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Abstract

This thesis is an autoethnography that explores an emergent topic within business and management that is the overlap between the fields of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change. The research presented here is not something that occurs independently in a linear world; it has emerged from the involvement of different actors, with different social constructions 'existing' in a dynamic, fluid world, and as the researcher I have a key role within this. So, by means of this autoethnography, I hope to provide narratives of both the research itself and my experiences as a student undertaking a doctoral research project. Neither one of these is completely separate form the other. I hope to have captured some of the energy, uncertainty and realities associated with the doctoral research process and research into the culture of 'intraprelearning' in two Welsh NHS Trusts through this autoethnography. The research spans the three broad fields of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change. Corporate entrepreneurship is entrepreneurship that occurs within or from a large organisation. Organisational learning is any learning that occurs within an organisation, and by its members. Organisational change is any form of change within an organisation. Following a critique of the relevant research literature, I highlight a form of synergy that appears to exist between the three constructs. For simplicity I have named the possible interrelationships between these three constructs as intraprelearning.

My autoethnography takes the reader on a journey. Firstly, a set of theoretical models are offered that may possibly explain intraprelearning. 11 research questions are formulated informed by the set theoretical models. I describe getting access into the NHS Trusts, and the ethical considerations that have been integral to the project. I also provide details of how a quality of research has been achieved through all stages of the process, but most especially through collecting and analysing the data. Through the empirical data collection (interviews with 21 strategic leads and 29 corporate entrepreneurs, observations and document analyses) I construct the cases of the two Trusts, which I have anonymised to Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. Throughout the thesis, I flow to and from the research and my experiences of conducting the research, highlighting insights, making connections with the existing body of knowledge and proposing questions and areas for future research agendas.

Key findings identify two different forms of entrepreneurship in the two different Trusts: enforced (Aberash) and empowered (Brynbeth). The entrepreneurs themselves are characterised as determined, able to communicate at all levels, change agents and proactive learners. An
unexpected finding, because of its contradiction with existing research is that Trust entrepreneurs do not have high levels of self-confidence and they look to their champions for providing them with the confidence behind their entrepreneurship. Champions provide the entrepreneurs with legitimate power (French and Raven, 1959), and protect the entrepreneurs from blame, risk-taking and failure. Champions are important in overcoming people who resist and block entrepreneurial efforts. Often resistors and blockers will constitute one senior consultant or nurse, or a group of subordinate staff who have accumulative power because of their numbers. Another finding is the significant role of learning and education is important in trying to shift resistance to entrepreneurship. A form of entrepreneurial learning referred to in the start-up entrepreneurship literature as Critical Learning Experiences have been identified as providing Trust entrepreneurs with an integrative world view. This world view appears to enable the identification and realisation of entrepreneurial opportunities. The research has identified that Trust entrepreneurs are active learners and provides details of the wide range of formal and informal learning activities that are undertaken. It also proposes that intraprelearning does not encompass all learning, but does include reading articles, teamwork, attending conferences, networks, working on the nursing bank and postgraduate study. Intraprelearning can be in work, at work (Sambrook, 2003) or away from work.

This study makes several original contributions to knowledge. It offers two sets of models that are theoretical attempts to address some of the weaknesses in the corporate entrepreneurship literature and intraprelearning literatures respectively. Developing the set of intraprelearning models, an empirical model describing intraprelearning within NHS trusts is offered. The model is an outcome of this extensive project and highlights the critical role of the champion in linking organisational learning, organisational change and corporate entrepreneurship. It illustrates the emergence and drivers of empowered and enforced entrepreneurship and sub-constructs within organisational learning and organisational change. The research enriches the extant knowledge base on Trust facilitators to and barriers of entrepreneurship, providing a useful platform for further research. A methodological contribution is made in terms of an alternative approach to reporting upon the methodology of a qualitative project. The use of spreadsheets as a calendar offers a useful way of providing a plausible and pragmatic account of the research process. Finally, in terms of contributions to practice, this research has identified significant implications for HRM, HRD, and strategic policy within NHS Trusts; it also has implications for the development and delivery of management and leadership training and development.
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Glossary

**Autoethnography**: is the cultural study of one’s own people, this term now commonly refers to a particular form of writing that seeks to unite ethnographic (looking outward at a world beyond one’s own) and autobiographical (gazing inward for a story of one’s self) intentions. The aim in composing an autoethnographic account is to keep both the subject (knower) and object (that which is being examined) in simultaneous view.

**Corporate Entrepreneurship**: involves teams within a firm led by intrapreneurs or corporate champions who promote entrepreneurial behaviour inside large organisations, proactively engaging in risky projects that seek to create new, innovative, administrative procedures, products and services that facilitate organisational renewal and growth.

**Organisational Learning**: refers to the learning process of an organization and by the organization in a collective (organizational) way.

**Learning Organisation**: is a 'living' representative of the image of 'learning organization'. If something is the representative of something, it does not need to contain all the characteristics of it but, rather, it possesses some major characteristics or features of it.'

**Organisational Change**: describes activities ranging from transforming an organisation’s basic culture and values to introducing a new policy or system. Change can refer to external shifts in technology, political climate as well as to internal modifications in structure, policies, or personnel. Change can be initiated from the top or can sell up from front-line employees; it can be viewed as positive and exciting or negative and threatening.

**Intraprelearning**: describes the possible interrelationships between the three processes of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change at all organisational levels. Intraprelearning has been derived from an abbreviation of the term intra-corporate entrepreneurial learning and (drawing from my literature review)
describes a set of interrelationships that may occur at the individual, team or organisational level. Intraprelearning may be formal or may be informal. Furthermore, intraprelearning may be externally oriented, or may be internally oriented. In all of these contexts intraprelearning incorporates change. Change may be the trigger to intraprelearning, it may be the result of intraprelearning, it may be incorporated within the corporate entrepreneurship and learning itself.

NHS entrepreneurship:- is the 'process' of proactively engaging in creative, ethical and guarded risk-taking behaviours, routines and ways of working that seek to create entrepreneurial behaviour that is;
(a) Perceived as new by a proportion of key stakeholders
(b) Linked to the provision or support of health care
(c) Discontinuous with previous practice
Which facilitates organisational redefinition and rejuvenation through improving: administrative efficiency, cost effectiveness; the user experience; and ultimately leads to enhanced patient care. NHS CE is engaged in by individual (or team) of corporate entrepreneurs and supported by a sponsor or champion. NHS CE may be formal and official, may be informal and unofficial or both. Activities may be oriented within the Trust or externally to the Trust.
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Chapter 1 - My Research, My Style and Myself

1.1 Introduction

This chapter is not a conventional first 'introductory' chapter typical of a PhD thesis. In this chapter I 'justify' my approach to this PhD study and in order to do this I first describe how I see things, my 'world view' or using academic language my 'ontology'. Once I have clarified how I view the world I then argue that because I view the world in the way that I do, it is important for me to write about my experiences as the researcher as well as those of the researched since each may possibly intertwine with the other and may also affect one another. Following this discussion I provide readers with some insight and tools, from the academic literature, that will help them to develop opinions concerning the quality and rigour of my research. I feel that it is more helpful to provide this at the start, as I believe that this will help readers in beginning to develop their opinions from the outset, and also enable them to provide more inclusive feedback and critique of my work. Traditionally, discussions of research quality are left until the latter stages of the PhD thesis, in particular, I have noted with scientific studies. Following from this, I then provide some background information about myself and how I have come to have an interest in the fields that I am writing about. Because of the epistemological paradigm in which this study is set, I feel that this is an important picture to paint. Finally, and more akin to the traditional PhD, I provide a summary of the rest of the thesis content. So, this autoethnography (I will explain this term later on in this chapter) begins with a look at my initial perceptions of the PhD process.

1.2 My Research

The traditional PhD thesis takes the shape of neatly bound pages, containing chapters typically organised in the sequence of introduction, literature review, methodology, results, analysis, conclusion, implications and recommendations for future research. This reconstructed logic (Sambrook, 1998) can give the impression to the new doctoral student, as it did to me, that the PhD process is a somewhat neat, linear, and a rather organised process of study. As I progressed through my PhD I began to realise that it was not going to be this neat and linear process. This critical learning experience was a
slow realisation that emerged from actively reflecting upon my lived experiences. Byrne-Armstrong et al (2001) define critical moments in the research process as:

‘The messy, unspoken, complex, and disturbing moments in their research processes...those times when researchers are impelled to negotiate between the theories of convention about research and their lived experience of it. Critical moments tell us the truth of the research process.’ (2001:4)

My PhD experience was, as Pinn (2001:185) describes, a ‘messy, alive, risky and uncertain process’. Due to this experience, and the philosophical bounds within which I am positioned, I have deliberately tried to capture the reality of my PhD experience and my logic-in-use (Kaplan, 1964) through the organisation of my thesis and the style in which I have written it.

1.3 Research Paradigms

In order to explain what I have done and why I have done it, I feel that it is first necessary to introduce the different paradigms underpinning research inquiry in general thus enabling me to defend my contemporary approach. Beginning a thesis with a discussion of inquiry paradigms is rather unconventional in itself and this is something that I struggled with when I was writing my thesis. It is another example of a critical moment of my PhD experience. After much deliberation, I decided that it would be important to make clear my philosophical orientation from the beginning of my thesis as the research paradigm sets the scene and direction for the entire research project. In order to explain my orientation, I will firstly provide an overview of the key components of research philosophy, as McGoldrick, Stewart and Watson (2002:2) state ‘it is necessary to engage with the philosophies... to make explicit the rationales underpinning the competing perspectives’.

A research framework or inquiry paradigm can be described as:

‘a set of basic beliefs...it represents a worldview that defines, for its holder the nature of the ‘world’, the individual’s place in it, and the range of possible relationships to that world and its parts.’(Guba and Lincoln, 1998: 200)
Inquiry paradigms define for inquirers and researchers what their basic beliefs are and what does or does not constitute a legitimate inquiry. Higgs, Titchen and Neville (2001) and Higgs (2001) offer a table of three different inquiry paradigms (which has been adapted later in figure 1.3):

- Empirico-analytic paradigm (or positivist philosophical stance).
- Interpretive paradigm (or idealist philosophical stance).
- Critical paradigm (or realist philosophical stance).

Understanding the paradigm in which a piece of research is set enables us to understand how knowledge is generated and verified in that instance, and knowledge and the generation of knowledge are central to the research process. Knowledge can be categorized into three forms (Berlin, 1979; Higgs, 2001):

- Deductive (things that are true either by definition or by deduction from other things that are themselves true purely by definition).
- Scientific (knowledge from empirical evidence that only remains 'true' for as long as it is not objectively refuted).
- Experiential knowledge (gained from personal experience, which is distinct and not reducible to either scientific or deductive knowledge).

Figures 1.2 and 1.3 summarise key philosophies of each of the paradigms listed above, and their respective knowledge, ontological and epistemological perspectives. Different research paradigms contain different ontological (worldview) and epistemological (knowledge derivation) perspectives of knowledge (Higgs, 2001).

Ontology (also referred to as 'metaphysics' – see Schwandt (2001:157)) is the 'worldview'. Guba and Lincon (1998) explain ontology, epistemology and methodology as a set of three questions. The ontological question is (1998:201), 'What is the form and nature of reality and, therefore, what is there that can be known about it?'

Epistemology is defined succinctly by Schwandt (2001) as 'the study of the nature of knowledge and justification' and by Easterby-Smith et al (2003:31) as the 'general set of
assumptions about the best ways of inquiring into the nature of the world.' The epistemological question (Guba and Lincon (1988:201)) is 'What is the nature of the relationship between the knower or would-be knower and what can be known?' It follows that the answer given to the above epistemological question is constrained by the answer given to the underpinning ontological question.

The methodological approach is integral to and informed from ontological and epistemological assumptions (D'Cruz, 2001). Methodology is defined as 'the theory of how inquiry should proceed' (Schwandt, 2001) and the methodological question (Guba and Lincon (1988:201)) is: 'How can the inquirer (would-be knower) go about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known?' and as is the case with the epistemological question, the answer given to the methodological question is constrained and dependent on those answers already given to the preceding ontological and epistemological questions. To summarise, Figure 1.1 describes ontology, epistemology, methodology and method.

**Figure 1.1 A summary of ontology, epistemology, methodology and method adapted from Easterby-Smith et al (2003:31) with inserts from Guba and Lincoln (1988)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Assumptions that we make about the nature of reality: What is there that can be known about?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>General set of assumptions about the best ways of inquiring into the nature of the world: What is the nature of the relationship between the knower or would-be knower and what can be known?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Combination of techniques used to enquire into a specific situation: How can the inquirer go about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Individual techniques for data collection, analysis, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within philosophical inquiry there are three different paradigms: Empirico-analytical, interpretive, and the critical paradigm. Positivism and social constructivism are two
contrasting perspectives found within the empirico-analytical and interpretive paradigms accordingly. These two approaches are no means the only ones within philosophical inquiry (see Figure 1.3 for examples of others). This research is set within a social constructionist lens and I will attempt to explain and defend the choice of this approach, drawing upon the implications of this and the contrasting approach of positivism. Both social constructionism and positivism has its own set of ontological, epistemological and methodological assumption.

Figure 1.2 The contrasting implications of positivism and social constructionism adapted from Easterby-Smith et al (2003:30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Social Constructionism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The observer</td>
<td>Must be independent</td>
<td>Is part of what is being observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human interests</td>
<td>Should be irrelevant</td>
<td>Are the main drivers of science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanations</td>
<td>Must demonstrate causality</td>
<td>Aim to increase general understanding of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research progresses</td>
<td>Hypotheses and deductions</td>
<td>Gathering rich data from which ideas are induced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>Need to be operationalised so that they can be measured</td>
<td>Should incorporate stakeholder perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis</td>
<td>Should be reduced to simplest terms</td>
<td>May include the complexity of ‘whole’ situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalization through</td>
<td>Statistical probability</td>
<td>Theoretical abstraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling requires</td>
<td>Large numbers selected randomly</td>
<td>Small numbers of cases chosen for specific reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.2 summarises the contrasting implications of positivism and social constructionism. In a positivist paradigm there is an ontological assumption that reality is external and objective and an epistemological assumption that knowledge is only of significance if it is based on observations of this external reality (Easterby-Smith et al, 2003). In a social constructionist paradigm there is an ontological assumption that reality is determined by people rather than objective external factors and there is an epistemological assumption that knowledge should be based on what people, individually and collectively, are thinking and feeling. The researcher should try to understand and explain why people have different experiences rather than search for external causes and fundamental laws to explain that behaviour.
Figure 1.3 identifies the three previously introduced research paradigms, of: empirico-analytical, interpretive and critical. Each of these paradigms has different perspectives of knowledge, ontology (worldview) and epistemology (knowledge derivation). Following a review of the inquiry literature, I have observed that different authors sometimes label and/or position some perspectives differently. I am not sure why this is the case, perhaps it is because different things can be interpreted differently by different people. In order to highlight this I have mapped Easterby-Smith et al's (2003) interpretations of ontology and epistemology onto Figure 1.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Paradigm</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Ontological Perspective</th>
<th>Epistemological Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirico-analytical paradigm (based on positivist or empiricist philosophy and employs the scientific method of enquiry). Adopted by the natural sciences and relies on observation and experiment in the real world, resulting in generalisations about the contents and events of the world which can be used to predict future experience.</td>
<td>- Is discovered. - Arises from empirical processes which are reductionist, value neutral, quantifiable, objective and operationalisable. - Statements are valid only if publicly verifiable by sense data.</td>
<td>The materialist view - science is only about that which exists materially. The positivist/ empiricist science is about that which exists independently of the knowers and it consists of events that are orderly and lawful. (Representationalism - Easterby-Smith et al, 2003)</td>
<td>To positivists or empiricists - arises from rigorous application of the scientific method and is measured against the criteria of objectivity, reliability and validity. (Positivism - Easterby-Smith et al, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive paradigm is commonly based on the philosophy of idealism. This paradigm encompasses a number of research approaches (including hermeneutics, constructionism, phenomenology and ethnography) that have the central goal of seeking to interpret the world, particularly the social world.</td>
<td>- Comprises of constructions arising from the minds and bodies of knowing, conscious and feeling beings. - Is generated through a search for meaning, beliefs and values, and through looking for wholes and relationships with other wholes.</td>
<td>The constructivist view knowers are seen as conscious subjects separate from the world of objects. The social constructivist view contends that reality and knowledge are socially constructed, that is reality exists because we give meaning to it. Different cultures have different constructions of reality. Within the interpretive tradition, the world and reality are interpreted by people in the context of historical and social practises. (Nominalism - Easterby-Smith et al, 2003)</td>
<td>The idealist approaches focus on interpretive understanding (verstehen) and hermeneutic processes. Interpretive understanding involves accessing the ideas and experiences of actors/participants as opposed to the explanatory and predictive approach of the physical sciences. Hermeneutic processes results in a focus on human behaviour as occurring within a context and the understanding of human behaviour as requiring an understanding of this context. (Social Constructionism - Easterby-Smith et al, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The critical paradigm is based on the philosophy of realism. In this epistemology, knowledge is not grasped or discovered but is acquired through critical debate.</td>
<td>- Is emancipatory and personally developmental - Requires becoming aware of how our thinking is socially and historically constructed and how this limits our actions. - Enables people to challenge</td>
<td>In critical theory there is a focus on the social world: people are socially located and therefore knowledge is always influenced by social interest.</td>
<td>The realist is concerned with social structures and how macro- and micro-political, historical, and socio-economic factors influence our lives and how we understand our lives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
learned restrictions, compulsions or dictates of habit. -Is not grasped or discovered but is acquired through critical debate. -Promotes understanding about how to transform current structures, relationships and conditions which constrain development and reform.

(Relativism - Easterby-Smith et al, 2003) Relativism - Easterby-Smith et al, 2003

Whereas Higgs (2001) identifies the critical paradigm as being a key paradigm based on the philosophy of realism, Easterby-Smith et al (2003) place 'critical realism' as a recent variant within the relativist position of social science. In their well known text, Guba and Lincoln (1998) identify four competing paradigms, namely: positivism, post-positivism, critical theory and constructionism. Other writers identify positivism, idealism and realism as the overarching paradigms (such as Higgs, 2001). Within the literature, each paradigm has its own set of approaches, goals, methods of inquiry and data analysis, accepted writing-up styles and quality controls. Figure 1.4 is an adaptation of work by Higgs (1998,2001) that highlights the differences between each factor in the positivist, idealist and realist philosophical paradigms.

Figure 1.4 Dimensions of positivist versus constructionist research adapted from Higgs (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Goals</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Idealism</th>
<th>Realism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To measure, test hypotheses, discover, predict, explain, control, generalise, identify cause and effect relationships.</td>
<td>To understand, interpret, seek meaning, describe, illuminate, theorise.</td>
<td>To improve, reform, empower, change reality or situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research approach(es)</td>
<td>Experimental method (The scientific method) Descriptive comparative studies (testing hypotheses).</td>
<td>Hermeneutics, phenomenology narrative inquiry, naturalistic inquiry, historiography.</td>
<td>Action research/collaborative research, Praxis - acting on existing conditions to change them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research methods-data collection</td>
<td>Controlled trials, interviews and questionnaires</td>
<td>Interviews, case studies, story telling, review of texts, creative arts, and media.</td>
<td>Interviews, case studies, story telling, review of texts, critical debate, review of espoused theory versus theory in action, creative arts media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Social Constructionism

As figure 1.4 highlights there are many contrasting factors in the application of research performed within different philosophical frameworks. Miles and Huberman (1994:4) argue that it is good medicine for researchers to make their preferences clear: ‘To know how a researcher construes the shape of the social world and aims to give us a credible account of it is to know our conversational partner’. My worldview orientation is that of a constructionist, I believe that reality and knowledge are socially constructed, that is reality exists because we give meaning to it. My constructionist philosophy is idealist in that I assume that what is real is a construction in the minds of individuals (Lincoln and Guba, 1985: Guba and Lincoln, 1998). Constructions can be multiple, complex, often conflicting and are always meaningful. Schwandt (1998) identifies a number of beliefs within constructionism including:

- Constructionists believe that what positivists take to be objective knowledge and truth is the result of perspective.

- Constructionists emphasise the pluralistic and plastic character of reality (expressible in a variety of symbol and language systems, and that reality is stretched and shaped to fit purposeful acts of intentional human agents).

- Constructionists emphasise the instrumental and practical function of theory construction and knowing.
Constructionists are anti-essentialists in that we assume that what we take to be self-evident kinds (e.g. man, woman, truth, self) are actually the product of complicated discursive practises.

The research process for the Social Constructionists is more than the development of a research question, collection and analysis of data, writing up and publication. Higgs (2001:56) provides a (meta-) framework for qualitative research which has been reproduced in figure 1.5. Higgs' framework highlights the need for a dynamic, coherent frame of reference within qualitative research rather than 'procedural regulations.'

At the centre of Higgs' framework the typical steps performed in a research project are shown, moving from forming a research question to publication of the thesis. Higgs illustrates this as a deductive, linear process, something that I myself would try to have avoided; however, it may have been difficult representing the real-life nature of doctoral research whilst at the same time capturing the meta-framework aspect in this model.

Figure 1.5 A (meta-) framework for qualitative research adapted from Higgs (2001:56)
In Higgs’ framework the black coloured frame represents the ‘research framework’ and the grey coloured frame represents the style framework. The outward face or actions of research are represented linearly in the white centre of the illustration. Higgs rightly argues that research needs to be embedded in a (meta-) framework comprising of the coherent and dynamic matching of the research goals, questions, intended product, research paradigm and its philosophical framework, the conceptual framework which informs the research and the strategies to the approach, data collection and analysis (black frame). Interweaving between the meta-framework and the outward face of research are the elements of style of the research including congruence, personal style, quality, and researcher’s purpose (grey frame). These elements of research are in ‘fluid balance’ (Higgs, 2001) and this is represented on the model by the infinite loops. The external context of the research and the self are also represented on the meta-framework.

I can identify with Higgs’ framework because my ‘worldview’ perspective is set within the idealist paradigm where knowledge is learned through exploring the social constructions of individuals and groups and the meanings and values they attribute to ‘things’. Figure 1.5 identifies ‘self’ as impacting upon the (meta-) philosophical framework. Due to the nature of the social constructionist viewpoint, the researcher or ‘self’ conducting the research is inextricably intertwined with the research being conducted. In part it is the personal frame of reference and the lived experiences of the researcher shaping the research. Byrne-Armstrong recognises the development of her ‘self’ within the research process (2001:68) whilst constructing her PhD thesis:

'I changed from a self that researched others’ learning transitions to one that recognized mine as inextricably woven with these others; from one that researched collaboratively to one that moved away from these methods, but most significantly, a thesis emerged that demonstrates that researching, my knowledge production and practise are not separable; that the play between theory, practise and life keeps the material alive and embodied.'

