

The Logic of Innovation: A Study on the Narrative Construction of Intrapreneurial Groups in the Light of Competing Institutional Logics

Seidenschnur, Tim

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Seidenschnur, T. (2019). The Logic of Innovation: A Study on the Narrative Construction of Intrapreneurial Groups in the Light of Competing Institutional Logics. *Historical Social Research*, 44(4), 222-249. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.222-249>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

The Logic of Innovation. A Study on the Narrative Construction of Intrapreneurial Groups in the Light of Competing Institutional Logics

Tim Seidenschnur*

Abstract: »Die Logik der Innovation. ‚Intrapreneurial Groups‘ als narrative Konstrukte in Deutungswettbewerben«. This paper focuses on entrepreneurial groups as a narrative construct within organizations, i.e., intrapreneurial groups. It analyzes the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups within different institutional logics using the example of a company in the automotive industry. As part of the institutional logic of the market, a logic of innovation exists in this company. This logic establishes narratives, which determine how sense-making and the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups occur. The paper analyzes these narratives and the way in which intrapreneurial groups are socially constructed within them. However, the analysis shows that while the logic of innovation is diffused throughout the entire organization, it comes into conflict with other logics when members of the organization apply it to discussions on upcoming changes. Referring to the research on institutional logics and institutional complexity, the paper analyzes such conflicts between logics. Within these conflicts, the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups changes. The paper further contributes to research on intrapreneurial groups by analyzing how the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups changes according to other logics, which are taken up in order to restrict the logic of innovation and confront the logic of innovation in conflicts.

Keywords: Automotive industry, culture of innovation, entrepreneurial groups, intrapreneur, institutional logics, narratives of innovation, sociology.

1. Introduction

Ongoing scientific debates on entrepreneurship have pointed out that the social context of entrepreneurship is highly relevant (Bruner 1990, Steyaert 2004). This is especially true for intrapreneurs, who can be regarded as entrepreneurs within organizations and as members of organizations (Parker 2011, 19) that are socialized into a specific social context within the organization. Research on the social context of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship shows that the

* Tim Seidenschnur, International Centre for Higher Education (INCHER), University of Kassel, Mönchebergstraße 17, 34109 Kassel, Germany; tim.seidenschnur@uni-kassel.de.

cultural framing under which entrepreneurs act is of high importance: when they appear, it is as if they “walk on a stage into a play whose enactment is already in progress” (Bruner 1990, 34; Hjorth and Steyaert 2004, 20). Others on that stage already have ideas on what the play is about and take some narratives and assumptions for granted (Meyer and Rowan 1977). This is especially important for intrapreneurs, who must refer to these narratives in order to take action, make sense of their ideas, and overcome resistance (Downing 2005, 180). At the same time, these narratives influence and limit the sensemaking of intrapreneurs (Weick 1995), who do not enter a context of prevailing narratives as outsiders, like external consultants, but instead have been socialized into these narratives over a long time. During the past few years, the analysis of this cultural framing has been identified as a research gap (Downing 2005; Gartner 2010). Consequently, the social aspect of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship has become a growing field of research (see, e.g., Hjorth and Steyaert 2004; Dalpiaz et al. 2010). There are, for example, quite a number of studies focusing on narratives and storytelling as enabling tools for entrepreneurs. Furthermore, entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship is no longer an individual, but typically a joint effort to implement innovation. Hence, entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial groups are a highly important subject and framework for narrations.

This paper contributes to the research on the social aspect of intrapreneurship by analyzing how intrapreneurial groups are established as a narrative construct in different narratives and according to different institutional logics. Depending on the way it is socially constructed, a narrative can motivate and push members of the organization to participate in intrapreneurial groups, but it can also do the opposite. This paper analyzes the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups within a large company in the automotive sector. In this company, intrapreneurial groups are a very important narrative figure that occurs when talking about innovation within the organizational culture. A culture that motivates employees to become intrapreneurs seems to be especially important in the German automotive industry, since highly successful German companies in this market fear dropping behind the competition in times of technological change, such as autonomous driving and electric vehicles. The belief of many participants in the market in a need to be innovative makes the automotive industry in Germany an interesting case.

However, in this company, as in other companies, intrapreneurs are embedded in logics and narratives which limit their sense-making (Thornton et al. 2012, 77). These logics and narratives are important enabling instruments for intrapreneurs to sell intrapreneurial action to other members of the organization and to craft their storyline in order to gain legitimacy (O’Connor 2004, 106; Suchman 1995). In such situations in which intrapreneurs try to promote changes, it can be expected that they refer to narratives and, within these narratives, to narrative constructs of intrapreneurial groups, which contribute to the promotion of change in terms of a broader logic of innovation. Hence, the logic

of innovation in this paper is understood as a cultural construct arising from narratives that shape the interpretative patterns, attitudes, and beliefs of members of the organization towards innovation which encourages these members to become intrapreneurs. The paper shows that such a logic of innovation is present in the company, analyzes how this logic of innovation becomes established, and asks which pictures and mechanisms of intrapreneurial groups are highlighted within this logic. At the same time, it can be expected that talking about innovation makes conflicts visible. The paper further analyzes how the logic of innovation is carried into conflicts with other logics and how the images of intrapreneurial groups as narrative constructs change within these conflicts and according to other logics.

In order to make this contribution, the paper refers to two further theoretical perspectives. It refers to theoretical works on narratives as cultural mechanisms, which are relevant for how certain logics can emerge and persist. Narratives are one important mechanism in a cultural toolkit such as symbols, stories, rituals, and worldviews (Rindova et al. 2011; Swidler 1986, 273). Within this toolkit, narratives play an important role for the socialization of members of an organization in interpretative patterns. This paper identifies narratives which are frequently told and reproduced in organizations and which constitute, reproduce, and actualize intrapreneurial groups as a narrative construct. The paper also shows how this narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups occurs in this company in the automotive industry and contributes to the logic of innovation in the company, which has become very important over time. It will be shown that there are narratives strong enough to establish a huge consensus concerning the need to be innovative in this company (see also Baregheh et al. 2009, 1324) and that the logic of innovation is also part of the institutional order of the market in the case at hand (Thornton et al. 2012, 56).

The institutional logics approach is the second theoretical perspective this paper uses to analyze the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups. The institutional logics approach has argued from different perspectives how different logics develop and expand within institutional fields over time (Thornton et al. 2012). This approach will be used as an analytical tool through which the cultural framing of the organization will be analyzed. The theoretical focus on competing institutional logics becomes relevant because the organization that is the subject of the analysis hosts not only one logic but a set of different, sometimes competing and sometimes peacefully coexisting institutional logics (Ocasio et al. 2017; Reay and Hinings 2009; Smets et al. 2015). Also, even if a logic of innovation as part of the market logic exists, is highly relevant, frequently reproduced, and motivates people to engage in intrapreneurial groups, this logic does not guarantee that people really participate in intrapreneurial groups in practice. Instead, the logic of innovation has to be operationalized and applied to upcoming changes, which are discussed contradictorily. Thereby, the logic of innovation becomes subject to conflicts that are the result of

competition for application in everyday activities. Only by being applied does a logic determine how upcoming changes and events should be interpreted and shaped. By focusing on such an upcoming change, which is one subject of the talk in the organization, the paper analyzes such competitions and the conflicts they cause with different institutional logics. Hence, the second goal of the paper is to analyze how the logic of innovation is applied to discussions on upcoming change, how it is limited by competing logics when it comes to competitions between logics, and how this changes the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups.

Overall, the paper will demonstrate how narratives establish and actualize a strong organizational logic of innovation that remains untouched in talks that are more general and may advise people to become intrapreneurs. Thereby, positive images of intrapreneurial groups are narratively constructed. It will also show how individuals bring this logic into conflicts with other logics when it is applied to discussions on upcoming change. In such competitions, the logic of innovation is challenged and the way intrapreneurial groups appear in narratives is modified due to the competing logics in the organization.

