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Abstract

This thesis is focused on the derivation of a new approach to business. Emphasis is put on organizations contributing to both economic success as well as social progress. This dual financial and social value creation is referred to as social entrepreneurship. Increased attention and inclusiveness of the concept has led to confusion regarding the means of organizations acting within the recited phenomenon. Organizations are met with skepticism and are questioned in the matters of legitimacy. Differences of opinion centralize on whether companies invest these resources because it is demanded, because it strengthens the brand or simply because it is the responsibility of the corporation. The perception of legitimacy is dependent on the support the organization receives from its different constituencies. To explore social entrepreneurship, a case study was conducted. This case study was executed through a consumer perspective, seeing as legitimacy is upheld by the perception of the organizations immediate audience. The case company used, GodEl, operates using traditional business models with the purpose of maximizing profits. However, 100% of their earned dividend is donated to various charity organizations. This study is set out with the ambition to gain an understanding of a corporation operating within social entrepreneurship. The conclusions imply that the customers of GodEl legitimize their choice through diverse legitimizing dimensions. The findings indicate that pragmatic legitimacy is a stronger legitimizing dimension than moral legitimacy. These conclusions imply that larger emphasis is given to consumer self-interest, rather than the consequences and judgment of the organizations accomplishments. The ways in which customers legitimize their choices, may also be argued as the same factors affecting GodEls legitimacy regarding their operations.

*Keywords: pragmatic legitimacy, moral legitimacy, customer perception, GodEl, social entrepreneurship, shared values, corporate social responsibility.*
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1 Introduction

In 2006 economist Muhammed Yunus was awarded with the Nobel Peace Prize for his development of the micro credit. In 2008 Bill Gates spoke of a humanistic perspective of capitalism and in 2011 Porter and Kramer further elaborated on the practical approach of interdependence between business and society, hence providing three examples of the derivation of a new approach to business. The phenomenon is discussed and has many names, such as the Fourth sector, social innovation, social business and social entrepreneurship, to name a few. There is an immense amount of information and research that targets this emerging phenomenon. It is necessary to clarify what the derivation of this approach to business entails, seeing as this phenomenon is gaining increased attention in the business world as well as the academia. The approach of a corporation’s responsibility to society leads to an inclusiveness in which all manner of socially beneficial activities fit (Martin & Osberg, 2007).

The approach of a corporations’ responsibility towards society is demanded and under progress, contributing to both economic success as well as social progress (Bockstette & Stamp, 2011). This type of hybrid organizational form is therefor emerging with the purpose of creating both financial and social value (Haigh & Hoffman, 2012). The concept of dual financial and social value creation has led to an increased attention and inclusiveness of the concept. It has also led to confusion regarding the means of the hybrid organization acting within the recited phenomenon, seeing as the definition is unclear (ibid).

Organizations that act within the recited phenomenon are met with skepticism and are questioned in the matters of legitimacy. Differences of opinion centralize on whether companies invest these resources because it is demanded, or because it strengthens the brand of the corporation in the eyes of the consumer, or simply because it is the responsibility of the corporation (Grafström et al., 2008). Legitimacy is a perception held by an organizations most immediate audience (Tornikoski & Newbert, 2007; Suchman, 1995). The level of legitimacy depends on various reasons. One important aspect of creating legitimacy is the
communication of an organization and how it is perceived by its external audience (Elsbach, 1994; Ginzel, Kramer & Sutton, 1992).

Therefore it becomes relevant to investigate what garners legitimacy in an organization of such hybrid forms, henceforth social entrepreneurship. When the aim is to create financial and social value, it can be argued that the audience perception becomes central in legitimizing the organizations dual purposes. Based on this argument, the ambition of this study is to explore an organization operating within the recited phenomenon, aiming to gain an in-depth insight of what instigates legitimacy. In order to pinpoint the legitimizing dimensions, a case company operating within the recited phenomenon will be explored. This study will be executed using a consumer perspective, seeing as legitimacy is upheld by the perception of the organizations most immediate audience.

1.1 Purpose and research questions

The purpose with this study is to gain a deeper understanding of social entrepreneurship as a phenomenon, and to assess which legitimizing aspects of organizations acting within the recited phenomenon possesses. In order to fulfill the aim of this study, the following research questions have been formulated:

*How does a customer legitimate the choice of an organization operating within the phenomenon social entrepreneurship?*

*How does the perception of a customer correspond with the organizations communication?*

*Are there any contradictions amongst the legitimizing dimensions?*
1.2 Delimitations

This paper focuses on exploring an organization executing dual financial and social value creation, henceforth addressed to as social entrepreneurship. Seeing as this study investigates a customer perspective, the single case company of GodEl will be used. Therefore exploring the perception of GodEls customers.

1.3 Outline

Following this introductory chapter, this thesis starts by presenting the literature review. The literature review provides a theoretical framework based on the concepts corporate social responsibility, the principle of shared values, social entrepreneurship and dimensions of legitimacy. The framework is followed by a presentation of the methodological frames used in this study, including a description of the chosen case company GodEl. The following chapters of this thesis illustrates the empirical findings which are discussed and analyzed with the purpose of assessing which legitimizing aspects organizations acting within the recited phenomenon possesses. GodEl is discussed and put into the context of dual value creation, and each legitimacy dimension is discussed in relation to the empirical findings. The concluding chapters summarize the central arguments of this paper and offers suggestions for further research in this field.
2 Literature review

The following literature review aims to present various aspects relevant to the study in question. The framework centers on the legitimacy perspective. However, in order to present this framework it is relevant to place legitimacy in its context of the social responsibility of corporations and how legitimacy is related to the shared values of a company and its constituents. Furthermore, a brief presentation is given on social entrepreneurship.

2.1 Corporate social responsibility and the principle of shared values

The nature and definition of corporate social responsibility (CSR) has a history attached to it and CSR remains a widely discussed concept. David (1960) stresses the effects of decisions and actions one must consider that affects the social system. He refers to the corporation and its obligations in his description. Adding to this point, CSR involves companies taking responsibility beyond what they are legally required to do (Vogel, 2005). This implies looking beyond the economic interest of a firm and including the ethical aspect affecting the interest of stakeholder and other constituents in the whole social system (David, 1967).