There are accounts within the field that attempt to capture the author’s struggles to illustrate the ‘self’ in the research narrative:

'Qualitative writing becomes very much an unfolding story in which the writer gradually makes sense, not only of her data, but
of the total experience of which it is an artefact. This is an interactive process in which she tries to untangle and make reflexive sense of her own presence and role in the research. The written study thus becomes a complex train of thought within which her voice and her image of those of others are often interwoven.' Holliday (2005:131)

Higgs (2001) describes it as 'one of the rich opportunities and challenges in qualitative research'. In particular, the changing nature and the development of the self during the research process can provide a challenge to the qualitative researcher, for example Sambrook (1998:2-3) identifies her struggle in her PhD thesis:

'I need to say that at the outset that I have felt very much part of this project, unlike the detached scientist... I have searched for a term that could describe and explain my approach. I have considered action research. I explored feminist research. A review of the literature describing the 'reflective practitioner' led me to the notion of myself as a 'reflective researcher' -showing myself to myself. A further stage is showing myself to the reader... (reflexivity).'

1.5 My style

At the beginning of this chapter, I introduced the concept of a critical moment. I experienced a number of critical moments during the course of my PhD experience. one of these critical moments was the problem of including my 'self' in my research, as experienced by others such as Ellis (2003). This critical moment concerned how I was going to express my own 'self' in this thesis. I explored various methodological approaches and writing styles that best fit my idealist ontology and social constructionist epistemology. I was not comfortable writing in the third person within this paradigm as I felt that it contradicted the fundamental nature of this particular worldview, neglecting the 'co-operative' (Sambrook, 1998) nature of social constructionist research and the 'self' that is inextricably intertwined with the research. Guba and Lincoln (1988:215) iterate that:

'the inquirer's voice is that of the 'passionate participant' actively engaged in facilitating the multi-voice reconstruction of his or her own construction as well as those of all other participants.'
Ellis (in Ellis and Bochner, 2003:201) argues this point well in a chapter examining the ‘researcher as subject’:

'Why should we take it for granted that an author's personal feelings and thoughts should be omitted in a handbook chapter? After all, who is the person collecting the evidence, drawing inferences, and reaching the conclusions? By not insisting on some sort of personal accountability, our academic publications reinforce the third-person, passive voice as the standard, which gives more weight to abstract and categorical knowledge than to the direct testimony of personal narrative and the first-person voice. It doesn't even occur to most authors that writing in the first person is an option.'

1.6 Autoethnography

It was when my PhD supervisor introduced me to Ellis and Bochner's chapter that I discovered a method of writing called 'autoethnography' which included the 'self' within research. The aforementioned chapter focuses primarily on autoethnography and reflexivity and is itself an excellent example of autoethnographic and reflexive writing. Autoethnography does not necessarily put the self at the centre of the research (unless the subject being researched happens to be the self), but acknowledges and even embraces the experiences and development of the researcher in parallel to and entwined with the research. As Schwandt describes:

'Originally defined as the cultural study of one's own people, this term now commonly refers to a particular form of writing that seeks to unite ethnographic (looking outward at a world beyond one's own) and autobiographical (gazing inward for a story of one's self) intentions. The aim in composing an autoethnographic account is to keep both the subject (knower) and object (that which is being examined) in simultaneous view.' (2001:13)

This form of writing seemed to fit what I was looking for. Drawing from Figure 1.5, it offers the opportunity to provide a realistic account of my whole research experience, as knowledge is co-produced (Sambrook 1998) in a social constructionist paradigm. I wanted to include my own personal experiences and journey of self-development that influenced and was influenced by the research. I wanted to reflect upon and analyse the critical moments that I experienced within my research. There are those that occurred in
the background and were significant in the development of myself, my project and my worldview (meta-framework) yet are not traditionally included in the final write-up (such as a moment of clarity in the organisation of the literature review or the tension between transcribing interviews personally and (lack of) time). And there are those that occurred in the outward face of the research that are most usually and traditionally described in the thesis (such as the identification of a theme from a review of the literature and/or analysis of the data). As Richardson (1992) criticises:

‘Almost axiomatically, interpretive social scientists assert that our work has consequences for others and ourselves. Sometimes we write about the consequences to others, but less often do we reflect upon the consequences to ourselves. Even more rarely do we consider those consequences in terms of subjectively felt experiences.’ (Richardson 1992:130)

I hope to address Richardson’s criticisms in this thesis through my style of autoethnographic writing.

Having read the chapter by Ellis and Bochner, I proceeded to read around the subject of narrative, ethnography and reflexivity. Iphofen (2001:44) highlights the 'power' of this form of writing:

‘Narrative is powerful. Through narrative connections are made between mind, body and society. Looking at the stories that a society allows and encourages its members to tell themselves reveals a great deal about that society's values and destination.’

The earliest reference to autoethnography that I found in the research literature is Hayano’s (1979) auto-ethnography. Since Hayano, the term has evolved to encompass an ethnographic style of writing as described by Schwandt (2001) above. I found that there are a number of forms and labels used within the literature to describe autoethnography (Ellis and Bochner, 2003) some regarded more rigorous than others within academic circles. Indeed Ellis and Bochner (2003:209) identify over thirty-six forms of ethnography including reflexive ethnographies, personal narratives, and literary autoethnographies:

‘Like many terms used by social scientists, the meanings and applications of autoethnography have evolved in a manner that makes precise definition and application difficult..
autoethnographers vary in their emphasis on the research process (graphy), on culture (ethnos) and on self (auto). Different exemplars fall at different places along the continuum of each of these three axes. Researchers disagree on the boundaries of each category and on the precise definitions of the types of autoethnography.

1.7 Reflexive ethnography

The reflexive ethnography is where ‘authors use their own experiences in the culture reflexively to bend back on the self and look more deeply at self-other interactions’ (Ellis and Bochner, 2001:211). In this sub-category of autoethnography, the researcher’s personal experience is important. Tedlock (1991) identifies and differentiates between two forms of reflexive ethnography ‘ethnographic memoir’ (also called confessional tales) and ‘narrative ethnography’. Ethnographic memoir is where the ethnographer tells a ‘personal tale of what happens in the backstage of the research processes’ (Tedlock 1991:70). Ellis and Bochner (ibid) highlight that many ethnographers write confessional tales about their research in reports that are separate to the research document. A narrative ethnography is where the experiences of the ethnographer are incorporated into the ethnographic description and analysis of others and there is an emphasis is on the ‘ethnographic dialogue’ or encounter between the narrator and members of the group being studied. I view narrative analysis as that which Riessman (2002:218) so succinctly describes:

‘the purpose is to see how respondents in interviews impose order on the flow of experience to make sense of events and actions in their lives. The methodological approach examines the informant’s story and analyses how it is put together, the linguistics and cultural resources it draws on, and how it persuades a listener of authenticity. Analysis in narrative studies opens up the forms of telling about experience, not simply the content to which language refers. We ask, why was the story told that way?’

Having explored all of the different ‘facets’ within the broad genre of autoethnography, and having read examples and experienced how each works in the reality of ‘being read’, I was torn as to the approach that I should use and the way in which I should manage the self within the research story. I could treat myself as one of the
experimental subjects and treat my experiences as primary data through writing up in a style similar to that of Ellis and Bochner (1992) in their experimental narrative on abortion. This narrative is written up as a playwright's script inclusive of director's notes. Ellis and Bochner (1992: 80) argue that the text 'was written with the express purpose of being performed so that nuances of feeling, expression, and interpretation could be communicated more clearly'. They aim to take the reader through a journey in which they develop an experiential sense of what it must have felt like to live through what happened.

However, I feel that this approach would be extremely difficult to integrate into my PhD research. I have decided to write my PhD in the style of narrative ethnography, in a style similar to that of Ellis and Bochner's book chapter. In this text, the authors switch from the personal reflexive narrative to citing other work (such as the transcript from a public reading or a previous report) written previously and sometimes in the third-person. I feel that this approach and style best facilitates the communication of the complex and dynamic nature of the background research process whilst enabling description and critique of the actual research conducted, both of which are inextricably intertwined and thus hard to pull apart and, in effect, disentangle.

Within the social constructionist paradigm, it becomes very difficult to separate the methodology of the research from the methodology of the entire research experience, from the initial literature review through to making recommendations. Whereas a positivist study quite clearly ring-fences a linear approach to research into distinct chapters, autoethnographic narrative should be a narrative of the whole research methodology. The narrative should describe the researcher and the researched, looking inward and looking outward. It is because of this that I view my entire PhD thesis as methodology and that I have taken a rather unusual approach in its organisation, as did Hilary Byrne-Armstrong in her thesis that explored conflicts and dilemmas in learning:

'My thesis documented the development of a narrative epistemology in pedagogy, heralding progressive shift away from individualistic accounts of conflicts and dilemmas in learning as being primarily embedded in psychological spaces to a
recognition of the importance of the social space; the cultural discourses that shape our everyday activity and interactions. Conflict, then is not simply a consequence of difference arising from personality or other psychological factors, but a consequence of prevailing cultural narratives that instruct/construct us into the identities we are' (Byrne-Armstrong, 2001: 69)

It is with this in mind that I have structured my PhD narrative rather innovatively so that it reflects as accurately as possible the chronological order of that which is being discussed took place. I aim to communicate my very real and lived research experience to the reader through selecting a honest approach to my narrative, making me somewhat vulnerable but enabling me to actively reflect, not only on the hard functions of the research process being discussed, but on the softer more intangible interactions between me and my research and the experiences I have had conducting this research.

1.8 Credibility

Before continuing my story, I feel that it is important to provide readers with the tools necessary to judge the credibility of my research. I feel that it is more useful to have this discussion at this point rather than half way through my research to help the development and formation of opinions thus keeping the discursive space open. This point is particularly well made and extended by Byrne-Armstrong (2001:71) as she reflects upon her PhD experience:

'A major learning outcome of the thesis was coming to the realization of the importance of holding the discursive space open. An open conversational space allows contradictions, inconsistencies, anomalies and conflicts to be visible, but it presents a dilemma when writing a thesis. A thesis is traditionally one in which these things are sanitized out, where the discursive space is gradually and systematically closed down in the name of results and conclusions.'

The matter of 'measuring' and gauging the value of a piece of qualitative research is documented increasingly within the literature. It has been an issue that has presented researchers with problems, that I understand have arisen from qualitative researchers having felt under pressure to provide research that is deemed valid and reliable by quality measures from traditional positivistic inquiry.
Traditionally viewed as the more academically robust methodology, quantitative rules have been applied to qualitative investigation and often used to pull apart its credibility. It is like using a set of scales to measure happiness.

Qualitative researchers have revisited the quantitative rules and adapted them for qualitative use. Quantitative studies are traditionally evaluated on: (questions in brackets adapted from Easterby-Smith et al 2003:53):

- **Construct validity** (Are the instruments used accurate measures of reality?)
- **Internal validity** (Is the research design capable of eliminating bias and the effect of extraneous variables?)
- **External validity** (What is the definition of the domains to which the results of the study can be generalised?)
- **Reliability** (Will the measures yield the same results on other occasions?)

There is much discussion on what constitutes validity and reliability in qualitative research. Easterby-Smith et al (2003:53) provide a summary of the different interpretations of validity, reliability and generalizability within positivist, relativist and constructionist perspectives. These are summarised in Figure 1.6 below. Qualitative researchers have generally responded to positivist assumptions of validity by either denying the relevance of the quantitative or scientific paradigm for what they do (for example Guba and Lincoln, 1989), or by arguing that qualitative research has its own procedures for attaining validity that are different from quantitative approaches as the example (by Easterby-Smith et al in figure 1.6) highlights:
Figure 1.6 Perspectives on Validity, Reliability and Generalizability taken from Easterby-Smith et al. (2003: 53)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Positivist</th>
<th>Relativist</th>
<th>Constructionist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do the measures correspond closely to the reality?</td>
<td>Have sufficient number of perspectives been included?</td>
<td>Does the study clearly gain access to the experiences of those in the research setting?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Will the measures yield the same results on other occasions?</td>
<td>Will similar observations be reached by other observers?</td>
<td>Is there transparency in how sense was made from the raw data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizability</td>
<td>To what extent does the study confirm or contradict existing findings in the same field?</td>
<td>What is the probability that patterns observed in the sample will be repeated in the general population?</td>
<td>Do the concepts and constructs derived from this study have any relevance to other settings?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maxwell (2002) argues that understanding is a more fundamental concept for qualitative research than validity. He sees five broad categories of understanding that are relevant to qualitative research and five corresponding types of validity that concern qualitative researchers:

- **Descriptive validity**: Primary descriptive validity is the factual accuracy of a researcher's account of what the researcher reports having seen or heard; Secondary descriptive validity is the validity of things that in principle could not be observed, but that were inferred from other data.

- **Interpretive validity**: what objects, events and or behaviours *mean* to the people engaged in and with them. It not only applies to the conscious concepts of participants, but also to the unconscious intentions, beliefs, concepts, and values of these participants.

- **Theoretical validity**: explicitly addresses the theoretical constructions that the researcher brings to or develops during the study. It refers to an account's function as an explanation thus refers to an account's validity as a theory of some phenomenon.

- **Generalizability**: the development of a theory that not only makes sense of the particular persons or situations studied, but also shows how the same processes in different situations can lead to different results: Internal generalizibility –
generalising within the community, group or institution studied to persons, events, and settings that were not directly observed or interviewed; and External generalizibility- generalising to other communities, groups, or institutions.

- **Evaluative validity**: the involvement of the application of an evaluative framework to the objects of study.

With specific reference to narrative analysis Riessman (2002:25) identifies four criteria to validation. Here validation is concerned with the trustworthiness of the researchers’ interpretations. Riessman emphasises the key semantic difference between ‘trustworthiness’ and ‘truth’. Truth ‘assumes an objective reality’ as in positivist paradigms, whilst trustworthiness ‘moves the process into the social world.’

The four criteria identified by Riessman are:

- **Persuasiveness and Plausibility** (The degree to which the interpretation is reasonable and convincing).
- **Correspondence** (taking the work back to those studied).
- **Coherence** (Global, local and themal).
- **Pragmatic use** (Extent to which a study becomes the basis for other’s work).

The persuasiveness and plausibility of a study depends on ‘the analyst’s capacity to invite, compel, stimulate or delight the audience..not on the criteria of veracity’ (Gergen, 1985: 272). Riessman argues that persuasiveness is situational: ‘what may be the most persuasive interpretation of a narrative text at one historical moment may not be later. Our texts have unstable meanings.’

Correspondence refers to returning the work back to those studied for validation. However, human stories are not static, meanings of experiences shift and change with time and reflection and deepened understanding, as the Personal Narratives Group (1989:261) identifies:

‘When talking about their lives, people lie sometimes, forget a lot, exaggerate, become confused, and get things wrong. Yet they are revealing truths. These truths don’t reveal the past “as it
actually was", aspiring to a standard of objectivity. They give us instead the truths of our experiences...Unlike the Truth of the scientific ideal, the truths of personal narratives are neither open to proof nor self-evident. We come to understand them only through interpretation, paying careful attention to the contexts that shape their creation and to the world views that inform them. Sometimes the truths we see in personal narratives jar us from our complacent security as interpreters 'outside' the story and make us aware that our own place in the world plays a part in our interpretation and shapes the meanings we derive from them.'

So this suggests that correspondence validity is complex, rather subjective and situational. What is important therefore is that as interpreters and writers, we are able to distinguish clearly between our views of subjects' lives and the views held and expressed by the subjects. What is clear is that in the final analysis, the work done is that of the researcher and therefore responsibility and ownership has to be taken by the researcher for any inferences and interpretations made (Reissman, 2002).

Drawing upon the work of Agar and Hobbs (1982) there are three levels of coherence validation: Global, local and themal. In order to demonstrate that the interpretations within a piece of research are more than merely a random set of statements, coherence should be as 'thick' as possible and ideally relating to all three of the above levels. The levels are: 'global', which refers to the overall or global goals that the interviewee is trying to achieve through his or her voice, so, for example, a global goal of an interview could be a story of past actions, or could be more strategic. 'Local' coherence is what the narrator is trying to effect in the narrative itself and how that person communicates events using metaphors, statements comparisons and actions. For example, the use of a metaphor to describe how an organisation responds very slowly and reluctantly to change. Thirdly, 'themal' coherence involves the content of the interview and the repeated or common themes that emerge from sections of text.

The final criterion of validation offered by 'pragmatic use' describes the validity of a narrative in terms of the extent to which a study becomes the basis for others' work. This validation criterion is one which can only be fully considered in retrospect. Reissman
(2002) attempts to overcome this problem through advising that researchers offer information in their research that will make it possible for others to determine the trustworthiness of work by:

(a) Describing how the interpretations were produced
(b) Making visible (what was done)
(c) Specifying how successive data transformations were accomplished
(d) Making the primary data available to other researchers.

With this selection of validation and quality models from the researcher in mind, readers will now be able to make more informed assessments as to the worth, value and trustworthiness of this thesis as a piece of academic research. I will discuss the implications of my research in terms of these models following the interpretation and analysis of my data later on in this thesis – thus completing a circle of sorts.

Silverman (2005:222) identifies 10 key questions as criteria for evaluating research. These are as follows:

1. Are the methods of research appropriate to the nature of the question being asked?
2. Is the connection to an existing body of knowledge or theory clear?
3. Are there clear accounts of the criteria used for the selection of cases for study and of the data collection and analysis?
4. Does the sensitivity of the methods match the needs of the research questions?
5. Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?
6. Is reference made to accepted procedures for analysis?
7. How systematic is the analysis?
8. Is there adequate discussion of how themes, concepts and categories were derived from the data?
9. Is there adequate discussion of the evidence for and against the researcher's arguments?
10. Is a clear distinction made between the data and its interpretation?
Silverman says that these questions can be applied to either a qualitative or quantitative study. He underlines that the questions above help the reader to identify those research reports which appear to tell entertaining stories or anecdotes but fail to convince the reader of their scientific credibility – a term he refers to as anecdotalism.

1.9 Myself

Before proceeding onto a review of the existing literatures that concern my project, I feel that it is important to introduce myself and provide you with some information concerning my background and why I am interested in corporate entrepreneurship organisational learning and change, which are the subjects explored within this research. Corporate entrepreneurship is essentially entrepreneurship produced or by or emerges from an organisation, and its other pseudonym is intrapreneurship (Pinchott, 1985). The whole ideology of ‘corporate’ entrepreneurship is an interesting one. It could be construed as a contradiction in terms: how can an organisation and/ or its employees be entrepreneurial? Organisations are often large, cumbersome, slow to react to trends and are hampered by red-tape and bureaucracy. Entrepreneurs are generally associated with feisty start-up businesses or technical innovation: Richard Branson (Virgin), Richard Dyson (Dyson vacuum cleaner), Anita Roddick (The Body Shop), they do not work for large companies, they create them.

But if ‘being’ entrepreneurial is behaviour and a way of working, and you can be entrepreneurial working for yourself, could you be entrepreneurial working for a large retail giant? Could you be entrepreneurial working within the public sector, such as within the National Health Service? If so, then how does it happen? How is the entrepreneur able to do this whilst working for someone else? What motivates him or her? What hinders him or her? How are they rewarded for successes? What happens if the venture fails? These are the sorts of questions that have enticed and developed my interest within this field of study, fuelled by a childhood that was shaped in many ways by small business entrepreneurship.
My parents ran their own photography business and from an early age our shop was like our second home, in fact it was our second home and we often used to sleep over in the bedrooms upstairs whilst my parents worked until the early hours. My mother turned her hand to many wide ranging administrative and financial tasks (Ram 1994, Sanders and Nee 1996 highlight the essential role of women’s labour in facilitating enterprise), whilst my father sacrificed many summer holidays and 'blue sky Sundays' for photographic opportunities.

In my teens I vowed that I would never work for myself, that I would always work for a large, seemingly 'safe' organisation, so I could enjoy the luxury of a company pension, paid holidays, sick-pay and apparent stability for my family. So I started my 'career' in a shoe shop at sixteen years of age, I moved on to piece-work in a factory, and then as a sales assistant in a fashion store. In my early twenties I started with a TV rental company as a sales advisor. This experience was quite painful in that the manager tended to bully staff. After two years I 'escaped' to attempt a degree in Business and Marketing. I met Dr Sally Sambrook (my PhD Supervisor) in my second year as she lectured on my Organisational Behaviour module. This subject area fascinated me: conflict, power, culture, hierarchy. It consisted of many things that I could relate to and had experiences of. The learning empowered me and provided me with a new found clarity and perspective. It was through Sally's lectures and seminars that my passion for organisational learning and organisational change were borne. After graduating with a first degree at the University of Wales, Bangor, I was offered the opportunity to study within an area of entrepreneurship for an ERSC funded PhD. So, this research project fuses three areas that really fascinate and enthuse me: corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change.

1.10 My thesis
Finally in this chapter, I explain the structure of my thesis. Each chapter starts with an overview of its contents. The arrows on the overview do not imply a causal relationship between each of the sub-headings. They merely provide an alternative way of introducing the key themes of each chapter and navigating within the chapter. I am quite
a visual person: for example, I always used to revise for my undergraduate exams using 'mind-maps'. I find this way of 'mapping' out a chapter beneficial towards my understanding and hope that it may make chapters clearer to those who are reading this thesis.

In Chapter 1, it should be clear by now that I have moved away from the traditional type of introduction and I have started with an explanation of my ontological, epistemological and methodological perspectives. I have explained how I am writing my thesis and different contributions concerning research quality and validity. I have concluded this chapter with an introduction to me and my background and then an overview of my thesis.

In Chapters 2, 3 and 4, I work towards identifying the research problem that underpins this research through a critical and thorough review of literature within each of three fields (see Figure 1.7) corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change. As part of the overarching methodological approach to this thesis I am writing is as logic-in-use (Kaplan, 1964). Therefore I start Chapter 2 with a description of how I reviewed the literature. I highlight my iterative strategy that was a combination of deductive and inductive approaches to collating relevant literature and I

---

1 When I first presented this, it was a neat diagram (Sambrook & Roberts 2004), but now I can only present in this complex, messy way as the latter best illustrates the fields and processes that I have become familiar with.
also discuss some of the barriers and facilitators that I experienced during this process. Since the literature review is an on-going process, I introduce Chapters 3, 4 and 5 with a summary of my experiences reviewing the relevant literatures.