For this purpose, the paper analyzes 43 semi-structured interviews with employees working in different sectors of the automotive company. By choosing a broad focus and including actors from different positions in the hierarchy of the company, the paper aims to reconstruct narratives and subjects of discussion and upcoming change, which are told in different places by different actors and thus transcend intra-organizational borders.

The paper proceeds as follows. In the first part of the second section, the paper focusses on the institutional logics approach with regard to the paper's research interest (2.1). The second part of the second section refers to theoretical approaches towards narratives and more precisely narratives on intrapreneurship (2.2). The third section will present the research methods (3). The fourth section argues the paper's approach towards the concepts of innovation and intrapreneurship (4). This is followed by the analysis, which will proceed in three steps. Section five will analyze the narratives shaping the logic of innovation (5). Section six will analyze how conflicts occur if the logic of innovation is discussed at the example of upcoming change (6). Section seven will summarize the results (7).

2. Theoretical Approaches

2.1 Narratives in Organizations

Narratives play an important role for the socialization of members of an organization in interpretative patterns as well as for their strategic options as intrapreneurs. The idea that narrative approaches are highly relevant in processes

that enable intrapreneurial action to emerge is widely acknowledged and has been further developed in different works (see also Cornelissen et al. 2015; Downing 2005; Garud et al. 2014; Hjorth and Steyaert 2004; Lounsbury and Glynn 2001; Mládková 2013). This paper identifies narratives which are frequently told and reproduced in organizations and which constitute, reproduce, and actualize intrapreneurial groups as a narrative construct. In doing so, a logic of innovation becomes visible in the company. The following section elaborates how narratives as a cultural construct can contribute to the establishment of this logic of innovation and includes pictures of intrapreneurial groups.

Narratives are reports on different objects, events, and links (Kreiwirth 2000, 294). They do not report one to one what has been experienced, happened, or what has been heard. Instead, they provide the narrator room for selections and interpretations without giving up the claim that the narrator is reporting on what really happened and not only on fiction (Kreiwirth 2000, 302). Building upon these basic assumptions, the paper conducts that narratives report on the companies' past as well as events that can be of concern for the company in a selective manner and introduce interpretative patterns in this context.

Czarniawska (1997, 18) states that narratives are characterized by a plot: “[A plot] that is the basic means by which specific events, otherwise represented as lists or chronicles, are brought into one meaningful whole”. Equally, Franzosi (1998, 520) describes how narratives connect different events in order to give meaning to them in the sense of a broader interpretative pattern. This makes narratives a fitting subject of analysis with a focus on institutional or organizational logics. They include a lot of information on how individuals select specific aspects of the past, how they make sense of them in terms of shared interpretative patterns, and how they diffuse these patterns via story telling. Hence, they are “complex social artefacts” (Dalpiaz et al. 2014, 1376) that constitute “storylike constructions containing description, interpretation, emotion, expectations, and related material” (Dalpiaz et al. 2014, 1376; see also Harvey 1995).

The literature on narratives is well aware of the function of narratives for the operational processes of organizations. Downing (2005, 187) shows how narratives summarize custom and practice in organizations. They help members of the organization to “pigeon hole” the current practices in the “correct category.” Also, Czarniawska (1997; 67, 177) focusses on the power of narratives for sustainability and change in organizations by driving the thinking of individuals in one direction. This makes it clear why narratives are an important strategic instrument for actors who try to engage in change and intrapreneurial action. For instance, Mládková (2013, 86) has analyzed this strategic use of narratives by entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs. She argues that narratives are a

tool of great importance because, through storytelling, they can overcome protecting barriers humans develop against the new.

In addition to this strategic use through actors, narratives also have an important function for socializing newcomers and thereby for the diffusion of logics: “narratives are especially instrumental in socializing newcomers and creating a common ground of social action within organizations” (Bartel and Garud 2009, 108). Also, Dalpiaz et al. stress that actors are “actively engaged in constituting his or her own identity through these narratives” (2014, 1389); see also Rhodes and Brown 2005, 176). Referring to the identity of group members means to acknowledge that entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship are embedded in a cultural frame and that narratives are part of this frame (see also Downing 2005, 188).

On this theoretical basis, the paper recognizes that narratives have both an enabling and a limiting side. This substantiates why they can be regarded as part of a broader set of institutional logics that are also characterized by enabling and limiting sides within the concept of embedded agency (Thornton et al. 2012, 85).

2.2 Competing Logics within an Organization – Peaceful Coexistence or Competition for Goals

Research on the social construction of innovations suggests that every good idea and every innovative approach can fail if the cultural framing in organizations is problematic (Gartner 2010). The theoretical approach of New Institutionalism (NIT) offers an appropriate analytical tool through which the cultural framing of the organization can be analyzed. NIT suggests that the cultural framing in organizations differs from one organizational field to another (DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Wooten and Hoffman 2017; Zietsma et al. 2017). According to field differences, this case shows a picture of a specific setting of logics within the automotive industry and its current situation, which might differ from other fields. Research on institutional logics in an organizational field has shown that the thinking of individuals is determined by different logics. Thereby, an institutional logic is understood

as socially constructed, historical pattern of cultural symbols and material practices, assumptions, values, and beliefs by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organize time and space, and provide meaning to their daily activity. (Thornton and Ocasio 1999; Thornton et al. 2012, 51)

Following this definition, the thinking about innovations and intrapreneurial groups can be highly influenced by an institutional logic. Different coexisting institutional logics cause different options within the institutional setting in an organization, determining how innovations are interpreted and how images of intrapreneurial groups are shaped.

One of these institutional logics is the market logic. It focuses on the organization's status in the market and drives the attention of actors toward the question of being competitive and toward comparing their own performance with the performance of other actors (Thornton et al. 2012, 73). According to this focus of attention, innovations appear to be a basic need in order to be competitive. In the case at hand, this dependence will be examined in the empirical data. Additionally, this paper focuses on conflicts when innovations are discussed and how the influence of the market logic is limited by competing logics in conflictual situations. Thereby, the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups changes according to the dominance of other different institutional logics. The research on institutional complexity shows that organizations are not only characterized by one institutional logic but by different logics that can compete with each other or coexist peacefully (Dunn and Jones 2010; Reay and Hinings 2009; Smets et al. 2015). Smets et al. (2015, 941) demonstrated how individuals act under the circumstances of institutional complexity in reinsurance trading in Lloyd's of London. They show that individuals who are embedded in different logics in their organization manage competing logics in their everyday work and dynamically balance (in their example) market and community logics. Depending on the situation and the audience, individuals can shift from one logic to another. Carrying this observation over to this paper means acknowledging that individuals can highlight intrapreneurial groups differently in various situations according to different competing institutional logics such as market and community logics.

This ability to shift between different institutional logics enables individuals to balance competing logics strategically. This also makes logics part of the cultural toolkit of intrapreneurs who make use of them in order to gain legitimacy by referring to taken-for-granted narratives and assumptions. However, since institutional logics not only provide guidelines for how to act but also influence who we are, institutional complexity brings individuals into the difficult position of making sense of and resolving the tensions they face from competing institutional logics (Battilana and Dorado 2010; Meyer et al. 2014; Thornton et al. 2012). This paper recognizes both perspectives and takes them into consideration in its analysis: the social mechanisms in the form of narratives, which transfer a logic into identities of individuals using the example of the logic of innovation (1) and the practical needs in discussions, which bring this logic into conflict with coexisting logics using the example of upcoming changes in the organization (2).

