/a1350246356042fb9ff3c515129e8baf/hslf-fs-2020-12-allmanna-rad-om-allas-ansvar-covid-19-tf.pdf [2020-06-20]

Foster, D. & Jonker, J. 2005, "Stakeholder relationships: the dialogue of engagement", Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 51-57.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: a stakeholder approach. Massachusetts: Pitman.

Golob, U. & Podnar, K. 2014, "Critical points of CSR-related stakeholder dialogue in practice", Business Ethics: A European Review, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 248-257.

Greenwood, M. 2007, "Stakeholder Engagement: Beyond the Myth of Corporate Responsibility", Journal of business ethics, vol. 74, no. 4, pp. 315-327.

Grunig, J.E. & Hunt, T. 1984, Managing public relations, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.

Irvine, A. (2011). Duration, Dominance and Depth in Telephone and Face-to-Face Interviews: A Comparative Exploration. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 10(3).

ISO. 2020. ISO 14000 Family - Environmental Management. Attainable: https://www.iso.org/iso-14001-environmental-management.html [2020-04-07]

Johansen, T. S. & E. Nielsen, A. 2011, "Strategic stakeholder dialogues: a discursive perspective on relationship building", Corporate communications, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 204-217.

Joosse, S., Powell, S., Bergeå, H., Böhm, S., Calderón, C., Caselunghe, E., Fischer, A., Grubbström, A., Hallgren, L., Holmgren, S., Löf, A., Nordström Källström, H., Raitio, K., Senecah, S., Söderlund Kanarp, C., von Essen, E., Westberg, L. & Westin, M. 2020, "Critical, Engaged and Change-oriented Scholarship in Environmental Communication. Six Methodological Dilemmas to Think With", Environmental communication, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 758-771.

Kaler, J. 2002, "Morality and Strategy in Stakeholder Identification", Journal of business ethics, vol. 39, no. 1/2, pp. 91-99

Kaptein, M. & Van Tulder, R. 2003, "Toward Effective Stakeholder Dialogue", Business and Society Review, vol. 108, no. 2, pp. 203-224.

Kujala, J. & A. Korhonen. 2017. Value-Creating Stakeholder Relationships in the Context of CSR. In: Freeman, R.E., Kujala, J. & Sachs, S. 2017, Stakeholder Engagement: Clinical Research Cases, Springer, New York. p. 63-85

Kvale, S. 1996, Interviews: an introduction to qualitative research interviewing, SAGE, Thousand Oaks.

35

Manetti, G. 2011, "The quality of stakeholder engagement in sustainability reporting: empirical evidence and critical points", Corporate social-responsibility and environmental management, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 110-122.

Maon, F., Lindgreen, A. & Swaen, V. 2008, "Designing and Implementing Corporate Social Responsibility: An Integrative Framework Grounded in Theory and Practice", Journal of business ethics, vol. 87, no. S1, pp. 71-89.

Mitchell, R. K., B. R. Agle and D. J. Wood: 1997, 'To- wards a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Sal- ience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts', Academy of Management Review 22(4), 853–886.

Morsing, M. & Schultz, M. 2006, "Corporate social responsibility communication: stakeholder information, response and involvement strategies", Business ethics (Oxford, England), vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 323-338.

O'Riordan, L. & Fairbrass, J. 2008, "Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): Models and Theories in Stakeholder Dialogue", Journal of business ethics, vol. 83, no. 4, pp. 745-758.

Pedersen, E.R. 2006, "Making Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Operable: How Companies Translate Stakeholder Dialogue into Practice", Business and Society Review, vol. 111, no. 2, pp. 137-163.

Perret, A. 2003, "BNFL National Stakeholder Dialogue: a case study in public affairs", Journal of Public Affairs, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 383-391.

Pfeffer, J. 1981. Power in organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.

Reed, M.S., Graves, A., Dandy, N., Posthumus, H., Hubacek, K., Morris, J., Prell, C., Quinn, C.H. & Stringer, L.C. 2009, "Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management", Journal of environmental management, vol. 90, no. 5, pp. 1933-1949.