In Chapter 2, I contribute a theoretical model of the types and labels of corporate entrepreneurship that I have found within the research literature. I describe further contributions in terms of organisational levels: those exploring the individual, group and organisational contexts. Finally, I introduce a linear and a cyclical model of corporate entrepreneurship, and discuss their strengths and weaknesses.

Chapter 3 explores organisational learning and it begins with a summary of the differences between a learning organisation, learning organisation and organisational learning. As with the literature on corporate entrepreneurship, I explore the organisational learning literature in terms of contributions to the individual, group and organisational levels and then I describe key contributions to the sub-field of learning organisation.

Chapter 4 explores organisational change. It was written some time after the first two literature reviews and in response to critique that my first conference paper (Sambrook and Roberts, 2004) received. As with the former two, the literature is vast, but broadly separable into different levels.

In Chapter 5 I emphasise the synergies between the three literatures and processes through a set of comparative tables. I then introduce three models that are partial models of the three processes and highlight the strengths and weaknesses. I define intraprelearning (a term used throughout the thesis for simplicity) and summarise the key features of the theoretical models that have been discussed. Drawing upon the strengths and in an attempt to address the weaknesses of this summary, I introduce a set of theoretical models, which I refer to as Inside-Outside Intraprelearning.
Chapter 6 introduces the National Health Service which is the context for my empirical research. Using just one of the models from Chapter 5 (Intraprelearning Inside-Out) I illustrate the different External and Internal Change constructs consequent on the NHS context. Before introducing the two Trusts, I describe my case study research strategy through a brief review of some of the key contributions to the literature. I then introduce the two Trust cases, which are anonymised as Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts. I then explain my approach to building and developing the case studies, including my interview strategy, the document analysis and the observations. It is at this point in the thesis that I introduce my research questions, as it was following the development of the working model of intraprelearning that these questions were constructed.

My research questions are as follows:

1. Who are the corporate entrepreneurs within the Trusts?
2. How are they entrepreneurs?
3. Why are they entrepreneurs?
4. Who has supported and/or hindered them (individuals/ groups/ culture/ leadership/ power)?
5. What organisational conditions have supported/ hindered them (strategy/ structure/ reward/ resources/ culture)?
6. How, where and when are they learning?
7. How are they agents of change and learning?
8. How has learning and change supported corporate entrepreneurs?
9. How are Trusts and the individuals and teams within intraprelearning?
10. What are the implications of the above for training, HRM, and Strategic Policy?
11. What is the best way to tell the story of this research?

In Chapter 7, I continue with the narration of my research method, moving from the initial literature review and model development onto the practicalities of 'getting in' and 'getting on' (Sambrook, 2003) within the two Trusts. I describe the process of access and ethics (Iphofen, 2005) and how I ensured that my research was underpinned by high ethical standards and practice. I describe how I identified my strategic participants and the strategy for approaching corporate entrepreneurs. I discuss how I piloted my
interviews (Kvale, 1996), and how this helped inform and shape my research. The realities and practicalities of conducting research interviews with busy professionals are discussed and the way in which I try to manage the pragmatics of this is explored. The chapter concludes with an exploration of the critical moments of my research experience.

Chapter 8 provides the results and analysis of the data collected from the strategic level. This chapter develops the tale of both Trusts through describing, exploring and comparing the ‘official’ and espoused strategic lenses. The main aim of the strategic interviews was to locate the corporate entrepreneurs within each of the Trusts. However, these interviews have also provided an opportunity to identify other themes within and between Trusts. I have attempted to build up a picture of both Trusts through those documents written around the interview data collection period which is 2004-2005. In some instances, I collected documents in 2004-2005, and others I have collected retrospectively, whilst writing up. I then present some emergent findings from the research interviews in terms of the various lenses, including: culture, power, nursing, champions, looking at entrepreneurs and the EWTD. I have completed the chapter with a map of the location and legitimate power (French and Raven, 1959) of senior leads and entrepreneurs from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts.

The focus of Chapter 9 is the data collected from the Trust Entrepreneurs. It aims to address the research questions that were introduced in Chapter 7 and explores the working model of intraprelearning along with other models in the research literature. The results are taken from the themes that have emerged primarily from the thematic analysis of my interview transcripts and observations made during the interview events. I have presented these results in a variety of ways, using: Tables, forms of Venn Diagrams and Force Field Analyses. I start making sense of and exploring the results by reflecting back and drawing upon models from the existing research literature, for example, Pinchot's (1985) table, Roger's (1969) adoption curve, Pedler et al's (1996) Characteristics of the Learning Company, and my working model of Inside-Outside Intraprelearning. I also use other models as alternative tools to explore the results, for
example, Huber's (1991) processual model and the 4I Framework (Crossan et al, 1999). I start building up a picture of the two Trusts, highlighting differences and similarities. Emergent issues are discussed and I draw from new literature that was not included or not deemed as significant in the initial literature review, including the differences between enforced and empowered entrepreneurship, the problem of low self-confidence in Trust Entrepreneurs, talent spotting the 'tall-poppies' and the importance of the Trust Champion. I complete the chapter with an empirical adaptation of the Inside-Outside model of Intraprelearning, which summarises those themes general to both Trusts.

Finally in Chapter 10, I have attempted to draw together the research summarising how it has addressed the original research question and the contributions it makes to theory and practice. I have summarised who the corporate entrepreneurs are from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, identified the dominance of nursing within my results. I have described how they are generally involved in making changes, improvements and new developments. I have revealed that general learning occurs formally, and informally, internally and externally to the Trust. These findings agree with the existing literature and emphasise the value of previous contributions to the literature such as Sambrook's (2003) learning 'in' and 'at' work. My research has made a distinction between learning that supports entrepreneurship and suggests that not all learning is entrepreneurial learning, forms of entrepreneurial learning include: reading articles, group/team work, conferences and networks. Entrepreneurial learning may occur through experiences that are away from the healthcare context, such as through the private sector, through living in other countries and experiencing other cultures and from involvement in home-based Do-It-Yourself projects. In terms of the case study of Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, I identify their different cultures and strategic orientations, and emphasise how both are successful at entrepreneurship. I introduce empowered and enforced entrepreneurship and demonstrate how Aberash drives enforced entrepreneurship, whilst Brynbeth encourages empowered entrepreneurship. I suggest that their cultures (Power versus People, Competitive versus Open) are the levers for managing these forms of entrepreneurship. I explain several contributions to knowledge that are made from this research project: theoretical, empirical, methodological and practical.
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Chapter 2 - Corporate Entrepreneurship

2.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the literature associated with the first of three key constructs or processes that underpin my project that is 'corporate entrepreneurship'. It has been a challenge to write as there is a growing abundance of literature, but very few attempts to review the field as a whole and map where the different findings and theories fit (or not) together. I begin by exploring the literature review process as a whole, providing the reader with a description of what I did, how I did it and how this has shaped my research. I then focus on entrepreneurship and corporate entrepreneurship as social constructs and then progress onto categories of corporate entrepreneurship. I propose a theoretical model of corporate entrepreneurship which is an attempt to include all of the labels of this process that I found in my search, and the fundamentals of their meaning. The model was developed from several attempts to make sense of the research literature and was necessary to provide me with a sense of clarity concerning the labels used within the field. I then explore contributions in terms of the individual, team and organisational levels of corporate entrepreneurship attempting to critique and raising questions for future research agendas.

2.2 Reviewing the Literature

For me the literature review was a very difficult process in that I had problems getting support from my first PhD supervisor, and many of the books within my subject-fields were not stocked in my University’s library, so I had an administrative nightmare and tiresome wait for Inter-Library Loans for much of my non-electronic literature.

Initially I tended to read everything, and this left me feeling overwhelmed. On reflection, I think that I have become much effective in my approach to reviewing literature and writing up. This was the first chapter that I wrote and I think that readers will see how I have developed in terms of my skill at writing and my skill at constructing chapters, as they progress through (the chapter order coincides with the order of writing up, excluding the first chapter which was written towards the end).
feel that it is important to leave the 'rawness' of these earlier chapters in, as it demonstrates implicitly my personal progression, and the development of my thinking which I feel is an important inclusion in an autoethnographic study.

This chapter has also been constructed from my earliest attempts at reviewing the research literature, and although the literature review process has not been static and has been on-going work-in-progress throughout the duration of my PhD, my understanding of the literature review process has become more informed. My first attempt at reviewing the literature and developing a sense of what was 'out there' in terms of academic contributions came with putting together a proposal for my PhD.

I started with a book that had been edited by my supervisor, and using the references from his Corporate Entrepreneurship section acquired copies of books and articles that appeared to be interesting and perhaps useful, based upon their title and abstracts. I used bibliographies and references as a portal to other work and contributions. I accessed other PhD's from the British Library to see how other people had produced their theses and to explore their references and bibliographies. I found the library was poorly stocked and I had to order many of the books that I required in from North East Wales Institute or further afield. This made reviewing the literature slow, bureaucratic and expensive. I browsed and searched the Stack facility in the University library, which houses all of the non-electronic journals and I photocopied interesting articles and cross-referenced them to locate other possible leads.

I found the electronic databases (most notably, Science Direct, JSTOR and Springerlink) a quick and convenient means of locating articles. I spent some time saving search preferences in the electronic databases and organising new article alerts under my saved searches, initially using search terms such as:

- "corporate entrepreneurship"

---

3 In my Viva Voce there was an interesting point raised about a PhD being a polished report of the research, and not the process itself and thus the decision to include the 'rawness' of my earlier work was questionable. I found this a very thought provoking point and it raises the tension of producing an 'autoethnographic thesis', which I argue could be an oxymoron due to the nature and purpose of each.
As my research progressed and I identified new fields of interest, such as organisational change and the NHS context, my search criteria expanded too to include searches such as:

- organisation* AND change
- Culture AND change
- creativity AND innovation AND learning
- "risk-taking" AND "National Health Service"
- change AND entrepreneurship
- "public sector" AND "private sector"
- Entrepreneurship AND "public sector"

I used the Google search engine to Google key contributors to the field, and locate their list of publications, which in turn I used to build up my literature. Initially I used Google general, but later I also used Google images and Google Scholar.

The electronic databases sent me alerts of new articles within this list every month and I would set time aside to read through these lists and filter out any articles that I thought were relevant, in terms of their theoretical, empirical or practical contributions.

I found meeting other delegates at conferences another way of informing my literature searches within this initial phase of my study. In particular, those delegates who had supervised PhDs or from those delegates who were current PhD students working on research that crossed-over into my areas. The literature review process was a mixture of deductive and inductive strategy, in that I knew my areas of interest and so could specifically look for articles that covered (or failed to) these areas, and the existing
literature could inductively guide me towards research agendas that were previously unknown to me.

Initially, I was not very sure how to summarise and theme the books and articles. I was nervous about how to summarise them, as it worried me that I might miss out something that could later emerge as important. I filed articles and summaries of chapters and books in terms of what I thought was the key contribution of the article (theoretical/empirical/methodological/practical) and then sub-divided these into categories such as 'venture group', 'individual entrepreneurship', 'types of entrepreneurship'. I also went through each contribution and highlighted any paragraphs or sections that I thought might be useful in the future development of my research, and noted any weaknesses of the research drawing from quantitative and qualitative quality measures (see Chapter 1). This process was helpful in that it not only provided me with a system of reference during the literature review and later on the analysis process, but also supported me in highlighting gaps within the field. It was during this process that I made some of the observations that I discuss in this chapter about the different types of contributor (the academic and the practitioner) the different quality of contributions (based on both quantitative and qualitative measures of quality) and the different labels of corporate entrepreneurship (in academia and in practice).

2.3.1 Entrepreneurship

To help explain the meaning of the term corporate entrepreneurship, I feel it is helpful to begin with the root or parent term of 'start-up' entrepreneurship. The Frenchman Richard Cantillon (1734) is one of the earliest writers in research literature who considers start-up entrepreneurship. He describes it as self-employment with unknown salary (translated into English by Pizarro, Real and Sousa, 2003). However, it is the economist, Joseph Schumpeter who is accredited as the 'founding father' of entrepreneurship within the business studies literature due to his 'Schumpeterian Innovation Concept' (1934). This concept is described by Schumpeter as:

'cover[ing] the following five cases: (1) The introduction of a new good – that is one with which consumers are not yet familiar – or of a new quality of a good. (2) The introduction of a new method of
production, that is one not yet tested by experience in the branch of manufacture concerned, which need by no means be founded upon a discovery scientifically new, and can also exist in a new way of handling a commodity commercially. (3) The opening of a new market, that is a market into which the particular branch of manufacture of the country in question has not previously entered, whether or not this market has existed before. (4) The conquest of a new source of supply of raw materials or half-manufactured goods, again irrespective of whether this source already exists or whether it has first to be created. (5) The carrying out of the new organisation of any industry, like the creation of a monopoly position (for example through trustification) or the breaking up of a monopoly position.' (Schumpeter, 1934: 66)

In summary, Schumpeter (1934) sees the entrepreneur as a person, who, through new combinations creates new forms of products, processes, markets, and organisational forms. Since Schumpeter's early contribution, the term entrepreneurship has evolved and today its meaning is rather more abstract and attributable to either an individual or group that identifies, shapes and develops business opportunities, and then transforms these into successful enterprises. There is a substantial amount of research within the entrepreneurship literature that explores the characteristics and attributes of the entrepreneur. Some of the more established include: Entrepreneurs are creators, creators of ideas, jobs and economic value (Thornberry, 2001) Entrepreneurs are achievement orientated, like to take responsibility for decisions and dislike repetitive routine work (Kets de Vries, 2000). Entrepreneurs may be risk-takers (Knight, 1921), they may give more weight to the importance of not missing out on an opportunity than they do the likelihood of a new venture failing (Dickinson & Giglierano, 1986.) Entrepreneurs have a high need for autonomy (Sexton and Bowman, 1985) and fear of external control (Smith, 1967).

2.3.2 Corporate Entrepreneurship

The term corporate entrepreneurship is much more recent with Pinchot (1985) claiming to be the first to coin the term. It is described by Pinchot (1985) as start-up entrepreneurship turned inward. Otherwise stated, corporate entrepreneurship is entrepreneurship that occurs within larger organisations as opposed to that associated with new start-up enterprises.
Here corporate entrepreneurship is seen as being different from entrepreneurship due to the context within which the entrepreneurship is occurring. It could be argued that entrepreneurship is a cognitive or trait function and is not determined by where this cognition takes place. As this research project is firmly situated within a social constructivist epistemology, I argue that the organisational environment and the interactions, relationships and meanings construed by all within may impact upon and affect entrepreneurship therefore making a contextual difference to that of traditional start-up entrepreneurship.

Thornberry (2001:526) describes the problem associated with being the large organisation:

'...Many large companies are seeking ways of reinventing or revitalising their entrepreneurial roots. These companies often long for some of the spark, innovation, speed and risk that they once had, but which have slowly eroded under the weight of size, bureaucracy, complex processes and hierarchy'.

Subsequently, corporate entrepreneurship is seen by many researchers and practitioners within the field as an antidote to this staleness associated with being 'the large organisation' in the new millennium. So what challenges are faced by such 'stale', large organisations? One challenge is that of improvements in technology. Technology has made it easier for smaller organisations to compete with their industries giants, and whilst these David's may not have access to the financial and non-financial resources of their Goliaths, they are able to react quickly, adapt quickly, innovate and take risks. A frequently cited case highlighting the possible success of small business entrepreneurships in competing with larger well-established organisations is that of the electronic bookstore Amazon.com. Amazon has forced traditional bookstore companies such as Barnes & Noble (an American bookstore company) and W.H. Smiths to enter into e-commerce in order to remain competitive. Jobber (2001:472) examines the impact of the Internet on marketing and lists new forms of competitive advantage that the Internet can offer newer entrepreneurships:
• Lower costs and prices (Easyjet is a successful entrepreneurial flight operator that offers competitively priced flights through the internet).

• Instant response (Lastminute.com is a successful entrepreneurial web-based facility for buying various kinds of cheap last minute tickets).

• Greater product variety (Amazon.com).

• Product customisation (Acumin corp. is an entrepreneurial web-based vitamin company that blends vitamins, herbs and minerals according to specific customer instruction.

Jones-Evans (2000) offers further internal and external organisational factors to try and explain the growing interest in the field of corporate entrepreneurship (2000:243):

- The blurring of boundaries between the formal and informal labour markets, with serious consequences for labour mobility and job security, especially for white collar workers.

- A change in attitudes towards entrepreneurship, with higher degree of individualism, particularly among the middle classes who make up the professional workers within many large organisations.

- The technological revolution, predominantly in computing and information services and agriculture.

- Economic uncertainties leading to changing and unstable market conditions.

- Pressures on the manufacturing sector to discard unnecessary overheads and externalise previously internalised services.

With such promises of regenerative outcomes, corporate entrepreneurship has attracted audiences across many disciplines including psychology, sociology, organisational behaviour and corporate strategy.

Below, I have adapted a model originally developed by Howard Stevenson (2000) to illustrate why those from academia and strategic practitioners’ interest in the corporate entrepreneurship phenomenon has and still is growing. Stevenson’s model was originally used to examine six critical dimensions of business practice in terms of a
range of managerial behaviours (at one end of Stevenson’s continuum is entrepreneurial type behaviour, and at the other end is administrative behaviour). Four of the six dimensions that Stevenson describes are particularly relevant in attempting to explain the increased interest in corporate entrepreneurship and are:

- Strategic orientation (Factors that drive the formulation of strategy).
- Commitment to opportunity (Includes identifying and pursuing opportunities).
- Management structure (Tension between traditional authoritative management and flexible management).
- Reward philosophy (Tension between reward based on performance and reward based on responsibility).

In Figure 2.1 some of the ideas from Stevenson’s discussion have been tabulated and adapted to demonstrate some of the self-perpetuating tensions that can pull a large organisation towards adopting a more administrative (bureaucratic and institutionalised) stance, the factors that can push an organisation towards corporate entrepreneurship, and the regenerative outcomes of the pull towards corporate entrepreneurship. Not all of the examples he discusses have been included. The ones that have been included have been chosen because of their applicability to the ‘large organisation’ context.

Figure 2.1 Pressures that push an organisation towards entrepreneurial behaviour or pull towards administrative behaviour. Ideas adapted from Stevenson (2000:8-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressures that push an organisation towards corporate entrepreneurial behaviour</th>
<th>DIMENSION OF BUSINESS PRACTICE</th>
<th>Pressures that pull an organisation towards administrative behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Diminishing opportunity streams. • Rapid changes in Technology.</td>
<td>Strategic orientation Factors that drive formulation of strategy.</td>
<td>• Greater demands upon executives for meeting Return on Investments over pursuing opportunities. • Responsibility to use all resources once acquired (e.g. Plant, People, Technology &amp; Financial).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Short decision windows. • Managing risk so revenues can be rapidly committed/withdrawn from projects.</td>
<td>Commitment to opportunity Includes identifying and pursuing opportunities.</td>
<td>• A greater number of responsibilities, necessitating a more complex, lengthier decision process. • Compromise in order to reach consensus and resultant evolutionary rather than revolutionary commitment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Figure 2.1 suggests, rapid changes in technology and diminishing opportunity streams are pushing organisations towards harnessing the creativity and innovativeness associated with start-up entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurs are also associated with their speed in decision-making and propensity for risk-taking (Knight, 1921), and it is these qualities that are drawing organisations towards corporate entrepreneurship so as to better handle shorter decision windows and manage risk. Changes in management structures due to pressures such as increasing demands for flexibility and increased needs for communicating across departments push an organisation towards adopting a more entrepreneurial stance, whereby flexibility is maximised through flat and informal structures and employees have high levels of autonomy. Finally, according to Stevenson, there are a growing number of employees that seek remuneration based upon their contribution within teams and organisations, rather than on their performance. Again, such changes are pushing organisations towards adopting a remuneration philosophy that rewards entrepreneurial activity and success.

However, the tensions that pull an organisation to adopting a more administrative stance are compelling. Executives are increasingly being demanded to achieve return on their investments over pursuing, potentially risky opportunities. Managers having increased responsibility and workloads can often make decision processes lengthy and time consuming. In order to function, large organisations require clearly defined authority,
and subsequently demand routine and formalised management systems-within-systems. These intricate chains of sub-systems, however, are more often than not complex and they perpetuate the inertia within the organisation. Finally it is extremely difficult to determine the actual and exact value of an individual's contribution in a team situation for remuneration purposes and a likewise a team's effort expended in an organisational push. This model may raise many more questions that are beyond the parameters of this literature review, however, what I hope it does provide is an indication of why academics and practitioners alike desire to understand corporate entrepreneurship and why its empirical exploration could be useful for the strategic development of private and public sectors sector organisations.

2.4 Corporate Entrepreneurship versus the Entrepreneurial Organisation

What is corporate entrepreneurship? I will begin by introducing, and discussing some typical definitions of corporate entrepreneurship found within the research literature, then I will explain the terms corporate entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial posture, and the entrepreneurial organisation.

With assurances of regenerative outcomes, this relatively recent management sub-field has attracted audiences and contributions from across many business disciplines. Subsequently definitions can very considerably in their approach and desired outcome. Broadly speaking, I have identified two streams of definition. Those that lean more towards a strategic management lens which view corporate entrepreneurship as a form of strategic renewal. I observe that definitions from this approach are usually associated with research that tries to explain corporate entrepreneurship through nomothetic methodologies. Secondly there are those that lean towards an organisational behaviour approach that acknowledges the interactions of the people working in and around the organisation's many structures and sub-structures as being an important factor in understanding corporate, entrepreneurial behaviour. This stream is typically associated with research that addresses corporate entrepreneurship using ideographic methodologies. However, the boundaries between these two streams are often blurred within the research literature and some definitions can partly fit into both.
Some researchers see corporate entrepreneurship as an extension of start-up entrepreneurship. Pinchot (1985) describes corporate entrepreneurs (he introduces the label intra-corporate entrepreneur or intrapreneur for short) as 'dreamers' who participate in 'entrepreneurship turned inward'. Stevenson and Jarillo (1990:23), build upon Pinchot's behavioural perspective, and define corporate entrepreneurship in relation to opportunity and risk-taking:

'Entrepreneurship is a process by which individuals –either on their own or inside organizations- pursue opportunities without regard to the resources they currently control'.

Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) use the term opportunity to describe a future situation that is deemed desirable and feasible. They argue that opportunity is relative since opportunities may vary among individuals and for each individual over time. Stevenson and Jarillo (1990:23) suggest that 'this behavioural, situational definition fits well with common experience that the level of entrepreneurship varies across the life of the individual or even across the different activities of an individual in a given moment.'

Covin (1999:47) highlights that innovation is the single common theme underlying all forms (and definitions) of corporate entrepreneurship. However, he advises caution explaining that:

'The presence of innovation per se is insufficient to label a firm entrepreneurial. Rather, it is suggested that this label be reserved for firms that use innovation as a mechanism to redefine or rejuvenate themselves, their positions within markets and industries, or the competitive arenas in which they compete.'

Covin's definition above epitomises those definitions offered by those leaning towards the strategic management lens. These contributions tend to draw upon the early Schumpeterian Innovation Concept (quoted at the beginning of this chapter) describing corporate entrepreneurship in terms of 'new combinations'. Similar definitions are offered by Burgelman (1984), Covin and Slevin (1991) and Russell (1999). For example, Burgelman (1984:154) states:
'Corporate entrepreneurship involves extending the firm's domain of competence and corresponding opportunity set through internally generated new resource combinations.'

Building on this, still within the strategic management lens, corporate entrepreneurship has been defined in terms of a set of three behaviours: innovation, risk-taking and proactiveness (Covin and Slevin, 1991; Miller, 1983; Miller and Friesen, 1978, 1982; Zhara and Garvis, 2000). As Miller describes (1983:771):

'An entrepreneurial firm is one that engages in product-market innovation, undertakes somewhat risky ventures, and is the first to come up with 'proactive' innovation.'

Zahra and Garvis (2000: 471) describe corporate entrepreneurship as 'the sum of a company's innovation, risk-taking and proactiveness. These activities usually seek to increase the firm's innovativeness, adaptation and agile strategic responses to changes in the external environment.'

Compared with the number of definitions from the strategic management lens, I found that there are fewer definitions that attempt to describe corporate entrepreneurship through the organisational behaviour lens. Those I found within the literature share similar patterns to those from the strategic management lens, for example most of the definitions link corporate entrepreneurship to innovation:

'Corporate entrepreneurship attempts to develop an internal entrepreneurial spirit, philosophy, and structure that will produce a higher than average number of innovations.' (Daft: 1992, 259)

Furthermore, there are definitions that view corporate entrepreneurship in terms of a set of behaviours. Within the strategic management lens these behaviours are proactiveness, risk-taking and innovation, however Morris and Paul (1987) from the organisational behavioural lens, define corporate entrepreneurship in terms of encouraging creativity, flexibility and supporting risk.

Thomson and McNamara (2001) define corporate entrepreneurship drawing heavily from the work of Stopford and Baden-fuller (1994). Stopford and Baden Fuller's work
will be discussed later. Even though they do not provide a definition themselves, they identify five attributes required by organisations for corporate entrepreneurship. These attributes are: proactiveness (strategic management lens), aspirations beyond current ability (based on Schumpeter Innovation Concept), team-orientation (organisational behaviour lens), capability to resolve dilemmas (drawing from Schumpeterian Innovation Concept) and learning capability (organisational behaviour lens). Based on this dynamic set of attributes, I feel that Thomson and McNamara have provided the field with one of the most inclusive definitions to date, and this is how I view corporate entrepreneurship:

‘Corporate entrepreneurship involves teams within a firm led by intrapreneurs or corporate champions who promote entrepreneurial behaviour inside large organisations, proactively engaging in risky projects that seek to create new, innovative, administrative procedures, products and services that facilitate organisational renewal and growth.' Thomson and McNamara (2001:671)

Their definition considers corporate entrepreneurship at the individual (intrapreneurs) team and organisational level. It includes the role of sponsors, or champions in supporting corporate entrepreneurial activity. The definition incorporates the three attributes frequently cited from the strategic management lens literature, proactiveness, risk-taking and innovation. Furthermore it specifies that corporate entrepreneurial activity may be administrative, procedural, a product or a service, and that the renewal is at the organisational (not necessarily strategic) level. Extending the notion of corporate entrepreneurship further, Covin and Slevin (1991) introduce the term ‘entrepreneurial posture’. The term ‘entrepreneurial posture’ draws from the Schumpeterian Innovation Concept (1934) and the work of Miller (1983). Organisations with entrepreneurial postures are described as those in which particular behavioural patterns are recurring:

‘In short, firms with entrepreneurial postures are risk taking, innovative, and proactive. They are willing to take on high-risk projects with chances of very high returns, and are bold and aggressive in pursuing opportunities. Entrepreneurial organizations often initiate actions to which competitors respond, and are frequently first to market with new product offerings. In support of this strategic orientation, entrepreneurial firms characteristically emphasise technological leadership and research development.’ (Covin & Slevin 1991:7-8)
Another label I have found within the literature to describe entrepreneurial posture is entrepreneurial organisation. Both terms are used interchangeably. Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) define an entrepreneurial organisation as (1990:23) 'that which pursues opportunity, regardless of resources currently controlled'. Both terms are suggestive of an organisation that is at its highest state of corporate entrepreneurship, perhaps in reality an unachievable position, as might be 'The Learning Organisation' that is described in Chapter 3.

2.5 Attributes of Corporate Entrepreneurship

Both streams of definitions discussed earlier identify specific constructs or attributes of corporate entrepreneurship. Before exploring the various forms of corporate entrepreneurship, I feel that it is important to define and describe each of these attributes and the context with which they are referred to in the research literature. The strategic management lens definitions provide us with three attributes: innovation, proactiveness and risk-taking. The organisational behaviour lens provides us with another two, namely: creativity and flexibility. Finally, Stopford and Baden-Fuller (1994), propose four more attributes that are common to all forms of corporate entrepreneurship and that underpin a definition offered by Thomson and McNamara (2001): Aspirations beyond current ability, team-orientation, capability to resolve dilemmas and learning capability. Given the limitations of this study only the construct common to all three, which is innovation, will be described briefly here.

Rogers (1962) explores 'diffusion of innovations' in terms of social systems. He defines social systems as (1962:14)

'a population of individuals who are functionally differentiated and engaged in collective problem solving behaviour. The members of the social system are individuals, although these individuals may represent informal groups, industrial firms, or schools.'

His work is based upon six major research traditions: anthropology, early sociology, rural sociology, education, industrial and medical sociology. Rogers' work has implications for a number of area within business research including, HRM, marketing, entrepreneurship
and organisational behaviour (including change). His work (Figure 2.2) introduces five 'adopter' categories of individuals within a social system based upon their innovativeness and the time at which the innovation is adopted.

Figure 2.2 Rogers' five adopters of innovation categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopter Category</th>
<th>Salient Values</th>
<th>Personal Characteristics</th>
<th>Communication Behaviour</th>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovators</td>
<td>Venturesome, willing to accept risks.</td>
<td>Youngest age, highest social status, largest and most specialised operations, wealthy.</td>
<td>Closest contact with scientific information sources, interaction with other innovators, relatively greatest use of impersonal sources.</td>
<td>Some opinion leadership, very cosmopolite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Adopters</td>
<td>Respect, regarded by many others in the social system as a role model.</td>
<td>High social status, large specialised operations.</td>
<td>Greatest contact with local change agents.</td>
<td>Greatest opinion leadership of any other category in most social systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Majority</td>
<td>Deliberate, willing to consider innovations only after peers have adopted.</td>
<td>Above average social status, average sized operation.</td>
<td>Considerable contact with change agents and early adopters.</td>
<td>Some opinion leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Majority</td>
<td>Sceptical, overwhelming pressure from peers needed before adoption.</td>
<td>Below average social status, small operation, little specialisation, small income.</td>
<td>Secure ideas from peers who are mainly late majority or early majority, less use of mass media.</td>
<td>Little opinion leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laggards</td>
<td>Tradition, oriented to the past.</td>
<td>Little specialization, lowest social status, smallest operation, lowest income, oldest.</td>
<td>Neighbours, friends and relatives with similar values are main source of information.</td>
<td>Very little opinion leadership, semi-isolates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The innovators are those that adopt innovations most quickly. The early majority and late majority would be those typically fitted within the front-half of the bell on a bell-shaped curve (see Chapter 4 organisational change for an illustration of Rogers' theory in a bell-shaped curve), those consisting of the majority of the sample or population would be in the bulbous part of the bell-shaped curve, and the laggards are those that are least likely or slowest to adopt an innovation and would be located in the trailing-tail of the bell-shaped curve.

For note, I have observed that there are signs of a divide emerging within those that study corporate entrepreneurship. This divide echoes those that I will discuss in Chapter 3 in relation to organisational learning and the learning organisation. Firstly there are
those contributions from academic researchers that attempt to understand the corporate entrepreneurship process and associated behaviours (corporate entrepreneurship), and contributions from practitioners that attempt to prescribe a toolkit to achieve an organisation that has reached the highest desired state of entrepreneurship, a state of Utopia in term of entrepreneurial organisation. As with 'the learning organisation', contributions from practitioners may lack the critical objectivity and academic robustness of those academics who contribute to the corporate entrepreneurship sub-field.

2.6 Classification-based Typologies of Corporate Entrepreneurship

I have found many different labels that are used in the research literature to describe forms of corporate entrepreneurship. Similarly, there are a number of researchers who have developed corporate entrepreneurship typologies (an attempt to describe corporate entrepreneurship by breaking it down into themed 'types'). Before introducing and critiquing the many different labels I found in the literature, I will introduce and critique the aforementioned classification typologies.

Within the research literature there are seven key classification typologies of corporate entrepreneurship. These models attempt to describe corporate entrepreneurship, by breaking them down into themed parts. For example Covin (1999:49) describes:

'Having defined CE as the presence of innovation plus the presence of the objective of rejuvenating or purposefully redefining organizations, markets or industries in order to create or sustain competitive superiority, it is possible to envision at least four forms of this phenomenon. These forms will be labelled sustained regeneration, organizational rejuvenation, strategic renewal, and domain redefinition. Significantly, all four CE forms are defined by at least one potential basis for competitive advantage, albeit some more clearly than others'.

Figure 2.3 lists, in chronological order, all of those authors that have developed classification typologies within the research literature, and the attributes and labels given by each researcher to the themed parts of their typology.
At first glance it is apparent that there is a lack of shared meaning within the field as there are several typologies offered, each with its own unique combination of themes.

Schollhammer (1982) proposed five broad categories of internal corporate entrepreneurship which he labelled: administrative, opportunistic, imitative, acquisitive and incubative. Each of these themes represents a strategic form of corporate entrepreneurship, and poses different challenges to the organisation.

Vesper (1984) in his investigation into the ‘faces’ of corporate entrepreneurship initially identified eight themes: New strategic direction, initiative from below, autonomous
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**Figure 2.3 Different classifications of CE within research literature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mode of CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schollhammer (1982)</td>
<td>Administrative, Opportunistic, Imitative, Acquisitive, Incubative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesper (1984)</td>
<td>New strategic direction, Initiative from below, Autonomously business unit operation, Ordinary new product development, Acquisition, Joint venture, Venture groups or divisions, Independent spin-offs or new start-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsberg &amp; Hay (1994)</td>
<td>Intrapreneuring, Internal corporate venturing, Merger &amp; acquisition, Entrepreneurial Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covin (1999)</td>
<td>Sustained regeneration, Organizational rejuvenation, Strategic renewal, Domain redefinition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornberry (2001)</td>
<td>Intrapreneuring, Corporate venturing, Organisational transformation, Industry rule-bending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
business unit creation, ordinary new product development, acquisitions, joint ventures, venture groups or divisions and independent spin-offs (or new start-ups).

However, Vesper centred his research on the first three (initiative from below, new strategic direction and autonomous business unit creation.) Vesper conducted 178, semi-structured interviews and found that respondents saw initiative from below, new strategic direction and autonomous business unit creation as the most characteristic of entrepreneurship. Vesper does not clearly explain in his study how respondents were selected, and their position and role within the organisations. I raise attention to the possibility that perceptions of corporate entrepreneurship may vary considerably between different organisational groups (departmental, technical, venture, hierarchical, cultural).

Ginsberg and Hay’s (1994) work builds on research from Botkin and Matthews (1992) and categorises corporate entrepreneurship into four strategic categories: Intrapreneuring, internal corporate venturing, merger and acquisition and entrepreneurial partnership. Stopford and Baden-Fuller (1994) examine corporate entrepreneurship as a strategic approach to management, rather than a potentially ad-hoc occurrence within a corporate setting, as do Ginsberg and Hay (1994). In their study, Stopford and Baden-Fuller identify three forms of corporate entrepreneurship: new business venturing, organisational renewal and frame-breaking change.

Covin’s (1999) approach in proposing a typology for corporate entrepreneurship stands out as being more academically robust and thorough in its methodology, even though it is discussion based and has not as yet been empirically tested. Covin (1999) lays out a criterion that each one of his ‘forms are defined by at least one potential basis for competitive advantage, albeit some more clearly than others’ (p49). He assesses his typology using criteria proposed by Hunt (1983:355) for evaluating classification schemata. The modes identified by Covin (1999) are: Sustained regeneration, organisational rejuvenation, strategic renewal and domain redefinition. Thornberry’s (2001) typology draws from key management texts, such as Pinchot’s (1985)
‘Intrapreneuring’ (see section 2.7.9) and Stopford & Baden-Fuller’s (1994) ‘Industry Rule-bending’ (see section 2.7.12).

From an in-depth literature review, eighteen different labels have been found that are used to describe forms of corporate entrepreneurship. All of these labels are included at least once in Figure 2.3 (page 47). Figure 2.3 will act as a loose framework for discussing these various forms, for example those included in Scholhammer’s (1982) classification will be defined and critiqued first, then Vesper’s (1984) and so on and so forth.

### 2.7 Types and Levels and Orientations of Corporate Entrepreneurship

The next section looks at the different forms of corporate entrepreneurship found from an in-depth review of the research literature. This list is not exhaustive, and there may be several more forms within the literature that have not been identified here. Figure 2.4 has been constructed to conceptualise the forms of corporate entrepreneurship found within key research. Figure 2.4 also shows the levels or combinations of levels from which these different types occur (strategic level, group level or individual level). The illustration depicts whether the form of corporate entrepreneurship is internally oriented (occurs from within the organisation) or externally oriented (occurs externally to the organisation, in its environment).
From Figure 2.4 several observations can be made:

- There are two streams of corporate entrepreneurship that stem from the strategic level: those that are internally orientated and those that are externally orientated - i.e. those that occur within the organisation or externally to the organisation - in its environment.
- An observation is the distribution of the forms. There are a higher proportion of forms realised at the strategic level.
- Intrapreneurship, internal corporate venturing, ordinary new product development and sustained regeneration have been used within the literature to
describe different entrepreneurial activity occurring from all levels of organisational hierarchy, hence their positioning in the middle of the diagram.

- Ambiguities in the literature have led to strategic renewal being used to describe activities that are both internally orientated and externally orientated, hence its positioning in Figure 2.4.

- Skunkworks and venture groups only occur at the team level

- Initiative from below can involve individuals and/or groups, but does not occur at the strategic level, and is always internally oriented.

- Independent spin-offs may occur at the individual level, when an individual leaves an organisation to set up his/her own organisation, or may be an intentional, deliberate strategy, when an individual is supported in setting up a spin-off, as part of the parent organisation's strategic plans. Independent spin-offs are always externally orientated.

As the observations above indicate, there are a number of grey areas within the field of research. Covin (1999:48) discusses the problems that arise due to these grey areas within the literature, with reference to the pursuit of competitive advantage.

'Part of the problem in trying to infer from the literature why corporate entrepreneurship works is the fact that while there is general agreement that firms per se can be entrepreneurial...there is no consensus on what it means to be entrepreneurial. This situation is exacerbated by the proliferation of labels for entrepreneurial phenomena in organisations. Thus, when management theorists talk about CE, they are often talking about different phenomena. And with ambiguity surrounding the nature of the CE construct, it is not surprising that a general understanding or theory of why CE often creates competitive advantage has failed to emerge.'

These ambiguities can lead to several problems for researchers. Firstly, it takes time to unpick and dissect the confusing and somewhat conflicting literature, before critical discussion or investigations can begin. Secondly, differences in interpreting the literature could lead to incorrect research, and subsequently incorrect practice. Thirdly, it makes accumulative research more problematic and open to further misinterpretation.
On a more positive note, there seems to be much more agreement concerning the meaning and the characteristics underpinning each of Vesper's (1984): ordinary new product development, venture groups (or divisions), joint ventures, acquisitions, independent spin-offs (or new start-ups) than there are with the other forms of corporate entrepreneurship he identifies and classifies. These terms are familiar to both business academics and business practitioners.

2.7.1 New Strategic Direction


'In their application it presumed newness to management of any two of (1) product, (2) market, (3) technology, plus the notion of current investment being made in the interest of future rather than immediate returns; not being simply a product line extension, and being perceived by customers and competitors as a new entrant in the market.' (1984:294)

New strategic direction occurs from the strategic level of an organisation. Drawing from the Schumpeterian Innovation concept, it may include any of the combinations cited in the above, and both individuals and teams can be involved within the process.

2.7.2 Initiative from Below

Initiative from Below is defined by Vesper (1984) as involving:

'employee initiative from below in the organisation to undertake something new. An innovation which is created by subordinates without being asked, expected, or perhaps even given permission by higher management to do so.' (1984:295)

Initiative from below describes an unofficial form of corporate entrepreneurship that may be generated by individuals or teams of individuals within the organisation. Initiative from below includes Pinchot's (1985) interpretation of intrapreneurship (see section 2.7.9), and bootleg group projects, commonly referred to in the literature as skunkworks (Peters, 1983: Kanter (1988). Initiative from below also fits into Covin's
(1999) sustained regeneration (see section 2.7.13). Initiative from below by definition does not occur from the strategic level, or involve formal strategy.

2.4.3 Autonomous Business Unit Creation

Autonomous Business Unit (ABU) creation is essentially when a parent organisation sets up a separate strategic business unit, which is decentralised from the parent. In order to encourage and promote corporate entrepreneurship, the ABU has separate governance to that of the parent organisation and is isolated from all of its associated bureaucracies. Even though the ABUs incorporate individuals and groups, this is still a strategic approach to corporate entrepreneurship and one which is externally orientated.

2.7.4 Ordinary New Product Development (ONPD)

Knight (1987) defines ordinary new product development as the traditional approach to corporate innovation. It is a more formalised set of procedures within an organisation to achieve competitive advantage.

'A typical pattern is where various specialists each play roles in a sequence which might begin with market research and/or brainstorming to identify new product directions. An R&D project is then authorised by top management to perform pilot exploration of technical problems. If results are favourable, some sort of larger new product team or task force is then appointed, likely through a matrix organisation to carry the product forward through prototyping, preliminary design, testing, production engineering, tooling, promotion and introduction in a relatively linear, albeit with some iterative loops, fashion.' Vesper (1984: 296)

As Vesper highlights, this form involves individuals, groups and strategic levels of an organisation. It could be argued that ONPD is not entrepreneurial due to its structured and linear nature, but it also can be argued that many forms of corporate entrepreneurship (such as domain redefinition, new strategic direction, autonomous business creation) are in some way structured if not linear, and so this remains open for debate. Ordinary new product development fits into Covin's (1999) sustained regeneration mode (2.7.13).
2.4.5 Merger and Acquisitions
Merger and acquisitions involve one organisation acquiring and taking over another, rather than creating a new one (Vesper 1984, Knight, 1987, Lengnick-Hall, 1991) through purchase or stock merger. Ginsberg and Hay (1994) in their article 'confronting the challenges of CE' highlight that merger and acquisitions usually involve a structure that is integrated into the organisation with external origins, i.e. the entrepreneurial resources are not 'home grown'.

2.7.6 Joint Ventures
A joint venture is when two firms 'contribute the necessary elements to create innovation' (Knight, 1987: 286). Vesper (1984) highlights how a joint venture may also incorporate other forms of corporate entrepreneurship such as something that is initiated from below or something that may lead to a new strategic direction. Ho Park and Kim (1997) underline the advantages of 'partial combinations' of resources between partners' which is another way of describing a joint venture.

'The cooperative relationships can be used to bind together the complementary assets that represent portions of the two partners' operations. Joint ventures can avoid market inefficiency when idiosyncratic and specific assets are involved by creating a reciprocal governance structure through equity sharing.' (1997: 86)

Again, this makes reference to the underlying principles behind the Schumpeterian Innovation Concept. A joint venture will be initiated from the strategic level of an organisation, but may (or may not) incorporate both group level and individual level activity.

2.7.7 Venture Groups and Divisions
Venture groups and divisions are groups of individuals that are brought together for the purpose of creating innovations within organisations. Vesper (1984) describes them as 'hothouses for cultivation of new ventures' (1984: 296). David (1994) in his study of internal corporate venture groups characterises venture group efforts as:

'1) Semi-autonomous R&D groups within the corporate entity; 2) [being] created to exploit (primarily) product concepts that promise to
help the firms get into new businesses; 3) [being]...the main responsibility of venture managers; and 4) using resources that are solely under the control of the firms.' (1994: 38)

Venture groups are normally recognised by the organisation, but bootleg venture groups or skunkworks can evolve in organisations. There is a plethora of research that explores team-work. This would definitely provide a fruitful source of information for understanding venture groups and divisions.

2.7.8 Independent Spin-offs
An independent spin-off is either where an organisation sponsors individuals to set up their own business, or where an individual sets up its own business after having left the 'parent' organisation due to frustration over its rules, regulations and conservative approach to innovation (Knight, 1987). The latter is usually characterised by an individual 'taking along a technology that serves as the entry ticket for the new business in a high-technology industry' (Steffensen, Rogers and Speakman, 1999:96). Spin offs are also referred to as start-ups and spin-outs within the literature (Jones-Evans, 2000).

2.7.9 Intrapreneurship
Intrapreneurship is a term that was popularised by Pinchot (1985) in his book 'Intrapreneuring'. Shorthand for intra-corporate entrepreneur, he defines the intrapreneur as 'any of the dreamers who do' (1985:1). Pinchot's view of intrapreneuring was very much from the individual level, and likened the intrapreneur to an entrepreneur within an organisational setting.