In the opinion of economist Milton Friedman (1970) the only responsibility a company possess is the one of maximizing profits, thereby satisfying its owners, the shareholders. Contrary to Friedman, Edward Freeman (1984) and his stakeholder approach elaborate on a corporation’s responsibility that includes groups beyond the shareholders that too are affected by the achievement of the corporation’s objectives. Moreover, Grafström (2008) describes the notion of CSR as the corporation investing resources to society beyond its financial responsibilities. However, the very reason for companies doing so is all the more debated. Differences of opinion centralize on whether companies invest these resources because it is demanded, by the general public and to some extent
governments, because it strengthens the brand of the corporation in the eyes of the consumer, or simply because CSR is the responsibility of the corporation (*ibid*).

Seeing as CSR is a broad term, there is no defined acceptance amongst researchers. CSR, as elaborated above, is often measured in hard cash or hours spent conducting volunteer work, instead of measuring effects of actual impact (Porter & Kramer, 2011). The interdependence of corporations and society indicates that there are shared values to be created, where business choices can benefit both the corporation and society, interdependently, contributing to both economic success as well as social progress (Bockstette & Stamp, 2011). This principle goes under the term shared values (Porter & Kramer, 2006). The principle entails a mutual dependence of social policies and business actions integrating to the good of both parties (Porter & Kramer, 2011). There are many different concepts in line with the dual financial and social value creation, one of them being social entrepreneurs (*ibid*).

### 2.2 Social entrepreneurs – drivers of change

The key component of social entrepreneurs integrates a practice of dual financial and social value creation (Mair & Marti, 2006). Their work is based on values intended to benefit both economic success as well as social progress (Porter & Kramer, 2011), contrary to the primary intention of corporations maximizing profit and generating revenue to its shareholders (Friedman, 1970). Social entrepreneurship is gaining popularity as it is attracting growing amounts of talents, money and attention (Martin & Osberg, 2007). However, it is also becoming more uncertain about what it actually means, which brings about the question of what activities it entails in practice. Social entrepreneurship is therefore adding confusion, seeing as it means different things to different viewers (Dees, 1998), resulting in all sorts of activities going under the name social entrepreneurship (Martin & Osberg, 2007).

The conceptualization of social entrepreneurship varies in approach as well as content depending on who is viewing it, seeing as different researchers and/or people adopt it (Dees, 1998). Some perspectives are process-based whilst other center on the entrepreneurial orientation (Mair & Marti, 2006). One aspect of
social entrepreneurship refers to a not-for-profit approach, which demands alternative sources of funding strategies and opportunities in the creation of social value (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skiller, 2003; Boschee, 1998). Another approach intended to address social entrepreneurship views it from a commercial point of view. It entails for-profit businesses operating across sector lines providing services similar to actions called for as socially responsible (Sagawa & Segal, 2000; Waddock, 1998). A third group perceives the approach of social entrepreneurship as a way to initiate and develop social transformation by focusing on the ease of social problems (Alvord et al., 2004).

The theoretical discussion above indicates that the concept of dual financial and social value creation enables inclusiveness, which in turn brings about the intentions of an organization to be investigated. It becomes important for companies to seek credibility regarding their actions as well as legitimacy in their relationship with society, in order to bridge this gap.

The following section will elaborate on the point of legitimacy and how it can be upheld in relation to its most immediate audience, such as their customers. Organizations can use different approaches in gaining legitimacy, which will be further elaborated on in the follow section.

### 2.3 The role of legitimacy and legitimation

Legitimacy can be defined as “a condition reflecting cultural alignment, normative support and consonance with relevant rules or laws” (Scott, 1995). It is a process through which an idea, a product or an industry becomes commonly accepted (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975). Legitimacy may also represent a key factor in understanding organizational survival and growth (Meyer & Rowan, 1997; Zucker, 1987) whereas the process of building legitimacy is a set of actions dedicated to acquire and maintain legitimacy. Through this process, industries gain or lose legitimacy, involving both cultural representations and individual responses to those representations (Diez-Martin et al., 2013).

The term legitimacy is widely used, however very few attempt to define it (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008; Hybels, 1995). Suchman stresses the description of legitimacy 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, and definitions” (Suchman, 1995:574). As such, legitimacy can be seen as constituting a critical factor as it contributes to an organizations success or failure (Diez-Martin et al., 2013).

It is essential that the establishment between norms and activities of the organization match the values of the larger social system (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975). If a mismatch is perceived between the values of society and actions of the organization, a legitimacy gap will be developed (Haniffa & Cooke, 2005). This gap can in turn threaten the status of the organization, seeing as the organization is perceived as not acting according to social norms and values (Bianchi & Ostale, 2006), resulting in loss of social support because a company lost its legitimacy from its constituencies (Vanhonacker, 2000).

2.4 Consumers as key constituents

Legitimacy provides people with a different method of decision-making. This method is distinguished from other forms of rational methods. People are being influenced in their ability to make decisions based on the belief that others’ decisions, such as legitimated organizations and/or other people, make decisions that are appropriate or correct and must be followed (Zelditch, 2001). Legitimacy also possesses the ability to induce voluntary compliance from external agents, as a result of creating feelings of obligation (Tyler, 2006). Based on this, legitimacy facilitates the survival of an organization and its’ activities (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), seeing as the constituents are more prone to support the organization they perceive to be desirable, proper, or appropriate (Parsons, 1960).

Legitimacy is dependent on the support the organization receives from its different constituencies. However, seeing as it is not possible to satisfy all constituents, organizations need to focus on key constituents (Sonpar et al., 2009). Therefor this paper will focus on the consumer as the key constituent. Moreover, media plays a critical role in the process of legitimacy. Consumers categorize industries based on the language media use in its reporting (Elsbach 1994; Gamson & Modigliani 1989; Humphreys 2010; Rosa et al., 1999). Therefor it is
also important to include the aspect of communication between the organization and its audience of consumers (Elsbach, 1994; Ginzel, Kramer & Sutton, 1992).

2.5 Legitimacy theory

The many aspects of legitimacy have been studied from numerous authors pending through diverse theoretical classifications, strategic actions and relationships between different forms of legitimacy and constituents (Diez-Martin et al., 2013). However, this paper follows the behavioral dimensions defined by Suchman (1995) due to the focus of consumers as key constituents. The following section will elaborate on pragmatic legitimacy and moral legitimacy and their respective sub-dimensions.

2.5.1 Pragmatic legitimacy theory

Pragmatic legitimacy emerges from the interest of the organizations most immediate audience (the consumers). In an organization’s relations with its surrounding environment, consumers support originates in the perception that the organization is being receptive and help them further their own well-being; not necessarily because the organization achieves its objectives (Diez-Martin et al., 2013).

