



BI Norwegian Business School - campus Oslo

GRA 19703

Master Thesis

Thesis Master of Science

Intrapreneurial Behaviour at BI Norwegian Business School
A Qualitative Study on the Success of BI2020 Pilot Program

Navn: Lena Houge Holter, Eline Ekkjestøl
Bruntveit

Start: 15.01.2019 09.00

Finish: 01.07.2019 12.00

Intrapreneurial Behaviour at BI Norwegian Business School

- A Qualitative Study on the Success of BI2020 Pilot Program -

Campus:
BI Oslo

Examination code and name:
GRA 19703 Master Thesis

Programme:
Master of Science in Leadership and Organisational Psychology

Supervisor:
Jon Erland Bonde Lervik

Acknowledgement

We would like to express our gratitude to those who helped and supported us with the completion of this master thesis. First and foremost, we would like to thank our supervisor, Jon Erland Bonde Lervik, for contributing with constructive feedback and interesting discussions concerning the topic. We really appreciate all your help and suggestions.

We would like to express our great appreciation to Anne Berit Swanberg and her colleagues at LearningLab for contributing with interesting perspectives, guidance and providing access to relevant information related to the pilot program.

Finally, a special thanks to the ten informants that accepted our invitation to participate in this study, their honesty and valuable insight. Thank you for taking the time in your busy schedule and sharing your experiences.

Abstract

The purpose of this research study was to investigate and shed light on intrapreneurial behaviour at BI Norwegian Business School. This thesis examines in what ways the participants of the BI2020 pilot program experienced it as successful. Three objectives will serve basis for evaluating the successfulness; 1) Employee engagement and experimentation, 2) Evaluation and continuation and 3) Dissemination of pilot results and organisational learning. The sample consists of ten employees, each responsible for their own pilot project. The analysis reveals two overarching themes; employee-driven intrapreneurship within “the hub” and employee-driven intrapreneurship outside “the hub”, where “the hub” refers to the context provided by the pilot program. The findings reveal that the participants experienced objective one as successfully achieved, while objective two and three were not successfully achieved. The participants were generally satisfied with the pilot program and the context it provided for engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour. However, when expanding out of “the hub”, challenges related to incentives, status differences and the organisational system arose. The concept of “corporate immune system” is valuable for understanding why it was difficult to continue with intrapreneurial behaviour after the pilot program, and why it is generally difficult to engage in intrapreneurial behaviour related to pedagogical development at BI.

Content

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.2 RESEARCH QUESTION | 2 |
| 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND..... | 3 |
| 2.1 INTRAPRENEURSHIP CONCEPTUALISING..... | 3 |
| 2.2 INTRAPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOUR | 5 |
| 2.2.1 <i>Opportunity Recognition/Exploitation</i> | 5 |
| 2.2.2 <i>Innovativeness</i> | 6 |
| 2.2.3 <i>Proactiveness</i> | 6 |
| 2.2.4 <i>Risk-Taking</i> | 6 |
| 2.2.5 <i>Networking</i> | 7 |
| 2.3 ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING INTRAPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOUR | 7 |
| 2.3.1 <i>Management Support</i> | 7 |
| 2.3.2 <i>Organisational structure</i> | 8 |
| 2.3.3 <i>Work discretion and autonomy</i> | 8 |
| 2.3.4 <i>Resources and rewards</i> | 9 |
| 2.3.5 <i>Organisational climate</i> | 9 |
| 3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH..... | 10 |
| 3.1 CHOICE OF RESEARCH CONTEXT..... | 10 |
| 3.2 A QUALITATIVE APPROACH TO INTRAPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOUR AT BI..... | 11 |
| 3.3 DATA SOURCES..... | 12 |
| 3.4 ANALYSIS | 13 |
| 3.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS | 14 |
| 4. FINDINGS..... | 14 |
| 4.1 DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS | 14 |
| 4.2 EMPLOYEE-DRIVEN INTRAPRENEURSHIP WITHIN “THE HUB”..... | 17 |
| 4.2.1 <i>The importance of LearningLab as a facilitating part</i> | 17 |
| 4.2.2 <i>Lack of sufficient follow-up of individual pilots</i> | 18 |
| 4.2.3 <i>LearningLab’s role in knowledge sharing</i> | 19 |
| 4.3 EMPLOYEE-DRIVEN INTRAPRENEURSHIP OUTSIDE “THE HUB”..... | 20 |
| 4.3.1 <i>The importance of suitable incentives for encouraging intrapreneurship</i> | 21 |
| 4.3.2 <i>Status differences at BI</i> | 23 |
| 4.3.3 <i>Management’s focus on intrapreneurship and the pilot program</i> | 24 |
| 4.3.4 <i>Lack of supportive organisational system</i> | 25 |
| 5. DISCUSSION..... | 26 |
| 5.1 EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT AND EXPERIMENTATION | 26 |
| 5.2 EVALUATION AND CONTINUATION OF PILOTS..... | 28 |
| 5.3 DISSEMINATION OF PILOT RESULTS AND ORGANISATIONAL LEARNING | 29 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 5.4 DIFFICULTIES WITH IMPLEMENTING NEW IDEAS IN BI'S EXISTING ORGANISATION..... | 30 |
| 5.5 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS | 34 |
| 5.6 LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH STUDY | 35 |
| 5.7 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH | 36 |
| 6. CONCLUSION | 37 |
| 7. REFERENCES..... | 38 |
| APPENDICES..... | 45 |
| A. INTERVIEW GUIDE | 45 |
| B. INITIAL ANALYSIS | 47 |
| C. INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS | 51 |

1 Introduction

The purpose of this research study is to investigate and shed light on the intrapreneurial behaviour at BI Norwegian Business School (BI). BI is an independent, non-profit organisation ranked as one of Europe's largest business schools with more than 20,000 students a year (BI, 2018). The organisation competes in the Norwegian and international market for higher education, which includes both private and public educational institutions. The 21st century is characterised by an increasingly global, digital and dynamic environment, and higher education is not immune to this development. There is a consensus between scholars that "the future of academia is and will be complicated, challenging and uncertain" (Pucciarelli & Kaplan, 2016, p. 312). Organisations must constantly renew their products and services to cope with the uncertain future and gain competitive advantage (Beer & Nohria, 2000). Therefore, BI must be proactive to stay competitive in the market of higher education.

As a response to the increased focus on innovation and digitalisation, the management team at BI established LearningLab in 2012. LearningLab is BI's resource centre for teaching, learning and information- and communications technology. Their aim is to support faculty members with pedagogical development and production of digital learning resources, to improve student learning. LearningLab initiated the BI2020-project on request from the senior management, with the goal of enabling BI to be the preferred provider of education within 2020. As a part of BI2020, LearningLab conducted a pilot program from 2013 to 2016. During this period, they distributed financial resources to seventy-two pilot projects at a sum of nine million kroner, with the goal of testing new digital tools for pedagogical purposes (BI, 2016). The pilot program can be seen as an arena for experimentation in a controlled context, where a small-scale project could be tested before potentially leading to a larger organisational project. This pilot program allowed the entrepreneurs within the organisation to unfold, which has also been referred to as intrapreneurs (Rule & Irvin, 1988). It would be beneficial for BI to take advantage of intrapreneurial behaviour, as research reveal that it is positively associated with both organisational growth and increased competitive advantage (Valsania, Moriano & Molero, 2016).

The pilot project was an initiative for engaging employees at BI to experiment with technology in pedagogy. The goal was to increase their technical skills and test new ways of lecturing, to make BI the preferred provider of higher education. Three clear objectives were stated in the BI2020 report, as favourable outcomes of the program. The first objective was to involve multiple faculty members in experimenting with how to benefit from using new technologies in their courses. The second objective was related to evaluation and potential continuation of the pilots. The pilots were considered as pre-projects and the ideas were to be evaluated with the purpose of deciding if they should be implemented in a particular course, a study program or dismissed (BI, 2013). The third objective was related to dissemination of the pilot results and organisational learning. It was required that all pilot results should be documented in a final report and presented to the management and in suitable channels. Thus, the objectives of the program were to promote intrapreneurial behaviour at BI, foster individual- and organisational learning and gain the required knowledge and skills to be market leaders within higher education.

1.2 Research Question

Intrapreneurship can be understood as a strategic response to improve performance and achieve competitive advantage (Azami, 2013). The pilot program provided the employees with an opportunity to engage in intrapreneurial behaviour and experiment with pedagogy in a controlled context. The program has not been explicitly evaluated and the participants experiences have not been accounted for beyond the final reports. Therefore, it will be interesting to investigate to what extent the participants experienced LearningLab's objectives of the program as fulfilled. Through investigating the participants experiences we will identify what aspects of the pilot program they experienced as successful and what challenges they faced when engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour at BI. Therefore, the research question in this thesis is as follows:

In what ways did the participants experience the BI2020 pilot program as successful?

The aim of this thesis is to qualitatively examine the employees perceived success of the BI2020 pilot program. The success of the program will be evaluated in

relation to the pilot program objectives established by LearningLab. These include that the program should foster employee involvement and experimentation, the projects should be evaluated, continuation should be discussed, and the pilots should lead to organisational learning through dissemination of pilot results. This thesis will provide a comprehensive evaluation of the pilot program, investigate which aspects of the pilot program that were successful and seek to explain what BI could have done differently. The findings will contribute to increasing the senior management and LearningLab's understanding of the potential benefits and challenges when initiating a pilot program related to intrapreneurial behaviour at BI. This insight can serve as foundation when facilitating intrapreneurial activity at BI in the future and contribute to the enhancement of BI's competitive advantage in the long run.

2. Theoretical Background

To understand the interaction between the intrapreneurial employees at BI and the organisation, relevant theory will be presented. First, the concept of intrapreneurship will be conceptualised and narrowed down. Second, the most prominent dimensions of intrapreneurial behaviour in the literature will be accounted for, before organisational factors identified as influencing intrapreneurial behaviour will be examined.

2.1 Intrapreneurship Conceptualising

The term "intrapreneurship" is somewhat ambiguous in the research field. Intrapreneurship can be seen as a subfield of entrepreneurship and concerns entrepreneurial activity within an existing organisation (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003). Researchers have used different labels when investigating related concepts such as; corporate entrepreneurship (Zahra, Nielsen & Bogner, 1999) firm-level entrepreneurship (Zahra, Jennings & Kurato, 1999) and entrepreneurial orientation (Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin & Frese, 2009). These related concepts limit intrapreneurship to the characteristics of the organisation, where intrapreneurship typically refers to "the entrepreneurship characteristics available in the present organisation" (Razavi & Ab Aziz, 2017, p. 771). The focus of the related concepts are mainly on climates for intrapreneurship, rather than individual employee intrapreneurial behaviour (Neessen, Caniels, Vos, & De Jong, 2018).

The term corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship are sometimes used interchangeably in the research literature (Åmo, 2010). Sharma and Chrisman (2007) investigated definitions of entrepreneurial activity within organisations and found inconsistency in the angulation in the definitions of corporate entrepreneurship. Their findings indicated that corporate entrepreneurship is usually defined at the organisational level (Sharma & Chrisman, 2007), whereas intrapreneurship relates to the individual level (De Jong & Wennekers, 2008). According to Morris, Kurato & Coving (2008), cited in Åmo (2010, p. 146) the corporate entrepreneurship perspective differs from the intrapreneurship perspective as the former is “a strategy which management can utilize to foster more innovative initiatives from their employees, and that it is the management level that is in charge of the process”. Corporate entrepreneurship proposes a top-down perspective on organisational innovation, where managers are in control over which initiatives to pursue and implement (Åmo, 2010). Intrapreneurship on the other hand is about employees who independently seek innovation in the organisation. The employee is seen as an active actor and the initiative comes forward in a bottom-up way (Åmo, 2010).