'These corporate risk takers are very much like entrepreneurs. They take personal risks to make new ideas happen. The difference is that they work within large organizations instead of outside them.' (1985:xii) 'Needless to say the resources of a large company can be attractive to a would be innovator. Corporations can provide manufacturing facilities, networks of supportive suppliers, a depth of proprietary technology, all kinds of personal resources, and marketing clout. Such advantages however are often offset by the bureaucratic systems that inhibit intrapreneuring.' Pinchot (1985:xvi)
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Pinchot uses examples of intrapreneurs such as Art Fry, the intrapreneur who gave the world post-it notes, and Chuck House who provided Hewlett Packard with the ‘electronic lens’ CRT display. Both of these intrapreneurs share many characteristics that have been attributed to entrepreneurs: autonomy, innovativeness and risk taking (Lumpkin and Dess (1996). I suggest that Pinchot’s work on intrapreneuring is most in keeping with the sub-field of ‘entrepreneurial organisation’ identified earlier in this chapter. His accounts of successful intrapreneurs are informative, but lack the critical objectivity that academic research requires. Furthermore, his work is largely prescriptive, and is geared towards supporting organisations in reaching the desired state of an entrepreneurial organisation (Covin & Slevin 1991).

Intrapreneuring is now commonly used to describe a multitude of organisational activities. Gibb (1990:49-50) in his comparison of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship highlights the extent of this practice through identifying eight organisational activities, within the literature, where intrapreneuring occurs:

- The development of the overall climate of management of the company.
- Intra-corporate venturing designed to stimulate the development of new products or product improvements. These can be mainstream, down stream or divergent from the main business. This can be internal, partly external or entirely external to the parent company.
- The selling out of existing technology into new markets.
- A means of stimulating innovation in process/ method/ organisation.
- A means of rationalizing business.
- A means of reducing personnel.
- A means of recharging, creating a more aggressive company.
- A means of developing individual management competencies.

As the above implies, the label ‘intrapreneuring’ has been adopted by both theorists and practitioners to describe a number of very different organisational activities. The activities identified by Gibb (1990) occur from the strategic level of the organisation, but can affect individual and groups at any hierarchical level within the organisation.
2.7.10 Internal Corporate Venturing

Internal corporate venturing is defined by Jones-Evans (2000:244) as:

‘the creation of new ventures within existing organisation to stimulate or develop new products or product improvements, including autonomous business units established within the corporation to develop new product and/or market, venture groups or divisions set up for the cultivation of new ventures and independent spin-offs.’

Thornberry (2001) describes ventures as requiring vast amounts of new learning on the part of the organisation. The study of internal corporate venturing has grown considerably within the last decade, to such an extent that it has becoming a field within itself. Journals such as the Journal of Business Venturing confirm the increased interest within this niche of CE.

2.7.11 Entrepreneurial Partnerships

An entrepreneurial partnership is described by Ginsberg and Hay (1994) as occurring when a large organisation partners with small, start-up firms. An example cited in their article explores the challenges of CE is the Swedish chemical company Perstop, which has entrepreneurial partnerships with over 30 small firms in Europe and the US. This form of corporate entrepreneurship would occur from the strategic level, autonomy is encouraged and the partnership is externally oriented.

2.7.12 Industry Rule-bending and Frame-breaking Change

Industry rule bending focuses on changing the rules of competitive engagement. It sits within Covin’s (1999) strategic renewal (see section 2.7.15) and is also referred to by Stopford and Baden-Fuller’s (1994) as frame-breaking change. Involving ‘transformative behaviour’ which is based around the Schumpeterian Innovation Concept, Stopford and Baden-Fuller (1994) emphasise that this form of corporate entrepreneurship must not only effect the organisation and its competitive environment, but it must also change it into something significantly different from what it was.
2.7.13 Sustained Regeneration

Sustained regeneration is a form of corporate entrepreneurship that can stem from all levels within the organisation, and has therefore been placed in the centre of Figure 2.4:

‘Firms successful at the sustained regeneration form of CE tend to have cultures, structures, and systems supportive of innovation. They also tend to be learning organizations that embrace change and willingly challenge competitors in battles for market share.’ Covin (1999:90)

Underpinned by the Schumpeterian innovation Concept, organisations that engage in sustained regeneration are those that regularly and continuously introduce new products and services or enter new markets.

2.7.14 Organisational Rejuvenation

Covin (1999) emphasises that organisational rejuvenation centres on change within organisations but not necessarily a change in strategy.

‘The current use of the term organizational rejuvenation is intentionally limited to corporate entrepreneurial phenomena for which the focus and target of innovation is the organisation per se. This position is adopted because we believe it important to recognise that firms need not change their strategies in order to be entrepreneurial. Rather, CE may involve efforts to sustain or increase competitiveness through the improved execution of particular, pre-existing business strategies. When this is the case, organizational rejuvenation is the label we would attach to the entrepreneurial phenomenon.’ Covin (1999:50)

Organisational rejuvenation is placed at the strategic level within Figure 2.4, as it describes a form of entrepreneurship whereby the organisation sustains or improves its competitive standing by altering its internal processes, structures and/or capabilities.

2.4.15 Strategic Renewal

In keeping with the emerging theme, there are a number of different definitions of strategic renewal within the literature reviewed. Covin defines strategic renewal as referring:
‘...to the CE phenomenon whereby the organization seeks to redefine its relationship with its markets or industry competitors by fundamentally altering how it competes.’ Covin (1999:50)

Simply put, this is the Schumpeterian Innovation Concept, but based from an organisation’s external environment. However, Guth and Ginsberg (1990) define strategic renewal as 'the transformation of organizations through renewal of the key ideas on which they are built' (1990:5). This interpretation of strategic renewal is more in keeping with Covin’s organizational rejuvenation (see section 2.7.14). To add to the ambiguity, Simons (1994) uses the term strategic renewal to describe the implementation of a new business strategy. All of these different interpretations occur from the strategic level of an organisation, but researchers need to be clear in whose definition they are drawing from when investigating into this area.

2.7.16 Domain Redefinition

Domain Redefinition is defined by Covin (1999:51) as when ‘the organization proactively creates a new product-market arena that others have not recognised or actively sought to exploit’. This would enable an organisation to have a first mover advantage over other organisations.

2.7.17 Organisational Transformation

Organisational transformation is similar to Covin’s (1999) organisational rejuvenation (see section 2.4.14), and involves changes in the intra-processes, structures and capabilities of an organisation. It espouses from the strategic level of an organisation and is internal in context. Thornberry (2001: 530) emphasises that:

‘This type of entrepreneurship only fits the original Schumpeterian definition if the transformation involves innovation, a new arrangement or combination of resources, and results in the creation of sustainable economic value.’

Thornberry underlines that de-layering, cost-cutting, re-engineering, downsizing and using the latest technology does not guarantee that the organisation will recognise or capture new opportunities, and therefore they do not meet the requirements of organisational transformation.
2.8 Key Areas of Research

Having introduced and critiqued some of the main forms of corporate entrepreneurship found within the literature, this section explores the main areas of research within the field of corporate entrepreneurship. As has been highlighted earlier in this chapter, the field of corporate entrepreneurship has attracted audiences from a diverse range of business disciplines. This section highlights that it has received much more attention from certain disciplines (such as strategic management) over others (such as human resourcing). I believe that corporate entrepreneurship would benefit from multidisciplinary contributions from fields such as organisational behaviour, management psychology and human resourcing in order to help to understand more fully its complexities.

There are three different ‘subject’ areas of research within corporate entrepreneurship: the individual, the team and the organisation. The literature that explores the individual focuses on Pinchot's (1985) intrapreneur, and draws heavily form the start-up entrepreneur literature. The majority of literature explores the characteristics of the corporate entrepreneur. At the team level, the research literature focuses on corporate venturing. Corporate venturing is becoming a field within its own right, and itself attracts audiences from medicine, psychology, sociology and organisational disciplines. Due to time and space constraints, I do not intend to provide an in-depth analysis of the corporate venturing literature for this project, but merely provide a summary of the key points and arguments emerging from the theory. At the organisational level key contributions exploring strategy, structure, reward and resources, management style and support will be introduced and critiqued. Finally, to tie up these three subject areas, three models will be introduced that attempt to describe the corporate entrepreneurship process.

2.9 Corporate Entrepreneurship at the Individual Level

Much of the research that looks at corporate entrepreneurship at the individual level draws heavily from the start-up entrepreneurship literature. The characteristics of
entrepreneurs have received some attention, particularly within the field of psychology. A high proportion of this research has been based on American entrepreneurs, and as a consequence faces criticism about its validity and applicability when considering entrepreneurs from different cultures, countries and continents (Spence, 1985: Delmar, 1996). Delmar (1996) states that there are five entrepreneurial characteristics that come from the psychology research:

- Risk-taking propensity (Entrepreneurs are willing to take risks rather than missing out on an opportunity (Dickinson and Giglierano, 1986).
- Desire for autonomy (entrepreneurs have a high need for autonomy (Sexton and Bowman, 1985).
- Need for achievement (It is the prospect of achievement satisfaction, not money, which drives the entrepreneur (Delmar, 1996).
- Locus of Control (Entrepreneurs have higher levels of internal control: they believe the achievement of control is dependant on their own behaviour and not just luck (Delmar, 1996).
- Over-optimism (entrepreneurs have higher perceived expectancy of success (Delmar, 1996).

As highlighted earlier, this research specifically focuses on the start-up entrepreneur rather than the corporate entrepreneur. Yet much of this start-up research is used as a foundation for corporate entrepreneurship research. This suggests that much of the research within this area does not attempt to examine the possible differences between the personality of a start-up entrepreneur and a corporate entrepreneur. Many questions arise from this disparity such as: do both personalities have a similar propensity for risk taking – even when one is ‘sheltered’ by a large organisation? Do both have high loci of control, even when the corporate entrepreneur possibly works within a highly bureaucratic organisation? Do both have a high desire for autonomy, even when a corporate entrepreneur may have to work within a team or even hand over projects to teams for completion? It seems that corporate entrepreneurs should not only require those characteristics inherent with successful entrepreneurship, but they should have
those skills and attributes that support operating within an organisational setting. However, I cannot find any literature that empirically explores these issues.

A seemingly comprehensive exploration of individual corporate entrepreneurial characteristics is a framework proposed by Jones-Evans (2000), see Figure 2.5 overleaf. His adaptation of Pinchot (1985:70) provides a comparison of the organisational attributes, managerial attributes, and personal attributes of traditional managers, traditional entrepreneurs and corporate entrepreneurs. However, this framework exposes itself to some criticisms. In particular, the original source Pinchot, (1985:70) offers no indication of his methodology underpinning the framework, for example how he collected the data and analysed his data. Furthermore, it is not clear what types of organisations were used to form the framework, what industry these organisations were in, and where these organisations were geographically located.

Figure 2.5 managers, entrepreneurs and corporate entrepreneurs (adapted from Jones-Evans, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Attributes</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL MANAGERS</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL ENTREPRENEURS</th>
<th>CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude to organisation</td>
<td>Sees organisation as nurturing and protective, seeks position within it</td>
<td>May rapidly advance in a firm - when frustrated, rejects the system and forms his/her own</td>
<td>Dislikes the organisational system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial satisfaction</td>
<td>Pleases others (higher in the organisational hierarchy)</td>
<td>Pleases self and customers</td>
<td>Pleases self, customers and sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Motives</td>
<td>Wants promotion and other traditional corporate rewards</td>
<td>Wants freedom. Goal oriented, self-reliant and self-motivated</td>
<td>Wants freedom and access to corporate resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with others</td>
<td>Organisational hierarchy as basic relationship</td>
<td>Transactions and deal-making as basic relationship</td>
<td>Transactions within organisational hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Attributes</td>
<td>Agrees with those in power/ delays decisions for superiors</td>
<td>Follows private vision. Decisive, action oriented</td>
<td>More patient and willing to compromise than entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of action</td>
<td>Delegates action - reporting and supervising takes most of time</td>
<td>Gets hands dirty and can upset employees by doing their work</td>
<td>Gets hands dirty – can do work but knows how to delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management attention</td>
<td>Primarily on events inside the organisation</td>
<td>Primarily on technology and marketplace</td>
<td>Both inside-management-and outside of firm-focus on customers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Market Research

| Has market studies done to discover needs and guide product/service concepts | Creates needs. Talks to customers and forms own opinions | Does own market research and intuitive market evaluation like the entrepreneur |

Problem-solving style

| Works out problems within the system | Escapes problems in formal structures by leaving to start own business | Works out problems within the system, or bypasses it without leaving |

Skills

| Professional management, Abstract analytical tools, people management and political skills | Knows business intimately. More business acumen than managerial skills. Often technically trained | Very like the entrepreneur, but situation demands greater ability to prosper within organisation |

Personal Attributes

| Personal Attributes | Can be forceful and ambitious – fearful of others ability to harm career development | Self-confident, optimistic, courageous | Self-confident; courageous-cynical about system but optimistic about ability to outwit it |

Education

| Highly educated | Less well educated - some graduate work, but rarely PhD | Often highly educated, especially in technical fields |

Failure and Mistakes

| Strives to avoid mistakes and surprises. Postpones recognising failure | Deals with mistakes and failures as learning experiences | Attempts to hide risky projects from view so can learn from mistakes without public failure |

Family history

| Family members worked for large organisations | Entrepreneurial small business, professional or farm background | Entrepreneurial small business, professional or farm background |

Risk

| Careful | Likes moderate risk. Invests heavily but expects to succeed | Likes moderate risk – unafraid of dismissal so little personal risk |

Status

| Cares about status symbols | Happy sitting on an orange crate if job is getting done | Dismisses traditional status symbols of freedom |

However, this framework provides fertile ground for future empirical research and exploration. If the relationship in this framework could be ‘tested,’ then we would understand more about the differences between traditional managers, traditional entrepreneurs and corporate entrepreneurs at the individual, managerial and organisational level.

2.10 Corporate Entrepreneurship at the Group Level

At the group or team level, there are a growing number of contributions which explore business venture groups. A significant proportion of this literature does not differentiate between the context of the venture group (for example whether the venture group is an entrepreneurial ‘start-up’ group, or whether it is an internal corporate venture group or whether it is an external ‘spin-off’ venture group’). The literature that focuses more
specifically on corporate venture groups is much more limited in quantity and methodological approach (largely quantitative).

Sykes (1986) identifies a classification of intrinsic and extrinsic factors affecting corporate venture success. Extrinsic factors include:

- Procedural differences (control, incentive compensation, selection of venture management and financing).
- Structural Differences (technology, markets, organisational independence and people background).

Intrinsic factors include:

- Product related (Technical development, market development, years to sales).
- Experiences of the venture management team (general managerial, marketing and sales (in the venture’s market area, technical (in the venture’s field)).

Using statistical analysis of data collected, Sykes argues that a venture manager's prior experience in the venture's target market area and his/ her general managerial experience are the factors most important to venture financial success.

Brazeal (1993) explored middle level managers in organisations where their positions appeared to include the potential for innovation or autonomous action. Using statistical analysis techniques, Brazeal concluded that in order to build an innovative organisational environment, the following actions should be taken by management: Making available formal and informal creative outlets to all managers, using financial and non-financial rewards to engage managers in innovative activities, and recruiting for corporate entrepreneurship positions within the organisation.

2.11 Organisational Level Themes
This next section focuses on organisational level themes including the strategic level, structure, reward, resourcing, management style and support for entrepreneurship within the organisational context.
2.11.1 Strategy

Strategy research into CE has grown considerably over the past twenty years, so much so that a new niche area is evolving which is referred to in the literature as ‘entrepreneurial strategy’ (Miller and Friesen, 1982). CE is by no means a new phenomenon in the strategy literature, with several key models emerging in the seventies, such as Mintzberg (1973), Miles and Snow (1978) and Miller and Friesen (1978). All of these models centre around categorising firms through the type of strategy they follow.

Mintzberg (1973) identifies three types of strategy or ‘modes’ in his discussion on strategy making, entrepreneurial mode, adaptive mode and planning mode. He defines the entrepreneurial mode as having the following characteristics:

‘1. In the entrepreneurial mode, strategy making is dominated by the active search for new opportunities.
2. In the entrepreneurial organisation, power is centralized in the hands of the chief executive.
3. Strategy-making in the entrepreneurial mode is characterized by dramatic leaps forward in the face of uncertainty. Growth is the dominant goal of the entrepreneurial organisation.’
Mintzberg (1973:45-46)

Mintzberg likens his adaptive mode to that of Lindblom’s (1959) ‘muddling through’. He describes the adaptive policy maker as accepting as given a powerful status quo and lack of clearly defined objectives. The four distinguishing characteristics of the adaptive mode as identified by Mintzberg are:

1) Clear goals do not exist in the adaptive organisation; strategy-making reflects a division of power among members of a complex coalition...
2) In the adaptive mode, the strategy making process is characterized by the “reactive” solution to existing problems rather than the “proactive” search for new opportunities...
3) The adaptive organisation makes its decisions in incremental, serial steps...
4) Disjointed decisions are characteristics of the adaptive organisation.’
(Mintzberg:1973:46-47)
The final type identified in Mintzberg's work is the planning mode. This mode is a much more rational and methodical strategy. Mintzberg identifies three characteristics:

1. In the planning mode, the analyst plays a major role in strategy making.
2. The planning mode focuses on the systematic analysis, particularly in the assessment of the costs and benefits of competing proposals.
3. The planning mode is characterized above all by the integration of decisions and strategies. (Mintzberg (1973:48)

Mintzberg highlights that these modes are likely to occur in different combinations within an organisational setting. The modes can be mixed in their pure forms, mixed by function, mixed between parent and subunit or mixed by stage of development.

Miles and Snow's (1978) typology differs from that of Mintzberg's (1973) in that it identifies four types of approach to strategy, namely: prospector, defender, analyser and reactor. The prospector strategy is similar to Mintzberg's entrepreneurial mode. A firm that follows the prospector strategy is a highly innovative and constantly seeks out new markets and new opportunities and is oriented towards growth and risk-taking (Griffin, 1999). The defender strategy is a strategy in which the firm focuses on protecting its current markets, maintaining stable growth, and serving current customers. The analyser strategy is 'a unique combination of the prospector and defender types' Miles and Snow (1978:68). A firm employing this strategy attempts to maintain its current business and to be somewhat innovative in new business (Miles and Snow, 1978). Finally, Miles and Snow's (1978) reactor strategy is similar to Mintzberg's adaptive mode. A firm that 'follows' this strategy has no consistent strategic approach. It drifts with its environmental events, reacting but failing to anticipate or influence those events. These firms do not tend to perform as well as those firms who adopt the other strategic approaches.

Miller and Friesen's (1978) quantitative study of 'archetypes of strategy formulation' investigates simultaneous associations among a large number of variables. The study criticises previous work for focusing merely on the organisational and environmental contexts in which they occur. Miller and Friesen identify ten archetypes of strategy.
successful archetypes are: the adaptive firm under moderate challenge, the adaptive firm in a very challenging environment, the dominant firm, the giant under fire, the entrepreneurial conglomerate, and the innovator. Failure archetypes identified are: the impulsive firm, the stagnant firm, the stagnant bureaucracy, the headless giant, and the aftermath.

Miller and Friesen’s (1978) archetypes are difficult to compare with Mintzberg’s (1973) and Miles and Snow’s (1978) typologies since the former explores strategy types using numerous organisational variables, whilst as previously stated, both Mintzberg and Miles and Snow typologies are limited to the organisational and environmental contexts in which they occur.

A well-cited corporate entrepreneurial model in the strategy literature is that of Burgelman (1983a). This model is reproduced in Figure 2.6 and looks at the interaction of strategic behaviour, corporate context and the concept of strategy. The model was developed as the result of a field study in one large, established firm and shows two very different strategic processes occurring simultaneously in large complex firms. More specifically it identifies two processes of innovation within organisations. Burgleman (1983a) describes these processes as loops, both of which are related to corporate strategy concepts.

Figure 2.6 A Model of the Interaction of Strategic Behaviour, Corporate Context and the concept of Strategy (Taken from Burgleman (1984: 155))
The first loop is the induced strategic behaviour loop. The induced strategic behaviour loop is seen as the official path for innovation within organisations and is the *outcome* of strategy (Kuratko et al, 1990). Structural context (see Figure 2.6) refers to all of the administrative mechanisms put in place by top management in order to manipulate and influence operational level employees and middle managers towards achieving the current corporate strategy.

The second loop is the autonomous strategic loop. This loop *influences* corporate strategy (Kuratko et al, 1990) and will occur when operational level employees identify opportunities that exceed those offered by strategic level management. Strategic context, therefore, is the process by which middle managers question the current concepts of strategy and provide top management with the "opportunity to rationalize, retroactively, successful autonomous strategic behaviour" (Burgleman 1983a: 1352). The autonomous strategic behaviour occurs outside of the structural context (in which the induced strategic behaviour occurs) yet to be successful, it needs to be accepted by top management and integrated into the corporate strategy.

Burgleman's model indicates how informal innovation can be transformed into official strategic planning. This model highlights the importance of diversity within organisations, and the important role of operational level managers in the innovation process. However, this model may only provide a partial overview of corporate entrepreneurship as it neglects the role of risk-taking and proactiveness, both of which are frequently defined within the strategy literature along with innovation as being necessary attributes of corporate entrepreneurship.

### 2.11.2 Structure

Achieving organisational goals in larger, more developed organisations require maintaining growth while managing complexity (Smith et al 1985). In order to manage these complexities, responsibilities are likely to be plainly defined, which often makes
them bureaucratic and overly structured. However, rigid structures and inflexible bureaucracies are said to diminish the entrepreneurial spirit (Lynskey 2002).

The effect of structure on corporate entrepreneurship has been well documented (Hage and Aiken 1970; Covin and Slevin 1991; Hornsby et al 1993). Key structural factors identified within the research literature are:

- Organisational hierarchy.
- Formalisation.
- Specialisation.
- Centralisation.

(Hage and Aiken 1970; Covin and Slevin 1991; Daft 1992; Hall 1996; Lynskey 2002).

An early study by Bridges et al (1968) revealed that extensive organisational hierarchy inhibits individual and group risk-taking. Expanding on this, later research emphasises how flatter organisational structures can support entrepreneurial activities within organisations (Kanter 1983; Covin and Slevin 1991; Lynskey 2002). The 'matrix' organisational structure (Davis and Lawrence, 1977) was first developed to support technological innovation in large organisations. Kanter (1983, 1988) argues that the matrix structure is more frequently found in those organisations that are able to change rapidly and innovate, than those organisations with more hierarchical structures.

The benefits of a matrix structure are highlighted by Kanter (1988:177-78) as:

- Forcing integration and cross area communication, by requiring managers from two or more functions to collaborate.
- Diffusing authority among groups of managers due to the structure requiring extensive cross-functional consultation.