Pragmatic legitimacy relates to the self-interest of the organizations most immediate audience (Suchman, 1995). It is founded on direct exchanges between the two parties, the organization and the audience, and how it visibly affects the audience well-being. Therefore scrutinizing organizational behavior hence defining practical consequences for the audience is expected at any given organizational action (Wood, 1991). Pragmatic legitimacy further elaborates on three sub-concepts; exchange legitimacy, influence legitimacy and dispositional legitimacy (Suchman, 1995).

A simple level of pragmatic legitimacy is exchange legitimacy. Basically it consists of a traditional and materialistic power-dependence relations in between the organization and its audience (Emerson, 1962; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Exchange legitimacy rests on the audience expected received value by
determining the practical consequences, for them, or any given activity (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975).

Influence legitimacy contains a more socially constructed view. Influence legitimacy emerges when the organization include the audience into their structure of policy making by adopting the audience standards as their own (Suchman, 1995). This is found where the constituents support the organization, not necessarily based on believes that the organization offers a favorable exchange to the audience, but rather the organizations responsiveness to the audience larger interest (ibid). A display of such commitment from the organization indicates measures of authority to the affected audience (Selznick, 1949), which is a more important display of responsiveness than producing immediate results (Meyer & Rowan, 1991).

Dispositional legitimacy entails the organization to affiliate the same values as the targeted audience (Suchman, 1995). Organizations are increasingly being personified and treated as morally responsible (Coleman, 1974; Horowitz, 1986; Zucker, 1983), seeing as audiences perceive organizations as possessing personalities just as though they were individuals (Pfeffer, 1981; Tuzzolino and Armandi, 1981). Audiences conform legitimacy to organizations including dispositional attributes such as “having their best interest at heart” (Suchman, 1995).

In summary, pragmatic legitimacy results in the scrutiny of an audience interest in organizational behavior and how it benefits the audience well-being. Unlike pragmatic legitimacy, moral legitimacy involves whether a specific action is “what should be done” rather than evaluating whether a specific action benefits the evaluator. Moreover, moral legitimacy reflects a positive normative evaluation of the organization and the activities it executes (Aldrich & Fiol 1994; Parsons, 1960).

2.5.2 Moral legitimacy theory

Moral legitimacy reflects the organizations beliefs and the activities it performs (Mahadeo et al., 2011). Moral legitimacy affiliates to managerial judgments on the organizations activities. Moral legitimacy assesses judgments about whether any given activity executed by the organization is “the right thing to do”
(Suchman, 1995). Unlike pragmatic legitimacy, whereas the audience judge whether the activity benefits the evaluator, the audience self-interest is not centered here the focus rather rests on a managerial judgment that the organization and its activities promote social welfare (ibid). Moral legitimacy reflects the organization and can be evaluated in terms of the activities it performs. This is made through different forms of evaluation-processes (ibid). Moral legitimacy can be evaluated in terms of the organizations consequences (consequential legitimacy) such as actual accomplishments or techniques and procedures (procedural legitimacy) such as goals, output and methods (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975; Suchman, 1995). The following section will further elaborate on two sub-concepts; consequential legitimacy and procedural legitimacy.

Consequential legitimacy entail that organizations should be judged by their accomplishments (Meyer & Rowan, 1991). However, the technical outputs are hard to distinguish and difficult to measure seeing as they are socially defined (ibid). Organizations can embrace different forms of procedures and techniques that comply with social acceptance. Moreover these processes can gain organizations consequential legitimacy (Scott, 1977), seeing as the audience complies with these processes.

Procedural legitimacy relates to the techniques and procedures of the organization. By embracing socially accepted techniques and procedures, organizations can garner moral legitimacy (Scott, 1977). Seeing as outcomes such as goals, output and methods that are related to social value are becoming more difficult to measure, procedural legitimacy appears as invisible though valued ends that are achieved by an organization (Scott, 1992).

In summary, moral legitimacy implicate larger cultural rules. It reflects the organizations behavior whether the activities effectively promotes societal welfare.

2.6 Summary of literature review

The theoretical discussion above illustrates a basis for the upcoming chapters. The review presents different concepts of the derivation of a new approach to business entailing the dual purposes of creating financial and social value. The chapter
illustrates a corporations’ social responsibility contributing to society beyond what it is legally required to do as well as different approaches to how a corporations’ execution can lead to shared values where both the corporation and society can benefit from their actions. These theoretical findings make it relevant to investigate how its constituents, its consumers, perceive such activities seeing as legitimacy is upheld by the perception of the organizations most immediate audience, which in this case is defined as GodEl's customers. The aim of this study is to gain a deeper understanding of social entrepreneurship as a phenomenon. One part of this thesis is to assess which the legitimizing aspects of organizations acting within the recited phenomenon possesses, while the other part is to investigate the perception of a customer and how it corresponds with the organizations communication. In order to do so, this study follows the behavioral dimensions defined by Suchman (1995). Pragmatic legitimacy involves investigating the self-interest of the consumers’ participation whereas moral legitimacy focuses on the managerial judgment that the organization and its activities promote social welfare. The theories of shared values and social responsibility will be used to put the case of GodEl in its context. Furthermore, the framework of legitimacy dimensions will be used as a tool when analyzing the case company and its key constituents in order to answer the research question, hence fulfilling the purpose of this study.
3 Method

3.1 Research design

The aim of this study is to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomena referred to as social entrepreneurship. The purpose is to investigate the perception of an organization creating dual financial and social value. As the ambition is to investigate the legitimizing aspects of organizations dealing of such, an inside consumer perspective is made by using a quantitative research approach. In order to meet this end, a single case study was chosen. The gathered data initially consisted of numbers and numerical information, which is in line with a quantitative approach (Saunders et al., 2009).

The basic form of using a case study lies in the intimacy and the advantage of studying details in examining the complexity of its nature (Bryman & Bell, 2005). What distinguishes a case study from other approaches is that researchers often want to highlight the unique features of a specific case, which in turn justifies as a means for conducting a single case study (Yin, 2009). Furthermore, exploring a phenomenon through a single case study adds to gaining an in-depth understanding in a rare and new context (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). Moreover initially a literature review was made. This was conducted prior to the empirical data collection, thus defining a deductive approach (Saunders et al., 2009).

This study is based on an unpublished paper entitled “A case study about social entrepreneurship”, written by Selamawit Bede and Richard Lawson (2013). Therefore some references will refer to Bede & Lawson (2013).