Rogers, E.M. and Kincaid, D.L. (1981), Communication Networks: Toward a New Paradigm for Research, Free Press, New York, NY.

Signori, S. 2017. "From "Managing for Stakeholders" to "Managing with Stakeholders": When Stakeholders Can Help Rescue a Company". In: Freeman, R.E., Kujala, J. & Sachs, S. 2017, Stakeholder Engagement: Clinical Research Cases, Springer, New York. pp. 167-192.

Suchman, M. C. 1995. Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. Academy of Management Review, 20: 571-610.

SS-EN ISO 14001:2015. Miljöledningssystem - Krav och vägledning. 3 edith. Stockholm: SIS förlag.

Sturges, J. E., & Hanrahan, K. J. (2004). Comparing telephone and face-to-face qualitative interviewing: a research note. Qualitative Research, 4(1), 107-118.

Textilia. 2020. Om Textilia. Attainable: https://www.textilia.se/om-textilia/ [2020-04-15]

Wagner Mainardes, E., Alves, H. & Raposo, M. 2011, "Stakeholder theory: issues to resolve", Management decision, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 226-252.

Yin, R.K. 2014, Case study research: design and methods, 5.th edn, SAGE, London.

Appendix 1 – Interview guide Textilia

Start: kort berätta studiens syfte, hur inspelningen kommer hanteras och inhämta godkännande för inspelning. Tydligggör att dem kan avbryta intervjun när dem vill och dem kan vara anonyma.

Inledandefrågor
- Vad är din roll på Textilia? Hur länge har du jobbat där?
- Vilken är din roll i förhållande till ert miljöledningssystem?
- Vad är din spontana tanke gällande kopplingen mellan ert miljöledningssystem och era intressentdialoger om miljö?

Tema: Intressentanalys
- Kan du berätta hu det gick till när ni identifierade och bedömde era intressenter?
- Vad är en intressent enligt dig?
- Hur avgör ni om en identifierad intressent är mer eller mindre viktig?
    - Använder ni några speciella kriterier?
    - Övervägde ni några andra kriterier eller vad fick er att välja just dem?
- Vad finns det för svårigheter eller risker vid identifiering och prioritering av intressenter?
- Vilka intressenter för ni sedan dialog med om miljö?
    - Varför just dessa?
    - Vad är anledningen till att ni inte för dialog med *alla* identifierade intressenterna utan endast dem ni valt ut som viktigaste?

Tema: Dialog
- Vad är en intressentdialog för dig?
- På vilket sätt skiljer det sig från andra former av kommunikation med intressenter?
- När börjar och slutar en intressentdialog?
- Vad tycker du kännetecknar en bra/lyckad intressentdialog?
- Hur ser dem intressentdialoger som ni genomfört om miljö ut mer konkret?
- Har ni några riktlinjer för hur intressentdialogerna ska genomföras?
- Vilka metoder använder ni er av för att genomföra era intressentdialoger?
    - Vad är det som gör att ni använder olika metoder?
    - Vad får ni ut av dem olika metoderna?
    - Ser du några för- och nackdelar med dem olika metoderna ni använder?
- Vad har ni fört dialog med era intressenter om?
    - Hur fattas beslut om vilka ämnen och frågor som tas upp i intressentdialogen?
    - Har intressenterna i vissa fall bestämt vad som ska tas upp?
- Vilka svårigheter ser du med att föra intressentdialoger om ert miljöarbete?

Tema: Efter dialogerna
- Efter intressentdialogerna vad händer då?
    - Vad händer med materialet ni samlat in som rör miljöfrågor? Hur används det?

- Vad har ni fått reda på genom att ha dilaogerna?
- Kan du berätta mer om arbetet med er väsentlighetsanalys, hur går det till?
    - Hur används väsentlighetsanalysen i utformandet av ert miljöarbete?
- Om det visar sig att intressenter har olika (eller motstridiga) åsikter eller intressen, hur hanterar ni det?
    - Hur avgör ni vilka åsikter/förväntningar som är mindre viktiga?
    - Har några intressentgruppers förväntningar ett större utrymme att påverka ert miljöarbete?
- Hur påverkar intressenterna och intressentdialogerna ert miljöarbete?
    - Vad tycker du är rimligt att dem får påverka?
    - Finns det något i ert miljöarbete som intressenter inte får påverka?
    - Hur hanterar ni intressentkrav på miljöarbetet som ni inte kan eller vill jobba med?