Formalisation is the extent to which organisational actions are manifested in written documents regarding procedures, job descriptions, regulations and policy manuals (Hall 1996). Many academics have discussed the damaging effects of formalisation on corporate entrepreneurial activity (Hage and Aiken 1970; Covin and Slevin 1991). In essence, a high degree of formalisation within an organisation can contribute to a level
of perceived bureaucracy. Furthermore it may stifle individual and group risk taking since employees may be restricted by excessive rules and regulations.

*Organisational specialisation* describes the extent of professionalism and the capabilities pooled in an organisation (Daft 1992: Hall 1996). High specialisation is said to reduce the level of bureaucracy by enhancing more flexible and open communication between organisational members (Lynskey 2002).

*Organisational centralisation* concerns the scale of control that senior managers have in their organisation (Hall 1996). Main themes coming from research on centralisation suggest that organisations with a high level of centralisation are more likely to perform organisational changes (Hage and Aiken 1970) and entrepreneurial activity (Covin and Slevin 1991).

There is an opposing argument concerning centralisation, as Lynskey (2002:30) explains.

'A higher level of centralisation may contribute to poor communication between different levels within an organisation since it inhibits the upward flow of voluntary communication, which may in turn, cause poor information exchange among groups and between senior management and lower levels. High centralisation may also depress individual initiative and risk taking activities, as individuals are not equipped with the necessary resources, information, or discretionary authority to handle likely risks associated with their activities.'

Lynskey’s argument above can be linked to the notion of the ‘champion’ or ‘sponsor’ (see 2.11.4 Management Style and Support). A positive benefit of having a manager support (or champion) an entrepreneurial venture would be their role in linking lower level employees with higher-level mangers. Kanter (1983) supports a more chaotic view or organisational structures in facilitating corporate entrepreneurship. She proposes that the disciplined world of ‘clearly defined structures’ does not exist in entrepreneurial organisations, which are ‘always operating at the edge of their competence’. Instead, she suggested that individuals should work in an environment that:
contains vague assignments, overlapping territories, uncertain authority and a mandate to work through teams rather than to act unilaterally.' (1983:138)

2.11.3 Reward & Resources

It is widely acknowledged within research literature that the effort expended into corporate entrepreneurship should be rewarded. (Carter and Jones-Evans, 2000. Brazeal 1996). Balkin & Logan (1988) have investigated the diverse systems that organisations can develop to reward entrepreneurial employees. They stress that:

'because the success of entrepreneurship depend on innovative, creative employees who are willing to accept risk, such organisations must develop policies that reward such behaviours (Balkin & Logan 1988:1)

They focus on four important pay policy areas:

- Pay level (How the organisation's employee salaries fit into the competitive pay market).
- Pay mix (The proportion of salary, benefits, and incentives that make up the employee's total package).
- Pay structure (The hierarchy of pay rates among jobs in the organisation).
- Pay raises (The administration of pay increase within the organisation).

They propose that corporate entrepreneurs should be salaried below the market rate with a considerable proportion of the person's earnings at risk in the form of pay incentives. This ought to be linked to personal and entrepreneurial accomplishment. Consequently, the fixed-package portion of a corporate entrepreneur's reward—salary and benefits, should be low. Nevertheless this should be compensated by a number of benefits including: Short-term variable pay benefits (profit sharing). Long-term variable pay benefits (Equity ownership). Education and health benefits. Furthermore, reward policies should not recognize status differences among employees. Pay rises should not be granted on an annual basis, and factored into employees' salaries. To promote entrepreneurship, Balkin and Logan (1988) argue that the 'lump sum salary increase' method 'shows promise for meeting the special needs of an entrepreneurship' (1988:25). Furthermore, Balkin & Logan (1988) propose two types of pay structure policies that are
appropriate for entrepreneurship: all-salaried pay system and a market-priced pay structure.

The *all-salaried pay-system* is 'when a large organisation develops different benefits, pay incentives, and administrative procedures for various employee levels.' (Balkin & Logan 1988:22) There are distinct advantages and disadvantages of this system, an advantage being that employees feel that they are being treated as mature, trustworthy individuals, which in turn makes them feel more responsible for their behaviour. On the other hand a perceived disadvantage of the all-salaried pay system is that employees may abuse their freedom and rates of absenteeism will increase.

The *market-priced pay structure* is where a company develops bureaucratic rules for pricing ventures within its organisation, and then hires internal employees for these tasks as if they were independent entrepreneurs hiring employees from the external labour market. Galbraith (1982) highlights the importance of rewarding the sponsors and champions in organisations, who are vital for supporting the entrepreneurs and therefore crucial to the success of entrepreneurial ventures.

Resource availability is emphasised as an important factor for facilitating and encouraging corporate entrepreneurship within the research literature. Kanter (1983, 1988), Fry (1987) and Hirsch and Peters (1986) discuss the importance of resources (including time) as an essential factor in the success of corporate entrepreneurial projects and ventures. Jones-Evans (2000) emphasises the importance of organisations making resources available to individual entrepreneurs in order that their ideas reach the marketplace. He warns that if funds or time are not available:

>'The intrapreneur may become frustrated to the point of abandoning the commercialisation of the idea altogether. More worrying for the company, the idea may be taken elsewhere to be developed by the intrapreneur, either to a competing organisation or to a new small business.' (2000:250)
2.11.4 Management Style and Support

Within large firms where new innovations can frequently vanish in the bureaucracy and unresponsiveness of the establishment, corporate entrepreneurs cannot sufficiently develop their ideas alone (Carter & Jones-Evans 2000). As discussed earlier, the corporate setting favourable for corporate entrepreneurship has sponsors and champions throughout the organisation (Pinchot 1985) who not only support the innovative activity and consequential failures but has the planning flexibility to set new objectives and directions as needed (Knight 1987). Such sponsors can be at all levels of the organisation, from chief executive to project manager to other corporate entrepreneurs. Pinchot (1985) states that the job of sponsorship solves three of the most basic barriers to intrapreneuring: lack of resources, nervous money, and political attacks (1985:146). Jones-Evans (2000:247) suggests ways in which the sponsor overcomes these three barriers:

- Reassuring managers and venture capitalists that have financial concerns regarding risky ventures.
- Defending proposals in evaluation meetings, allocating initial exploration funding to new ideas and permitting flexibility in budgets in terms of money, people and equipment.
- Ensuring that corporate venturing develops quickly within an organisation by putting the rewards and initiatives in place for corporate entrepreneurs.
- Fighting internal departmental issues, such as the hoarding of resources in one division, and ‘empire-building’.

Many corporate entrepreneurs have several sponsors: lower level sponsors to take care of the day-to-day support needs of the venture, and higher level sponsors to fend off major strategic attacks that might threaten it (Pinchot 1985).

Building on this, there has been an increasing amount of discussion within the literature on the role of middle managers as champions in supporting corporate entrepreneurship. Drucker (1985), Kanter (1983), Peters & Waterman (1982) and Pinchot (1985) have all discussed different aspects of a middle manager’s contribution to corporate
entrepreneurship. Quinn (1985) recognised the valuable contributions middle managers make in linking top management communications to lower level employees and communicating lower level innovative ideas to upper level management. Kanter (1983, 1985, 1989) and Quinn (1985) highlight the role of middle managers in encouraging and promoting informal, unofficial corporate entrepreneurship. Furthermore middle managers are discussed within the literature as providing political support, access to intrinsic rewards and acting as agents for change (Kanter, 1983; 1985; Pinchot, 1985; Quinn, 1985; Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1996; Hornsby et al, 2002) In a quantitative study examining the middle managers' perceptions of internal environment conducive to corporate entrepreneurship, Hornsby et al (2002) document the existence of five organisational factors perceived by middle managers as influencing them to foster entrepreneurial activity. These factors are: management support, work discretion/autonomy, rewards/reinforcement, time availability and organisational boundaries.

2.12 Process Models of Corporate Entrepreneurship

The research literature provides two different models of the corporate entrepreneurship process:

- An interactive model of corporate entrepreneurship (Hornsby et al 1993), which explores the various components that affect the CE process (as illustrated in Figure 2.7).
- A model of corporate entrepreneurship (Gautam and Verma, 1997) that explores the organisational components that lead to entrepreneurial activities (as illustrated later in Figure 2.8).

Unlike Burgelman's (1983a) strategically centred model, they are both more holistic in nature, looking at the interrelationships between the environment, the organisation and the individuals within the organisation. Both of the models have been constructed using previous research, but have not yet been empirically substantiated.
As discussed earlier, Hornsby et al.'s (1993) model is based on previous discussion and previous empirical research. The model depicts the process of corporate entrepreneurship (or intrapreneuring as it is referred to in the diagram) from the initial 'trigger' or precipitating event, to the occasion when the idea becomes implemented. The model seems to look at the process that is more formal and official in nature, rather than the ad-hoc form of corporate entrepreneurship that may occur in organisations.

Precipitating events discussed in the model include (Hornsby et al 1993:33):

- Environmental factors such as:
  - Hostility (threats to a firm's mission through rivalry).
  - Dynamism (instability of a firm's market because of changes).
  - Heterogeneity (developments in the market that create new demands for a firm's products).
- Organisational factors such as:
  - Structure.
Managerial values.

- Environmental factors such as:
  - Organisational change (precipitates or ignites the interaction of organizational characteristics and individual characteristics to cause intrapreneurial events.

The decision to act intrapreneurially is shown in this model as being 'caused' by the culmination of three events. Organizational characteristics, individual characteristics and the precipitating event. Referring to the individual characteristics in the model and reflecting back to the discussion on individual themes, it can be argued that these characteristics are based on entrepreneurial characteristics and not those associated or empirically proven to be associated with corporate entrepreneurs.

Before idea implementation can be realised, this model requires business feasibility planning (business plans), resource availability and any barriers to be overcome. The importance of resources has been discussed (see section 2.11.3), and Hornsby et al’s study reiterates much of the literature reviewed, to support the importance of available resources. Barriers to corporate entrepreneurship that may hinder or even prevent idea implementation include (Hornsby et al 1983:35):

- Organisation's enforcement procedures for making mistakes.
- Long-term planning activities.
- Functional management structures.
- Uniform compensation policies.
- Promotion of compatible individuals.

Even though this model has not had any empirical support, it is still useful in that it describes the process of corporate entrepreneurship as a whole, which in turn appreciates the interactive, complex and multifunctional nature corporate entrepreneurship. Some of the limitations of this model have been discussed, but there are others that may help towards a future research agenda. The model does not appreciate the spiralling nature of the corporate entrepreneurship process. Such a model would take the process further.
than the implementation stage, and show how the organisation grows, develops and learns from entrepreneurial activities, and how barriers to corporate entrepreneurship may cause negative growth, negative development and negative learning.

Gautam and Verma's model conceptualises previous discussion and empirical research. As with Hornby et al's (1993) model, it shows individual and organisational and environmental factors as contributing to the corporate entrepreneurship process. However, this model does appreciate the entire process may be spiralling in nature. The model shows the cycle that may develop, when organisational, environmental and individual factors create corporate entrepreneurship. The corporate entrepreneurship created contributes to organisational growth, which in turn affects and changes the organisation. The model also neglects the effects of organisational and individual culture in the model. It is suggested here that culture would have a great impact on individual characteristics and on organisational factors. Reflecting back to the work on individual entrepreneurs, Delmar (1996) identifies research on entrepreneurship as being culturally dependant. This may be the case for corporate entrepreneurs. Following from this, it is suggested here, that further empirical investigation into the relationship between culture and corporate entrepreneurship would contribute valuable insight to the
research literature. The relationships in this model have not been supported empirically, but this model does provide a good foundation for future experimental research.

2.13 Conclusion

This chapter is the first of four reviewing the theoretical and empirical literature that already 'exists' within the fields concerning this research. This chapter has focused on the 'sub-field' of corporate entrepreneurship. Firstly, I begin this chapter with a review of the actual process of conducting the literature review. I highlight my strategy and note some of the problems and helpful experiences. I introduce the review itself highlighting how corporate entrepreneurship is contextually different to that of start up entrepreneurship and therefore it provides a new and different set of challenges for 'entrepreneuring' practitioners, those supporting and 'championing' entrepreneurship and those academics studying it. Drawing from Thomson and McNamara, I take the view that corporate entrepreneurship:

> 'involves teams within a firm led by intrapreneurs or corporate champions who promote entrepreneurial behaviour inside large organisations, proactively engaging in risky projects that seek to create new, innovative, administrative procedures, products and services that facilitate organisational renewal and growth.' Thomson and McNamara (2001:671)

I have attempted to make sense of the field through unpicking and categorising the literature and as a result of this sense-making I have developed a table of different classifications, and an illustration of types and levels and orientations (Sambrook and Roberts, 2005). Both of these provide new foundations for the development of corporate entrepreneurship theory, and could also provide an easy reference for strategic practitioners.

Through exploring contributions to the field in terms of organisational levels, I have highlighted some gaps in the research. The field is growing, but contributions tend to be positivistic in their empirical and theoretical approach. For a richer understanding of this dynamic 'process', I feel that practitioners and academics would benefit significantly from contributions exploring corporate entrepreneurship from other lenses,
such as social constructionism and realism. Furthermore, contributions from a wider range of disciplines could create a broader perspective of corporate entrepreneurship, most particularly subjects such as psychology, organisational behaviour, and Human Resource Management.

Corporate entrepreneurship could offer both public and private sector organisations solutions to the new and changing stakeholder demands. It is important that academics enrich contributions to the field through pluralist and multi-lens empirical research. Practitioners do not work in organisations that are linear models. they co-exist in complex, dynamic, vibrant and often bureaucratic and political organisations. In order to be useful and to be of significant value to those in the 'real world' researchers cannot ignore this.

Having explored the corporate entrepreneurship literature, the next chapter focuses on organisational learning.
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Chapter 3 - Organisational Learning

3.1 Introduction
I started the review of the literature on organisational learning at the beginning of the PhD process, along with the review of the corporate entrepreneurship literature. Organisational learning was a subject that I had developed a passion about during the dissertation period of my undergraduate degree, and I actively explored for research agendas that incorporated my first supervisor's speciality (corporate entrepreneurship) and my passion for organisational learning. In Chapter 2, I highlighted some of the literature review strategies that I employed. The review process that informed this chapter was significantly supported through meeting other researchers at conferences, most notably Birdthistle (2003). Her PhD explored learning in the context of start-up entrepreneurship and I have drawn upon her review of organisational learning later on in this chapter. Reviewing the literature on organisational learning informed the way I organised the newer but more fragmented field of corporate entrepreneurship. I found it easier to identify the key contributions and contributors to the organisational learning literature (than in the corporate entrepreneurship literature) because they shone out clearly.

In the previous chapter on corporate entrepreneurship I suggest that rapidly changing market environments, improvements in technology and increasing globalisation has generated interest in the field of corporate entrepreneurship. Similarly is can be argued that increasing demands and changes in work patterns, changes in employee motivations, and the volatile nature of consumer demands are creating a need for more organisations, and the individuals within, to learn more effectively and manage what is learned more efficiently and openly.

'In an economy where the only certainty is uncertainty, the one sure source of lasting competitive advantage is knowledge. When markets shift, technologies proliferate, competitors multiply, and products become obsolete almost overnight, successful companies are those that consistently create new knowledge, disseminate it widely throughout the organisation, and quickly embody it in new technologies and products.' (Nonaka 1991:22)
As Nonaka observes, knowledge and learning is seen as central to creating and retaining competitive advantage. The field of organisational learning explores the activities, processes and interrelationships of learning within and by organisations. In this chapter I critically review the research literature and attempt to unpick, sort and explain key contributions within the field.

### 3.2 Organisational Learning versus the Learning Organisation

Contributors to the field have discussed the ambiguous use of the terms *learning organisation (LO)*, *organisational learning (OL)* and *a learning organisation (ALO)*. Although they are subtly different in the way that they are spelt, they do have very different meanings and thus different implications and the terms are often used 'incorrectly' within the research literature. Sun (2003) reviews the definitions and meanings of organisational learning, learning organisation and a learning organisation from a linguistics perspective. He argues that organisational learning:

> 'refers to the learning process of an organization and by the organization in a collective (organizational) way.' (2003:156)

He argues that 'learning organisation' can infer 'a concept functioning as a vision' (2003:157) or 'a subject of scientific study and research.' (2003:158)

The subtle difference between *learning organisation* and *a learning organisation* is explained by Sun (2003:158) as:

> 'a learning organization is a 'living' representative of the image of 'learning organization'. If something is the representative of something, it does not need to contain all the characteristics of it but, rather, it possesses some major characteristics or features of it.'

To clarify my position, and that of this research, I adopt Sun's (2003) definitions of organisational learning and learning organisation. Firstly looking at organisational learning, some of the definitions offered within the literature are:

> 'Organisational learning means the process of improving actions through better knowledge and understanding.' (Fiol and Lyles 1985:803)
‘An entity learns if, through its processing of information, the range of its potential behaviours is changed.’ (Huber 1991:89)

‘By the term 'organizational learning' we mean the changing of organizational behaviour.’ (Swieringa and Wierdsma 1992: 33)

‘Organizational learning is the acquisition of new knowledge by actors who are able and willing to apply the knowledge in making decisions or influencing others in the organisation.’ (Miller 1996:486)

Definitions in the research literature usually consist of both cognitive (references to knowledge) and behavioural changes (Tsang, 1997). The differences with the definitions is usually as to whether these changes are described as potential changes, or whether they are actual and will impact upon future organisational behaviour. Miller (1996), Fiol and Lyles (1985) and Swieringa and Wierdsma (1992) all offer definitions that imply actual behavioural changes within the organisation, whereas Huber’s (1991) definition suggests a potential change in behaviour. All of the definitions above imply that organisational learning is a process (Sun, 2003), be it a process of improving actions, change or knowledge acquisition.

Some definitions of ‘a learning organisation’ offered in the research literature include:

‘Organizations that aim to extend their learning ability at all levels and continuously in order to optimise their effectiveness.’ (Bomers cited in Simons 1995: 280)

‘A learning company is an organisation which facilitates the learning of all its members and continuously transforms itself.’ (Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell 1991: 3)

‘A learning organization is an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge, and at modifying its behaviour to reflect new knowledge and insights.’ (Garvin 1993:80)

‘A learning organization is one where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning together.’ (Senge 1990:3)
Garvin’s definition follows the same structure of those discussed for organisational learning. It includes a cognitive change, a behavioural change and the behavioural change described is actual and not potential. Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell’s (1991) definition of a learning company is frequently criticised within the research literature due to it being overly descriptive and not lending itself well to being easily measured or audited (Coopey, 1995. Harrison, 1998). Building on this criticism, I argue that Senge’s (1990) definition with descriptions such as ‘where collective aspiration is set free’ and ‘when new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured’ could also be rather impractical in research and practice. It is interesting to note, that the literature search revealed no definitions of ‘the learning organisation’. This agrees with Sun’s (2003:159) findings ‘that learning organization is a concept and a name for a subject for a scientific study and research.’

3.3 Components of Organisational Learning.

3.3.1 Learning

Research into learning is rich in both breadth and depth. Spanning a vast number of academic disciplines, and incorporating a diverse range of research methodologies, an in-depth analysis of the research literature is neither relevant nor appropriate for this project. However, since ‘learning’ is a fundamental construct of organisational learning, a brief synopsis of the key ‘classic’ contributions relevant to workplace learning will be introduced and the main arguments for each presented.

As with organisational learning and a learning organisation, there are many definitions offered within the research literature for learning. A well-known definition is that offered by Bass and Vaughan (1967: 8)

‘Learning is a relatively permanent change in behaviour that occurs as a result of practice or experience.’

This definition emphasises the importance of practice and experience in bringing about a ‘relatively permanent change’ in behaviour. Harrison (1988) notes the neglect of ‘knowledge’ but its importance in the organisational context.
'...It does not refer to changed ways of perceiving, thinking and knowing. ...I am drawing attention to them here in order to emphasise the need to see learning not just as behavioural change but as knowledge. Management must foster that kind of individual and collective learning that not only produces changed behaviour but also adds to the store of valuable knowledge that the organisation possesses and which on its long-term future depends.' (1988:225)


'A change in knowledge or behaviour, the changes brought about by learning are relatively permanent and it results from previous experience.' (1995:9)

This definition appreciates that learning involves a change in either knowledge or behaviour, and as a result of this it supports that the changes that occur have to be 'relatively permanent', thus indicating that temporary changes in either knowledge or behaviour is not learning. Both definitions suggest that the change in behaviour is due to practice or previous experience.

Mullins (1999) extends the principles underpinning learning by stating that learning does not only involve knowledge and skills, but includes attitudes and social behaviour. His discussion also points out that learning can be a conscious effort, such as the learning formal work-place training may produce, or incidental such as the learning through the observation of others, or from listening to colleague's experiences. Similarly, Sambrook (2003) notes the subtle differences between learning at work and learning in work. She suggests that learning at work is a more formal (deliberate) learning activity whilst learning in work is more informal (accidental or on-the-job learning), and may be integrated with the actual process of working.

3.3.2 Knowledge

Knowledge can be seen as the cognitive outcome of learning. Gibb (2002) suggests there is wide misuse of the term knowledge in the learning literature. He explains that the term is often used to describe a range of cognitive capacities, of which knowledge is a lower-level constituent part. Figure 3.1 illustrates Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive
capabilities, which has been adapted from Gibb (2002) to illustrate the range of cognitive capabilities the term 'knowledge' is often used to describe.

Figure 3.1 Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive capabilities adapted from Gibb (2002:66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Type</th>
<th>Statement Form</th>
<th>Surface Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Recall previously learned material, state, list, identify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Grasp the meaning of new material. explain, give examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Use of learned material in the new and concrete situations. relate demonstrate, show</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Break material down, into component parts. analyse, compare, contrast, investigate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>Put parts together to form a whole. design, create, formulate, organise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Judge the value of material for a given purpose. assess, appraise, contrast, critique, argue</td>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 shows knowledge as the most basic foundation in this hierarchical model. At the highest level, evaluation implies that deep learning has taken place and is the most complex cognitive capacity. If I relate this model to the context of work-place learning, some tasks will merely require knowledge (surface learning - knowledge) such as a market researcher filling in a scripted interview sheet, whilst others tasks will require evaluative performance (deep learning - evaluation), such as a heart surgeon carrying out a transplant.