By focusing on the questions of whether a logic of innovation is established in the company, on the social mechanism through which this logic is produced, on the occasions in which it is brought into conflicts, and on the competition and conflicts with other logics, the paper aims to elaborate which narrative constructions of intrapreneurial groups are established in the light of different institutional logics. When the paper refers to the cultural frame of the organiza-

tion in this analysis, it means the landscape of competing logics, the mechanisms through which they are transferred into definitions and concepts, and the pictures (of intrapreneurial groups) which emerge therefrom.

3. Method

In order to analyze the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups, the focus is on 43 semi-structured interviews that were conducted with employees of a large company in the automotive sector. The German automotive industry is a most interesting case for analyzing the culture of innovation for different reasons. German automotive companies are very successful; however, the automotive industry worldwide stands at a technological point of inflection (see, i.e., Brenner and Herrmann 2018; Broggi et al. 2016). In particular, two grand challenges are mentioned in the literature: autonomous driving and electric vehicles. Companies in the automotive industry have to manage these grand challenges successfully in order keep their position in the market. This situation, among other things, directs the managers' view on cultural aspects of the organization, as they identify a strong need for an organizational culture which favors open attitudes of its members to participation in intrapreneurial groups.¹ In Germany, this situation becomes even more striking since the emissions scandal creates the impression that German automotive companies make more effort in keeping the prevailing technologies competitive instead of being innovative.

The sampling of the interview partners tried to include the complete corporate structure of the company. The interviews were conducted with workers in the manufacturing site with different working positions and responsibilities (19), with managers from the middle and top management in different departments (24), and also with engineers in the planning and development departments (11). This broad sampling was chosen in order to evaluate whether narratives on innovations are only part of the cultural beliefs of members of a single profession, a certain department, or whether they are reproduced by all members of the organization in one logic.

The interviews are semi-structured. The structural aspects of the interviews follow ideas that were developed in a workshop with experienced employees of the organization before the interviews were conducted. This workshop focused on identifying intrapreneurial actions in the company's past, which are still present in the discussions of employees today. Thereby, the research generated potential opportunities to reflect on the worth of innovations and anchors

¹ Even if the wording for intrapreneurial groups differs in the interviews. Interview partners sometimes use the word "teams," "innovation teams," or a simple "we" referring to the analytical concept of intrapreneurial groups.

which, once introduced in the interviews, could induce interview partners to report narratives on innovations. In order to provide the interviewees with the necessary space for such descriptions in the interviews (Flick 2011, 273), the content of the interviews was structured in episodes, referring to some selected discussions on changes in the company. Within these episodes, the interviews included narrative sequences.

This study followed a two-step approach for the analysis of the data. The first step tried to identify narratives of innovation and followed a deductive coding strategy. We identified stories in the data. The interview partners in different departments do not tell the same story in detail, because narratives give narrators some leeway in shaping their own story, but they tell stories with the same plot-structure. From this data set we interpreted the meaning which is given in the stories to objects, events, and organizational developments in order to identify the narratives as a whole, including reports and the reconstruction of meaning (Czarniawska 1997, 18). We will describe these narratives using the example of the most meaningful sequences within larger interview sections elaborating the narrative in the data. We regard these interview sequences as being particularly representative of the collected data in the context of one narrative.

The second step analyzes how individuals deal with the logic of innovation when they apply it in debates on upcoming changes. Thereby, the level of abstraction of debating innovations is reduced and upcoming change is discussed using the example of wages. An ongoing debate in the company has been mentioned in the workshop with experienced employees and played a big role during the interviews. This debate is about the extent to which intrapreneurial work and innovative ideas should determine the amount of salary. It has been shown in the literature that logics give sense to how situations are interpreted in decision making (Thornton et al. 2012, 95) and also that the narratives in a certain logic can play an especially crucial role when a logic is challenged in difficult situations with complex discussions (Dalpiaz et al. 2014, 1365).

Following the assumption that conflicts will be induced by the general request to take intrapreneurial action, it is very probable that different institutional or organizational logics will be taken up in order to challenge this request. In the interviews, the question was raised whether the employees agree that innovative ideas should be rewarded by a higher salary due to the importance of innovations.

At the time we conducted the interviews, the company's structure offered two possibilities to pay employees for innovative ideas and their conceptualization. The first is that employees formally submit an "Idea for Improvements" (IfI). If this idea is implemented later on and reduces costs for the company, part of the cost-reduction will be paid as an award to the inventor. The second possibility is that the salary includes an additional award

that is negotiated based on the employee's performance every year, but the sum of this award is very low. Besides these two mechanisms, there is a discussion in the management of the company whether the overall salary can be coupled more strongly to innovative ideas and work. The analysis of how the logic of innovation is applied will be conducted by referring to interview sequences in which this discussion was addressed by the interview partners.

4. Innovation and Intrapreneurial Groups

This empirical background also enables a more precise definition of the concepts of innovations and of intrapreneurial groups. Innovation is a generic word and, in organizations, may apply to various sectors of the corporate realm, such as, products, services, operations, processes, and people (Baregheh et al. 2009, 1323). Intrapreneurs are members of an organization who initiate and implement innovations (Vargas-Halabi et al. 2017, 88). They are described as domestic entrepreneurs in the literature "as they pursue the interest of that organization while maintaining their focus on innovation and creativity" (Lages et al. 2017, 828). With regard to intrapreneurs, Antoncic and Hisrich (2001, 495) developed four dimensions that can be applied to the concept of innovation: the new-business-venturing dimension, the innovativeness dimension, the self-renewal dimension, and the proactiveness dimension. New-business-venturing refers to pursuing and entering new business related to the current market of the company, innovativeness emphasizes the creation of new products, services, and technologies in the market, self-renewal means to reformulate strategies and reorganize organizations, and proactiveness reflects top management orientation in pursuing enhanced competitiveness including initiative and risk-taking (Antoncic and Hisrich 2001, 495).

Since this study analyzes the culture of innovation in the company as a general sphere, it can theoretically include all types of intrapreneurial action. Nevertheless, the study empirically gave some interpretative space to experienced actors in the company. These actors introduced ideas and interpretations of what people regarded as innovations and intrapreneurial actions in the company both currently and in its recent past. We used these definitions and views for structuring the questionnaire for the interviews. This empirical strategy gave us the opportunity to induce talk and narrative sequences on innovation and intrapreneurial action in the company's past. However, this empirical approach and the interview partners' definitions have revealed that the study has a more limited understanding of intrapreneurial action and did not include all possible dimensions as they have been defined by Antoncic and Hisrich (2001). There are no examples of new-business-venturing given in the data. Instead of focusing on creations of new businesses, the study addresses strategic intrapreneurship that corresponds to a broader array of intrapreneurial initiatives (Kuratko

and Audretsch 2013, 332), including especially the dimensions of innovativeness and self-renewal. Consequently, the culture of innovation will be analyzed in the paper primarily according to intrapreneurial action in terms of the development of new products within the company's market, the renewal of strategies, and the reorganization of working processes. Narratives, which are part of the culture of innovation, refer to the meaning of both innovations of new products in the market and working processes in the company in the past. In making sense of this past, they require employees to become intrapreneurs in the future – for instance, when employees contribute towards the innovations of autonomous driving or electric vehicles and innovate working processes with regard to effectiveness and creativity, such as the creation of intrapreneurial teams. Additionally, there are some aspects of the dimension of proactiveness in the data. However, the role of this dimension of intrapreneurial action seems to be more complicated because of the actual position of the German automotive industry in the market. The culture of innovation includes elements of intrapreneurial proactiveness in the company's past. Here, the merits are ascribed to proactive intrapreneurs in the past who are described as being an important factor for the success of the company today. Nevertheless, with regard to the future perspective in sensemaking, the German automotive industry is more generally regarded as lagging behind the times when concerning key innovations such as electric cars and automotive driving. Consequently, members of the organization see intrapreneurial action as related more often to the idea of catching up than of being proactive.