The following section will describe the chosen case company, GodEl. This illustration will form a basis for the upcoming operationalization, which is based on the exposed values of GodEl in their communication found on their webpage (GE1).
3.2 The case of GodEl

The chosen case company, GodEl, is an electricity company based in Stockholm, Sweden. It was established in 2005 and possesses a market share of 2 %, providing electricity to the Swedish market. GodEl was created with the purpose of contributing to a better world, which is executed by donating 100 % of their earned dividend to different charity organizations. (GE5)

GodEl co-operates with seven different established charity organizations such as SOS Barnbyar, Stockholm Stadsmission, Rädda Barnen, Läkare Utan Gränser, Naturskyddsföreningen, Hand in Hand and Barncancerfonden. Each of these organizations performs work that contributes to society (GE3). GodEl's mission is to maximize their profits and contribute to the work of the organizations they cooperate with, hence relating to the conception of an organization creating dual financial and social value. Seeing as they donate their dividend to charity, this in turn justifies the choice of GodEl as the case company for this study as the ambition is to explore social entrepreneurship. GodEl is found suitable as it provides the opportunity of exploring all themes necessary to answer the posed research questions.

GodEl supplies energy at a cost price (GE2). However the option of adding the service of sustainable energy certified by Naturskyddsföreningen is available. Consumers are provided with the opportunity to choose if they wish to add sustainable energy, by making that active choice.1 Furthermore, GodEl's customers are provided with the opportunity to choose how the dividend is shared amongst the different volunteer organizations that they cooperate with. Therefore customers are given the option to decide which one of the several charitable organizations they would like to support. Moreover GodEl communicates various means and accomplishments made from the donated dividend and e.g. supply of sustainable energy by using different channels such as their webpage, newsletters and social media. (GE4)

1 From May 1st 2013 and onwards, customers of GodEl are provided with the service of sustainable energy. (GE1)
3.3 Gaining access

Getting access to a company is a challenge in itself. Seeing as this study aims to capture the phenomenon from a consumer perspective, inside access and information was needed. However this problem was eliminated as one of the authors completed an internship at the case company (Bede & Lawson, 2013), hence the role of practitioner-research (Saunders et al., 2009). The advantage of data access also brings forth the shortcoming of familiarity to the organization (ibid). Nevertheless being conscious of the biases related to familiarity provides the importance of awareness regarding the preconceptions and assumptions that may come with it (ibid). However it is hard to have a completely objective standpoint, with regard to an inside perspective of the organization (Fox et al., 2007) but balance can be found as one of the authors contributes with an outside perspective (Bede & Lawson, 2013). Moreover Saunders et al. (2009) argues for the advantage of understanding the complexity of an organization due to an inside perspective.

3.4 Sampling of respondents

The study is primarily based on interviews with GodEls customers, due to the purpose of pursuing a consumer perspective. These respondents were chosen in order to answer how they perceive GodEl. Initially an introduction meeting was held with the manager of market and the manager of customer loyalty. The ethical aspects of anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents’ records was ensured and kept in order to further strengthen trust and establish access (Saunders et al., 2009).

The data collecting was conducted through phone interviews. Potential advantages in association with this form are associated with granted access as well as the notion of speed (ibid). A randomized sample of 500 respondents was excerpt from GodEls customer base and the population coincides with the company’s four segments, as illustrated in the compiled table below.
500 phone calls were dialed and a total of 122 completed interviews collected, resulting in a response rate of 24.4 %. In regards to the focus of an in-depth study, a sample of this size was in order (Saunders et al., 2009). The data was collected during weekdays between the hours of 11am to 7pm. This is in line with convenience sampling, seeing as the sample will consist of respondents who are available to the researcher during the set hours of conducting the phone interviews (Bryman & Bell, 2005). The sample depends on the probability of a respondent answering their cell phone, taking into account that all consumers may neither possess a cellphone or even have their number registered in the customer base. Adding to this point, awareness is raised concerning what type of people that are available during these hours. One might not have the opportunity to take phone calls during work hours, others may be unemployed or retired, to name a few examples.

The aspect of language is one facet to uplift. This is due to the fact that English is not the first language of the respondents, the interviews as well as the interview guide was conducted in Swedish. Therefore the questions in Appendix remain in Swedish, as a translation could result in misleading data (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

3.5 Data collection

The data collection consists of primary quantitative data (the phone interviews conducted) but in order to form an interview guide consisting of questions to ask the respondents, GodEls exposed values found on their webpage was reviewed.
In order to grasp the perception their consumers possess of the company in question, questions were formulated targeting GodEls exposed values, such as the purpose of their focus on charity and sustainable energy. As the purpose of this study is to measure the variables coinciding with social entrepreneurship, certain indicators were created. Firstly, GodEls exposed values was collected, based on internal reports and marketing material found on their webpage for their consumers to see - addressing the perception based on what is exposed to the consumers. Secondly, indicators were formulated based on the legitimacy theory illustrated in the literature review in chapter 2. Thirdly, ten questions based on legitimacy connected to GodEls exposed values were formulated and asked during the phone interviews conducted (Appendix). For five of the questions, the respondent was asked to answer on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 equals strongly disagree and 5 equals strongly agree. For four of the questions, the possible answers were “Yes”, “No” or “I don’t know”. The tenth, and last, question was formulated so that the respondent could speak freely.

The upcoming operationalization is based on Suchman’s (1995) conceptualization of legitimacy, as illustrated in the theoretical section. This section will illustrate the operationalization in which the primary data was collected. The ambition is to ask targeted questions in order to estimate the perception of GodEls consumers. Each question in the interview guide (Appendix) refers to an exposed value of GodEls communication found on their webpage (GE1).

### 3.6 Operationalization

Indicators of legitimacy theory are made to serve as a basis for the empirical findings and the analysis. These indicators are based on GodEls exposed values in relation to the behavioral dimensions of legitimacy. Lastly a compiled table of the operationalization will illustrate the connections made, which in turn are recited in the interview guide (Appendix).

*Exchange legitimacy* ultimately comes down to power dependence, in this case in between the organization and their customers. The commodity GodEl provide is electricity. In turn GodEl generates revenue, enabling them to donate
their dividend to charitable organizations. Thus defining the dependence. Therefore if a preference is shown towards the price or the service provided, it will be boxed in the category of exchange legitimacy (Q1).