I note that a downside of Bloom's taxonomy is that it indicates a rigid hierarchical structure, so in order for deeper learning to occur (such as evaluation) the learner must have already progressed up the hierarchy from basic surface learning. I question whether this is the case in reality, is it more realistic that a learner's position in this hierarchy will be situational? Perhaps my research may be able to address this area.

There is an abundance of research that explores knowledge in the workplace, so much so that over the past decade a new field has emerged called 'Knowledge Management'. This field is often 'bundled' together as with the field of organisational learning. This
can make things rather confusing for the novice researcher, as distinctions may seem blurred. In essence, knowledge management explores the effects or results of learning and its research approach tends to be normative (set within a positivist paradigm). Organisational learning explores the learning process, and does have a more ideographic approach, to-date. Although underpinning philosophical approaches may be quite different, the knowledge management literature has contributed valuable insight to our understanding within both fields. For example, Nonaka’s (1991) theory on tacit and explicit knowledge is a knowledge management model that contributes rich insight into learning within an organisational context.

Nonaka (1991, 1994) identifies two types of knowledge that he describes as the ‘epistemological dimension to organisational knowledge creation’ (1994:15) or the fundamental building blocks to understanding organisational knowledge creation. These two types of knowledge are explicit and tacit knowledge.

‘Explicit knowledge is formal and systematic, it can be easily communicated and shared in product specifications or scientific formula.’ Nonaka (1991:27).

A familiar example of explicit knowledge is the set of formalised procedures used by staff at fast food chains such as MacDonald’s. These procedures cover everything from food preparation to kitchen hygiene, through formalised step-by-step instructions. All of the staff have access to this type of knowledge, and if members leave, the knowledge is not lost by the organisation. However, tacit knowledge is defined by Nonaka (1991) as:

‘Highly personal: It is hard to formalize and, therefore, difficult to communicate to others. [It] is also deeply rooted in action and in an individual’s commitment to a specific context – a craft or profession, a particular technology or product market, or the activities of a work group or team.’ (Nonaka (1991:27-28)

An example of tacit knowledge is the ‘know-how’ of a master craftsman. Years of experience have given him (or her) the capabilities to become an expert at his craft, but the skills never becomes formalised as explicit knowledge. Once he leaves the company the knowledge will leave with him. Nonaka (1994) extends the idea of tacit and explicit knowledge by looking at four basic patterns for creating knowledge in organisations.
Figure 3.2 shows the four patterns that are created by converting either tacit or explicit knowledge.

**Figure 3.2 Patterns of Knowledge Creation, adapted from Nonaka (1994)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Tacit Knowledge</th>
<th>From Explicit Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tacit Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>e.g. Learning from observation – cannot easily be leveraged by organisation as whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalization</td>
<td>e.g. articulation of tacit knowledge – made available to others in organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>e.g. explicit knowledge that is adapted broadened and extended and not articulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>e.g. when pieces of explicit knowledge are combined into a new whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonaka argues that in a ‘knowledge-creating’ organisation each one of these four patterns is present. I shall briefly explain this model using an example. Consider two people handling customer complaints at a call centre. One employee is much more successful at ‘turning around’ disgruntled customers than the other, even though both follow semi-structured scripts. The less successful operator listens in to several of her colleague’s calls, and learns that she frequently uses phrases that are not in the script such as ‘I’m really sorry you feel this way, but we’ll sort this out together, once and for all’ and ‘what would you like me to do sort out this situation and to make you happier?’ The less successful operator is now learning her colleague’s tacit secrets (socialisation). She then writes down these phrases and gives them to her line manager (externalisation/articulation). The line manager revises the scripts to include such phrases, and issues the revised scripts to the call centre team (combination). Finally individual members of the call team build on this revised script, adding other phrases and enriching their own tacit knowledge base (internalisation).
Nonaka’s (1994:34) model is very useful as it provides insight into how knowledge can be transferred from an individual tacit level to the whole organisation at an explicit level. It also highlights the importance of making individual tacit knowledge explicit, to create what he refers to as ‘a spiral of learning and knowledge creation’.

### 3.3.3 Levels of Learning

There is seeming consensus amongst researchers of organisational learning that in order to begin to understand this field properly, the inter- and intra-relationships of individual level, team level and organisational level learning must be researched and understood (Argyris and Schön, 1978; Hedberg, 1981; Klimecki, Probst and Eberl, 1991; Dixon, 1992; Kim, 1993; Simons, 1995; Marquardt, 1996). With this in mind I will introduce, describe and critique some of the key models of individual learning, team learning and organisational-level learning. Figure 3.3 shows the key research models and theories of learning relating to the individual, team or organisation.

![Figure 3.3 The key research models and theories of learning relating to the individual, team and organisation.](image-url)
3.4 Individual Learning

It makes sense that in order to begin to understand team level and organisational level learning, understanding the process and context of individual, workplace learning is an important prerequisite. As Hedberg (1981: 6) explains:

‘Individuals’ learning is doubtless[ly] important in organisational learning. Organizations have no other brains and senses than those of their members.’

The majority of organisational behaviour texts begin their exploration of individual learning by looking at two broad fields from the psychology research, namely the behavioural and cognitive approaches to learning. According to Huczynski and Buchanan (2001), both of these theories have been developed using the same empirical data, but the interpretation of the data is what makes the two approaches different. It is beyond the scope of this literature review to explore these models in detail so I have summarised a few key contributions.

3.4.1 Behavioural Approach

The behavioural approach analyses learning through observable behaviour and it ignores the possibility that non-observable intervening mental processes (such as thinking) can have an effect on the learning process. Many of the theories that have come from the behavioural approach stem from research using animal experimentation.

Classical conditioning theory shows how the timing of a naturally occurring behaviour can be altered (Pavlov, 1928). Classical conditioning is also known as respondent conditioning. This is because it focuses on responses that are reflexive such as knee jerks, pupil contractions and salivation.

Another key theory coming from the behavioural approach is operant conditioning. This theory associates a voluntary response or behaviour with its consequence. Operant conditioning helps to explain how new patterns of behaviour become established. The effects of consequences on behaviour can be stated as:

- Behaviours will increase in frequency if they are rewarded.
Behaviours will increase in frequency if they result in the avoidance of an unpleasant event, or in something unpleasant being terminated.

Behaviours will decrease in frequency if they lead to something unpleasant happening.

Behaviours will decrease in frequency if they have been rewarded in the past but are subsequently no longer rewarded (Skinner, 1953).

There are criticisms of the behavioural approach to learning. Much of the research is based on animal experimentation, and this raises doubt as to its transferability and relevance to the complex human mind. Drives and reinforcements may be straightforward to define when experimenting with hungry animals, but become increasingly complicated to identify when examining groups and individuals. Moreover, what one person may perceive as a reward another may perceive as a punishment. By focusing on observable behaviour, the behavioural approach only provides a partial view of learning. It does not explore those areas which are 'particular and special to humans' Mullins (1999:361) such as:

• Personality
• Perceptions
• Motivations
• Attitudes
• Previous experiences including learning experiences
• Curiosity
• Desire to learn
• Incidental and accidental learning

3.4.2 Cognitive Approach
Cognitive approaches to learning attempt to explore the internal workings of the mind. Since this cannot be done directly, it is done through analysing feedback. The argument is, that it is self-feedback about the success of a previous personal behaviour that will lead to the modification or change made to that particular behaviour. Since feedback is
processed through the mind, it is through the analysis of feedback that cognitive psychologists explore learning.

Feedback can be used to update ‘internal representations’ and subsequently to refine and adapt inputs. There are four main types of feedback identified in the cognitive literature:

- **Intrinsic feedback** (Information that comes from within bodies such as muscles skin and balance).
- **Extrinsic feedback** (information that comes from the environment such as visuals).
- **Concurrent feedback** (information that arrives during behaviour and is used to control behaviour as it occurs).
- **Delayed feedback** (information that is received after having completed a task and is used to influence future performance).

The cognitive approach comes under some criticism in the research literature (Mullins, 1999: Marchington and Wilkinson, 2000: Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001). The approach may be rich and interesting, but it can be complex, vague and difficult to research. Questions are raised about its applicability to adult learning since much of this ‘traditional’ research has been conducted using animals and children.

### 3.4.3 Social Learning Theory

Another theory stemming from the cognitive approach and supported by cognitive psychologists is **social learning theory** (Bandura, 1977b). This theory argues that correct behaviours are learnt through experience and through the examples of others or socialisation. Central to this theory is a learner’s capabilities for reflection and self-determination (Bandura, 1977b).

An example of socialisation is when new employees begin working for an organisation. Not only will they undergo formal training and instruction, but also much of what they learn is through observing others at an informal level. Socialisation is accomplished without intentional intervention, by giving rewards such as praise, encouragement and recognition for correct behaviour. It is achieved by negative reinforcements and punishments, such as being ostracised for unacceptable behaviour.
Reflecting back to Nonaka’s (1991, 1994) research on tacit and explicit knowledge, this form of learning may actually enable the transfer of tacit skills from one employee to another. Furthermore reconsidering Sambrook’s (2003) distinctions between learning in work and learning at work, learning in work may incorporate forms of socialisation.

3.4.4 Individual Mental Models

Mental models (or cognitive maps) stem from the cognitive approach to learning. This area contributes to our understanding of the individual learning processes by appreciating how we, as individuals, have deeply rooted images with which we perceive the world in which we exist, and how this could/should affect our learning. Kim (1993) describes mental models as (1993: 39).

‘Mental models represent a person’s view of the world, including explicit and implicit understandings. Mental models provide the context in which to view and interpret new material, and they determine how stored information is relevant to a given situation. Mental models not only help us to make sense of the world we see, they can also restrict our understanding to that which makes sense within the mental model.’

Mental models approach memory as an active process and as Kim (1993:39) highlights, understanding active memory helps build an understanding of learning itself.

‘The concept of memory is commonly understood to be analogous to a storage device where everything we perceive and experience is filed away. However, we need to differentiate between stored memory like baseball trivia and active structures that affect our thinking process and the actions we take. That is, we need to understand the role of memory in the learning process itself.’

More researchers exploring organisational learning and the learning organisation are using mental models to link individual learning, through team-level to the organisational-level. This will be discussed in greater depth further on in this chapter.

Behavioural and cognitive approaches focus on building blocks, hierarchies of skills and reinforcing theory with examples (Marchington and Wilkinson, 2000). Iphofen (1998)
states that theorizing has progressed from basic-stimulus response ideas towards interest in more authentic accounts produced in learning dialogues. Many researchers within the field suggest that these approaches may be appropriate to traditional instructional situations such as school education, but not as appropriate for adult learning in and at work, partly due to the nature of adult learning and partly due to the nature of the work environment. (Harrison, 1998. Marchington and Wilkinson, 2000. Gibb, 2002). Figure 3.4 highlights how various components of traditional instruction can conflict with the realities of adult learning.

Figure 3.4 Instruction and Adult learners taken from Gibb (2002:87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>ADULT LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get attention</td>
<td>Have different kinds and degrees of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Can already perform many skills, get bored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td>Seek to avoid pain and embarrassment, dislike feeling exposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Pacing for different abilities, some bored, some lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice and feedback</td>
<td>Feel exposed and vulnerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant practice</td>
<td>Through experience, feel classrooms or cases are unrealistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td>Have own experiences to reflect on, dislike being ‘taught’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas traditional approaches view learning as ‘filling up empty vessels with prescribed and standardized bodies of knowledge, discrete predetermined capabilities and behaviours’ (Gibb (2002:88), experiential learning views learning as a cycle whereby the learner is proactively involved in ‘constructive learning’. This constructive learning occurs through experience and discovery (Gibb, 2002:87). The proactive nature of experiential learning is seen as a way of embracing the diverse needs of adult learners (as listed in figure 3.4) by directly integrating the learner with their learning.

Rogers (1969) is one of the earliest advocators of experiential learning. His research identifies four components of experiential learning (1969:5) personal involvement, self-initiation, pervasiveness and evaluation by the learner. Rogers’ research concludes that there is a need to create communities of learners, where the educator is facilitating change and learning, not instructing learners.
3.4.5 Experiential Cycles

More recently Kolb et al (1984) contribute an experiential cycle to the literature, as illustrated in Figure 3.5. This cycle has become extremely popular in management and organisational behaviour texts.

Figure 3.5 Experiential Learning Cycle taken from Kolb, Osland and Rubin (1984: 49)

Kolb et al’s experiential cycle has certain characteristics (1984:50). It has no specific starting point, and likewise it has no specific ending point. Learning is individual both in its direction and in its process. For learning to occur the cycle must complete its four stages. The direction that learning takes place is governed by the learners’ needs and goals, but needs to be clarified in order to prevent learning from becoming erratic and inefficient.

As shown in Figure 3.5 there are four stages to this cycle.

- The **concrete experience** stage is based on the learner’s perception of the objective world and can be planned or accidental.

- Reflective observation is when the learner actively thinks about this experience, its basic issues and its significance.

- The **abstract conceptualisation** stage is when the learner generalises from their reflections, and analyses this in order to develop a body of ideas, theory or
principle with which they can then apply to other, similar problems or situations. This subsequently leads to more successful behaviours in these given situations.

- Finally the **active experimentation** stage is when the learner tries out the learning in other similar situations. This stage would lead the learner to having a new concrete experience, and thus the cycle would continue to spiral around the subsequent stages.

Harrison (1988) criticises this cycle for providing an oversimplified explanation of the learning process. However, I think that it highlights the importance of reflection and internalisation (Mullins, 1999) and emphasises the significance of the synthesis between an individual’s behaviour and the evaluation of their actions.

**Figure 3.6 Kolb et al’s Learning Styles Inventory and Honey and Mumford’s Learning Styles Questionnaire**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kolb et al’s Learning Styles Inventory</th>
<th>Honey and Mumford’s Learning Styles Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An orientation towards <strong>concrete experience</strong> means that individuals adopt an intuitive stance, relying upon their personal judgement rather than systematic analysis. These individuals enjoy relating to people, being involved in <strong>real situations</strong>, and adopt an open minded approach to life</td>
<td><strong>Activists</strong> who learn best by active involvement in concrete tasks, and from relatively short tasks such as business games and competitive teamwork exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An orientation towards <strong>reflective observation</strong> leads individuals to view situations carefully, considering their meaning, and drawing out the implication of ideas. These people prefer to <strong>reflect</strong> on issues rather than acting, looking at questions from different points of view, and they value patient and thoughtful judgement.</td>
<td><strong>Reflectors</strong> who learn best by reviewing and reflecting upon what has happened in certain situations, where they are able to <strong>stand back</strong>, listen and <strong>observe</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An orientation towards <strong>abstract conceptualisation</strong> implies the learners emphasise the use of logic, ideas and concepts, opposing intuitive judgements. These individuals are good at systematic planning and quantitative analysis, and they value precise formulations and neat, conceptual systems.</td>
<td><strong>Theorists</strong> who learn best when new information can be located within the context of concepts and theories, and who are able to absorb new ideas when they are distanced from real-life situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An orientation towards <strong>active experimentation</strong> means that the individual enjoys practical applications, active involvement in change, and pragmatic concern with what works in practice. Achieving results is important for this group of learners, and they value having an impact on their working environment.</td>
<td><strong>Pragmatists</strong> who learn best when they see a link between new information and real life problems and issues, and from being exposed to techniques that can be applied immediately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this experiential learning cycle, Kolb et al (1984) and Honey and Mumford (1992) have developed learning styles instruments (see Figure 3.6). Unlike Kolb’s Cycle, which shows how the learning process may occur in individuals, the learning styles instruments attempt to classify learners into four learning style categories. Figure 3.6 compares Kolb et al’s (1984) and Honey and Mumford’s (1992) learning styles instruments.

I have highlighted words in figure 3.6 to demonstrate that there are similar themes between both models. My further observations include:

- Kolb’s concrete experience is very similar to Honey and Mumford’s Activists.
- Reflective observation is similar to Reflectors
- Abstract conceptualisation is similar to Theorists
- Active experimentation is similar to Pragmatists

Both of these learning style instruments show how different adult learners learn differently. For example a pragmatist may learn better solving a real working example, whilst a reflector may benefit from reflecting on their good and bad learning experiences. Such instruments provide a greater understanding of teaching and learning techniques in workplace learning. Some argue that these categories are somewhat idealistic and are not representative of real learners. Marchington and Wilkinson (2000) argue that the ‘reality’ is that learners are usually a combination of the different types. My opinion is that even if these models are idealistic they still generate an awareness of the potential differences in the way people learn and this awareness is insightful and enriching in itself.

Koffman’s (1992) Observe Assess Design Implement (OADI) cycle of learning (Figure 3.7) contains similar features to that of Kolb’s cycle, but its labels have clearer connections to work-related activities conducted in an organizational context’ (Kim, 1993: 38).
I have a number of queries concerning the OADI model. For example, why is the cycle moving in an anti-clockwise direction compared to Kolb's? Is this an important differentiating feature? How does the OADI cycle fit in with Honey and Mumford's Learning styles? I think that the usefulness of the tool could be improved through the clarification of these and perhaps other questions.

3.4.6 Workplace learning.


- Instrumental learning (learning how to do the job better once the basic standard of performance has been achieved).
- Dialogic learning (involves interacting with others in ways that will produce a growing knowledge and understanding of the culture of the organisation, and how it typically achieves its goals).
- Self-reflective learning (leads individuals to redefine their current perspective in order to develop new patterns of understanding, thinking and behaving).
Instrumental learning will often initially involve formal training. Once such training has been given, tacit and explicit knowledge can be learned on the job, both in and at the workplace.

Dialogic learning is often required when an individual needs to acclimatise to a new environment. Harrison (1988) identifies mentoring as a powerful way of ensuring dialogic learning. Socialisation may also contribute to dialogic learning.

Self-reflective learning is required when people have to operate within new roles within the organisation or in situations that are very different to what they are accustomed to. Self-reflective learning is very challenging and according to Harrison (1988:230) as it requires ‘breaking out of old mindsets it requires unlearning as well as new learning’.

Due to its reflective nature, it could be argued that experiential learning is a form of self-reflective learning. Similarly, Harrison argues that Argyris and Schön’s (1978) ‘double-loop’ learning is a form of self-reflective learning. Argyris and Schön’s (1978) work on double-loop learning will be discussed further on in this chapter.

Organisations are increasingly using teams for encouraging entrepreneurship. Subsequently, understanding the processes and the relationships within team learning could not only provide valuable contributions to understanding organisational learning, but could also benefit the theory and practice of corporate entrepreneurship. Yorks et al (2003:103) highlights this issue.

‘Team learning has been championed as an important ingredient for organizations striving to maintain competitive advantage through organizational learning in increasingly turbulent task environment. The concept of team learning positions it as the pivotal element linking the individual to the whole.’

Nevertheless, it seems from a review of the research literature that team learning has received less attention than both individual and organisational learning. I suggest that a
richer foundation of literature on the processes and constructs of team learning could enrich our understanding of both organisational learning and corporate entrepreneurship.

Many texts on individual learning state that the theory can also be taken to refer to group and team learning (Harrison, 1998. Marchington and Wilkinson, 2000). Since teams comprise of individuals, I agree that many aspects of individual learning do apply to teams, this said, the collective nature of team learning implies that there are constructs present that distinguish and complicate it from individual learning. This review of team learning focuses on those aspects of learning that are specific to collective learning.

A frequently cited definition of a team is.

'A team is a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, set of performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable.' Katzenbach and Smith (1993:112)

This definition highlights how teams exist to share their expertise in order to achieve some goal, and team members perceive themselves as having a shared responsibility. Katzenbach and Smith (1993) distinguish teams from working groups, suggesting that teams require both individual and mutual accountability and this is what makes a team more than the sum of its individual members.

'Teams rely on more than group discussion, debate, and decision. on more than sharing information and best practice performance standards. Teams produce discrete work products through joint contributions of their members. This is what makes performance levels greater than the sum of all the individual bests of team members.' (1993:112)

Before exploring group and team learning, I feel it is necessary to summarise key theories on group (or team) development. I feel that it is not practical or necessary to review group theory in detail for this research project. What follows is a brief introduction to a few of the key theories on group work within the management literature. Figure 3.8 is a summary of the key contributions to group theory. Mohrman et al (1995) provides seven benefits of working within a group. Steiner describes three forms of group task that require different capabilities from group members. additive,
conjunctive and disjunctive. Huzynski and Buchanan (2004) define formal and informal groups and describe how each may emerge. One of the most frequently cited theories on groups is Tuckman and Jensen's (1977) five stages of group development, which are forming, storming, norming, performing and adjourning. Figure 3.8 illustrates some of the issues that a group may face (Cohen et al, 1995).

3.5 Team Learning

There are numerous definitions of team learning. Pearn (1998:139) offers the following. 'Team learning links performing and learning, which includes the way teams select their vision and goals.' Senge (1990) identifies team learning as one of five disciplines necessary to realise a learning organisation (the other disciplines are shared vision, mental models, personal mastery and systems thinking – these will be discussed in the review of the literature on the learning organisation). Senge (1990:236) defines team learning as:

'the process of aligning and developing the capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire'

He proposes that for teams to learn effectively, shared vision (a vision that many people are committed to, because it reflects their own personal vision) and personal mastery (approaching one's life as a creative work) are required. Both Pearn's and Senge's definitions see team learning as a process, and imply some degree of commonality of purpose.
### Benefits of working within a group (Mohrman et al. 1995)

- They allow organisations to develop and deliver products and services quickly and cost-effectively while maintaining quality.
- They enable organisations to learn and retain that learning more effectively.
- Cross-functional groups promote improved quality management.
- Cross-functional design groups can undertake effective process reengineering.
- Production time can be reduced if tasks performed concurrently by individuals are performed concurrently by people in groups.
- Group-based organisations with flat structures can be monitored, co-ordinated and directed more effectively if the functional unit is the group rather than the individual.
- Groups can handle the rise in organisational information-processing requirements caused by increasing complexity better than individuals.

### Types of group task (Steiner, 1972)

- **Additive Task** – a task that is dependant on the sum of all the individual efforts within the group.
- **Conjunctive Task** – a task dependant on the effort and performance of the group's least capable member.
- **Disjunctive Task** – a task dependant on the groups most capable member.

### Types of Group

- **Formal Group** – one which has been deliberately created to achieve some part of an organisation's collective purpose.
- **Informal Group** – a collection of individuals who become a group when members develop interdependencies, influence one another's behaviour and contribute to mutual need satisfaction.