Overall, the way this paper understands intrapreneurship is based on how employees define intrapreneurship and emphasizes specific aspects of the theoretical concept of an intrapreneur: the development of new products within the company's market, the renewal of strategies, and the reorganization of working processes. Therefore, the paper still has a comparably broad access to intrapreneurship and innovation. This access will be used in the paper, which focuses on the cultural side of innovations in order to analyze how institutional logics and their narratives are used to interpret different types of intrapreneurial action. Moreover, the analyzes will show how intrapreneurial groups are highlighted as more positive or more negative symbols in this culture of innovation according to competing logics, which, in the end, can contribute or can hinder the formation of intrapreneurial teams in the company.

5. Narrating the Logic of Innovation – the Uncertainty of the Past and its Meaning for the Future

Narratives claiming innovations as a basic need for a prosperous future can be easily found when changes in a company's past are discussed. Recent research has shown that such narratives are highly relevant for claiming legitimacy for

future ventures (Garud et al. 2014, 1480; Mlãdková 2013, 86). In the case of the company in the automotive sector that is the subject of this analysis, we identify three narratives. Each one emphasizes the importance of being innovative in order to compete successfully in the market, which indicates the affiliation of the logic of innovation to the institutional logic of the market. The first one is a narrative about the responsibility of every single employee for innovations (1), the second narrative refers to technological progress in order to explain the basic need for being innovative (2), and the third narrative reminds people of heroic intrapreneurship in the company's past (3). Within these three narratives, intrapreneurial groups appear as a narrative construct and the sense-making within the narratives will be analyzed with this regard.

5.1 Responsibility for Innovations

The core of the first narrative is the responsibility of every single actor (1): "Everyone is more responsible for innovations" (11, 63). Its plot contrasts what members of the organization were seen as responsible for in the past compared with the responsibilities of members of the organization today:

If you take away the responsibility for innovations from single persons, these persons stop to think. We have had such times in our company [...]. I have worked here since 1985, I have had a traditional boss in these times and he had the mindset: you don't need to think, we think for you. (11, 63)

Therefore, the plot of the narrative of responsibility deals with the subject of who is responsible for innovations and who can be requested to develop new ideas: either selected groups of employees or individual employees that can be part of any intra-organizational group. It has a timeline that contrasts the responsibility of the few in the past with the responsibility of every employee today. The narrative evaluates this development and gives meaning to it:

That is a good development because employees have the opportunity to establish themselves, because they are made responsible. And we really have this trend that everybody can do more concerning innovations and has to do more. (11, 63)

Hence, we can see that this narrative not only reports the tendency of how the organization develops over time, but it also supports this development by distinguishing between the positive effects for the actors involved and the needs of the company. In summary, the interviews show a narrative about the responsibility of every single member of the organization and the positive effects of this development. We identified one story that circulated in the organization, was told repeatedly, and which gets to the heart of the narrative:

In the past it has been said that you leave your brain at the entrance gate. Now, you are not supposed to leave your brain there, you shall take it with you and think and have ideas. (9, 213)

This story repeats the narrative's plot. In the past, it was not appreciated that every employee was concerned about the working processes in the company. Today, the situation is different. Sometimes, some interview partners also use this narrative to insult employees who have missed the change in the organizational culture and who are not willing to contribute innovative ideas:

Employees, who are presidents of rabbit breeding associations or sport associations or whatsoever and doing a good job, and then they come here, and because they have never been asked to be innovative they pretend not to be able to write a correct sentence. Now, we must motivate these people and give room for ideas. We must motivate these people to think innovatively. Our company can profit from them and needs their capacities. (38, 4)

Emphasizing the responsibility of every single member of the organization, this narrative contributes to an organizational culture in which the development of new and innovative ideas is well positioned in the interpretative patterns of members of the organization and contributes to a logic of innovation. The narrative strengthens the idea that being a member of this company means a willingness to be an intrapreneur and reinforces the economic need for intrapreneurship. Referring to this economic need and pointing out that being innovative is about increasing the company's profit also shows the relationship between this narrative within the logic of innovation and the institutional logic of the market.

Within this narrative of responsibility, intrapreneurial groups play an important role as a narrative construction. Following the plot of the narrative of responsibility, innovations were the inventions of individuals in the past, while innovations nowadays are the work of intrapreneurial groups. Intrapreneurial groups give people the opportunity to develop innovative ideas. This narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups therefore includes ascriptions of a positive meaning to intrapreneurial groups, highlighting its inclusive effects for the employees. Since inventions are no longer made by single persons but within intrapreneurial groups instead, it becomes easier for actors in this narrative to become team members and contribute to innovations (Boltanski and Chiapello 2007, 187; Ruef 2010). Following this narrative, working in intrapreneurial groups with experts from different fields of knowledge makes employees more self-confident and can help to overcome hierarchies, which have restrained innovations in the past:

The relationship between bosses and employees is different today compared to 20 years ago. Back then it was like this: Boss says – employee starts running. Today that is different. Now, people must appreciate the new opportunities. (11, 29)

This narrative shows how the practice of working in intrapreneurial groups is appreciated because it offers new opportunities. Simultaneously, the other side of opportunities means responsibility. In order to make the company more successful, its members are responsible to take these opportunities and use

them for creativity, innovative ideas, and becoming intrapreneurs. This narrative is apparent at all levels of the company. Consequently, intrapreneurial groups have the power to include more people with different qualifications and this development emerges in the responsibility of everyone to be innovative:

I believe, nowadays we have the right mechanisms. Very important is the work in innovative teams. And concerning these teams, I'm no longer talking about academics. From academics I could always expect that they use their opportunities. But now we include every working sector and working experience. Hence, everybody has the opportunity to provide thoughts. (42, 63)

And this changes completely the relation to your boss, because besides it's all about working in teams where you can develop ideas. (11,27)

In summary, these sequences demonstrate that the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups within the logic of innovation happens in a positive manner, highlighting the economic need for members of the organization to participate in intrapreneurial groups and their responsibility to do so.

5.2 Technological Advancement

Regarding innovations, there is another narrative that is told in the data and contributes to the logic of innovation. This narrative focuses on technological advancement (2). Here, innovations are essential for the survival of the company in the market because new technologies can only be used in the company with people continuously doing intrapreneurial work. It begins with a story not about the organizational change concerning how work is organized, nor about increasing responsibility, as in the earlier defined narratives. It starts, instead, as a story about the necessities of modern technology for working processes:

Yes, it is much more challenging today. Work is faster, it is more exigent, but therefore it is also more interesting. To take a technical construct as an example like a gearing mechanism. The old gearing mechanisms had very different tolerances. That was a different material, a different power transmission. From today's view, it was five times oversized. So solid and heavy that you could throw a sandwich into it and it would keep on running. Today, a metal splinter of the size of a hair would destroy it. (7, 167)

The plot of this narrative tells us something about how accurately workers have to be nowadays to work efficiently and avoid mistakes. But when people continue in this narrative, they also report how necessary it is to have innovative ideas about how to reduce the risk of making mistakes. If the slightest mistake causes serious damage, it is up to innovative ideas to find out how to avoid such mistakes: "New technologies are new challenges for us. If I want to master these challenges, I have to be innovative" (11,33). Then, the narrative continues ascribing meaning to innovative teams, which are regarded as essential tools to handle this technological challenge:

I have to be innovative in coping these challenges, I have to develop ideas how to work with new technologies, and I have to work in innovative teams where we can share our ideas and experiences. (11, 34)

Since we have people working together in innovation teams, it became easier to test new ideas and try to improve technologies. (17,62)

Referring to new technologies as challenges, the narrative on technological advancement shows the need to engage in innovative work and in intrapreneurial groups for employees in the company. Again, it brings this need together with the idea of competitiveness:

Technology advances very quickly. [...] Hence, you also must be willing to advance. [...] The market is very dynamic and we have to keep pace through advancements. (30, 58)

Overall, this narrative also contributes to a logic of innovation and demonstrates how this logic is established in the organizational culture. The logic of innovation gives meaning to how events in the past are interpreted by the members of the company. There are different keywords for this interpretative pattern: intrapreneurial groups and the positive ascription of meaning to intrapreneurial groups, the grown responsibilities of members of the organization, technological advance, and increased opportunities of members of the organization to participate in intrapreneurial work. By way of the narratives, this logic is updated and diffused in the organization. In a broader meaning, it contributes to the thinking in the institutional logic of the market by aiming for competitiveness, technical advancements, profit, and status in the companies' market through innovations (Thornton et al. 2012, 73).