A more socially constructed form of legitimacy is addressed to as influence legitimacy. This entails support to the case company based on factors such as affecting the respondent’s larger interest. This in turn reflects GodEls responsiveness and inclusiveness, hence any appreciation towards providing the consumer the opportunity of choosing which charity organization the dividend shall go to. If so, the preference is categorized as influence legitimacy (Q 5, 6).

Dispositional legitimacy involves the character of an organization and speaks to the concept of shared principles and values between the actors in play. Based on the preference shown towards charity; if the consumer is engaged in conducting volunteer work and/or actively donates money to charity organizations, respondents are categorized as adding dispositional legitimacy (Q 2, 7, 8).

Organizations are being judged on their actual accomplishments. This coincides with the dimension of consequential legitimacy. If the respondent shows privy towards GodEls communication informing the consumer the results of the donated dividend, it in turn is categorized as consequential legitimacy (Q 9).

Organizational processes such as procedures and techniques are found coherent with procedural legitimacy. GodEls supply of sustainable energy is adding value of invincible ends. Thus if a respondent shows privy regarding sustainable energy, it is categorized as procedural legitimacy (Q 3, 4).

The above-mentioned categorizations add up to nine close-end questions. Lastly a tenth question is asked, providing the respondent an open question. Hence the opportunity to speak freely regarding what attracted them in their choice of GodEl as a service provider (Q 10). The collected responses from the open question are coded in the same procedure as recited above.
Table of Operationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legitimacy indicators</th>
<th>Pragmatic legitimacy</th>
<th>Moral legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy Indicators</td>
<td>Exchange legitimacy</td>
<td>Influence legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key points of legitimacy theory</td>
<td>Materialistic power-dependence</td>
<td>Socially constructed for larger interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors of GodEl’s exposed values</td>
<td>Price and service</td>
<td>Responsiveness; choice of distributing donations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The compiled table illustrates the operationalized variables for the upcoming empirical findings in chapter four.

3.7 Data analysis

The data gathered through above-mentioned methods was analyzed using the theoretical framework as a tool. The forthcoming elaboration of the empirical findings is focused on correlations that extract the respondents pronounced importance in their choice of GodEl as a service provider, which is further put in relation to their actions. Using Excel pivot tables, the results are demonstrated in diagrams of different forms. Diagrams belong to one of the common methods of illustrating quantitative data, seeing as they are easy to understand and interpret (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

The method in which the data was analyzed brings about a few aspects important to consider. The reliability of the findings refers to consistency, as these may appear different in another time conducted on another set of sample (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Therefore, it is important to consider that the questions asked and the researcher conducting the interviews may have influenced the outcome. However, the coding of the answers were performed separately and independently by two persons (Bede & Lawson, 2013), and finally discussed. Furthermore, due to the close-end questions and the customer base of the case GodEl, the replicability can be considered high. Although there might be a question of access, the gathering of information could otherwise be conducted using the same close-
end questions on the same customer base in order to replicate the study (Saunders et al., 2009). However, the interpretation of the single open-end question as well as the analysis of the findings needs to be reflected on as a limitation in the question of replicability. Moreover, it is important to note that the results of this study cannot be generalized, as it would be difficult to apply the findings to other settings (Saunders et al., 2009). This is due to the chosen method of one case study, where the aim was to achieve an in-depth knowledge of the case, rather than a generalized understanding of the subject.
4 Findings

The following chapter will illustrate the results from the conducted phone interviews. Initially descriptive data regarding the sample of respondents will be presented, followed by a figure presenting an overview of the respondent’s total preference of legitimacy indicators. Lastly correlation analysis data will be presented.

4.1 Descriptive data

4.1.1 Sample of respondents

A total of 500 phone calls were dialed. Of the corresponding customers, 122 phone interviews were completed, which resulted in a response rate of 24.4%. Figure 1 illustrates four segments the respondents consisted of. These reflect the customer base of GodEl.

![Figure 1, Sample of Respondents](image-url)
Of the completed phone interviews, 75% consisted of customers of middle age (36+) and 25% of young age (-35). Furthermore 76% of the respondents live in the metropolitan area (zip code 1-2, 4) and 24% live on the countryside (zip code 3, 5-9).

4.1.2 Respondents total considered importance

One question (Q10) presented the respondents with the opportunity to speak freely regarding what they perceived as the most important factor in their choice of GodEl as a service provider. The collected data was coded in the same procedure as the legitimacy indicators are illustrated in the operationalization (p.16). Figure 2 consists of more than one answer per respondent.

![Figure 2, Legitimacy Dimensions of most Importance when Choosing GodEl as a Service Provider]

The largest approximation in figure 2 relates to dispositional legitimacy (42%). The results show that the consumers perceive GodEl’s engagement in charity as an important factor when they were asked to evaluate their choice of GodEl as a service provider. Secondly the respondents showed privy towards exchange legitimacy (29%). This dimension relates to the aspect of service and price. Followed by procedural legitimacy (27%) relating to an appreciation towards the techniques and procedures of GodEl. These consist of GodEl’s supply of
sustainable energy, their business idea and organizational form. Furthermore influence legitimacy (2%) resulted in a low interest regarding GodEls responsiveness and consumers affiliated perception in effecting the distribution of donations being made. Moreover, none of the responses could be related to consequential legitimacy (0%). This dimension is connected to GodEls communication being evaluated as an important factor, thereof GodEls actual accomplishments. In conclusion, figure 2 illustrates dispositional legitimacy (charity), exchange legitimacy (price and service) and procedural legitimacy (sustainable energy) as the most uplifted dimensions perceived by the respondents as most important.

### 4.2 Analysis data

#### 4.2.1 Pragmatic legitimacy data

**Exchange legitimacy**

The following figure 3 is based on the correlation between price (Q1), charity (Q2) and sustainable energy (Q3). The factors are correlated in order to discern price in relation to charity and sustainable energy.

![Graph of Price in Relation to Charity and Sustainable energy](image)

*Figure 3, Graph of Price in Relation to Charity and Sustainable energy*
The graph results in a negative trend. This demonstrates that the higher importance is assigned to price, the less importance is given to the two other factors charity and sustainable energy. Looking at the results from another point of view it can also be perceived vice versa, seeing as the higher importance the respondent attaches to charity and sustainable energy, the less importance is given to price. However charity constitutes a larger impact than sustainable energy, seeing as the trend line keeps a stable and higher level throughout the diagram.