Intrapreneurship from a bottom-up perspective investigates the characteristics and behaviours of the intrapreneurial employee. From this perspective intrapreneurship has been defined as “initiatives by employees in organisations to undertake new business activities” (Bosma, Stam & Wennekers, 2010, p. 8), “the introduction and implementation of a significant innovation for the firm by one or more employees working within an established organisation.” (Carrier, 1996, p. 6) and autonomous strategic behaviour of the employee to exploit a given business opportunity (Kuratko, Montagno & Hornsby, 1990). The definitions indicate that intrapreneurship concerns employees’ self-initiative to engage in unexpected, innovative behaviour.

Neessen and colleagues (2018) conducted a systematic literature review of the concept “intrapreneurship” and proposed a reunifying definition, which reflects the multilevel nature of the construct. The authors propose that *“Intrapreneurship is a process whereby employee(s) recognize and exploit opportunities by being innovative, proactive and by taking risks, in order for the organisation to create new products, processes and services, initiate self-renewal or venture new business to enhance the competitiveness and performance of the*

organisation” (Neessen et al., 2018, p. 7). The definition includes both the organisational and individual aspects of intrapreneurship and will further be used as a foundation for understanding the interaction between the individual and the environment for intrapreneurship at BI.

2.2 Intrapreneurial Behaviour

To create an environment where intrapreneurs can succeed, it is important to understand the characteristics of their behaviour. Intrapreneurial behaviour has been referred to “the extent to which individual workers proactively engage in the creation, introduction and application of opportunities at work, marked by taking business-related risks” (De Jong, Parker, Wennekers & Wu, 2011, p. 982). Heinonen and Korvela (2003, p. 3) argued that intrapreneurial behaviour is concerned with “recognizing an opportunity, exploiting it and trusting that exploiting an opportunity in a new way that deviates from previous practice will succeed and support the realisation of the organisation’s goals”. The recent review of Neessen and colleagues (2018) identified opportunity recognition, innovativeness, proactiveness, risk-taking, and networking as the main dimensions of intrapreneurial behaviour (Stull and Singh, 2005; De Jong et al., 2011; Neessen et al., 2018). Following Neessen and colleagues (2018), this section will elaborate the identified dimensions of intrapreneurial behaviour and how they relate to the intrapreneurial employees at BI.

2.2.1 Opportunity Recognition/Exploitation

To behave intrapreneurially, an employee must be able to recognize opportunities and use available resources and knowledge to exploit these opportunities (Urbano & Turró, 2013). When recognizing an opportunity, the individual identifies a gap between the marked needs and the possible resources (Baron, 2006). It is crucial to understand why some individuals discover opportunities that go unseen by others (Kirzner, 1997; Shane, 2000). It has been argued that individuals have different understandings of a resource’s potential to be transformed into a different state (Kirzner, 1997). This can be based on individual differences in background information, experience, education or other factors (Venkataraman, 1997). This can explain why only some employees chose to participate in the pilot program, even though all employees received the same information.

2.2.2 Innovativeness

Engaging in innovative behaviour is often seen as the main component of intrapreneurial behaviour (Neessen et al., 2018). Innovativeness is concerned with coming up with new ideas or taking part in experimentation leading to new services, processes or products (Lyon, Lumpkin & Dess, 2000). Innovative behaviour in the workplace consists of three different processes; idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization (Scott & Bruce, 1994). Employees are rarely required to perform innovative work behaviours, as these are often considered extra role behaviours (Janssen, 2000). One can assume that the pilot program promoted the employee's innovativeness, as they were responsible for their own pilot project.

2.2.3 Proactiveness

A proactive employee is characterised as a person who anticipate future needs, changes, or challenges that may lead to new opportunities (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). These individuals change and influence status quo and manage to create competitive advantage for themselves (Razavi & Ab Aziz, 2017). Proactive faculty members at BI may be active in following the newest trends within the field of education or research, take advantage of opportunities and be innovators or early adaptors within their field. Through finding innovative teaching methods which preserve the education quality, faculty members can increase their efficiency. As a result, the proactive employee may have time to take on other topics or do more independent research, which can influence their own employability and salary.

2.2.4 Risk-Taking

At an individual level, risk-taking involves calculating the extent of risky behaviour, without being reckless (van Dam, Schipper & Runhaar, 2010). Research has shown that successful intrapreneurs balance the degree of risk, where too much risk-taking can lead to negative outcomes (Rauch & Frese, 2000). New ideas and behaviours can also be risky as they represent disturbances in the status quo and power balance (Albrecht & Hall, 1991, cited in Dewett, 2007). For the faculty members at BI, engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour can be risky, as failure can influence their employability, financial reward and social status. As perceived fear of failure has a negative effect on intrapreneurial behaviour and

most people are risk averse (Urbano & Turró, 2013), management support, encouragement and trust will be especially important to promote intrapreneurial behaviour (Dess et al., 2003). However, the pilot program creates an arena with lower risk than normal.

2.2.5 Networking

The ability to create and take advantage of networking has been identified as an important aspect of intrapreneurial behaviour (Neessen et al., 2018). As intrapreneurs act within an organisation with a particular climate and political field, an important skill is to effectively navigate through personal networking (Smith, Rees & Murray, 2016). Networks have been referred to as “one of the most powerful assets that anyone can possess: it provides access to power, information, knowledge and capital as well as other networks” (Elfring & Hulsink, 2003, p. 409). For faculty members at BI, networking involves creating and maintaining strong personal ties with influential colleges and other stakeholders in the field of higher education. In addition, a strong network can work as a support system and minimize the perceived risk when engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour at BI.

2.3 Organisational factors influencing intrapreneurial behaviour

To sufficiently understand the concept of employee-driven intrapreneurial behaviour, it is important to examine the organisational factors that either facilitate or inhibit this behaviour (Azami, 2013). Numerous organisational factors have been identified as influencing intrapreneurial behaviour in the literature. The six most prominent variables are management support (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001; Åmo, 2006; Alpkán, Bulut, Gunday, Ulusoy & Kilic, 2010), organisational structure (Kuratko et al., 1990; Hornsby, Kuratko & Zahra, 2002), resources (Urbano, Alvarez & Turró, 2013; Neessen et al., 2018), rewards (Chisholm, 1987; Hornsby et al., 2002; De Villiers-Scheepers, 2011), autonomy (Kuratko et al., 1990; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996) and organisational climate (Hisrich, 1990; Bulut & Alpkán, 2006). These factors will further be elaborated and discussed in relation to BI and LearningLab.

2.3.1 Management Support

Management support refers to the willingness of managers to facilitate and

promote intrapreneurial activity (Hornsby et al., 2002). Management support is important for handling employee uncertainty, problem resolution in the innovation process and especially in the idea implementation phase (Alpkan et al., 2010). Employees who experience management support are also more likely to take risks when developing and actualize useful ideas and projects (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). One can assume that the initial senior management at BI was supportive in the pilot program, as they were involved in selecting the participants for the project and distributed resources. The established function, LearningLab, can also be seen a resource centre for supporting participants in their intrapreneurial activity. However, perceived management support from the participants functioning leader cannot be accounted for but will further be explored in the case study.

2.3.2 Organisational structure

Flexible organisational structure provides supportive administrative mechanisms (Hornsby et al., 2002), centralization of decision making and information flow through open channels (Neessen et al., 2018). Reduction of organisational hierarchy has been found important for promoting intrapreneurship (Menzel, Aaltio & Ulijn, 2007). Through a flexible organisational structure, ideas are more likely to be generated, evaluated and implemented, than in bureaucratic organisations. A decentralised and informal structure can also lead to higher degree of autonomy, where employees at lower levels of the organisation can propose and test new ideas (Russell, 1999). At BI, LearningLab promotes organisational flexibility by being a division dedicated to pedagogical innovation and support. It is likely to assume that LearningLab enhance employees' engagement in intrapreneurial activity. However, LearningLab may face potential challenges when lifting employees intrapreneurial contributions up at the organisational level, as BI can be understood as a large, bureaucratic institution.

2.3.3 Work discretion and autonomy

Work discretion and autonomy can be seen as two similar, but distinct constructs that influence intrapreneurial behaviour. Work discretion refers to “the belief that employees have the freedom to determine activities related to their work” (Sebora, Theerapatvong & Lee, 2010, p. 455). Autonomy on the other hand, has been defined as “the degree to which a task provides substantial freedom,

independence, and discretion to individuals in determining the procedures to be used in carrying out a task” (Oldham & Hackman, 1981, p. 72). Autonomous employees possess the ability to implement innovative ideas more effectively, and previous research has found that autonomy is related to intrapreneurial behaviour (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). High degree of autonomy anticipates a decentralisation of decision-making power to the individuals who perform the job (Alpkan et al., 2010). It can be assumed that the faculty members at BI, like other professional educators, have high degree of work discretion and autonomy to plan and conduct their lectures, which can influence intrapreneurial behaviour.

2.3.4 Resources and rewards

In the literature of intrapreneurship, an organisation’s resources have been found to play a key factor in promoting intrapreneurial behaviour. Resources concerns financial support for engaging in innovative projects, time availability, resource availability (Neessen et al., 2018), as well as intangible resources such as knowledge (Franco & Haase, 2013) and intrapreneurial experience and competence (Urbano et al., 2013). Rewards on the other hand concerns cash bonuses, promotions or other rewards and should be aligned with the goals. An effective reward system is found to have a large impact on intrapreneurial activity, as rewards encourage the desired activity (Hornsby et al., 2002, Seborá et al., 2010) and increase commitment (Brazeal, 1993). Contrary, an ineffective reward system can discourage intrapreneurial behaviour by rewarding other forms of behaviour. At BI, the participants of the pilot program received financial resources for engaging in a pilot project, as well as technical support from LearningLab. The case study will further investigate if the participants received sufficient resources and if they received any rewards or reinforcement for engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour.

2.3.5 Organisational climate

Today, most organisational researchers agree that the organisational culture and organisational climate is key for succeeding with innovation and intrapreneurship (Ahmed, 1998; Büschgens, Bausch & Balkin, 2013). This is because individual creativity and innovation in an organisational setting is influenced by the external environment (Amabile, 1988). The organisational culture can be defined as a “complex set of values, beliefs, assumptions and symbols that define the way in

which a firm conducts its business” (Barney, 1986, p. 657). The organisational climate on the other hand can be defined as “the shared perceptions of and the meaning attached to the policies, practices, and procedures employees experience and the behaviours they observe getting rewarded and that are supported and expected (Schneider, Ehrhart & Macey, 2013, p. 2). The organisational culture can therefore be seen as the deeper foundation of the organisation which guide life in the organisation, whereas the climate reflects what behaviours the organisational members experience as being rewarded, desired and expected. Therefore, one can assume that it is easier to change the organisational climate to promote employees intrapreneurial behaviour.

Amabile and Gyskiewicz (1987) conducted a qualitative study where the researchers investigated qualities of the environment and the creative climate that influenced employees creativity in a R&D division. The research study identified nine qualities in the environment that served to promote creativity, and nine qualities that served to inhibit creativity. The most important factors for promoting creativity were freedom to decide what to do or solve a task, good project management, sufficient resources, encouragement from management and various organisational characteristics such as a cooperative climate and an atmosphere where innovation is prized, and failure is not fatal (Amabile, 1988). Contrary, inappropriate reward systems were found to be the most significant organisational characteristic inhibiting creativity. Other factors identified as inhibiting creativity were work constraint, organisational disinterest, poor project management and inappropriate evaluation and feedback systems (Amabile, 1988). There are no indications on how the climate for intrapreneurial behaviour is at BI, this will further be investigated.

3. Methodological approach

The aim of this study is to investigate which aspects of the BI2020 pilot program the participants experienced as successful. This section will explain and justify the choice of research context, strategy, data sources, analysis and ethical considerations.