Avslutande
- Efter att vi pratat om och reflekterat kring allt detta vad skulle du säga är din viktigaste lärdom kring intressentdialoger?
- Finns det något du skulle vilja skicka med till exempelvis företag och organisationer som ännu inte börjat med dialoger, eller till intressenterna?

- Är det något du tycker att jag har missat, som du vill tillägga?

Appendix 2 – Interview guide Stakeholders

Start: kort berätta studiens syfte, hur inspelningen kommer hanteras och inhämta godkännande för inspelning. Tydligggör att dem kan avbryta intervjun när dem vill och dem kan vara anonyma.

Inledande

- I vilken roll har du varit med i dialogerna (befattning och relation till Textilia, tex kund)?

Dialogen

- Vilka intressntdialoger som Textilia arrangerat har ni deltagit vid? Enkäter, intervjuer, fokusgrupper, event.
- Hur upplevde ni den intressentdialogen/de intressentdialoger ni deltagit vid?
    - Lärde ni er något?
    - Vad fick ni ut av att delta?
- Vad var ert syfte med att delta i den dialogen?

Påverkan miljöarbete

- Hur vill ni påverka Textilias miljöarbete?
- Upplever ni att ni får det?
- Är dialogen ett tillfälle för er att påverka deras miljöarbete eller sker det på andra vis?
- Upplever ni att Textilia tagit till sig av dem miljöfrågor/problem ni lyft och som ni vill att dem ska adressera?
- Vilka svårigheter eller begräsningar ser du med dem här dialogen eller den här typen av dialoger?

- Något du vill lägga till? Några frågor till mig?

Anonymitet

- Vill du vara anonym i studien? Uppsatsen skrivs vid ett universitet och kommer därav publiceras.

Appendix 3 – Questionnare

Om dig

- I vilken roll har du varit med i dialogerna (befattning och relation till Textilia, tex kund)?

Dialogen

- Hur upplevde ni den dialogen/tillfället? Vad fick ni ut av att delta? Vad ger det när man träffas olika aktörer på det sättet? Lärde ni er något?
- Vad är ert syfte med att delta i dessa dialoger?
- Hur vill ni påverka Textilias miljöarbete? Upplever ni att ni får det? Är dialogen ett tillfälle för er att påverka deras miljöarbete eller sker det på andra vis?
- Upplever ni att Textilia tagit till sig av dem miljöfrågor/problem ni lyft och som ni vill att dem ska adressera?

Anonymitet

- Vill du vara anonym i studien? Uppsatsen skrivs vid ett universitet och kommer därav publiceras.

Appendix 4 – List of original quotes

1. Stakeholder analysis

1.1. Original quote: "En intressent är en person eller organisation som kan påverka, påverkas av eller anser sig vara påverkad av ett beslut eller en åtgärd"

1.2. Original quote: 1) "Hur viktigt är det för oss att föra dialog/lyssna på intressentens krav?" and 2) "Hur viktigt är det för intressenten att föra dialog/lyssna på våra krav?"

1.3. Original quote: "inte viktigt", 2 represents "ganska viktig" and 3 represents "ovärderlig"

1.4. Original quote: en intressent är ju någon som har krav på oss men även stor påverkan, likväl som att vi har krav eller påverkan på intressenten

1.5. Original quote: det är en reflektion av vår upplevelse av hur mycket, hur mycket vikt dem själva lägger vid dem här frågorna

2. Stakeholder dialogues - definition

2.1. Original quote: När man pratar om intressentdialoger ur CSR eller hållbarhetsperspektiv (...) då är det den här dialogen där vi identifierar vilka som är viktiga och vad tycker dem är viktigast och det ska ge oss input i vad ska vi fokusera på"