**Influence legitimacy**

The following figure illustrates the respondents perceived importance of being an integrated part of distributing the donations made by GodEl (Q5). This is put in correlation to the respondents action of doing so, or not (Q6).

![Figure 4, Importance of Choosing Distribution of Donations](image)

The discerned trend reads that if the respondents perceive the opportunity of choosing which charity organization the dividend should go to as an important factor in their choice of GodEl as a service provider, the respondent would take the opportunity of choosing a favorite organization. However, if the respondents indicate a smaller preference of taking part in the provided opportunity of making that choice, they would in turn not exercise that power.

The lower respondents value the possibility of choosing one favorite organization (i.e. 1), the less they make that active choice (59%) seeing as these
respondents had not chosen a favorite organization. And vice versa (i.e. 4 and 5) illustrated 90% versus 78% of the respondents making an active choice of an organization.

**Dispositional legitimacy**

The following two diagrams (figure 5 and 6) demonstrate the respondents’ perception regarding charity as a factor of importance in their choice of GodEl as a service provider. The figures are illustrated in relation to the respondents actions beyond GodEl, such as if the respondents donate money to charity and/or participate in charitable activities such as conducting volunteer work.

Figure 5 demonstrates the importance of charity in a respondent’s evaluation of GodEl (Q2) to deduce whether this preference is coherent with the respondents’ actions. In this case, figure 5 illustrates if coherence is shown in relation to executing donations to charity organizations beyond GodEl (Q7).

![Figure 5, Importance of Charity versus Active Donations](image)

The result show trend lines illustrating coherence between the respondent’s displayed importance of charity being a factor of importance in their evaluation process, which are in line with respondents acting accordingly. The higher a respondent rates charity (i.e. 4 and 5) the trend line reads a coherence of active donations beyond GodEl being made (i.e. 75% and 84%). The diagram also
demonstrates a trend line in the opposite direction that states the respondents low rating on charity (i.e. 1 and 2) are found coherent with the respondents smaller donations (33% and 43%).

Figure 6 displays the importance of charity in a respondents’ evaluation of GodEl (Q2) in relation to whether the respondents engage in conducting volunteer work themselves (Q8). This is interpreted as an indicator of sharing the same values as GodEl, and executing them beyond choosing the company as a service provider.

Figure 6, Importance of Charity versus Active Volunteer Work

Figure 6 displays a less distinct trend line. The results point to a more even distribution of volunteer workers (i.e. 3, 4 and 5) irrespective of whether the respondents perceive charity as an important factor or not. Moreover, the respondents that perceives charity as a factor of smaller importance (i.e. 1 and 2) does so by acting accordingly (i.e. 100% and 86%).

4.2.2 Moral legitimacy data

Consequential legitimacy

This diagram presents the conducted result of respondents taking note of GodEls communication available to them through various channels (Q9) such as
Facebook and newsletters e.g., Figure 7 shows a delicate interest of the information available to the respondents.

![Figure 7, Communication of Actual Accomplishments]

The results demonstrate that GodEls communication, thereof the actual accomplishments of GodEls donations, does not reach its audience to the fullest. A majority of respondents replied that they “Never” (29%) or “Rarely” (29%) take note of the information available to them.

**Procedural legitimacy**

Figure 8 presents the respondents considered importance of sustainable energy when choosing GodEl as a service provider (Q3). The correlation is made in relation to respondents actively making the choice of adding the provided service of sustainable energy (Q4).
Figure 8 illustrates an uneven distribution seeing as the trend lines are not pronounced. The result displays a somewhat uneven impression due to the high percentage of respondents answering, “Don’t know”, when asked if they made an active choice of adding sustainable energy. However, it is important to note that the customers’ have indicated that they had taken for granted that sustainable energy was automatically a part of the offer. Therefore a less distinct coherence of respondent perception is in line with active choices of adding the service of sustainable energy.

The above stated correlations are made with the purpose of distinguishing an impression of GodEls customer perception to serve as a basis for the forthcoming analysis. The following section will account for answering the posed research questions.
5 Discussion and analysis

This chapter is based on the empirical findings in relation to the theoretical approach. Firstly, GodEl is discussed and put into the context of Social entrepreneurship. Thereafter, each legitimacy dimension will be discussed in relation to the empirical findings.

5.1 GodEl – dual value creation

GodEl operates is in line with what Friedman (1974) refers to as maximizing profits, however the purpose of GodEl doing so can be viewed as going in line with Freeman’s (1984) stakeholder approach as well. This argument is based on the mission GodEl stresses, seeing as GodEl was established for the purpose of contributing to a better world. GodEl’s contribution is executed by donating their earned dividend to the seven different volunteer organizations they co-operate with. This, in turn, can be related to taking responsibility beyond what a corporation is legally required to do (Vogel, 2005; David, 1967). Seeing as GodEl was created with the purpose of contributing to society, it can be put in relation to the phenomenon social entrepreneurship. Therefore, it can be argued that GodEl operates in line with the principle of shared values (Porter & Kramer, 2011), integrating a practice of dual financial and social value creation (Mair & Marti, 2006). GodEl strive for maximizing profits, hence economic success, and donate their dividend to different charity organizations, hence contributing to social progress. The ends of GodEl’s means are met interdependently and therefore benefit both parties: business and society (Bockstette & Stamp, 2011).

However, the theoretical framework indicates that organizations often have their purposes put into question (Grafström et al., 2008). Despite their purpose of contributing to society, GodEl is a private profit-maximizing corporation. Stakeholders questioning intentions may threaten the status of the organization if a mismatch is perceived between the consumers and the
organizational actions (Haniffa & Cooke, 2005). The analysis above puts GodEl in its context of CSR, social entrepreneurship and striving for shared values and how this can result in an organization purposes being put into question.

For the purpose of exploring GodEls legitimizing aspects, this chapter moves further into the analysis of the empirical findings based on GodEls customers' perception in relation to the theoretical perspective of legitimacy and legitimizing dimension as posed in chapter two.