3.1 Choice of research context

This research study was conducted with participants from the BI2020 pilot program. The pilot program was part of the BI2020 project, which aimed to

position BI as an innovative and preferred provider of higher education. Amongst other things, this included utilizing the available technology in the dissemination of research-based knowledge and facilitation for learning and knowledge development among students (BI, 2013). LearningLab's role was to coordinate the program, offer technological assistance and support with implementation. Further, LearningLab was responsible for securing organisational learning through systematic evaluation and knowledge sharing of the pilots. All faculty members could apply to participate in the pilot program. The application needed to address an educational and/or business challenge within large-scale teaching at BI. This context was chosen to be investigated further, as the participants of the pilot program have all engaged in intrapreneurial behaviour within the same time period at BI. Further, the context allowed for investigating the successfulness of the program and LearningLab's role in managing high-uncertainty projects in a protective environment within the boundaries of the organisation.

3.2 A qualitative approach to intrapreneurial behaviour at BI

The research process began with an exploratory approach, which can be understood as "unstructured, informal research that is undertaken to gain background information about the general nature of the research problem" (Burns & Bush, 2016, p. 94). Exploratory research allows for high degree of flexibility and promotes the researcher to select sources to be investigated to get an understanding of the problem at hand (Burns & Bush, 2016). This approach allowed us to explore the pilot program with an open mind and evaluate which pilot projects and research participants that was of interest. Further, the exploratory approach laid the foundation for which direction this research study would take and what research strategy that should be applied.

A qualitative research strategy was decided to be suitable for answering the research question. Qualitative research can be seen as verbal description of real-life situations. This strategy is appropriate when the aim of the research is to understand a phenomenon in a context-specific setting, such as a "real world setting [where] the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the phenomenon of interest" (Patton, 2002, p. 39). Compared to quantitative research, a qualitative research strategy is more applicable when the objective is to make sense out of the subjective and socially constructed meanings expressed about the phenomenon being studied (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). As we were interested in the

employees' experiences of the pilot program, a qualitative strategy would provide deeper insight to the subjective experiences of the pilot participants.

The research applied a case study research design. A case study can be referred to an in-depth inquiry into a topic or phenomenon within its real-life setting (Yin, 2011). The purpose of a case study design is to understand the dynamics of the topic that is being studied within its context (Eisenhardt, 1989). Dubois and Gadde (2002) also argued that a case study is the most appropriate when the purpose is to understand the interaction between a phenomenon and its context. However, qualitative research has been criticized for not being able to produce generalizable, reliable and theoretical contributions to knowledge (Saunders et al., 2009). Qualitative researchers on the other hand point that this research paradigm is based on other underlying assumptions, where there are multiple realities or truths based on the individual's construction of reality (Sale, Lohfeld & Brazil, 2002). The findings of qualitative research are not meant to be generalizable, and the sample should rather consist of small, purposeful samples of respondents who can provide important information instead of a sample that represent a large population (Reid, 1996).

3.3 Data Sources

With a qualitative research strategy and a case study design, purposive sampling was identified as a suitable approach to select research participants. This way of sampling enabled us to seek out individuals who were relevant for answering the research question (Silverman, 2014). The participants selected were ten employees who were engaged in the BI2020 pilot program and were project owners. The sample was drawn from a pool of thirty-nine final pilot reports and with assistance from the Dean of Teaching and Lecturing, Anne Berit Swanberg. The pilot projects are therefore the units of analysis, where ten pilots will be investigated. The participants experiences connected to the pilot execution will further be used to answer the research question. The sample consisted of five professors, three lecturers and two employees from the administration, who were all involved in academic teaching at BI to some degree. By including three employee groups in the sample, we were able to gain different insight into the phenomena being studied and enabled the research question to be assessed from different perspectives (Saunders & Townsend, 2016).

The primary data was collected through semi-structured interviews (See appendix A). A semi-structured interview can be seen as a conversation, where standardized questions and topics are to be covered in order to collect detailed information (Harrell & Bradley, 2009). This form of interview allowed us to include follow-up questions and provided the freedom to investigate related topics that might be interesting for answering the research question at hand. The interview guide was developed based on related theory, the BI2020 documents and the final reports. Further, the first interview provided insight into areas related to the research question that we were not prepared for, which led to changes in the interview guide before the following interviews were carried out. Lastly, three meetings with Anne Berit Swanberg was conducted, one before, during and after the interviews, to gain relevant information and cross-check the findings with LearningLab's experiences.

3.4 Analysis

To draw meaning from the interviews conducted, an Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) was carried out. IPA was considered a suitable methodology, as it is developed specifically for psychology (Smith & Osborn, 2004). IPA recognizes that individuals perceive the world in different ways and attempt to “explore/understand/make sense of the subjective meanings of events/experiences/states of the individual participants themselves” (Smith & Osborn, 2004, p. 229). Through conducting an IPA, we were able to explore how the participants ascribe meaning to their interactions with the environment (Smith, Jarman & Osborn, 1999) and how they experienced their participation in the pilot program.

Prior to the analysis all interviews were transcribed. The transcript was read several times for us to gain rich insight to the material. Further, we systematically went through interview one and wrote down the main categories and superior themes. Five main themes were found. Thereafter, interview two was reviewed to see if the themes from interview one could be conformed and if other themes occurred. This process continued until all interviews were carefully reviewed and the list of appropriate themes was created. The initial list consisted ten first-order themes that was presented in a table with examples of each item to support and illustrate the theme (See appendix B). The ten themes were later clustered into two main categories to organise the findings in a sensible way.

3.5 Ethical considerations

In all research, there are ethical considerations that must be made. Prior to conducting the interviews, a formal application was submitted and approved by Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD). Further, an information letter including a consent form was sent to the research participants to ensure that the participant had a sufficient understanding of the scope of the project (See appendix C). This letter included information about the nature of the research project, why they were selected as participants and their right to withdraw at any time.

The focus in this study concerns the employees' experiences and perceptions of their work situation and organisation. Therefore, ensuring anonymity was of high importance to receive true and honest answers. Anonymity was ensured by using randomly selected numbers when referring to the research participants, instead of their real names. Moreover, revealing information that could potentially expose the identity of the individual has been avoided. Since the interview data is closely connected to the participants, it is not possible to store the data anonymously or provide data access to other researchers. Based on this, the purpose of the data and NSD's guidelines for storage and destruction, it has been decided that all data will be deleted after grading.

4. Findings

The findings are based on a thorough analysis of the interviews conducted with the ten selected employees who participated in the pilot program. A descriptive overview of the different pilot projects will first be presented, before the findings will be elaborated. The findings can be categorized in two main themes; 1) Employee-driven intrapreneurship within "the hub" 2) Employee-driven intrapreneurship outside "the hub".

4.1 Descriptive findings

The main descriptive findings related to the pilot projects are presented in Table 1. These includes the pilot themes, potential challenges during the processes, the participants' relation to LearningLab, whether the pilots were continued and degree of engagement in knowledge sharing at BI.

| Pilot | |
|-------|---|
| 1 | The pilot project involved carrying out an experiment related to student learning. The experiment was completed without problems, and the participant was not dependent on support from LearningLab, nor colleagues during the project. The project participant received no follow-up after the project, the project was not implemented after the program ended and the participant did not engage in any form of knowledge sharing. |
| 2 | The participant tested the use of video, to engage a broader range of students in the lecture. The pilot was completed without problems but was not continued after the program ended. The participant engaged in knowledge sharing at BI. |
| 3 | The pilot concerned using videos in class, as a means for the students to better understand the course material. The pilots encountered some technical challenges concerning the quality of the videos, and they have therefore not been systematically used after the pilot program. The participant engaged in knowledge sharing at a BI learning seminar. |
| 4 | The pilot concerned the development of a mobile application. The goal of the project was to increase students learning outcome and provide a flexible solution for class preparation. The participant cooperated closely with LearningLab in designing the app and making the necessary recordings. The participant experienced some technical difficulties, which negatively influenced the process. The product was used for a couple of years but faded out due to new technical challenges after the program ended. The participant was not invited to learning seminars, nor engaged in any form of knowledge sharing. |
| 5 | The participant developed a mobile application to make learning objectives and summaries more available for students. The participant cooperated with LearningLab in developing the app and received positive feedback from the students. The app was continued for 2 years after the pilot program but terminated when the participant changed position. The participant shared knowledge and learning outcomes in relevant forums. |
| 6 | The project concerned “Flipped Classroom”, to free time for class discussion. The project was completed without problems, and the participant experienced good cooperation with LearningLab. The videos were used for two years after the pilot, but then faded out due to poor quality. Shared the learning experience at a seminar. |
| 7 | The pilot project concerned experimenting with “Flipped Classroom”. The participant was inspired by LearningLab to engage in the program and developed the pilot in close dialogue with them and their support. The pilot was completed without problems and was considered a success. The final product is still used in the courses that were part of the pilot program, and the participant has engaged in knowledge sharing both internally at BI and in external channels. |
| 8 | The pilot project concerned improvement of student learning, as a supplement to increase student learning. The project owner completed the pilot project without |

| | |
|----|---|
| | difficulties together with colleagues. The participant received no follow-up after the project. The pilot is still used today as an integrated part of the course material. The participant has not participated in any form of knowledge sharing. |
| 9 | The project concerned “Flipped Classroom” to increase student learning. Lack of technical competence made the process of completing the pilot difficult, and the participant did not receive the desired and expected support from LearningLab when creating the videos. The product was partly continued after the program. The participant has presented the pilot results in relevant external forums but has not engaged in knowledge sharing internally at BI. |
| 10 | The pilot project concerned creating “Flipped Classroom”, where videos were used to increase learning through activities. The participant completed the pilot without problems and received the necessary support from LearningLab. The participant experiments a lot in general, both before and after the pilot program. The result is still in use at own initiative and the project owner has not engaged in knowledge sharing. |

Table 1.

The pilot projects can be categorised in three groups depending on their continuation after the program ended; 1) pilot project one to three were terminated after the program, 2) pilot project four to six continued for approximately two years and 3) pilot project seven to ten were either partly or fully implemented in a course.

To summarise, pilot project one terminated due to lack of follow-up and discussion about how to take the project further, while pilot project two and three were terminated as they were not further prioritized by the pilot owner. The three following project, pilot four, five and six, were continued for two years. They were all implemented by definition after the project, as they concerned creating mobile applications or videos. Pilot four and six later faded out due to technical challenges and poor quality, whereas pilot five was terminated when the pilot owner changed position. Lastly, pilot project seven, eight, nine and ten are still in use. Pilot nine has been partly incorporated in a course, whereas the remaining three have been fully implemented. Pilot eight and ten were conducted by employees who stated that they would have conducted the pilot independently of the pilot program but applied to gain financial resources. Pilot nine on the other hand is still in use, but the employee emphasized that the project was conducted due to the pilot program, the financial support and encouragement from LearningLab.

4.2 Employee-driven intrapreneurship within “the hub”

The first overarching theme that emerged from the analysis was that LearningLab provided a safe space for engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour at BI. This conceptual space can be seen as a “hub” where LearningLab had great influence on the pilot projects and the pilot participants. The aim is to understand which role LearningLab had in the successfulness of the program, and which factors that either encouraged or discouraged the participants when engaging in the program.

4.2.1 The importance of LearningLab as a facilitating part

The majority of the participants, seven out of ten, experienced LearningLab as a supportive institution during the pilot program. The participants highlighted that LearningLab provided high expertise, support and technical assistance which simplified the project execution. This can be illustrated by the following quote from a participant who was asked about LearningLab’s support during the project;

“Phenomenally, very good! They are professionally skilled, which I need. Because I do not know how to set everything up (technical assistance). And the pedagogical, they are really good at that. They have many resources which I could benefit from. They were very easy to access, they knew their topic and were there for me” (10, 12:06).

Other participants also emphasize that LearningLab provided the support needed to complete the project and that the employees at LearningLab were easy to cooperate with. Further, LearningLab provided the participants with financial resources, which was one of the most mentioned factors that encouraged the participants to engage in the pilot program. Even though three participants would have done the project without the initiative from LearningLab, all ten commented that the financial support was something positive and worked as a promoting factor for engaging in the program. For instance, one participant explains that *“I received resources after I applied, and that was very good and that is why the project was conducted” (7, 14:23)*. When asked whether the participants would have participated again, nine out of ten comment that they would, and that the financial incentive played an important factor. For instance; *“If they had done it again (pilot program) I would have done it again as well. Because it is always fun with some extra financial support when you have to work more than what you*

have to...(8, 9:19). Financial support can therefore be seen as an important promoting factor for intrapreneurial behaviour at BI.