2.2. Original quote: "det är jättesvårt att säga om det har en början och ett slut, men det är inte bara dem fyra timmarna när vi ses, utan det är en uppstartsperiod och en lång period efteråt"

2.3. Original quote: "vi lyssnar mycket mer på intressenterna, andra former av kommunikation så handlar det oftast mycket om vad vi tycker eller vad vi tycker är viktiga frågor att driva. I det här fallet så vänder vi ju helt och hållet på det och vill verkligen och bemödar oss för att låta intressenterna komma med sina inspel"

2.4. Original quote: "strukturerat sätt förstå vad är deras åsikter, inspel, synpunkter, fokus för tex miljöarbetet då. Så man kan säga, det är en strukturerad process för att gemensamt öppna upp en dialog och komma fram till målsättningar som reflekterar alla parters intressen"

2.5. Original quote: " när man på något sätt kan få gemensamma insikter (...) när man ändå kan komma till konsensus om viktiga frågor fast att det kan vara obekvämt"

2.6. Original quote: "ja men absolut, absolut, vi fortsätter ju enträget att driva vår fråga, att tala om skillnaden, att tydliggöra, att så mycket vi kan bara vara med och påverka"

2.7. Original quote: "om nån säger "men ni måste ha förnyelsebart bränsle i alla era tankar i alla era lastbilar" och vi säger, "men det är viktigare att jobba med svinnet", ja då får man ju argumentera för dem två ståndpunkterna i den dialogen"

2.8. Original quote: "du har en möjlighet att påverka i intressentdialogen, annars så skulle vi inte ha den"

2.9. Original quote: "i slutändan är det ju vi som företag som bestämmer hur vi driver företaget"

2.10. Original quote: Annars är det för oss att tolka och värdera själva den här inputen, och det ska man väl ha klart för sig (...) det innebär inte att det blir som man har sagt i den här intressentdialogen"

2.11. Original quote: "hela kontexten för det här är ju en dialog, så att vi går ju liksom inte ut med "bra kom med idéer så kommer vi att genomföra dem", så att det är ju för det första hela kontexten, det här är en dialog och en inspiration och det handlar om att hitta bra åtgärder som vi kan genomföra, men vi går inte ut och lovar någonting från början"

3. Stakeholder dialogues - performed & perceived

3.1. Original quote: "det är ju jättebra att prata om liksom utmaningar och vägar framåt tillsammans(...) jag antar att leverantörerna lär sig lite mer om vad våra förväntningar är(...) aa, vi lär oss mer om varandras perspektiv"

3.2. Original quote: "En slags omvärldsanalys. Att se vad våra kunder anser är viktigt men även för oss att få chansen att informera om oss och vad vi jobbar för."

3.3. Original quote: "det kan jag tycka är den faktiskt absolut viktigaste saken med intressentdialoger, att man kan skapa ett forum där man kan hitta minsta möjliga nämnare så att man kan förstå, okej det är det här som spelar roll för er och det är det här som ni bedömer vara viktigt"

3.4. Original quote: "nej det utrymmet fanns inte (..) det var inte utrymme för det om man hade gjort det mer som en workshop där man liksom ställer frågor och där fem personer sitter och faktiskt levererar in sina bidrag och sitt tyckande och liksom att det faktiskt påverkar deras strategi eller sånt eller lyfts fram i rapporteringar, då tror jag att det hade varit bättre eller lättare för mig att lyfta in dem perspektiven"

3.5. Original quote: "Programmet kändes för mig väldigt mycket som, okej nu ska jag få höra vad dem är bra på (...) det var inte så mycket dialog"

3.6. Original quote: "för det är det som är häftigt när man samlar olika, det är skillnad om man bara har kunderna, men i det här fallet är det även NGOs och representanter från personal och så vidare, att kunna se på en och samma fråga men utifrån olika perspektiv"

3.7. Original quote: "den vi hade nu senast, jag tror vi kallade den för hållbarhetens pris (..) när man i ett sådant forum med kunder kan enas om att hållbarhet måste få kosta, det tycker jag, då är det ju verkligen lyckat"