5.3 Heroic Intrapreneurs

Another narrative that contributes to the logic of innovation can be identified in stories on big intrapreneurs in the company's past (3). This is interesting because it also refers to the market logic and contributes to the logic of innovation in terms of highlighting the "imperative necessity" to be innovative, but it shifts the focus from intrapreneurial groups to the heroic emphasis. Its plot visualizes the importance of being innovative by using the example of selected people. It reports difficulties and hard times in the company's past, when it ran the risk of being closed down. Afterwards, it makes the innovative contributions of heroic intrapreneurs responsible for pushing the company in the right direction. The plot ends up in describing the current situation as quite comfortable, but reminds people not to forget the importance of innovations in being successful in the market.

In this difficult situation [name of the former CEO] really made a great effort and said: 'No, this is the wrong way.' Then, he pushed many new things and we all joined in. We saw, ok, this is the right track; we can do it with him. Then we all made a great effort and today, no [name of the product] leaves an assembly line without us. [...] But we have to keep that in mind. (9, 56)

Included in this narrative are different characteristics that are usually ascribed to intrapreneurs². These characteristics are, e.g., diligence and undertaking major efforts, recognizing the need for change, showing willingness to take risks, and having the knowledge to induce change and to inspire people (Bröckling 2016, 51). It ends with the comfortable position the company is in today and again brings together the logic of innovation and the company's success in market competition, as a result of heroic intrapreneurship. However, it only includes a weak emphasis on teamwork, which remains somehow vague and colorless behind the heroic emphasis of the intrapreneur of the past. Here, the narrative highlights the heroic emphasis of a single person, who is held accountable for the company's success in the market. This narrative indicates that the culture of innovation, which is usually established by narratives that put high emphasis on intrapreneurial teams, also includes some other remarks in narratives that keep the importance of being innovative in mind.

Overall, we can see that all three narratives contribute to the "logic of innovation." Within this logic, the company's success in the market depends on innovations. The logic includes different narratives and, within these narratives, intrapreneurial groups are a very relevant narrative construct (technological advancements and heroic intrapreneurs are further relevant symbols) which establishes a cultural framework that encourages members of the organization to contribute to innovative ideas and change. Intrapreneurial groups are highlighted and are of high importance for the development of ideas. Accordingly, intrapreneurial groups give people the opportunity to contribute ideas and, because of the existence of this "new" opportunity, members of the organization are held responsible to establish and to participate in intrapreneurial groups. This logic of innovation is very dominant in general talks in which people refer to the role of the company in the market and make sense of intrapreneurial groups with this in regard.

6. Reducing the Level of Abstraction – the Application of the Logic of Innovation to Discussions on Upcoming Change

Up to here, the analysis has proven that a logic of innovation exists in the company, which invites and requests members of the organization to engage in intrapreneurial groups. This logic of innovation remains untouched in conversations on a more general and abstract level, but the data shows different dynamics when it comes to discussions of upcoming changes in the organization. In the following chapter, I will analyze such dynamics using the example of

² Regardless of whether these properties are really empirically found in intrapreneurs.

discussions in the company about the question of whether salaries should take innovations and intrapreneurial work more extensively into account. This example documents both that the logic of innovation is transferred in order to interpret the question about innovative work and salary and that other logics within the organization are brought into the discussion. When other logics are applied to this discussion, it changes the way in which intrapreneurial groups are constructed in the narratives. Hence, by focusing on this discussion in the interviews, the analysis concentrates on a setting of logics competing for application and the impact on the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups.

6.1 Transferring the Logic of Innovation

When the logic of innovation is taken up, the attempt to give innovations a higher financial account in the salary is appreciated. However, the interview partners focus on the unsatisfactory solutions which are offered at the time of the interviews. These solutions are deemed unsatisfactory because of insufficient monetary reward. Employees interpret these solutions as impression management (Kipping 2011, 546). They feel that the management gives the impression of attributing high importance to innovations only in talk while they act rather moderately in situations where the need to become more innovative should be taken more seriously. Given the high importance of innovations, they argue that intrapreneurs should receive higher appreciation. One can find such explanations in interview sequences on what can be awarded in the bonus system of the company's salaries:

Well, almost no one would ever give X Euros [minimum amount] to an employee, at least I never did. Innovations are important and I would give Y Euros [maximum amount] to an creative employee. But, if you really have a lazy bugger, he would never be impressed by Z Euros [double-digit differential amount]. (33, 50)

In this view, the positive attitude towards the idea of rewarding innovative ideas with financial gain becomes clear. Furthermore, the actual situation is characterized as unsatisfactory because of the small revenue for innovative work:

This is my experience, if I earn X Euros (minimum amount) or Y Euros (maximum amount), this is the difference we are talking about, that does not make it very desirable to perform higher. (29, 138)

You have this additional salary you can distribute up to X (a low three digit amount). [...] Now you can argue that an employee has participated in a team and really engaged in the processes last year and that you have noticed that it was less engagement this year. Then you can give him Y (low double-digit amount) less. That's nothing. (9, 98)

The existing situation is similarly interpreted when interview partners on the other existing instrument to value innovative work (Ideas for Improvements):

We have the opportunity to submit ideas for improvements. These ideas are evaluated and awarded with regard to this evaluation. But there are too many limits in this instrument. (23, 62)

Hence, we can see that if employees transfer the logic of innovation into the discussion, it introduces a specific interpretative pattern. In this interpretative pattern, a positive development of the organization depends on giving higher awards for the work in intrapreneurial groups, which are at the same time socially constructed as highly important for being competitive as an organization. This should be a guarantee that employees gain more financial rewards in this logic.

However, the data also shows that the narrative of innovation is not always transferred. In addition, members of the organization bring different other logics into discussion and apply them to the question of a higher financial reward for innovative ideas, for example, a professional logic.

6.2 Confronting the Logic of Innovation with Professional Logics – the Discourse on Creativity

One professional logic which interview partners apply to this question is the logic of the professional work of artists³. In this logic, the act of taking intrapreneurial action is tightly related to very concrete presumptions. It shows that the invention of “creativity” is a product of a long-lasting, discursive process of social construction in western societies.

The literature on innovations establishes “innovation” and “creativity” as affiliated concepts. Thereby, creativity plays a role in the ideation, diffusion, and adaption processes of innovations (Baragheh et al. 2009). By applying the professional logic of artist to the idea of innovation, the narrative takes for granted that creativity is a necessary condition of innovation. Hence, the narrative puts a special emphasis on the generation of ideas. Being creative does not guarantee successful innovation, but innovation cannot work without people being creative in the logic of this narrative. At the same time, within the professional logic of artists, the way creativity is understood follows a specific model of professional work (Reckwitz 2017). In contrast to working in intrapreneurial groups in an economy of speed in which the number of requested innovations rises and the time to develop these ideas becomes shorter, the classic idea of artistic work follows an ideal of waiting for inspiration, usually alone in an artist’s studio (Reckwitz, 2017). This ideal is taken up, for example, by remembering celebrity professionals (Thornton et al., 2012, 56) who are artists

³ By using the term professional logic, I refer to a broader reading in the institutional logics approach. I acknowledge that there are intense and rich debates on professions in sociological research which define professions by different criteria (see, e.g., Abbott 1988) and that one cannot refer to ‘artist’ as a profession in general.

that embody the idea of being creative by working alone in their studio having more or less serendipitous ideas. Bringing this professional logic into the discussion means that inspiration cannot be enforced by organizational pressure (which is also a pressure of time and space). Instead, inspiration in terms of artistic work needs time and scope for development. Applying this idea about creativity to the discussion means bringing the logic of innovation into conflict with the professional logic of artists.