LearningLab and the pilot program also provided the respondents with time, which was mentioned as an important promoting factor by all participants. Six out of ten respondents said they would not have engaged in the project without the pilot program. One participant stated that; «*Without this I would probably not have done it. This just gave me a context to deliver*” (1, 6:39), whereas another said “*We decided that we had to use the opportunity when one could apply for funds and allocate time through this project. It was also a good opportunity to try to change something we had seen a need for*” (9, 1:58). As the faculty members at BI have a heavy workload, the pilot program provided a context and the time to engage in intrapreneurial behaviour.

Even though seven out of ten were satisfied with the support from LearningLab during the program, some of the participants had different perceptions of LearningLab in general. One participant commented; “*I experience that there is too great of a distance between LearningLab and the educators who lectures...and between LearningLab and the departments. They have good contact with some individuals in some areas, but they don’t have a large contact surface against this institute for instance... I don’t think there is knowledge about what LearningLab can offer*” (6, 15:29). The distance between LearningLab and the faculty members is being explained by lack of knowledge about how employees could benefit from LearningLab’s services. Another participant stated; “*LearningLab has no impact, it’s more of a support function now*” (7, 33:32). One can therefore argue that the participants perceived the launch of LearningLab as a great initiative and valued their support during the pilot program. However, it can be discussed whether LearningLab has achieved the desired impact at BI after the pilot program.

4.2.2 Lack of sufficient follow-up of individual pilots

LearningLab was considered as highly important for facilitating and encouraging intrapreneurial during the pilot program. However, several participants identified lack of sufficient follow-up after the pilot program. There was a broad understanding among the participants that the purpose of the pilot program was not to implement all seventy-two pilots. However, a closer dialogue between the participants and LearningLab was eagerly anticipated. This can be illustrated with

a quote from participant eight, when being asked about the procedure for follow-up;

“I am a bit disappointed about the whole thing... No one from LearningLab ever asked me how I was doing, or if I still use the pilot? I think it is a bit strange that BI is so focused on intrapreneurship and developing new things, but when you make an effort, there is no one that asks how it is going?” (8, 7:09).

The statement indicates that participant eight was not satisfied with the efforts done with following up the pilots and participants. This experience is congruent with participant one’s experience, who argued that the biggest problem with the program was the lack of evaluation and discussion of the next possible step;

“...If you think about it, I learned a lot and the students learned a lot and it was fun and all of that...But, from a BI perspective, you can say it was a total failure. Right, because they did not even engage in how to put it into practice. I am not saying putting it into practice, but engage in discussing how to do it, IF and HOW... They may say: “It was great, does not fit”. Then it is great” (1, 17:10).

Even though the two participants had the same experience, the fate of the pilots are contrasting. Pilot one stopped due to lack of follow-up and further support from LearningLab, while pilot eight is still running, with great success and satisfied students. Moreover, the analysis revealed that all seven pilots that were continued after the pilot program were maintained and carried on solely on the pilots participants own initiative; *“Yes, it was continued on my initiative, but I could have just stopped after the pilot...” (8, 7:09)* and *“Yes, it was on my own initiative. However, it is aligned with what BI encourages us lecturers to do” (9, 9:45).* It is a great disparity between what sort of follow-up the research participants expected and what they received, which again had detrimental consequences for the fate of some pilots.

4.2.3 LearningLab’s role in knowledge sharing

The analysis reported that the participants wondered why there had not been a proper evaluation of the pilots, and why the results had not been more efficiently shared. Several of the conducted pilots were perceived as successful, leading

participants to wonder why the pilots were not scaled up in other courses and programs at BI; *“I have not heard that it has been implemented further. After all, it is a good idea and I only received positive feedback from the students who used it”* (5, 3:09) and *“I experience that this (pilot program) has not lead to any synergy effect, it is a shame that it has not been spread more”* (10, 13:33). All research participants were satisfied with their own learning experience, but it is evident that most research participants were dissatisfied with the dissemination of knowledge at an organisational level; *“BI as a system has never had a proper evaluation, which they should have done. Understanding what worked and what did not, and how this could be handled. Then you get institutional learning”* (4, 40:33). An evaluation could increase the understanding of what the participants learned and how this could be used in other parts of BI as well.

After completing the pilot program, LearningLab facilitated different forums for knowledge sharing, including seminars and uploaded videos online. The goal was to share and transform individual knowledge to organisational learning, by raising the individual’s projects out of the “safe contextual space”. Five research participants reported that they were involved in some kind of knowledge sharing, but one of these emphasised that; *“The tendency is often that the individuals who are already interested in pedagogy are attending these knowledge sharing seminars, and not the ones that might could have needed some renewal on this matter”* (6, 4:10). The five remaining participants reported that they cannot remember being invited to or participating in any dissemination of knowledge; *“I thought it was the plan in the beginning...But maybe they have forgotten me? Or that these seminars have not happened? I don’t know...”* (8, 7:39). It is therefore evident that the research participants expected more knowledge sharing initiatives from LearningLab, as they were not satisfied with the efforts done with transforming individual learning to organisational learning.

4.3 Employee-driven intrapreneurship outside “the hub”

The second overarching theme that appeared from the analysis was the organisational factors that influenced employees self-driven intrapreneurial behaviour after the pilot program. Consistent with the research literature, some organisational factors will influence intrapreneurs interaction with the organisation (Neessen et al., 2018). This section will present the most prominent

organisational factors at BI which influenced the research participants involvement in self-driven intrapreneurial activity.

4.3.1 The importance of suitable incentives for encouraging intrapreneurship

Suitable incentives were stated as an important factor for promoting or hindering intrapreneurial behaviour at BI. The participants had different perceptions of which incentives played the biggest role in encouraging the continuation of the pilot and engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour in general at BI. Three main themes occurred; 1) Access to financial resources, 2) The remuneration system and other incentives and 3) Time for pedagogical development. These themes will further be presented.

Access to financial resources

Financial resources were emphasised as one of the main reasons for why the participants got involved in the pilot program, but also explained why some of the pilot projects were not scaled and implemented in other courses. This was highlighted by one participant;

“Sometimes I teach other courses, and then I have not received financial support to change those...You have a one-time cost when you have to change the course and produce videos, and at that time I have not received any extra support...and since I am a researcher and that is what is most important to me, I have not spent any more time and effort to change the teaching in other subjects” (7, 10:52).

The quote illustrates that applying current knowledge to other courses is time consuming, which often depends on additional financial resources. The analysis reveals that lack of additional financial resources discouraged the pilot participants to apply their knowledge to other courses and failed to scale the pilots further.

The remuneration system and other incentives

Seven out of the ten research participants commented that there is no financial, nor social incentive that promotes intrapreneurial behaviour except from this pilot program. The current incentives at BI is illustrated in the following quote;

“We have very clear incentives to teach a lot, to work a lot and to write research articles for example. As how the system is today, we are rewarded by continuing on the same track and we are almost penalized by slowing down the pace to plan, prepare and write applications” (6, 11:23).

BI also operate with a remuneration system, where faculty members receive overtime payment for lecturing more than what is required. *“They who develop courses are not compensated or receives hours for it” (3, 10:17). “It is much more profitable for someone who does not research to spend the extra time on lecturing 4-5 extra courses a year. They get paid for it, it is above duty” (7, 23:16).* The remuneration system provides an incentive for faculty members to increase their course load and lecture more than demanded at the expense of course content- and teaching quality.

Finally, three of the research participants mentioned that incentives for engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour does not necessarily need to include money; *“Since I am a professional researcher I am dependent on being tempted to do it...one need to at least be compensated for lack of recognition or facilitate in a totally different way” (7, 33:32).* Other participants also emphasized that incentives does not have to be financial rewards, but that acknowledgement and acceptance from colleagues and leaders would promote their intrapreneurial behaviour.

Time for pedagogical development

Exemption from duty and time was found to be an important factor for why the participants was encouraged to participate in the pilot program. However, time was also mentioned as a reason for why some successful pilot projects were terminated or phased out within two years and why the projects were not implemented in other courses. One participant explained the reason for why the project was not continued; *“It was used quite a lot of resources on those recordings, and then they were published, and then it ended in a way...But it is about time, with everything else you are to be responsible of...I prioritized differently, and I was in a sense done with that project” (6, 19:23).* A participant also commented that time would be a suitable incentive to promote more pedagogical development; *“It would be nice if there were some sort of arrangement where I was allowed to exempt a course and spend that time to*

develop new things for other courses” (8, 15:36), whereas another highlighted the importance of being able to slow down; “If there is going to be any change, I think it must be accepted that we slow down on other activities” (6, 12:53). The findings illustrated that the employees lacked time to develop the pilot projects further. Reduction of duty was emphasized as a necessity for prioritizing pedagogical development after the program.

4.3.2 Status differences at BI

The analysis revealed that seven out of the ten research participants mentioned unsolicited that different work and faculty groups provide different status at BI. The faculty members are divided into lecturers, researchers and the administration. There is a common perception that research foster higher individual status, as well as status for BI as an institution. This can be supported by the participants statements; *“Status is to publish in a recognized journal” (4, 18:12), “In an international perspective, research is what counts. Thus, if I want to participate on conferences or become a recognized researcher, I need to focus on research and not teaching...” (8, 15:36). A lecturer also commented that; “...research is being recognized and highlighted, but there is no focus on pedagogy” (10, 17:18). The analysis display that the status difference parts the researchers and lecturer at BI. The lecturer clearly expressed dissatisfaction concerning that pedagogy is given less priority by the management, but that the pilot program provided a feeling of being included and valued at BI.*

Status is also seen as one of the reasons for why individual knowledge was not efficiently shared and distributed at BI. A participant explained how resistance from colleagues influenced the willingness to engage in knowledge sharing;

“This (pedagogical tools) is playing. You see, and this hinders me. In other words, this makes me not share it. If I share it, I get criticized. And I do not want that. They tell me that I am just playing and that this is not serious or research, that it is not a kindergarten we run here. This makes me withdraw, and I only speak to only a few who I can play with. If we are to call it playing then, it does not matter to me. I know it works, but I am not interested in having that discussion for the 20th year in a row. So it hinders me.. Or it ruin a bit for BI...”(10, 20:20).

The statement illustrates how status differences at BI influenced knowledge sharing and institutional learning related to pedagogical development. Status differences are also a factor for explaining why knowledge related to pedagogical development often reach only a few individuals at BI. As the pedagogical interested employees meet resistance, it seems like they only share their knowledge with those who are interested to learn. This way, status contributes to a negative spiral, where those who could benefit from learning about new pedagogical methods do not hear about it, and those who are good at it gets better.

4.3.3 Management's focus on intrapreneurship and the pilot program

Support from closest leader

Seven out of the ten research participants perceived the support from their closest leader during the pilot program as non-existing. However, the seven participants were inconsistent in their answers whether they missed support or whether they were indifferent. Two participants answered the following when asked whether his or her leader were supportive during the pilot program;

“It didn't exist - but not in a negative sense, but not in a positive sense. It was just irrelevant. I didn't need anything there..So i don't think I had much contact with my leader at that time about this at all” (1, 16:12).

“My closest leader has never shown interest in things like this. It is zero. I am employed here to work, but pedagogy has no standing at BI at all. At least not back then and not now either. It is all about writing articles” (4, 15:42).

The two statements illustrate that the employees differed in their need for support from their closest leader. The lack of support was by several of the participants justified with “this is the life of university” and the fact that leaders have responsibility for many employees. Finally, the analysis revealed that the research participants have high levels of autonomy in their work, which is an aspect of the job that is highly valued by many.