3.8. Original quote: Det (the stakeholder dialogue) får ett lite bredare perspektiv i termer av att en ägare har ju så att säga, eller jag upplever att vår ägare har en tydlig vision om att han vill att vi ska jobba med hållbarhet och det är viktigt och ett prioriterat område, men han måste ju också naturligtvis, ha det finansiella med (...) Medans när man pratar med tex kunder, så upplever jag att det som är deras, som jag var inne på, så kan ju dem nästan ohämmat säga här är alla hållbarhetsaspekter som vi vill att ni ska uppfylla"

3.9. Original quote: "Och då är tanken att vi har satt den stora riskbedömning på textilia, mot intressenternas synpunkter. Och så ser vi vilka är viktigast i våran och vilka är viktigast i intressenternas och då får vi ut dem väsentliga riskerna för textilia"

3.10. Original quote: "det ligger nog lite hos mig att trycka på det, jag blir som ett litet mänskligt filter (..) det finns ingen matematisk modell"

3.11. Original quote: "om vi säger att vi har att alla intressenter har det här som högsta punkt då får det en hög poäng. En av våra intressenter tycker det här är viktig ah men då är det med på listan, men det är osäkert. Vi kan kanske inte sätta högsta poäng på det utan det blir ett mellan poäng" (

3.12. Original quote: "det som är generellt och som blir genomgående"

3.13. Original quote: "i slutändan är det ju vi som företag som bestämmer hur vi driver företaget, (...) om du inte är ägare då, det är den enda intressenten som kan säga nej vi ska göra såhär"

3.14. Original quote: för att utan våra kunder så har vi ingen verksamhet, så är det ju"

3.15. Original quote: Vi har inte lyft miljöfrågor under den tid vi har haft avtal med Textilia. Det har inte varit där vårat fokus har legat"

3.16. Original quote: "egentligen så kan man tänka såhär att, just textilias miljöarbete spelar ju stor roll, men om man inte förändrar konsument, eller kundbeteendet,(..) då spelar det nästan ingen roll vad textilia gör för miljöarbete om det inte spelar roll hos slutkunden"

3.17. Original quote: alltså vi gör det väl kanske mest med våra krav och våra avtalsuppföljningar

3.18. Original quote: "inför upphandlingar, vi behöver veta vart branschen ligger så att vi ställer krav så vi får anbud. Dem behöver vara uppmanande, men också realistiska. Annars får vi inte anbud"

3.19. Original quote: jag upplevde ju inte riktigt att man har intressentdialogen jättemycket för att ta till sig input nödvändigtvis"

3.20. Original quote: "kemikaliehantering, vattenförbrukning, el, pellets, olja, transporter, utsläpp till avlopp, avfallshantering, textilåtervinning"

3.21. Original quote: "Tydliggör att det är gruppen som själva ska lyfta upp de frågor som de tycker är viktigast på Textilia"

3.22. Original quote: "var inte begränsad av dessa utan tänkt stort"

3.23. Original quote: det är inte så mycket som är "det där har vi aldrig tänkt på" som dyker upp, och det kanske handlar om hur vi har upplagt det, du såg alla exemplena, det kanske är vi som styr för mycket med våra exempel, men om det är helt tomt kanske det inte blir någonting, så risken är att som man frågar får man svar så därför kommer det inte upp så mycket nytt"

3.24. Original quote: "vad kan vi alla göra för en mer hållbar textilservice och bättre socialt ansvarstagande i leverantörsleden?"

3.25. Original quote: "hur vill ni utveckla ert samarbete med Textilia när det gäller hållbarhetsfrågor och CSR?"

3.26. Original quote: "Vad önskar ni att Textilia fokuserar på i närtid?"

3.27. Original quote: "Det var väldigt väldigt bra, just att man sätter en agenda för vad det är man ska prata om så håller man sig inom det ämnet"

3.28. Original quote: "mycket givande och väldigt genomtänkta uppgifter och frågor"

3.29. Original quote: "det fanns såklart möjlighet att ställa frågor och diskutera, men inte riktigt möjligheten, tyckte jag, att komma in med nya perspektiv eller lyfta andra frågor som inte var i schemat"