5.2 Pragmatic legitimacy analysis

5.2.1 Exchange legitimacy

The results in the empirical section indicate that price is opposite to the two other factors; charity and sustainable energy. The higher importance consumers assign to price, the less importance is given to charity and sustainable energy, as resulted in a negative trend found in figure 3. However the diagram shows that charity constitutes a larger impact of importance to the respondents than sustainable energy, with regard to the focus on the factor of price in this section. Seeing as there is a trade between the buyer/consumer and the seller/GodEl, this trade can be found going in line with exchange legitimacy as a materialistic power-dependence relation between GodEl and its consumers (Emerson, 1962; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). This trade relates to the exchange, seeing as the relation can be interpreted as the offered price and service and the exchange between the two parties. Hence the power-dependence of GodEl offering a service of supplying power to its consumers who in turn pays for that service. Seeing as price demonstrated a higher impact of importance in relation to GodEls other two variables (charity and sustainable energy) this may point to consumers justifying price as a factor of legitimacy in evaluating their choice of GodEl as a service provider. However the results can also be perceived vice versa. The graph demonstrates that the higher importance the consumer attaches to charity and sustainable energy, the less importance is given to price.
5.2.2 Influence legitimacy

GodEls customers are provided with the opportunity of participating in their operations as an integrated part of GodEls value chain. This relation is in line with the more socially constructed type of pragmatic legitimacy referred to as influence legitimacy (Suchman, 1995). In this case influence legitimacy boils down to GodEls responsiveness to consumers larger interest (ibid). The responsiveness in this case refers to the consumers’ opportunity of choosing which volunteer organization the donations of GodEl will be distributed to. The results of figure 4 points to a coherence between the respondents perceived importance of making the choice of a volunteer organization of their liking and executing the provided opportunity of participating in such an action (Selznick, 1949). This goes in line with Meyer & Rowan (1991) stressing the importance of organizations responsiveness, which is more important than producing immediate results. For instance, figure 4 shows that of the respondents indicating less importance of choosing volunteer organization (i.e. have answered 1 or 2) the majority chooses not to exercise their power to select volunteer organization. And vice versa, implying that of the respondents showing a larger importance of choosing volunteer organization (i.e. have answered 4 or 5) the majority chooses to exercise their power to select a volunteer organization.

5.2.3 Dispositional legitimacy

When evaluating the shared values between GodEl and their customers, the factor charity is in focus. This evaluation is in line with dispositional legitimacy (Suchman, 1995), wherein the customer identifies and relates to the values of the organization. The results of figure 5 and 6 indicates a moderate coherence with the customers actions in relation to the customers perceived importance of charity, when choosing GodEl as a service provider. However the results in figure 6 are also somewhat contradictory. The contradiction in figure 6 depends on the following, as the outcome is not distinct when the respondent does not act accordingly to his/hers perceived importance. Looking at the outcome of results from the customers’ point of view it can be argued that the ones that actively engage in charitable activities, such as donating money to volunteer organizations
and/or conducting volunteer work, are the consumers that perceive charity as a factor of importance in their choice of GodEl. Nevertheless the correlation between donating funds and charity in figure 5 is stronger than the correlation between conducting volunteer work and the perception of importance regarding the factor charity found in figure 6. This is displayed by the strong trend between donations and importance of charity in figure 5 versus the less distinct trend line between conducting volunteer work and importance of charity in figure 6 (hence the contradiction). The latter diagram shows correlation that implies a distribution of workers and non-workers of conducting volunteer work, as the factor of charity is perceived higher (i.e. 4 and 5). However the less interested the respondent is, i.e. the ones answering that charity is not important (i.e. 1 and 2) are also not involved in conducting volunteer work. Looking at the respondents having answered a 1 on the scale 1-5, 100% said they are not actively participating in conducting volunteer work. This goes in line with the above mentioned reasoning that the customers identify with the values of the organization (Suchman, 1995). If a respondent attaches less importance to conducting volunteer work, he/she also does not place any importance to charity.

5.3 Moral legitimacy analysis

5.3.1 Consequential legitimacy

The results in regard to GodEls actual accomplishments can be related to consequential legitimacy (Suchman, 1995), seeing as they are in line with the notion of the organizations communication. By using various channels (such as webpage, e-mails and Facebook) GodEl communicates executed accomplishments as a result of their distributed charity donations. This in turn leaves the consumers with the opportunity to take part of GodEls actual accomplishment, as in line with Meyer & Rowan (1991) stressing that organizations should be judged by their accomplishments. However, in evaluating if the consumers take note of the information explicitly sent to them, the majority (58%) responded does “Rarely” or “Never” take note of it. In addition 27% answered “Sometimes”, hence the communication of actual accomplishments does not reach its targeted audience to
the fullest. This in turn indicates a mismatch in regard to what is exposed and communicated from GodEl in relation to what is perceived by the consumers, due to the fact that a majority does not take note of the communication. Therefore, the notion of judging the organization based on actual accomplishments (Scott, 1977) is not fully supported by the respondents, as shown in figure 7. Moreover, figure 2 strengthens this conclusion, where none of the respondents expressed considering GodEls actual accomplishments when they were asked to state what they perceived as factors of most importance in their choice of GodEl as a service provider.

5.3.2 Procedural legitimacy

The maintained techniques and procedures of GodEl can be found compatible to their supply of sustainable energy. Sustainable energy is in line with achieving valuable albeit invisible end results, hence Suchman's (1995) conceptualization of procedural legitimacy as stressed by Scott (1992). The results of this notion demonstrate ambiguities due to the trends that could not be inferred from the correlations made in figure 8 based on customer responses. Moreover based on the pronounced importance made by the customers, trend implications could not illuminate inferred results. In figure 8 the trend lines are not pronounced, yet the answers do follow a pattern. For instance, the stronger importance the respondent attaches to sustainable energy, the somewhat higher is the percentage of respondents making an active choice of sustainable energy. The respondents who did not find sustainable energy important did also indicate this, as they were less prone to make an active choice of sustainable energy. This is noted in a slightly negative trend in figure 8. However the percentage of respondents answering “I don’t know” is high in all of the possible responses (45-58%). This indicates a mismatch as well as contradictions amongst the recited results of procedural legitimacy in relation to GodEl and their consumers perceived importance. This can be perceived as opposed to Scott (1977) relating techniques and procedures of an organization as garnering moral legitimacy. Nonetheless, since the consumer indicated sustainable energy to be included in the service of GodEl, the high level of “I do not know” could still be perceived as a legitimizing factor. One possible explanation in regard to this insight (high percentage of “I don’t know) could be
that the importance of charity overshadows sustainable energy (as seen in figure 3). The consumer gives higher importance to charity and therefore the question of sustainable energy becomes more unanswerable.
6 Conclusions

The aim of this study has been to gain a deeper understanding of social entrepreneurship as a phenomenon. One part of this thesis has been to assess which of the legitimizing aspects organizations acting within the recited phenomenon possesses, while the other part has been to investigate the perception of a customer and how it corresponds with the organizations communication.