Senior management's focus on intrapreneurship

The participants valued that BI's senior management initiated the establishment of LearningLab and allocated resources to the pilot program. The pilot program provided an accept for the research participants to work with new teaching methods and allocated resources promoted an opportunity to experiment. However, four out of the ten participants made negative comments regarding the current senior management's effort concerning fostering intrapreneurial behaviour at BI. One participant mentioned that BI's business model is to provide education to many students, which can be perceived as hindering innovation within the organisation (7, 25:44). Another participant stated that the senior management talks about investing in pedagogy, but the relocation of LearningLab to the library sends a clear signal to the lecturers of the contrary (10, 17:18). Lastly, when a participant is asked whether he or she experience that the current management prioritize innovation in pedagogy, it is stated;

“No, they don't. It is not a culture for it, they don't have the relationship with their employees for it and they lack an understanding for what quality is, and what one need to do to increase the culture for innovation...What the management can do is to start creating a better culture for cooperation and inclusion, talk about how to free up resources and reward employees, not necessarily with money, but to make BI better and increase the pride” (3, 13:58).

The statement illustrates a recurring theme in the analysis. The employees' perceived that the new senior management did not take LearningLab nor intrapreneurship seriously. Further, the employees experience that the senior management team does not “Walk-the-Talk” and do not have a correct understanding of their employees work life today.

4.3.4 Lack of supportive organisational system

The final finding from the analysis is related to the organisational system. Three of the participants emphasized that BI lack administrative systems that support innovation. One participant stated the following; *“BI needs to do a better job with their systems. Many good projects exist, many talented employees, but stuff just disappear if you do not catch it and put it in a system” (4, 26:17).* Another employee emphasized the importance of organisational systems to transform individual learning to organisational learning;

“My main message is that things cannot only happen at an individual level. At the individual level there are many things that work well, but that is dependent on personality, own initiative and who you know. If we want to succeed with this development, we need to connect it to a more dynamic system and culture” (3, 26:01).

The statement illustrates the importance of implementing a functional system to ensure systematization of learning material and to transform individual knowledge to organisational learning. Further, the employees stressed that learning material and knowledge are vulnerable when changing digital platforms as there is not a sufficient organisational system in place to handle, store or share individual learning today.

5. Discussion

The findings presented the most prominent factors affecting intrapreneurial behaviour during the pilot program and the organisational factors which hindered intrapreneurial behaviour after the pilot program. LearningLab identified three main objectives of the pilot program, which included; 1) Employee involvement and experimentation, 2) Evaluation and continuation of pilots, and 3) Dissemination of pilot results and organisational learning. An evaluation of which aspects of the BI2020 pilot program the participants experienced as successful will be discussed in relation to the findings and relevant theory.

5.1 Employee involvement and experimentation

The overall objective of the pilot program was to involve employees in experimenting with pedagogical teaching methods, for improving BI's position in the market of higher education. The pilot program provided resources and time and resulted in acknowledgement and acceptance for intrapreneurial behaviour at the time. From the findings it is evident that the participants experienced the first objective of employee involvement and experimentation as successful. All employees reported satisfaction with their own learning experience and everyone would participate again. It is evident that the program had an impact on the organisation as hundred employees applied, seventy-two got accepted and thirty-nine submitted the final report. LearningLab succeeded with involving many

employees in the pilot program and it was a successful initiative for promoting intrapreneurial behaviour among the employees at BI.

Introducing a pilot program allowed the participants to recognize and exploit an opportunity (Urbano & Turró, 2013), which is the first dimension of intrapreneurial behaviour. By recognizing and exploiting an opportunity, the participants engaged in innovative behaviour through idea generation, idea promotion and idea realisation (Lyon et al., 2000). The perception of the participants aligns with the research done by Janssen (2000), as he argued that behaviours related to generating, promoting and realizing innovative ideas are considered as extra role behaviours. If participants wanted to be innovative with their teaching methods, they would have to do it in addition to their regular work tasks. The participants stated that high levels of work pressure, lack of incentives and status lead to pedagogical development not being prioritised in the everyday work. However, the pilot program offered an opportunity for engaging in this extra role behaviour within the frames of their normal full-time job.

Another aspect of the pilot program is related to proactiveness, which is concerned with anticipating future needs, changes and challenges (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). By participating in the program, the participants experimented with how to benefit from technological methods in teaching settings. The participants emphasised that students today require more than before, and the traditional way of teaching is no longer enough. The pilot program allowed the participants to test the newest trends and exploit opportunities that others may not yet have discovered (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996).

The third dimension of intrapreneurial behaviour is risk-taking (Rauch & Frese, 2000). However, participating in the pilot program was not directly associated with taking risk, as the participants received the necessary financial resources, support and acknowledgement. The program allowed for testing ideas, and the participants were not dependent on successful pilot results to avoid negative personal consequences. The result of the pilot does not influence the employees' reputation, employability or salary, which indicate that the pilot program had a high tolerance for failure. Nevertheless, participating in the pilot program may have reduced the perceived risk of engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour in the future.

The fourth dimension of intrapreneurial behaviour concerns being able to take advantage of networking (Neessen et al., 2018). It is evident that the

employees who had cooperated closely with LearningLab previously, was among them who were able to best benefit from their services in the process.

Participating in the pilot program was a learning experience where employees could network with peers, which again could promote intrapreneurial behaviour in the future. It can be stated that the pilot program encouraged employee involvement and experimentation, which could increase intrapreneurial behaviour at BI in the future. This could be highly beneficial for BI, as research show that employee-driven innovation is important for effectiveness and success (Valsania et al., 2016).

5.2 Evaluation and continuation of pilots

Two of the main objectives of the pilot program were to secure an evaluation of the projects and make decisions whether the pilot project should be continued in a) the course, b) implemented in other courses at BI or c) not continued at all. All participants submitted a final report as a self-evaluation, but the findings illustrated that LearningLab was not involved in further evaluation of the projects. In the last meeting with Swanberg (2019), this was explained by lack of financial resources to follow-up the participants further. Several of the research participants expressed a disappointment that there were no follow-up or evaluation of the pilots, leading to the termination of three pilots after the program and a total of six projects were terminated within two years. The pilots that were continued can be explained by the participants own initiative and intrinsic motivation. These findings are consistent with the innovation and intrapreneurship literature, where intrinsic motivation is positively related to intrapreneurial behaviour (Klein & Sorra, 1996; Neessen et al., 2018).

The lack of evaluation and continuation of pilots can be seen in relation to the difficulties related to implementing new ideas. The literature on innovation stress that implementation failure, not innovation failure, is the cause of many organisations' inability to achieve the intended benefits of the innovations they adopt (Klein & Sorra, 1996). Without further support from LearningLab one can assume that management support could have been beneficial in the evaluation and continuation of the pilots, as management support is found to be particularly important in the implementation phase (Damanpour, 1991). However, the findings revealed that management support from the employees' closest leader was absent for all participants. Therefore, it can be argued that BI did not reach the goal of

creating a system for the evaluation and dissemination of the results, and that lack of resources and management support were the main factors for why the pilots were not further continued or implemented at system level.

Lack of management support can be seen in relation to the participants autonomy and work discretion. The participants reported high levels of autonomy, which is found to be an important factor for intrapreneurial behaviour (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996), and a characteristic of the academic world. However, one can debate if the combination of high work discretion and lack of management support led to the termination of six pilots within two years. With more management support and directives for what tasks to perform, the leaders could have influenced the participants to continue with the pilot and further engage in intrapreneurial behaviour. On the other hand, intrapreneurship is today seen as extra role behaviour, and it might be sufficient to include pedagogical development in the work description to promote more intrapreneurial behaviour at BI.

5.3 Dissemination of pilot results and organisational learning

The pilot program was successful as it provided a context where employees could experiment and engage in intrapreneurial behaviour. However, the findings illustrated that the pilot participants did not experience that organisational learning occurred. All research participants expressed satisfaction with their own individual learning, but there was a common agreement that the individual learning experiences had not been optimally shared. Knowledge sharing is a key process in transforming learning from the individual level to the organisational level (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). Research has also identified knowledge sharing as crucial for organisational success and effectiveness (Gupta and Govindarajan, 2000), especially in knowledge-intensive organisations like higher education institutions (Sadiq Sohail & Daud, 2009). LearningLab had a clear vision of the importance of organisational learning as an outcome of the pilot program, and sought to achieve this through the final reports, presentations of the pilots in learning forums and videos online where research participants explained their pilots and their experiences. The question is then why the initiated measures did not provide the desired effects for organisational learning?

The participants identified BI's reward system as the main hinder for engaging in knowledge sharing. The willingness of individuals to share and

integrate their knowledge has been identified as one of the central barriers for knowledge sharing in the literature (Goh, 2002; Lam & Lambermont-Ford, 2010) and can be seen in relation to lack of incentives. Two of the participants emphasized that the knowledge sharing seminars often consisted of employees who were already interested in pedagogical development. On one side it can be questioned whether LearningLab involved all participants to the learning forums or if they only invited those they already knew would attend. However, LearningLab initiated learning forums and published the pilot evaluation and videos online. It can therefore be argued that the participants did not sufficiently engage in knowledge sharing due to lack of incentives and willingness. It can therefore be stated that BI's current reward system hindered the objective of organisational learning and that BI needs a reward system that is aligned with the organisational goals.

5.4 Difficulties with implementing new ideas in BI's existing organisation

The finding illustrated that the participants found it difficult to behave intrapreneurially and implement the projects further after the pilot program was completed. The discussion up until this point argues that the pilot program achieved its first objective related to employee engagement but failed with the objectives related to evaluation, dissemination of knowledge and organisational learning. These objectives are at the intersection between the safe context created by the pilot program and the organisation as a whole. The concept of corporate immune system has been helpful for understanding why these objectives were not achieved and why it is generally difficult to implement new ideas related to pedagogical development at BI. The corporate immune system is a complex, multi-level phenomenon which defines an organisation's defence system (Birkinshaw & Ridderstråle, 1999). Like the human immune system, the corporate immune system consists of "a collection of internal processes and mechanisms that have been developed to protect corporations by identifying and eradicating threats" (Simmons, 2013, p. 1136). This system is partly psychological and partly structural, where the psychological aspect concerns the mindset of the management, while the structural aspect includes formal review and reward systems (Birkinshaw, 2000). For BI, the most prominent aspects of the corporate immune system include incentives, climate and management's focus. So, what

happens when the participants wanted to proceed with their pilot from a safe and controlled context into the existing organisation?

5.4.1 Lack of incentives for intrapreneurial behaviour

Incentives are a part of the structural aspects of a corporate immune system. For the participants at BI, lack of incentives for engaging in intrapreneurial behaviour were identified as the reason for why some of the pilots were not continued. The participants experienced that they were rewarded by continuing on the same track and keeping the high working pace. Further, they experienced to be financially punished for slowing down to improve course material, and some expressed that time spent on teaching and course improvement stagnated their position as acknowledged researchers. However, some participants also emphasised that a monetary reward was not necessary essential for promoting intrapreneurial behaviour, but highlighted that more time, exemption from duty and recognition could be preferred incentives. Our findings are congruent with the results from a research study conducted by De Villiers-Scheepers (2011) who investigated the effects of different rewards organisations use to motivate intrapreneurs. The study revealed that social incentives, such as verbal recognition and appraisal, formal acknowledgement, support and recognition of employees were most important for motivating intrapreneurs (2011). These findings illustrate that BI's corporate immune system hinder intrapreneurial behaviour at BI, due to lack of sufficient incentives for pedagogical development.

5.4.2 Climate and status differences at BI

The organisational climate at BI can be seen as part of the corporate immune system, which made it difficult for pilots to be scaled or further continued. The climate concerns what behaviours employees experience are being rewarded and expected (Schneider et al., 2013). It is likely to assume that if the employees perceived the pilot program as successful, the program would positively influence the intrapreneurial climate at BI. This include an increased management focus, available resources, more freedom to act and fail and a climate where people like to share ideas, goals and can criticize how things work (Fry, 1987). However, the participants experienced that individual learning was not shared and institutionalized. Without organisational learning, the program did not have any significant impact on the organisational climate.