I don't know if that puts pressure on you, if you try to improve your salary. Then you think you have to be innovative and that implants a brake into your head. As soon as I put myself under pressure, I can't be creative, because I think too much about how I could be creative. (24, 61)

One must be careful that people don't think they have to participate. One cannot force good ideas. You develop innovative ideas during your everyday work, if you start thinking calmly and without pressure. But if you begin to arrange innovative teams from nowhere and push them to develop ideas you will get less. (13, 33)

This logic is applied to individuals as well as to intrapreneurial groups. If the company implies a structural framework to push employees into working in intrapreneurial groups, for example, through financial reward, this is suggested in the narrative to be counterproductive. This assumption is made plausible with the professional logic of the artists and the understanding of creativity within this logic. Every rule or structure can be thought of as an insurmountable limitation of creativity in this logic. Thereby, this changes the way the narrative of intrapreneurial groups is constructed.

Now intrapreneurial groups appear as one tool to be more innovative amongst others. Intrapreneurial groups no longer appear as a best-practice mechanism to be more innovative, as suggested in the logic of innovation, but as a mechanism that only works without pressure and in the freedom of artistic work.

Therefore, a conflict becomes visible in the discussions of a higher salary for innovative ideas. This conflict is signified in the data by a competition between the logic of innovation and the logic of creativity. Both logics argue that today there is a general need for being innovative. Therefore, on a more abstract and general level, the logic of innovation with its calls for more innovative ideas remains untouched. On this level, the logics can coexist peacefully, while in the case of a concrete implication the logics induce conflict. The professional logic of artists introduces a different narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups into this conflict. This narrative construction includes a vocabulary of limitations by the rules of creativity within the professional logic of artists. For single members of the organization to induce this professional logic also means parrying the calls for more responsibilities and establishing a picture of intrapreneurial groups as having fewer obligations.

Another logic that is applied to the discussion is the institutional logic of the community in the form of discussions of distributive justice. This logic allows for some interpretative variation as it refers either to the measurement of performances or to social inequalities.

6.3 Confronting the Logic of Innovation with Community Logics – Distributive Justice in Measuring Achievements in Intrapreneurial Teams

The institutional order of the community is signified, for example, by the commitment to community values and ideology (Thornton et al. 2012, 73). Distributive justice is an important aspect of these community values.

If narratives on distributive justice are applied to the discussion, one aspect that is questioned on rewarding innovations is the fair measurement of innovative achievements and performances. It also questions whether innovative ideas can be measured fairly at all. The literature on entrepreneurial groups acknowledges the problem of “distributive justice” (Ruef 2010, 116). In the case at hand, employees argue that only a very small number of innovative ideas are given into the “Ideas for Improvements”-System (IfI) while a large number of innovations remain unnoticed.

To question working processes and to develop innovative ideas to improve it [...] is hidden in everyday work in the company. (34, 74)

Many people don't conceptualize their ideas – they just innovate. (2, 76)

There are ideas, you can't measure. I'm here since 23 years, I contributed many innovations, but I only submitted one IfI. (38, 82)

Therefore, narratives on distributive justice, if transferred to this discussion, argue that hidden innovations do not lead to additional financial rewards and, therefore, monetary rewards based only on noticed innovations are unfair. Furthermore, there are also examples when the question of distributive justice is transferred to the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups. Within intrapreneurial groups, difficulties with the copyright of innovative ideas are identified as an example of unjust measurement. Yet, it is not about the worth of innovations; it is about failure to identify the inventor. This argument refers directly to working processes in intrapreneurial groups (Ruef 2010, 113):

Well, I don't think it is a good idea, because it's also a question of self-presentation. There are people in innovation teams, taking ideas from everywhere, presenting them very convincingly and then they are honored and rewarded. (7, 59)

In this presentation, distributive justice is challenged by the failure to differentiate between real inventors and people who are giving their voice to ideas from colleagues. This aspect of the narrative is reminiscent of the “Free Rider Prob-

lem” that is mentioned in the literature with regard to people having the opportunity to profit without effort in intrapreneurial groups (Ruef 2010, 139).

By analyzing the conflictual relationship between narratives of distributive justice and the logic of innovation up to this point, it becomes apparent that the narrative of distributive justice questions the mechanism and the transfer of the logic of innovation to the discussion. Thereby, the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups is characterized by testing intrapreneurial groups in the sense of community logics. Again, the logic of innovation remains unchallenged in a more general term because the overall need for the logic of innovation for the necessity of innovations and for everybody’s responsibility to contribute innovative ideas is not called into question. However, the discussion of a salary more dependent on innovative work induces competition between logics and changes the way intrapreneurial groups are narratively constructed as a potential challenge for distributive justice in the sense of community logics. Thereby, it also relieves members of the organization to some extent from measuring their performance in intrapreneurial groups.

6.4 Confronting the Logic of Innovation with Community Logics – Social Inequalities

Another way to apply the community order to the discussion is by referring to the preconditions of being innovative in terms of human capital. Social inequalities are discussed with regard to talent and capabilities in such sequences:

Some employees only do their work. And I say every human being only performs in line with its capabilities. Not everybody can become a dentist. But why should somebody who is lazy but very intelligent and has a brilliant idea, why should he earn more money, only because of innovations. If you do the same work like somebody who is not very intelligent [...] you should not get a higher salary. (21, 52)

This is not a “Free Rider Problem” (Ruef 2010, 139) because the discussion is not about free riders having the opportunity to profit without effort in intrapreneurial groups; it is more about personal profit and capabilities. Dubet (2008) has elaborated that every performance has two elements: deserts and merit. One is the objective result of an action and the other one is the dedication and commitment in the process of acting (Dubet 2008, 127). Hence, to measure performances one could either refer more strongly to the result or to the commitment. The plot of the story told in the interview sequence applies the logic of social inequality by arguing that innovations only refer to results but hide commitment in everyday working processes. Disregarding commitment and efforts is discussed as being unfair. This problem of fairness is sharpened in the interview sequence by questioning that everybody has the natural capabilities to achieve deserts. The interview partner argues that intelligence is a precondition for innovations and that intelligence must be regarded as a gift, while commit-

ment is a question of motivation. In this argumentation, rewards for innovations make gifted people richer and less gifted people poorer:

People who are working at the machinery and only do their work would get a raw deal (23, 62); people at the machinery also may have less time to think about improvements. (14, 69)

The analysis of these sequences shows a clear difference between distributive justice and social inequality. Both include statements inducing conflict and competition in the attempt to apply community logics. However, contrary to the idea of distributive justice and also to the idea of creativity within the professional logic of artists, referring to social inequalities includes statements which assume that efforts are more important than innovations and intrapreneurial success. These statements challenge the general message of the logic of innovation that claims that the success of the organization was related to innovations in the past and will be related to innovations in the future. It also changes the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups which offer more opportunities to gifted people than to “normal” people. Consequently, there are interpretations in this logic challenging the narrative of responsibility to engage in intrapreneurial groups, which has been elaborated in section 5.1. Instead, working in intrapreneurial groups becomes more exclusive: “I would say managers and engineers ok. For them I could imagine such a practice. But for workers? I think that’s not suitable” (30, 144).