Conclusions are drawn based on the collected empirical findings in relation to the theoretical approach of legitimacy theory. The respondents were asked what they perceived to be important for them in their choice of GodEl as a service provider. The factors that the consumers perceive as important, which in turn are in line with their actions, can be found to be legitimizing factors. Moreover seeing as this would indicate respondents legitimizing their own choices, it may also be argued that the same factors therefore in turn legitimize GodEl and their operations. The following table illustrates the summarizing conclusions of the case of GodEl.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pragmatic legitimacy</th>
<th>Moral legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange legitimacy</td>
<td>Influence legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimizing factors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of concluding remarks

On the discussion of pragmatic legitimizing aspects; Exchange legitimacy was found to be a legitimizing factor for the customers of GodEl, without mismatch or contradictions. This conclusion is based on the power dependence found between
the factor price on the one hand and charity and sustainable energy on the other hand. Influence legitimacy was also discovered as a legitimizing factor for the customer of GodEl, without mismatch or contradictions, seeing as the customer is acting accordingly to the customers’ perceived importance. The active choice of a specific volunteer organization is in direct correspondence to the customers’ perceived importance of making such a choice and it therefore corresponds to the stated conclusion. Furthermore, the analysis indicates that dispositional legitimacy is a legitimizing factor without mismatch. However, there were contradictions in the relationship between the customers’ perception of charity and the action of conducting volunteer work. This contradiction is based on the findings that the customers perceived importance of charity was not in direct line with the commitment of conducting volunteer work.

On the discussion of moral legitimizing aspects; Consequential legitimacy was not found to be legitimizing, seeing as the majority of respondents did not take note of the communication consisting of GodEl’s actual accomplishments. Therefore, the results indicate a mismatch between communication and perception, as the consumers did not read the information available to them. There was no contradiction, based on figure 2 and 7 indicating that the actual accomplishments were not considered a factor of high importance.

Procedural legitimacy was found to be a legitimizing factor. However, both a mismatch and a contradiction were discovered. The contradiction was that even though consumers perceived sustainable energy as an important factor in their choice of GodEl as a service provider, the consumers did not know that they had to make an active choice. Based on the contradiction, a mismatch could be identified seeing as there was confusion regarding the need of making an actual choice of adding the service of sustainable energy.

The conclusion can be drawn that the customers legitimize their choice of GodEl through diverse legitimizing dimensions. Through the conclusions above, pragmatic legitimacy is a stronger legitimizing dimension than moral legitimacy. These conclusions imply that larger emphasis is given to consumer self-interest, rather than to the consequences and judgment of the organization “doing the right thing”.
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7 Suggestions for further research

The insights of this paper leads to reflections regarding the background of GodEls customers. Questions such as awareness in consumption come to mind. Practical implications of this study can lead to corporations’ further engaging in building a relationship with their customers and engaging them in their operations. With reference to GodEls customers of this case study, it can be of advantage to investigate what characteristics these customers possess. This can in turn lead to a larger and more distinct target group for GodEl to engage with in their operations.

Furthermore, in order to grasp an overall perception of what is demanded and appreciated from the public, suggestions of further case studies can saturate the credibility challenge that exists for organizations that act within social entrepreneurship. In order to add clarity and exceed confusion and credibility challenges, more studies within this recited phenomenon is needed.
8 Limitations

This section will stress the limitations bound to this thesis. The theoretical framework of behavioral legitimacy dimensions was based on Suchmans’ (1995) conceptualization, however his research is based on a review of previous extensive legitimacy review. Due to the execution of a single case study, the ambition has not been to generalize on these findings, but to add an understanding to what intrigues the consumer to enact and legitimize a corporation operating of such dual financial and social value creation within the frames of the phenomenon social entrepreneurship. The data is GodEls customers’ individual perception and therefor not fact. Seeing as a single case study was used, the respondents are in line with the four segments of GodEls customer base, hence reflecting the perception of the specific case company’s customers.
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10 Appendix

10.1 Interview guide with GodEls customers

Q1. Priset var viktigast vid mitt val av GodEl, Skala 1-5: instämmer inte alls, instämmer helt
   1=18, 2=26, 3=41, 4=28, 5=9
   122 respondents
   Exchange legitimacy

Q2. Välgörenheten var viktigast vid mitt val av GodEl, Skala 1-5: instämmer inte alls, instämmer helt
   1=3, 2=7, 3=23, 4=51, 5=38
   122st totalt
   Dispositional legitimacy

Q3. Miljöcertifierad el (BMV) var viktigast vid mitt val av GodEl, Skala 1-5: instämmer inte alls, instämmer helt
   1=15, 2=19, 3=36, 4=30, 5=22
   122st totalt
   Procedural legitimacy

Q4. Har du Miljöcertifierad el via GodEl (BMV)? (Har du själv tagit ställning och valt BMV?) Ja, nej, vet ej
   Ja=34, Nej=25, Vet ej=63
   122st totalt
   Procedural legitimacy

Q5. Möjligheten att välja vart mitt bidrag ska gå till var viktigast vid mitt val av GodEl. Skala 1-5: instämmer inte alls, instämmer helt
   1=32, 2=36, 3=24, 4=21, 5=9
   122st totalt
   Influence legitimacy
Q6. Har du valt välgörenhetsorganisation? Ja, nej, vet ej
   Ja=67, Nej=37, Vet ej=18
   122st totalt
   Influence legitimacy

Q7. Donerar du till välgörenhetsorganisationer? Ja, nej, vet ej
   Ja=90, Nej=32, Vet ej=0
   122st totalt
   Dispositional legitimacy

Q8. Är du involverad i ideella sammanhang? Liksom engagemang som hjälper andra? Ja, nej, vet ej
   Ja=51, Nej=71, Vet ej=0
   122st totalt
   Dispositional legitimacy

Q9. Tar du del av GodEls kommunikation om vart pengarna/donationerna går till (hemsida, kundservice, Facebook, infoblad etc) Skala 1-5: 1 aldrig 2 sällan, 3 ibland, 4 ofta, 5 alltid
   1=35, 2=35, 3=33, 4=10, 5=9
   122st totalt
   Consequential legitimacy

Q10. Vad är det som gör att du är kvar som kund hos GodEl? Vad tycker du är viktigast?
    122st totalt
    Öppen fråga