The participants stated that behaviours related to research is more acknowledged, praised and gives higher social status at BI, than pedagogical development. Status can be defined as “an actor’s relative standing in a group based on prestige, honour, and defence” (Thye, 2000, p. 411), and is found to be an important motivating factor for behaviour (Mutter & Kundisch, 2014). One can assume that a climate where status is tied to research will hinder intrapreneurial behaviour related to risk-taking and proactiveness in pedagogy. Thus, management support is likely to be especially important to promote employees intrapreneurial behaviour when the organisational climate favours research development. In this case, the unfavourable climate, status differences and lack of support from the participants closest leaders, inhibited employees intrapreneurial behaviour after the pilot program.

The experienced status difference is likely not only applicable to BI, but other Norwegian and international educational institutes. The findings demonstrated that publishing an article in a recognized journal leads to personal status and recognition, as well as contributing to BI’s international ranking. It is evident that it is important for BI to have a strong research base, as it provides both accreditations and acknowledgement in academic environments. It can therefore be assumed that the focus and incentives for research is influenced by the sector BI operates in. However, some of the participants criticize the senior management for paying too much focus on research and underinvesting in pedagogy.

5.4.3 Senior management’s focus on facilitating intrapreneurial activity

The participants perceived the establishment of LearningLab as a positive initiative by the senior management team at BI. LearningLab and the pilot program provided an accept to spend time on intrapreneurial activity, as well as financial support made projects feasible. However, it seems like the change of the senior management during the BI2020 project influenced the management’s willingness to invest in the pilot projects and contributed to negatively strengthen BI’s corporate immune system. The literature support the importance of the senior management’s willingness to facilitate and promote intrapreneurial activity, which includes their willingness to championing innovative ideas, providing necessary resources, expertise and protection (Hornsby et al., 2000). A longitudinal research study conducted by Leifer and colleagues (2001) studied the implementation of

radical innovations in mature firms and identified the importance of senior managers involvement. The executives were found to play a central role in acting as patrons, provocateurs and shapers of culture. Further, in half the companies they studied, the departure of the executive who followed a project either slowed down or killed the project (Leifer, O'Connor & Rice, 2001). This study is congruent with our findings, as the change of management team slowed and hindered the BI2020 pilot program to gain real impact at BI.

5.4.4 An integrative perspective of intrapreneurial behaviour at BI

Research emphasise that resistance to intrapreneurship is understandable, as corporate immune systems are fundamentally conservative (Birkinshaw & Ridderstråle, 1999). LearningLab challenged the corporate immune system by initiating the pilot program. The program succeeded with providing a safe context, resources and acceptance to experiment. Further, they were given the chance to recognize and exploit an opportunity, to be proactive and innovative in a context with low risk. However, the corporate immune system works continuously to keep unwanted “intruders” at a distance and in the case of the pilot program it managed to do so. Lack of senior management support and commitment influenced the reward and incentives system, which again affected the participants intrapreneurial behaviour. The reward system was also found to influence the intrapreneurial climate and contributes to a status difference at BI, which promotes research behaviour and inhibit pedagogical development. Lastly, all factors together; lack of management support, resources, incentives, status and climate are prominent aspects of BI’s corporate immune system which prevented the organisation from gaining maximal outcome from the pilot program.

This final discussion concerned the interaction between the intrapreneurial employee and the organisation. However, most of the research on intrapreneurship has been limited to the characteristics of the organisation (Neessen et al., 2018). Such a perspective focuses solely on ‘climates’ for intrapreneurship and suggests that intrapreneurship is developed from a top-down perspective. This research study highlights that intrapreneurship is dependent on the employee's initiative to engage in intrapreneurial behaviour in relation with an organisation that facilitates this behaviour and is ready to institutionalize new ideas. It is difficult to imagine how innovation within organisations can emerge without individual engagement,

and how individual's innovative ideas can be brought to live without a supportive organisation.

5.5 Practical implications

This research study has attempted to gain a deeper understanding of what aspects of the pilot program the participants experienced as successful and why. The study revealed that the participants did not perceive that all objectives of the program were achieved. The concept of corporate immune system was used to understand why the participants had difficulties of scaling and implementing project ideas after the pilot program ended. Based on the findings from this case study, five suggestions will be presented for how BI can improve the facilitation and implementation of intrapreneurial activity.

- 1) *Pilot programs*: The findings display that initiating a pilot program promotes employees to engage in intrapreneurial behaviour, due to allocated resources, time and acceptance. LearningLab should continue initiating pilot programs but have a clear agenda for what to do with the results. The program can include fewer participants which could allow for closer pilot- and participant follow-up. LearningLab should establish commitment from the participants to engage in knowledge sharing and develop a plan for how projects can be scaled and implemented at a system level in the future.
- 2) *Appropriate reward systems*: The findings illustrated that the research participants perceived BI's reward system and incentives to inhibit their intrapreneurial behaviour. If the senior management are committed to increase employee-driven intrapreneurship at BI, the reward system should be congruent to promote this type of behaviour. The employees can for instance receive time to develop courses, be exempted from duty to engage in intrapreneurial activity or be financially rewarded when implementing or scaling successful methods in their courses.
- 3) *Status*: The status difference between researchers and lecturers inhibit employees intrapreneurial behaviour and knowledge sharing. One way to equate the status difference between the groups is to have the institute leaders acknowledge and bring attention to lecturers who engage in intrapreneurial behaviour. By creating acceptance and promoting this form

of behaviour, it is likely that employees would share more of their pedagogical experiences and learn from each other.

- 4) *Resource pool*: Through establishing a resource pool allocated to intrapreneurial activity, it will be easier for employees to gain access to financial resources. This way employees can apply for funding independently of LearningLab and can act when they have the time or discover a need. Further, a resource pool would benefit employees who see a need to improve or update already existing pilot projects or to scale a project to other courses.
- 5) *Increase senior management's focus and support*: The above mentioned recommendations are dependent on that senior management and institute leaders increase their commitment and focus on intrapreneurial activity. One way to make the management committed is to include aspects of intrapreneurial activity as a business objective and in employees' performance appraisals. It is likely difficult to change the climate for intrapreneurship at BI without the management's focus and support.

This study also contributes to the theoretical understanding of intrapreneurship within the domain of higher education. The revelation that status influence individuals' willingness to engage in intrapreneurial behaviour and knowledge sharing was unexpected and can contribute with a new dimension of the theoretical understanding of the phenomena. Further, the concept of corporate intrapreneurship provides a new perspective for understanding why it is difficult to engage in intrapreneurial behaviour in established organisations. As far as we know, this connection has never been made in the research literature. Lastly, the findings can provide useful knowledge and insight for other educational institutes which consider initiating a pilot program with focus on pedagogical innovation.

5.6 Limitations of research study

The first limitation of this research study concerns the study's sample size and variation. The sample consisted of ten research participants that were selected based on the thirty-nine final reports. To gain a wider range of perspectives, the study could benefit from including a higher number of participants as well as including participants who did not hand in the final report. This could potentially result in an even greater understanding of which aspects of the pilot program that

succeeded, and what improvements BI needs to implement to promote intrapreneurial behaviour. Further, by only sampling from BI, the results cannot be generalized beyond this organisation. However, the thesis can provide insight for similar educational institutions on how pedagogical intrapreneurship can be promoted and hindered in the context of higher education.

The second limitation concerns the time gap from the pilot was conducted in 2013-2016 and the data was collected in 2019. One can assume that the participants recollection of participating in the pilot program have to some degree been affected by this gap in time. Moreover, the participants experience with organisational factors influencing intrapreneurial behaviour has likely changed from 2013 until today. If this research study was conducted in 2016 the experiences were fresh in memory, other findings might have appeared. Despite these limitations, the research has provided interesting and relevant knowledge in which aspects the pilot program succeeded and how BI better can facilitate for intrapreneurial behaviour in the future.

5.7 Recommendations for further research

We will like to propose two recommendations for further research and present how these can contribute to complement the research on intrapreneurship. The first recommendation concerns investigating intrapreneurial behaviour at BI from several angles. This thesis has taken an employee perspective and mainly focused on the organisational factors affecting intrapreneurial behaviour from bottom-up. By for instance including the senior management, a more complex understanding of intrapreneurial behaviour at BI could have been achieved. Further, a more comprehensive study could be conducted, where one could include several educational institutions and compare pedagogical intrapreneurship. This way one could gain knowledge that could be generalized across organisations in the sector of higher education.

The second recommendation for further research is to empirically study organisations that successfully promote intrapreneurial behaviour. More research is needed on this topic to understand the dynamics between the intrapreneurial employee and the organisation. By investigating this further one can gain a deeper understanding of how organisations succeed with facilitating intrapreneurial behaviour in the organisation. Further, this can also provide new insight to the

phenomenon of corporate immune system and how this concept relates to intrapreneurial activity in other contexts.

6. Conclusion

The aim of this research study was to examine which aspects of the BI2020 pilot program the participants experienced as successful. The pilot program provided a context for pedagogical intrapreneurial behaviour. It was therefore of interest to investigate how BI facilitated employee-driven intrapreneurship and how the interaction between the intrapreneurial employee and the organisation played out. The study reveal that the pilot program provided a safe conceptual space, where time, financial resources and support were the main promoting factors for intrapreneurial behaviour. Further, it was found that organisational factors such as lack of management support, unavailable resources, status differences and the organisational climate served as a corporate immune system, which hindered knowledge sharing and intrapreneurial behaviour after the pilot program. It can therefore be concluded that BI succeeded with creating an arena for intrapreneurial behaviour but did failed to achieve organisational learning and further promotion of pedagogical intrapreneurial behaviour at BI.

7. References

- Ahmed, P. K. (1998). Culture and climate for innovation. *European journal of innovation management*, 1(1), 30-43.
- Alpkan, L., Bulut, C., Gunday, G., Ulusoy, G., & Kilic, K. (2010). Organizational support for intrapreneurship and its interaction with human capital to enhance innovative performance. *Management decision*, 48(5), 732-755.
- Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in organizational behavior*, 10(1), 123-167.
- Amabile, T., & Grysiewicz, S. S. (1987). *Creativity in the R&D laboratory*. Center for Creative Leadership.
- Antonic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of business venturing*, 16(5), 495-527.
- Antonic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2003). Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, 10(1), 7-24.
- Azami, S. H. A. B. A. N. A. (2013). Intrapreneurship “an exigent employment”. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 2(4), 194-198.
- Barney, J. B. (1986). Organizational culture: can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage? *Academy of management review*, 11(3), 656-665.
- Baron, R. A. (2006). Opportunity recognition as pattern recognition: How entrepreneurs “connect the dots” to identify new business opportunities. *Academy of management perspectives*, 20(1), 104-119.
- Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *HBR's 10 must reads on change*, 78(3), 133-141.
- BI. (2013). *Nye undervisningsformer og ny teknologi*. Retrieved from: https://www.bi.no/globalassets/forskning/learninglab/learninglab2/bi2020_norsk.pdf
- BI. (2016). *Korte rapporter fra pilotene*. Retrieved from: https://www.bi.no/globalassets/forskning/learninglab/learninglab2/korte_rapporter_fra_pilotene.pdf
- BI. (2018). *Annual report*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bi.edu/about-bi/annual-report-2017/>
- Birkinshaw, J. (2000). *Entrepreneurship in the global firm: enterprise and renewal*. Sage.