Hence, if this narrative is applied successfully to discussions over time, it could challenge the logic of innovation on a more general level and could change the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups, which would become more exclusive and no longer an integrative element of the organizational culture.

7. Conclusion

This paper focused on intrapreneurial groups as a narrative construct. In order to analyze the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups, different narratives in 43 interviews in a company in the German automotive sector were reconstructed. This sector is in a difficult situation since highly successful German companies in this market fear dropping behind the competition in times of technological change, such as autonomous driving and electric vehicles. The paper argues that a logic of innovation is present in this company. Within this logic, intrapreneurial groups play an important role and are narratively constructed in a positive manner. All interview partners, no matter where they work, what their work looks like, or what their educational background is, agree on the importance of this logic of innovation. By analyzing narratives which are contributing to this logic of innovation, the first contribution of the paper is that it documented and analyzed how members of the organization

reproduce this logic of innovation, what the contributing narratives look like, and how intrapreneurial groups are narratively constructed within this logic (1).

Next, the paper experimented with a different setting. It analyzed how the interview partners applied the logic of innovation to the discussion of higher financial rewards for innovative work. This discussion was selected in earlier talks in a focus group with members of the company prior to the interviews and is one example of an upcoming change that is part of the management's agenda. In this discussion, it became clear how different competing logics conflicted with the logic of innovation. By analyzing these processes in interview sequences, the paper made two further contributions (2+3).

The second contribution of the paper addresses the research on competing institutional logics and sheds light on the cultural dimension of innovations and intrapreneurship (Gartner 2010). It adds the idea that even if there is a strong logic of innovation in terms of the market logic, the transfer of this logic into action drives the logic into competition for application with other institutional logics (2). It describes such a competition between logics at the example of the market logic, a professional logic (with a special interpretation of creativity as understood in the tradition of arts), and the community logic. The logic of professional artists illustrates that creative ideas and innovative change can only be reached without organizational pressure and thereby this logic sets limits to structural approaches to intensify work in intrapreneurial groups in big companies. The community logic is applied to the discussion in two variations – narratives of distributive justice and narratives of social inequality. Narratives of distributive justice refer to a problem of a fair measurement of innovations. They argue that if innovations remain invisible, intrapreneurs do not profit even if they would deserve benefits. Alternatively, they argue that if inventors remain unidentifiable in intrapreneurial groups, people who are giving their voice to ideas from colleagues profit more than they deserve. Narratives of social inequality argue that referring to innovations means to refer to natural ability, but it hides commitment in everyday working processes. Disregarding commitment and effort is described as being unfair. Thereby, narratives on the artists' creativity, which are part of a professional logic, and narratives on distributive justice, which are part of the community logic, introduce competition on the level of discussing an empirical case. Additionally, they create open spaces for members of the organization to avoid the requests within the logic of innovation that every member of the organization has to engage more intensely in intrapreneurial work. Thereby, the competing narratives call into question the methods through which intrapreneurial action can or cannot be increased and how, or if, it should be rewarded. However, the narratives still illustrate agreement on the general importance and worth of innovation and intrapreneurial activity and, with this regard, they coexist peacefully with the narratives in the logic of innovation. In contrast, narratives on social inequality cast doubt upon the general worth of intrapreneurship and innovation in relation to other

efforts and thereby challenge the logic of innovation (as part of the market logic) on a more general level.

The third contribution (3) is to identify how the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups changes within these conflicts between institutional logics. Within the logic of innovation, intrapreneurial groups become a highly important symbol that introduces new opportunities and new responsibilities for all members of the organization. The narrative of responsibility for participation in intrapreneurial groups describes intrapreneurial groups as offering new opportunities because everybody has the option to participate jointly in innovative work. In this narrative, intrapreneurial groups introduce responsibilities because, given the new option, one expects members of the organization to participate in intrapreneurial groups in order to make the organization competitive and successful. Simultaneously, the focus can also shift within the logic of innovation to more heroic accentuations of single intrapreneurs in order to elucidate the necessity to be innovative. Within the competing logics, the narrative construction of intrapreneurial groups changes. In professional logics, intrapreneurial groups are highlighted with regard to mental pressure. Being creative and the structure of intrapreneurial groups are described, with regard to narratives on the artists' work, as being more or less incompatible with one another. In community logics, they are tested with regard to fairness: either intrapreneurial groups appear to be potentially unfair because of the problem in identifying contributions of single members of the team or they are highlighted as being exclusive organizational structures. Then they are only open to talented and highly-educated employees and exclude motivated hard workers who appear to be less talented in the narratives on community values.

With these three contributions, the paper addresses research on the cultural aspects of innovations and demonstrates how different logics and their narratives function as cultural mechanisms, which are also cultural preconditions for members of the organization to participate in intrapreneurial groups. As embedding elements, they limit the interpretative range for actors who internalize them and determine how they make sense of intrapreneurial groups. As enabling elements, they allow intrapreneurs to make sense of their ideas and to gain legitimacy.

References

- Antoncic, Bostjan, and Robert D. Hisrich. 2001. Intrapreneurship. Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing* 16 (5): 495-527.
- Baregheh, Anahita, Jennifer Rowley, and Sally Sambrook. 2009. Towards a multi-disciplinary definition of innovation. *Management Decision* 47 (8): 1323-39.
- Bartel, Caroline A., and Raghu Garud. 2009. The role of narratives in sustaining organizational innovation. *Organization Science* 20 (1): 107-17.

- Battilana, Julie, and Silvia Dorado. 2010. Building sustainable hybrid organizations: the case of commercial microfinance organizations. *The Academy of Management Journal* 53 (6): 1419-40.
- Boltanski, Luc, and Eve Chiapello. 2007. *The new spirit of capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Brenner, Walter, and Andreas Herrmann. 2018. An overview of technology, benefits and impact of automated and autonomous driving on the automotive industry. In *Digital marketplaces unleashed*, ed. Claudia Linnhoff-Popien, Ralf Schneider and Michael Zaddach: 427-42. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Broggi, Alberto, Alex Zelinsky, Ümit Özgüner, and Christian Laugier. 2016. Intelligent Vehicles. In *Springer Handbook of Robotics*, ed. Bruno Siciliano and Oussama Khatib: 1627-56. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Bröckling, Ulrich. 2016. *The entrepreneurial self: Fabricating a new type of subject*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1990. *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cornelissen, Joep P., Rodolphe Durand, Peer C. Fiss, John C. Lammers, and Eero Vaara. 2014. Putting communication front and center in institutional theory and analysis. *Academy of Management Review* 40 (1): 10-27.
- Czarniawska, Barbara. 1997. *Narrating the organization: Dramas of institutional identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dalpiatz, Elena, Paul Tracey, and Nelson Phillips. 2014. Succession narratives in family business: The case of alessi. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 44 (2): 1375-94.
- Di Maggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 1983. The iron cage revisited. Institutional isomorphism an collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* 48 (2): 147-60.
- Downing, Stephen. 2005. The social construction of entrepreneurship. Narrative and dramatic processes in the coproduction of organizations and identities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 29 (2): 185-204.
- Dubet, François. 2008. *Ungerechtigkeiten: Zum subjektiven Ungerechtigkeitsempfinden am Arbeitsplatz*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.
- Dunn, Mary B., and Candace Jones. 2010. Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation of care and science logics in medical education, 1967-2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55 (1): 114-49.
- Flick, Uwe. 2011. Das Episodische Interview. In *Empirische Forschung und Soziale Arbeit*, ed. Gertrud Oelerich and Hans-Uwe Otto, 273-80. Wiesbaden: VS.
- Franzosi, Roberto. 1998. Narrative analysis-or why (and how) sociologists should be interested in narrative. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 517-54.
- Gartner, William B. 2010. A new path to the waterfall: A narrative on a use of entrepreneurial narrative. *International Small Business Journal* 28 (1): 6-19.
- Garud, Raghu, Joel Gehman, and Antonio P. Giuliani. 2014. Contextualizing entrepreneurial innovation: A narrative perspective. *Research Policy* 43 (7): 1177-88.
- Hjorth, Daniel, and Chris Steyaert. 2004. *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Harvey, John H. 1995. Accounts. In *The blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology*, ed. Antony S. R. Manstead and Miles Hewstone, 3-5. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kipping, Matthias. 2011. Hollow from the start? Image professionalism in management consulting. *Current Sociology* 59 (4): 530-50.

- Kreiswirth, Martin. 2000. Merely Telling Stories?: Narrative and knowledge in the human sciences. *Poetics Today* 21 (2): 293-318.
- Kuratko, Donald F., and David B. Audretsch. 2013. Clarifying the domains of corporate entrepreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 9: 323-35.
- Lages, Marisa, Carla S. Marques, Ferreira, João J. M., and Fernando A. F. Ferreira. 2017. Intrapreneurship and firm entrepreneurial orientation. Insights from the health care service industry. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 13 (3): 837-54.
- Lounsbury, Michael, and Mary A. Glynn. 2001. Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal* 22 (6-7): 545-64.
- Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology* 83 (2): 340-63.
- Meyer, Renate E., Isabell Egger-Peitler, Markus A. Höllerer, and Gerhard Hammerschmid. 2014. Of bureaucrats and passionate public managers. Institutional logics, executive identities, and public service. *Public Administration* 92 (4): 861-85.
- Mládková, Ludmila. 2013. Leadership and Storytelling. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 75: 83-90.
- Ocasio, William, Patricia H. Thornton, and Michael Lounsbury. 2017. Advances to the institutional logics perspective. In *The Sage Handbook of organizational institutionalism*, ed. Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Thomas B. Lawrence, and Renate E. Meyer, 509-532, 2nd ed. London: Sage Publishing.
- O'Connor, Ellen. 2004. Storytelling to be real. Narrative, legitimacy building and venturing. In *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship*, ed. Daniel Hjorth and Chris Steyaert, 105-24. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Parker, Simon C. 2011. Intrapreneurship or entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business Venturing* 26 (1): 19-34.
- Reay, Trish, and C. R. Hinings. 2009. Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization Studies* 30 (6): 629-52.
- Reckwitz, Andreas. 2017. *The invention of creativity: Modern society and the culture of the new*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Rhodes, Carl, and Andrew D. Brown. 2005. Narrative, organizations and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 7 (3): 167-88.
- Rindova, Violina, Elena Dalpiaz, and Davide Ravasi. 2011. A cultural quest. A study of organizational use of new cultural resources in strategy formation. *Organization Science* 22 (2): 413-31.
- Ruef, Martin. 2010. *The entrepreneurial group: Social identities, relations, and collective action*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smets, Michael, Paula Jarzabkowski, Gary T. Burke, and Paul Spee. 2015. Reinsurance trading in Lloyd's of London: Balancing conflicting-yet-complementary logics in practice. *Academy of Management Journal* 58 (3): 932-70.
- Steyaert, Chris. 2004. The prosaics of entrepreneurship. In *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship. A second movements in entrepreneurship*, ed. Daniel Hjorth and Chris Steyaert, 8-21. Cheltenham/Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Suchman, Mark C. 1995. Managing legitimacy. Strategic and institutional approaches. *The Academy of Management Review* 20 (3): 571-610.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review* 51 (2): 273-86.
- Thornton, Patricia H., William Ocasio, and Michael Lounsbury. 2012. *The institutional logics perspective. A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vargas-Halabi, Tomás, Ronald Mora-Esquivel, and Berman Siles. 2017. Intrapreneurial competencies. Development and validation of a measurement scale. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics* 26 (1): 86-111.
- Weick, Karl E. 1995. *Sensemaking in organizations*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Wooten, Melissa, and Andrew J. Hoffman. 2017. Organizational fields: Past, present and future. In *The SAGE handbook of organizational institutionalism*, 2nd ed, ed. Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Thomas B. Lawrence and Renate E. Meyer, 55-74. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing.
- Zietsma, Charlene, Groenewegen, Peter, Logue, Danielle M., and C.R. Hinings. 2017. Field or fields? Building the scaffolding for cumulation of research on institutional fields. *Academy of Management Annals* 11 (1): 391-450.

Appendix

Table 1: Interview Partners

Interviewee	Position ⁴	Interviewee	Position
1	Lower and middle management	23	Lower and middle management
2	Lower and middle management	24	Lower and middle management
3	Worker	25	Lower and middle management
4	Worker	26	Lower and middle management
5	Worker	27	Lower and middle management
6	Lower and middle management	28	Lower and middle management
7	Worker	29	Lower and middle management
8	Worker	30	Lower and middle management
9	Worker	31	Lower and middle management
10	Worker	32	Lower and middle management
11	Worker	33	Lower and middle management
12	Worker	34	Lower and middle management

⁴ The research has included different interview partners from a large number of sectors and positions and given that huge range, detailed information on the sector or field of activity of the interview partner could make it possible to identify individuals in the organization retrospectively. With regard to hierarchies, it can be added that the term "workers" includes workers without additional responsibilities, foremen, and people with additional responsibilities as team speakers of working groups. With regard to management positions, we have addressed engineers and managers with other educational backgrounds from technical production, development, and planning departments as well as managers from human resources, marketing, and other departments in order to identify narratives which are present in the whole organization.

13	Worker	35	Lower and middle management
14	Worker	36	Lower and middle management
15	Worker	37	Lower and middle management
16	Worker	38	Top management level
17	Worker	39	Top management level
18	Worker	40	Top management level
19	Worker	41	Top management level
20	Worker	42	Top management level
21	Worker	43	Top management level
22	Lower and middle management		

Historical Social Research

Historische Sozialforschung

All articles published in HSR Special Issue 44 (2019) 4: Entrepreneurial Groups & Entrepreneurial Families.

Isabell Stamm, Allan Discua Cruz & Ludovic Cailluet

Entrepreneurial Groups: Definition, Forms, and Historic Change.

doi: [10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.7-41](https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.7-41)

Katharina Scheidgen

Social Contexts in Team Formation: Why Do Independent Start-Ups and University Spin-Offs Form Teams Differently?

doi: [10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.42-74](https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.42-74)

Paloma Fernández Pérez

Pioneers and Challengers in the Global Plasma Protein Industry, 1915-2015.

doi: [10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.75-95](https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.75-95)

Robert Peters

The Interrelationship between Structure and Collective Actors: A Concept for a Dynamic-Reciprocal Model of Structural Change.

doi: [10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.96-128](https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.96-128)

Maria Elo

Immigrant Effect and Collective Entrepreneurship – The Creation and Development of a Turkish Entrepreneurial Group.

doi: [10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.129-161](https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.129-161)

Stefan Berwing

Extending Mixed Embeddedness: Entrepreneurial Figurations of Entrepreneurs with Migrant Origins in Germany.

doi: [10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.162-185](https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.162-185)

Michael Weinhardt & Isabell Stamm

Drawing Samples for the Longitudinal Study of Entrepreneurial Groups from Process-Generated Data: A Proposal Based on the German Register of Companies.

doi: [10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.186-221](https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.186-221)

Tim Seidenschur

The Logic of Innovation. A Study on the Narrative Construction of Intrapreneurial Groups in the Light of Competing Institutional Logics.

doi: [10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.222-249](https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.44.2019.4.222-249)