-
- Birkinshaw, J., & Ridderstråle, J. (1999). Fighting the corporate immune system: a process study of subsidiary initiatives in multinational corporations. *International Business Review*, 8(2), 149-180.
- Bosma, N. S., Stam, F. C., & Wennekers, A. R. M. (2010). Intrapreneurship: An international study.
- Brazeal, D. V. (1993). Organizing for internally developed corporate ventures. *Journal of Business venturing*, 8(1), 75-90.
- Bulut, Ç., & Alpkan, L. (2006). Behavioral Consequences of an Entrepreneurial Climate within Large Organizations: An Integrative Proposed Model. *South East European Journal of Economics & Business (1840118X)*, (2).
- Burns, Alvin C., & Bush, Ronald F. (2016). *Marketing Research, Global Edition* (Global ed of 8th Revised ed.). Pearson Education M.U.A.
- Büschgens, T., Bausch, A., & Balkin, D. B. (2013). Organizational culture and innovation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of product innovation management*, 30(4), 763-781.
- Carrier, C. (1996). Intrapreneurship in small businesses: an exploratory study. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 21(1), 5-20.
- Chisholm, T. A. (1987). Intrapreneurship and bureaucracy. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 52(3), 36.
- Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of management journal*, 34(3), 555-590.
- De Jong, J. P. J., Parker, S. K., Wennekers, S., & Wu, C. (2011). Corporate entrepreneurship at the individual level: measurement and determinants. *EIM research reports. Zoetermeer: EIM*, 11, 13.
- De Jong, J., & Wennekers, S. (2008). Conceptualizing entrepreneurial employee behaviour. EIM-SCALES (Scientific Analysis of Entrepreneurship and SMEs)
- De Villiers-Scheepers, M. J. (2011). Motivating intrapreneurs: the relevance of rewards. *Industry and Higher Education*, 25(4), 249-263.
- Dess, G. G., Ireland, R. D., Zahra, S. A., Floyd, S. W., Janney, J. J., & Lane, P. J. (2003). Emerging issues in corporate entrepreneurship. *Journal of management*, 29(3), 351-378.
- Dubois, A., & Gadde, L. E. (2002). Systematic combining: an abductive approach
-

to case research. *Journal of business research*, 55(7), 553-560.

- Dewett, T. (2007). Linking intrinsic motivation, risk taking, and employee creativity in an R&D environment. *R&D Management*, 37(3), 197-208.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of management review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Elfring, T., & Hulsink, W. (2003). Networks in entrepreneurship: The case of high-technology firms. *Small business economics*, 21(4), 409-422.
- Franco, M., & Haase, H. (2013). Firm resources and entrepreneurial orientation as determinants for collaborative entrepreneurship. *Management Decision*, 51(3), 680-696.
- Fry, A. (1987). The post-it note: An intrapreneurial success. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 52(3), 4.
- Goh, S. C. (2002). Managing effective knowledge transfer: an integrative framework and some practice implications. *Journal of knowledge management*, 6(1), 23-30.
- Gupta, A. K., & Govindarajan, V. (2000). Knowledge flows within multinational corporations. *Strategic management journal*, 21(4), 473-496.
- Harrell, M. C., & Bradley, M. A. (2009). *Data collection methods. Semi-structured interviews and focus groups*. Rand National Defense Research Inst santa monica ca.
- Heinonen, J., & Korvela, K. (2003). How about measuring intrapreneurship. *Small Business Institute, Turku School of Economics and Business Administration*.
- Hisrich, R. D. (1990). Entrepreneurship/intrapreneurship. *American psychologist*, 45(2), 209.
- Hornsby, J. S., Kuratko, D. F., & Zahra, S. A. (2002). Middle managers' perception of the internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship: assessing a measurement scale. *Journal of business Venturing*, 17(3), 253-273.
- Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and organizational psychology*, 73(3), 287-302.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1997). Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market

-
- process: An Austrian approach. *Journal of economic Literature*, 35(1), 60-85.
- Klein, K. J., & Sorra, J. S. (1996). The challenge of innovation implementation. *Academy of management review*, 21(4), 1055-1080.
- Kuratko, D. F., Montagno, R. V., & Hornsby, J. S. (1990). Developing an intrapreneurial assessment instrument for an effective corporate entrepreneurial environment. *Strategic management journal*, 49-58.
- Lam, A., & Lambermont-Ford, J. P. (2010). Knowledge sharing in organisational contexts: a motivation-based perspective. *Journal of knowledge management*, 14(1), 51-66.
- Leifer, R., O'connor, G. C., & Rice, M. (2001). Implementing radical innovation in mature firms: The role of hubs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 15(3), 102-113.
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- Lyon, D. W., Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (2000). Enhancing entrepreneurial orientation research: Operationalizing and measuring a key strategic decision making process. *Journal of management*, 26(5), 1055-1085.
- Menzel, H. C., Aaltio, I., & Ulijn, J. M. (2007). On the way to creativity: Engineers as intrapreneurs in organizations. *Technovation*, 27(12), 732-743.
- Mutter, T., & Kundisch, D. (2014). Don't take away my status!—Evidence from the restructuring of a virtual reward system. *Computer Networks*, 75, 477-490.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of management review*, 23(2), 242-266.
- Neessen, P., Caniels, M., Vos, B., & De Jong, J. (2018). The Intrapreneurial Employee: Towards an Integrated Model of Intrapreneurship and Research Agenda. *Proceedings - Academy of Management*, 2017(1), 10355.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (1981). Relationships between organizational structure and employee reactions: Comparing alternative frameworks. *Administrative science quarterly*, 66-83.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.).
-

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Pucciarelli, F., & Kaplan, A. (2016). Competition and strategy in higher education: Managing complexity and uncertainty. *Business Horizons*, 59(3), 311-320.
- Rauch, A., & Frese, M. (2000). Psychological approaches to entrepreneurial success: A general model and an overview of findings. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 15, 101-142.
- Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G. T., & Frese, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 33(3), 761-787.
- Razavi, S. H., & Ab Aziz, K. (2017). The dynamics between entrepreneurial orientation, transformational leadership, and intrapreneurial intention in Iranian R&D sector. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 23(5), 769-792.
- Reid, A. J. (1996). What we want: qualitative research. Promising frontier for family medicine. *Canadian Family Physician*, 42, 387.
- Rule, E. G., & Irwin, D. W. (1988). Fostering intrapreneurship: The new competitive edge. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 9(3), 44-47.
- Russell, R. D. (1999). Developing a process model of intrapreneurial systems: A cognitive mapping approach. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 23(3), 65-84.
- Sadiq Sohail, M., & Daud, S. (2009). Knowledge sharing in higher education institutions: Perspectives from Malaysia. *Vine*, 39(2), 125-142.
- Sale, J. E., Lohfeld, L. H., & Brazil, K. (2002). Revisiting the quantitative-qualitative debate: Implications for mixed-methods research. *Quality and quantity*, 36(1), 43-53.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students*. Pearson education.
- Saunders, M. N., & Townsend, K. (2016). Reporting and justifying the number of interview participants in organization and workplace research. *British Journal of Management*, 27(4), 836-852.
- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual review of psychology*, 64, 361-388.

-
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of management journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
- Sebora, T. C., Theerapatvong, T., & Lee, S. M. (2010). Corporate entrepreneurship in the face of changing competition: a case analysis of six Thai manufacturing firms. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 23(4), 453-470.
- Shane, S. (2000). Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization science*, 11(4), 448-469.
- Sharma, P., & Chrisman, S. J. J. (2007). Toward a reconciliation of the definitional issues in the field of corporate entrepreneurship. In *Entrepreneurship* (pp. 83-103). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Silverman, D. (2014). *Interpreting qualitative data*. Sage.
- Simmons, O. S. (2013). The corporate immune system: Governance from the inside out. *U. Ill. L. Rev.*, 1131.
- Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2004). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Doing social psychology research*, 229-254.
- Smith, J. A., Jarman, M., & Osborn, M. (1999). Doing interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative health psychology: Theories and methods*, 218-240.
- Smith, L., Rees, P., & Murray, N. (2016). Turning entrepreneurs into intrapreneurs: Thomas Cook, a case-study. *Tourism Management*, 56, 191-204.
- Stevenson, H.H. and Jarillo, C.J. (1990), "A paradigm of entrepreneurship: in: Entrepreneurial management", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp. 17-27.
- Stull, M., & Singh, J. (2005). Intrapreneurship in nonprofit organizations: Examining the factors that facilitate entrepreneurial behavior among employees. Retrieved May, 2
- Thye, S. R. (2000). A status value theory of power in exchange relations. *American Sociological Review*, 407-432.
- Urbano, D., & Turró, A. (2013). Conditioning factors for corporate entrepreneurship: an in (ex) ternal approach. *International entrepreneurship and management journal*, 9(3), 379-396.
- Urbano, D., Alvarez, C., & Turró, A. (2013). Organizational resources and
-

-
- intrapreneurial activities: an international study. *Management Decision*, 51(4), 854-870.
- Valsania, S. E., Moriano, J. A., & Molero, F. (2016). Authentic leadership and intrapreneurial behavior: cross-level analysis of the mediator effect of organizational identification and empowerment. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12(1), 131-152.
- van Dam, K., Schipper, M., & Runhaar, P. (2010). Developing a competency-based framework for teachers' entrepreneurial behaviour. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 965-971.
- Venkataraman, S. (1997). The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research. *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence and growth*, 3(1), 119-138.
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of case study research*. Sage.
- Zahra, S. A., Jennings, D. F., & Kuratko, D. F. (1999). The antecedents and consequences of firm-level entrepreneurship: The state of the field. *Entrepreneurship Theory and practice*, 24(2), 45-65.
- Zahra, S. A., Nielsen, A. P., & Bogner, W. C. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship, knowledge, and competence development. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 23(3), 169-189.
- Åmo, B. W. (2006). Employee innovation behaviour in health care: the influence from management and colleagues. *International nursing review*, 53(3), 231-237.
- Åmo, B. W. (2010). Corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship related to innovation behaviour among employees. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 2(2), 144-158.

Appendices

A. Interview guide

1. Bakgrunn og motivasjon

1. Har du lyst til å fortelle litt om deg og din arbeidshverdag?
2. Kan du fortelle om prosjektet du gjennomførte i BI 2020 pilotprogrammet?
- Hva var bakgrunnen for piloten?
3. Hva var din motivasjon for å bli med på dette?
Hvor kom denne ideen fra?
- Er dette noe du har tenkt på lenge, arbeidet med tidligere etc?
4. Hvordan var prosessen etter at piloten var ferdig?
- Kunne du bidratt med noe annerledes?
- Hvis dette fungerte godt - hvorfor tror du det ikke har blitt tatt i bruk av andre? Og hva kunne evt. BI bidratt med her?
- Fikk du delt kunnskapen din enten i forum, artikler eller andre måter?
- Lærte du noe av andre som også deltok i pilotprosjektet?

2. Organisatoriske faktorer

1. Kan du fortelle om noen utfordringer du opplevde underveis?
2. I en perfekt verden - hvis alt hadde gått som du ønsket - hvordan hadde BI tilrettelagt for å gjøre gjennomføringen av pilotprosjektet enklere?
3. Hvordan vil du beskrive støtten fra ledelsen, da både nærmeste leder og toppledelsen?
- Både under og etter pilotprosjektet
- Støtte og oppfølging av LearningLab - stod de til forventningene?
4. Hva forventet du av tildelte ressurser for å gjennomføre prosjektet og ble disse innfridd?
5. Opplever du at BI har nok ressurser til å drive med nyskaping?
6. Hvordan er kulturen på BI for nyskaping?
7. Opplever du at innovasjon blir prioritert av toppledelsen?
8. Opplever du at pedagogikk ikke har like høy prioritet som forskning?
9. Opplever du at kulturen for nyskaping har endret seg etter pilotprosjektene?

- Hva tror du kan være BI sine utfordringer generelt når det kommer til innovasjon og nyskaping?

3. Avslutning

1. Hvis du skulle gjennomført prosjektet igjen, hva ville du gjort annerledes?
2. Hvordan vil du si at pilotprosjektet har påvirket din motivasjon til å gjøre noe lignende igjen?
3. Helt avslutningsvis, er det noen aspekter av prosjektet som du mener ikke har blitt belyst i løpet av dette intervjuet?

B. Initial Analysis

| Pilot | Project after the program | Support from LearningLab during program | Motivation for participation |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Not continued, Lack of follow-up and discussion. | Experienced LearningLab as not interested in the projects, only interested in movies. Solely systematic follow-up, no real interest. | It sounded exciting. Would not do it without the program. |
| 2 | Not continued after the pilot program | Satisfied with the support. | A result of team-work and an evaluation of how one could take advantage of the financial resources made available. |
| 3 | Was continued for two years. The content is unprofessional and outdated, not systematically used today. | Very good support from the team that helped out with the pilot project. Followed up, coordinated and planned. Felt more like a project participant than project owner. | Was asked. Always interested in doing things better, so participated. |
| 4 | Continued for a time. Stopped due to technical difficulties. BI changed platform. | Received the technical support needed. | Inspired by a colleague. Wanted to use new technology, curious and take advantage of the financial support. |
| 5 | Continued a couple of years at own initiative. Disappointed at other course coordinators' willingness to spend resources on this. The pilot owner created a template, so it would be easy for others to use the idea. The idea died when the pilot owner changed position. | Excellent support. Worked close with LearningLab, good relation to the employees that work there. | The idea was there, but the pilot program facilitated. Wanted to seek out alternative teaching methods. Very interested in pedagogy. |
| 6 | Continued for two years. Technical challenges | Very satisfied. Highly skilled employees, received a lot of help. | Wish to investigate new pedagogical teaching methods. |
| 7 | Continued at own initiative. Only continued in the course that was part of the pilot. Wanted to scale the projects, but did not receive money for this. Think it is strange that not more employees use the idea. | Very satisfied with LearningLab and the support. | Was board by lecturing the same, traditional way. Was encouraged by an employee a LearningLab to participate. Would not have done it without financial support. |
| 8 | Continued at own initiative. Lack of follow-up, no one would have cared if it was not continued. | Only financial support. Disappointed in LearningLab, felt forgotten and experienced that the effort was not appreciated. | Would have executed the pilot anyway. It was good timing. Chose to apply to receive financial support. |
| 9 | Still in use at own initiative | Satisfied with the financial support. Expected more support with the video production, had to figure it out at own hand. | Three reasons; Easy to get allocated time. Accept from leader and colleagues. 2) Learn and increase own knowledge and 3) Promote the department in the organization. |
| 10 | Continued at own initiative. The pilot is still in use. Experiment a lot in general. | Phenomenally! Professionally skilled, easy available and many resources. | Would have executed the pilot without the program. Have been engaged in experimenting for many years. The money was a bonus. The financial support also highlight the work internally at BI. |

| Pilot | Knowledge sharing | Time | Status |
|-------|---|---|---|
| 1 | No knowledge sharing. Will not force ideas on others, but missed learning from others and a discussion of how one could scale the pilot. | "It takes time..." | |
| 2 | Presented at a forum initiated by LearningLab and published the experiences at a blog. | Have the possibility to prioritize pedagogical development. | |
| 3 | Shared knowledge at a seminar. Those who are interested shows up. When the theme is related to teaching and pedagogy less employees show up. | Improvement is a time-consuming activity. Needs resources and time. Do not have much time to spare. | Research provides more status. Focus on that research is how BI as an institution gets recognized. It is important for an educational institution to have a solid research base. Status differences between lecturing at bachelor and masters. |
| 4 | Was not invited at the knowledge sharing forum. Missed an evaluation- and archive system. No organizational learning, only individual. | The use of time is a negative consequence of intrapreneurship | Only research that counts. Pedagogy gives no status, has low prestige, no incentives nor organizational focus. Miss proper incentives and acknowledgement. The lecturers against the researchers. |
| 5 | Talked at a conference and shared knowledge from the pilot. Wish it was shared more. | | Talks about the conflict between researchers and lecturers without using the word status directly. |
| 6 | Presented at a seminar for individuals who were interested in pedagogy. | It takes time. That is why the pilot stopped. Have not prioritized to record the videos again. | Clearly status differences at BI. Researchers are rewarded by publishing. Working with pedagogy gives no reward. |
| 7 | Written several articles about this topic and participated in an online video. | Thinks research is most important. Do not want to invest more time to change other courses. | Conflict between research and lecturing. Research gives prestige, but lecturing provides money. Those who teach could lecture less and spend more time on improving the course material. Is not interested in pedagogy, wants to research more. |
| 8 | Missed knowledge sharing after the pilot and learning from each other. | Developing the lecture material costs time. One possibility would be to skip a course in order to develop another course. Do not want it to be at expense of research. | In an international perspective, research is what's counts. Must spend the time on research to become a recognized professor. |
| 9 | Talked at two external conferences. Wrote a research paper. But the program did not contribute to more collaboration between the departments at BI. | The video production took more time than expected. Did not have the time to complete all aspects of the pilot. Difficult to be engaged in these types of projects in an otherwise busy work life. | BI highlight those who are already engaged in pedagogy. could put more pressure on those who could need to improve their courses. |
| 10 | Did not experience any synergy-effect. Unfortunate that the learning has not been shared more. Experience resistance in the work life when it comes to innovation, avoid sharing knowledge. | Pedagogical development is time-consuming. Could have reduced duty to have more time for this. "Give me time and money please" | Talks about three employee groups, where the researchers and lecturers do not understand each other. |

| Pilot | Support from Leader | Financial resources | LearningLab in general |
|--------------|---|---|--|
| 1 | The leader did not know about the participation. | | |
| 2 | Experienced the leader as very encouraging. | Good that they established LearningLab, but beside that there is no focus on pedagogical development. | Very satisfied, skilled employees. |
| 3 | Do not believe that the leader know about the pilot participants participation in the program. | | |
| 4 | The leader has never cared. The participant experience that he/she is employed to work, but that pedagogy has no standing at BI. | BI have the financial resources, but harder now to get access. More bureaucracy, miss that the institutions do not have more freedom and money. | Satisfied with LearningLab in general. |
| 5 | Did not experience any support beside the acceptance to participate in the pilot program. Did not experience that the leader was proud, experienced rather an indifference. | The resources were there, but the faculty members are too conservative and do not want more work. There are cultural barriers that hinder new ways of thinking around pedagogy. | Very satisfied with LearningLab. Enjoy collaborating with the employees that work there. |
| 6 | The leader did not know about the participation but did not miss support either. | There is no resources nor incentives for the employees to work with pedagogical development. Very strong incentives to work a lot with the same as usual. | Very satisfied. Have collaborated with them after the program. |
| 7 | | Believe BI have enough resources, but not enough commitment. Do not experience tat BI invest in this at all. An enormously bureaucracy. | Very satisfied with the establishment of LearningLab. LearningLab has not the desired impact at BI and serves now as a support function. Experience that the establishment of LearningLab has improved the culture for innovation. |
| 8 | No support. Do not believe the leader know about it. | There is not enough resources nor incentives. Would be nice to drop a course in order to develop another. | Not satisfied. Feel they cannot help. Wish they were a step ahead on the technical aspects and could inspire the employees with new ways of doing things |
| 9 | Very good support. Received help to manage the time and was allowed to attend conferences. | Can apply for financial resources to join courses and seminars. | |
| 10 | Did not experience any support at the time. | Lack time and money | Collaborate a lot with LearningLab, both before, during and after the pilot program. Contribute to easing the work, makes things better. |

| Pilot | Senior Management | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|
| 2 | It is not a culture at BI for intrapreneurship. The management does not have the relationship with the employees to foster this, and do not know what quality is and what one needs to do to increase the intrapreneurial climate. There is a cost perspective and the systems are not aligned to support innovation. Lack the team spirit, the culture and the focus on how one can create time for this activity. | | |
| 3 | The senior management does not know how it is to work in our position and fails to understand the situation we are in. | | |
| 8 | We have no assertive leaders at BI. Do not experience that the management invest in this at all. There is only a focus on research at BI. | | |
| 9 | Very dissatisfied with the senior management. They must recognize both the researchers and the lecturers. Very low recognition of the lecturers. The fact that they are moving LearningLab to the library is a signal to the lecturers. It is outrageous. | | |

C. Information Letter to participants

Vil du delta i forskningsprosjektet *”Masteroppgave om intraprenøriell atferd”?*

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om å delta i vårt forskningsprosjekt der formålet er å undersøke hvilke faktorer som hindrer og fremmer intraprenøriell atferd hos ansatte på Handelshøyskolen BI. I dette skrivet gir vi deg informasjon om målene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for deg.

Formål

Vi ønsker å studere fenomenet ‘intraprenøriell atferd’ nærmere i forbindelse med vår masteroppgave, våren 2019. Studien vil ha en kvalitativ tilnærming, der 10 ansatte inviteres til dybdeintervju. Studiens overordnede problemstilling er:

“In what ways did the participants experience the BI2020 pilot program as successful?”

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?

Handelshøyskolen BI er ansvarlig for prosjektet, med veileder Jon Erland Bonde Lervik.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Forskningsprosjektet er i samarbeid med BI LearningLab. Du får spørsmål om å delta i prosjektet på bakgrunn av din medvirkning i BI 2020 pilot program. Du har blitt identifisert som intraprenør og vi ønsker å undersøke hvordan du som ansatt på BI opplevde å utøve intraprenøriell atferd i denne perioden. Totalt vil 10 ansatte som deltok i pilotprogrammet motta denne henvendelsen. De utvalgte ansatte er plukket ut basert på BI2020 pilot rapporter og i samarbeid med Anne Berit Swanberg, leder for LearningLab.

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?

Hvis du velger å delta i prosjektet, innebærer det at du deltar i et dybdeintervju på ca. 1 time. Intervjuet vil fokusere på hvorfor du ønsket å delta i pilotprosjektet,

hvordan du opplevde å endre arbeidsmetode, samt hvilke faktorer hindret eller fremmet ditt arbeid. Det vil bli gjort lydopptak av intervjuet og opptaket vil slettes etter transkribering.

Det er frivillig å delta

Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Hvis du velger å delta, kan du når som helst trekke samtykke tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle opplysninger om deg vil da bli anonymisert. Det vil ikke ha noen negative konsekvenser for deg hvis du ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke deg.

Ditt personvern – hvordan vi oppbevarer og bruker dine opplysninger

Vi vil kun bruke opplysningene om deg til formålene vi har fortalt om i dette skrivet. Vi behandler opplysningene konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket. De som vil ha tilgang til dataene utover oss, er vår veileder Jon Erland Bonde Lervik. LearningLab vil ha tilgang til endelig masteroppgave, men ikke til rådata.

Ditt navn og kontaktopplysninger vil bli erstattet med en kode som lagres på egen navneliste adskilt fra øvrige data. Dine kollegaer vil ikke kunne identifisere deg i ferdig masteroppgave, da oppgaven ikke direkte vil knytte prosjekt opp mot individuell opplevelse.

Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet?

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes 31.06.2019. Dine personopplysninger vil bli slettet etter sensur, ca. 6 uker etter prosjektslutt.

Dine rettigheter

Så lenge du kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, har du rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke personopplysninger som er registrert om deg,
- å få rettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få slettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få utlevert en kopi av dine personopplysninger (dataportabilitet), og
- å sende klage til personvernombudet eller Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

Hva gir oss rett til å behandle personopplysninger om deg?

Vi behandler opplysninger om deg basert på ditt samtykke.

På oppdrag fra Handelshøyskolen BI har NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Hvor kan jeg finne ut mer?

Hvis du har spørsmål til studien, eller ønsker å benytte deg av dine rettigheter, ta kontakt med:

Handelshøyskolen BI ved:

- Eline Bruntveit, elinebruntveit@gmail.com
- Lena Holter, lena.h.holter@gmail.com
- Jon Erland Bonde Lervik (veileder), Jon.e.lervik@bi.no

NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS, på epost

(personverntjenester@nsd.no) eller telefon: 55 58 21 17.

Med vennlig hilsen

Prosjektansvarlig

Jon Erland Bonde Lervik

Masterstudenter

Eline Bruntveit & Lena Holter

Samtykkeerklæring

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet [*Masteroppgave om intraprenøriell atferd*], og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål. Jeg samtykker til:

- å delta i intervju

Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet, ca. 31.08.2019.

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)