### Stages of Group Development

- **Tuckman & Jensen (1977)**
  - **Orientation Phase**
  - **Norming** – This is the cohesion stage when members develop closer relationships. Task-wise members are more open about goals and there is an increase in data flow.
  - **Performing** – At this stage the group concern is with achieving the job in hand. Task-wise there is a high commitment to objectives.
  - **Adjourning** – This is the final stage the group may disband due to achieving objectives or members leaving.

### Issues facing any workgroup

- **Cohen, Fink, Gadon & Willits, (1995. 142)**
  - Atmosphere and relationships
  - Member participation
  - Goal understanding and acceptance
  - Listening and information sharing
  - Handling disagreements and conflict
  - Decision-making
  - Evaluation of member performance
  - Expressing feelings
  - Division of labour
  - Leadership
  - Attention to process

#### 3.5.1 A model of Team Learning

Kasl, Dechant and Marsick (1993) approach team learning as an experience. Their study derives four phases of group learning. They specifically choose to label their research 'group learning' as opposed to 'team learning' as their intention is:

'to communicate the possibility that [their] model is applicable to groups who are not functioning as units of organizations, such as'
community action groups, research teams, self help groups, etc.)
(1993:143-4)

The data underpinning their study was collected from two profit-oriented corporations, and therefore helps in understanding team learning in dynamic organisational-related contexts.

Their four phases of group learning are as follows (Kasl et al 1993:144-5):

- **Phase 1: Contained learning**: a group exists, but learning, if any, is contained within individual members.
- **Phase 2: Collected learning**: Individuals begin to share information and meaning perspectives. Group knowledge is an aggregate of individual knowledge. there is not yet an experience of having knowledge that is uniquely the group’s own.
- **Phase 3: Constructed learning**: the group creates knowledge of its own. Individual's knowledge and meaning perspectives are integrated, not aggregated.
- **Phase 4: Continuous learning**: the group habituates processes of transforming its experience into knowledge.

Kasl et al (1993:145) describe these phases as having particular characteristics. Firstly, 'these phases are described as developmental to indicate progression and growth in learning. this does not mean that groups never regress.' Secondly, 'individual groups can cycle through the learning phases starting at Phase 1 with each new learning task'. and finally 'as groups develop skills as 'learning bodies' it is likely that very little time is spent in the first two phases of group learning.

They propose how groups are propelled from one phase to the next through the following propositions (ibid:155):

1. Groups move from the contained to the collected phase when particular learning conditions are present, including. mutual trust, respect and regard among the participants, as well as perception that association in the context of a group can bring personal benefit.
2. Groups move from the collected to the constructed phase when members listen carefully and respectfully to each other, and understand each other with enough depth that multiple perspectives can be integrated to construct meaning.

3. The energy that propels a group from constructed to continuous learning is created when the group frames its identity as a learning group, becomes conscious of monitoring its processes as learning processes, rather than the processes of interpersonal interaction and role fulfilment that are described in the groups dynamics literature.

With reference to their first proposition, Kasl et al (1993) identify mutual trust, respect and regard as necessary for movement. Other contributors to the field have discussed the importance of trust in team learning. Lawler (1992) implicated trust as being vital in the implementation of self-managed work-teams. Moreover, in a recent empirical study, Edmondson (1999) showed that work groups with high levels of trust amongst its members are more likely to engage in learning behaviours than other groups.

Edmondson (1999) and Edmondson, Bohmer and Pisano (2001) reintroduce the concept of psychological safety, discussed in an earlier paper by Popper and Lipshitz (1988) as an important in fostering collective learning in work teams. Edmonson, Bohmer and Pisano (2001) describe psychological safety as ‘a shared belief that well-intentioned interpersonal risks will not be punished’ (p688). In order to achieve perceived psychological safety, I suggest that a high level of trust amongst team members would be necessary. The relationship between trust and psychological safety is not discussed in the research literature. Empirical investigation of this relationship would make an insightful research agenda.

I feel that Kasl et al’s second proposition links with the concept of emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence is defined by Mayer and Salovey (1977:10) as
'An ability to perceive accurately, appraise and express emotion, the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought, the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge, and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth'.

Druskat and Wolff (2001) have evaluated emotional intelligence and its interaction with teams. They found that teams can develop high levels of emotional intelligence, and in the process, they can increase their overall performance. In support of this, Kernan (2003:12), in an empirically substantiated report, highlights that most of the participating respondents mentioned emotional intelligence as a 'unifying thread of their work with teams'.

The third proposition proffered by Kasl et al (1993) is the most exciting in relation to this research project. Kasl et al (1993), tentatively suggest that in order to move from constructed learning to continuous learning a group has to actually frame and identify itself as a learning group (regardless of the purpose and goals of the group) and subsequently treat all of its activities as a learning experience. This third proposition presents new perspectives for researching the relationships between learning and corporate venture team activity. The perspective of teams' framing themselves as learning teams raises possible research questions, such as:

- How do successful and unsuccessful venture groups frame and identify themselves?
- How do informal venture groups frame and identify themselves compared with formal venture groups? What are the implications of this?

Such questions coupled with issues raised via the other two propositions, such as trust and emotional intelligence could act towards the basis for a future research agenda within the fields corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning.

3.5.2 Group Learning

Cranton (1996:25) identifies three types of group learning, based on 'a well-respected philosophical framework' offered by Habermas (1971). Cranton (1996) identifies three types of knowledge as a learning goal. People have three basic interests, each of which
may lead them to acquire a different kind of knowledge’. The knowledge acquired may be:

- **Instrumental knowledge** is derived from a person’s interest in ways to control and manipulate their environment, in order to have shelter, food and transportation. Instrumental knowledge is ‘scientific, cause-and-effect information’.

- **Communicative knowledge** is derived from a person wanting to understand others, and the social norms and the context within which they live and work. Communicative knowledge consists of mutual understanding and social knowledge.

- **Emancipatory knowledge** is derived from a person’s basic interest in their own personal growth and development, including freedom from the constraints of not knowing. This knowledge consists of increased self-awareness and transformation of a person’s perspectives.

Cranton (1996:26) argues that instrumental knowledge, communicative knowledge and emancipatory knowledge form the foundation of cooperative, collaborative and transformative group learning, respectively. Cooperative group learning is described as when the ‘focus of learning is on the subject matter rather than on the interpersonal processes.’ This type of group learning is structured and appropriate and popular in military education, health professional education and in most technical training.

‘In cooperative group learning the ‘educator’ designs the exercises, activities and experiences, or problems the learners work through. The learning is structured, including objectives, time constraints, detailed formats for the presentation of products, and perhaps the evaluation guidelines. In this role the educator remains the expert, keeps position power, and is in control of the learning process of evaluation’ (Cranton, 1996:27)

Collaborative group learning is where individuals work together to construct knowledge rather than to discover objective truths (Cranton, 1996:27). In collaborative group learning communities or groups socially produce knowledge (Imel 1991), and anyone can participate in the process of shaping and testing ideas. Ideas, feelings, experiences,
information and insights are exchanged, and through this exchange process, group members come to an understanding that is mutually accepted. In collaborative group learning 'the educator establishes the atmosphere in which inquiry is possible and participates in the shared exploration.' (Cranton, 1996:27)

Transformative group learning occurs when groups revise their underlying expectations, assumptions, or perspectives. This type of learning empowers the individuals within groups.

'In transformative group learning, individuals take responsibility for their own learning, they seek out new perspectives, challenge commonly held views, question themselves and each other, and often work toward change outside of the group or program. Learners may identify problems and constraints that they share, define collective goals, and engage in group action to address their concerns.' (1996:30)

Transformative group learning is described as occurring in groups where social change is a goal. Such groups include community action groups, environmental groups, political networks and women's groups. Even though Cranton's work looks at group learning in a broad context, I think that it would be interesting to explore how her typology and theories fit into an organisational context and entrepreneurship culture.

3.6 Organisational Learning (OL) and Learning Organisation (LO)
The question as to whether organisations can actually learn is widely debated in research literature. Popper and Lipshitz (1998) refer to this as the problem of anthropomorphism in organisational learning – attributing human qualities to nonhuman entities. For example March and Olsen (1976) state that learning implies thought and that the concepts of organisational learning and learning organisation attributes human characteristics to organisational structures. Conversely, Hedberg (1981) contends that organisations are learning entities because.

'Organizations do not have brains, but they have cognitive systems and memories. As individuals develop their personalities, personal habits and beliefs over time, organizations develop word views and ideologies. Members come and go, and leadership changes, but organizations' memories preserve certain behaviours, mental maps, norms, and values over time' Hedberg (1981:6)
Likewise Kim (1993:37) maintains that ‘organizations can learn independent of any specific individual but not independent of all individuals’.

Following from this, it is widely appreciated in the research literature that organisational learning is more than just the cumulative result of individual members’ learning. (Argyris and Schön, 1978. Hedberg, 1981. Dixon, 1992)

‘There is no organizational learning without individual learning, and that individual learning is a necessary but insufficient condition for organizational learning.’ Argyris and Schön (1978:20)

Earlier on in this chapter, the differences between the definitions of organisational learning, learning organisation and a learning organisation were discussed. It was explained how organisational learning describes the learning process of an organisation, how learning organisation can describe either a concept functioning as a vision or a subject of scientific study and research and how a learning organisation describes an organisation that possesses some major characteristics or salient features of learning organisation. The rest of this chapter looks at key contributions to the subjects of research of organisational learning and learning organisation.

Following from the analysis of the definitions of organisational learning, learning organisation and a learning organisation, it makes sense that some researchers have commented that literature within the field of organisational learning concentrates on understanding the learning processes within organisational settings, whilst the literature within the field of learning organisation is geared towards creating an ideal type (Easterby-Smith, 1997. Tsang, 1997). There also seems to be divisions in the ‘type’ of author behind contributions to the fields of organisational learning and learning organisation. Easterby-Smith and Araujo (1999:8) describe two communities of authors, consultants and academic researchers. Those contributing to the learning organisation literature are represented by consultants, and those contributing to the organisational learning literature are represented by academic researchers. Following from this Easterby-Smith and Araujo criticise the academic quality of contributions to learning organisation literature. This, they argue, has been caused from the growing number of
contributions from consultants who have caught onto the commercial significance of learning organisation, inspired by a number of best selling books by such as Senge (1990) and Pedler et al (1991,1996).

‘Although these accounts are often very insightful, some may lack the critical objectivity of traditional academic work.’ Easterby-Smith and Araujo (1999:2)

Since contributions to the fields of organisational learning and learning government are different in their authors, quality of research and research objectives, they will be discussed separately.

3.6.1 The Disciplines of Organisational Learning
Before reviewing the key contributions to the organisational learning literature, I will introduce a summary of disciplines of organisational learning from Easterby-Smith (1997). The summary is reproduced in Figure 3.9. His work highlights the many disciplinary perspectives that exist within the field and demonstrates the contributions made by each perspective and the problems that each perspective attempts to solve. His work acts as an informative foundation with which to build this section of the literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Contributions / ideas from perspective are:</th>
<th>Main problems seen as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Psychology and Organisational Development | Human Development | • A view that there are different hierarchical levels to individual learning  
• Recognition of the importance of context  
• The assumption that ideas about individual learning can be adjusted to relate to organizational learning  
• Recognition of the importance of cognitive maps and frames of thinking  
• Recognition of the interrelationships between thinking and action | • How to move the content of learning from individuals to the collectivity  
• Defensive reactions among individuals and groups  
• Poor communications between organizational members which can be improved through greater dialogue |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management science</th>
<th>Information processing</th>
<th>Sociology and organizational theory</th>
<th>Social structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                    | • The creation and dissemination of information  
• The notion of organizational knowledge  
• Levels of learning are progressively desirable  
• Informating  
• The holistic view | • The distorting effect of organizational politics  
• The tendency of managers to behave in 'nonrational' ways  
• Conflicts between short- and long-term agendas  
• Unlearning |
| Strategy            | Competitiveness         | From this perspective the main problems may be seen as self-inflicted since they arise from the pressures due to competitive forces and the structural changes resulting from organizational growth. |
| Production management | Efficiency | Limitations in using single criteria to compare organizational configurations  
• The methodological weakness of conducting comparative research |
| Cultural anthropology | Meaning systems         | The relativity of cultural beliefs  
• That it may be difficult to transfer ideas from one cultural setting to another. |

- Drawing attention to the politics, conflict and power as normal realities of all organizations, and not something that can be avoided by the introduction of better information systems.  
- Providing a fundamental questioning of the nature of learning in organizations, and the process of construction that underpins it  
- Raising the question about whose interests are served by the concept of organizational learning

- A strong belief in the competitive advantages that can be gained from an application of the principles of learning  
- Identification of the continuing debate over how far organizations are capable of adapting to changing environmental circumstances and niches  
- The importance of direct experience and the significance of the tacit knowledge that can result  
- Exchanges of information are crucial among communities of high technology companies, but among joint-venture partners the exchange of general management practices is more important.

- The use of productivity as a criterion to assess organizational learning  
- The concept of the learning curve  
- The debate about endogenous and exogenous sources of learning  
- The impact of organizational design on the transfer of individual to organizational learning

- To draw attention to the importance of values and beliefs  
- To show that culture may affect both the process and nature of organizational learning  
- To raise the question of whether some cultures may be considered as superior to others in their facilitation of learning
Easterby-Smith (1997: 1086) stresses that the ‘disciplines’ identified serve as mere labels for the different standpoints from which the contributions to the literature have been made and are not disciplines in the strict sense of the word. Some are recognized as sub-disciplines or as specialisms within the field of management. His discussion does not attempt to fit authors into any one particular ‘box’.

3.7 Models of Organisational Learning
The next section will explore models of organisational learning. Cross-references will be made to Easterby-Smith's (1997) categories during the course of the review. Some authors produce ideas that are multi-disciplinary and match more than one of Easterby-Smith's categories proposed above.

3.7.1 March and Olsen's Cyclical Model
March and Olsen (1976) propose a cyclic model of organisational learning that is a ‘stimulus-response system’ (Hedberg, 1981). The model makes a clear distinction between individual and organisational learning. A learning cycle begins when an individual’s actions contribute to the organisations' actions. An organisation’s actions are shown to induce environmental responses (see figure 3.10). Environmental responses are conveyed back to the organisation, which in turn alter individuals' cognitive maps, and therefore influence individuals’ future actions.

Kim (1993) suggests that if the environmental response is static and unchanging, individual beliefs, actions and therefore organisational actions will also remain unchanged. I question the model as individual learning and organisational learning are not represented. Individual action and beliefs, and organisational action are shown, however, there is no link provided from action and beliefs to learning.
March and Olsen's model addresses the issue of incomplete learning cycles. They argue that this will occur when learning is impaired or prevented due to either weak or broken links in the cycle. Four cases are identified that weaken or break the learning cycle and are shown in figure 3.10 accordingly.

1. Role-constrained learning (this can occur when individual learning has no affect on individual action, due to the constraints on the individual’s role).
2. Audience learning (this can occur when the individual affects organisational action in an ambiguous way).
3. Superstitious learning (this can occur when the link between organisational action and environmental response is broken).
4. Learning under ambiguity (occurs when the individual affects organisational action, which in turn, affects the environment, but the connections among the events are not clear).

The model is criticised in the research literature for being driven by environmental responses (Kim, 1993). Kim (1993) argues that March and Olsen’s (1976) model implies that all organisational learning is in some way affected by the environment, and it neglects to explore the organisational learning that may occur from within the organisation, independent of the external environment. Referring back to Easterby-Smith’s (1997) typology, I think that March and Olsen’s model fits best into the ‘information processing’ category.
3.7.2 Argyris and Schön's Feedback Model

Argyris and Schön's (1978) model of organisational learning (see figure 3.11) draws upon the ideas created from cybernetic cognitive learning theory. In cybernetics, the notion of feedback is a critical component of learning, and Argyris and Schön extend the idea of feedback to the organisational level.

Figure 3.11 Single-loop and Double-loop learning taken from Argyris (1995)

Argyris and Schön (1978) view learning as occurring under two conditions. Firstly, learning occurs when an organisation achieves what it initially sets out to achieve, 'that is there is a match between its design for action and actuality of outcome' (Argyris, 1995:8). Secondly learning occurs when something goes wrong, but is rectified, 'that is, a mismatch is turned into a match' (Argyris, 1995:8). Single-loop learning describes the process whereby something that is going wrong is 'detected and corrected without questioning or altering underlying values of the system' (Argyris, 1995:8). As figure 3.11 shows, single-loop learning occurs when either.

1. Matches are created.
2. Or when mismatches are detected, and then are corrected by changing some actions, which in turn alter consequences to create matches.

Single-loop learning occurs within the set of governing variables. Governing variables are described by Argyris (1995:9) as.

'The preferred states that individuals strive to “satisfice” when they are acting. These governing variables are not the underlying beliefs or values people espouse. They are the variables that can be inferred, by observing the actions of individuals acting as agents for the organization, to drive and guide their actions.'
Otherwise stated, single-loop learning is concerned with accepting change without questioning underlying assumptions and core beliefs. Double-loop learning occurs through altering the organisation's governing variables. So in double-loop learning mismatches are identified and then through altering governing variables, actions are altered to correct mismatches. As Harrison (1988:230) explains double-loop learning is 'concerned to question why [a] problem arose in the first place and tackle its root causes'. Argyris (1995) clearly states that both single-loop and double-loop learning only occur when the solution to a problem has actually been produced.

Deutero-learning is the highest level of learning in Argyris and Schön’s typology, and can be described as how an organisation develops the ability to pre-empt changes in its environment (Birdthistle, 2003), and learn how to learn (Worrel, 1995). Deutero-learning is concerned with the why and the how to change the organisation. Deutero-learning facilitates the learning and improving of organisational processes through building on the single-loop and double-loop learning processes. Argyris and Schön acknowledge, that in actuality, learning in organisations is normally restricted to single-loop learning and not double-loop learning. They also suggest that deutero-learning is predominantly used for reflection about single loop learning and not double-loop learning.

Argyris and Schön’s model fits within the management science ontology of organisational learning, as its underpinning theory draws heavily from that of cybernetics, where information processing and feedback are central processes.

Argyris and Schön are not unique in offering a typology of learning levels. Figure 3.12 (adapted from Fiol and Lyles, 1985. Perin and Sampaio, 2003) shows the many different contributions found within the organisational learning research literature that separate organisational learning into three levels of learning. However, Argyris and Schön’s labels (single-loop, double-loop and deutero learning) are probably the most well known and frequently cited.
Figure 3.12 Labels for the Three levels of learning found in the Research Literature adapted from Fiol and Lyles (1995) and Perin and Sampio (2003:3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Single-loop learning</th>
<th>Double-loop learning</th>
<th>Deutero-learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bateson (1973)</td>
<td>Learning level I</td>
<td>Learning level II</td>
<td>Deutero-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedberg (1981)</td>
<td>Adjustment learning</td>
<td>Turnover learning</td>
<td>Turnaround learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrivastava (1983)</td>
<td>Adaptive learning</td>
<td>Assumption sharing</td>
<td>Development of knowledge base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiol and Lyes (1985)</td>
<td>Lower-level learning</td>
<td>Higher level learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauzke (1989)</td>
<td>Raising effectiveness</td>
<td>Learning from experience</td>
<td>Change in knowledge structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garratt (1990)</td>
<td>Operational learning cycle</td>
<td>Policy learning cycle</td>
<td>Integrated learning cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klimecki et al (1991)</td>
<td>Improvement Learning</td>
<td>Change learning</td>
<td>Learning to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sattelberger (1991)</td>
<td>Organizational change</td>
<td>Organizational development</td>
<td>Organizational transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staehle (1991)</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Equilibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawlowsky (1992)</td>
<td>Idiosyncratic learning</td>
<td>Adaptation to environment</td>
<td>Learning to solve problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.3 Huber's Processual Model

Huber (1991) proposes a construct and process model of organisational learning based on a thorough review of the research literature. (1991:90), please refer to Huber's work for a complete description of his model. His model explores organisational learning through discussion around four learning-related constructs

- Knowledge acquisition (the process by which knowledge is obtained).
- Information distribution (process by which information from different sources is shared and thereby leads to new information or understanding).
- Information interpretation (process by which distributed information is given one or more commonly understood interpretation).
- Organizational memory (which knowledge is stored for future use).

Figure 3.13 (on the next page) shows the subconstructs and subprocesses relating to knowledge acquisition, information distribution, information interpretation and organizational memory. Huber proposes that organisations acquire information through five processes.
- Congenital learning (a combination of the knowledge inherited at an organisation's conception and the additional knowledge acquired prior to its birth).
- Experiential learning (this is knowledge acquired through direct experience at an organisation's birth).
- Vicarious learning (this is learning through imitation of competitors).
- Grafting (this is when an organisation increases their existing store of knowledge by acquiring and grafting on new members who possess knowledge not previously available within the organisation).
- Searching and noticing (this is when an organisation increases its existing knowledge base through tasks such as scanning, focused searches and performance monitoring).

Figure 3.13 Constructs and Processes associated with Organizational Learning taken from Huber (1991:90)

Huber (1991) identifies information distribution as being the construct that determines the occurrence and breadth of organisational learning. He points out that distribution of
information can lead to an increase in the rate of occurrence of new information through open sharing of information between departments. According to Huber (1991) the breadth of organisational learning is increased through information distribution when information is widely distributed in an organisation. This makes information more accessible to individuals and groups, therefore facilitates learning. Information interpretation is the third learning-related construct in Huber's model of organisational learning processes.

'It seems reasonable to conclude that more learning has occurred when more and more varied interpretations have been developed, because such development changes the range of organization's potential behaviours, and this is congruent with the definition of learning. It also seems reasonable to conclude that more learning has occurred when more of the organization's units understand the nature of the various interpretations held by other units' (1991:95).

Huber argues that more learning occurs in an organisation when there are wide ranging and diverse interpretations held by its individuals. Additionally, more learning occurs when there is a wide understanding between individuals of other members' interpretations.

Huber's (1991:105) final learning construct is Organisational Memory. He argues that the problems associated with poor organisational memory are more complex than mere 'considerations of the deficiencies of humans as repositories of organizational information and knowledge'. He identifies three problems associated with poor organisational memory.

- The 'knowledge-gap' that is created when personnel leave the organisation
- Due to lack of anticipation for future needs, a substantial amount of information is either not kept by the organisation (e.g. blackboards get erased, or is not easy to retrieve within the organisation.
- Organisational members who require information often do not know how to find the information, where to find it and whether the information is available within the organisation.
When I try to fit Huber's (1991) model of organisational learning into the categories in Figure 3.9 it seems to fit into two categories, that is, management science perspective and the psychology & organisational development perspective. Its emphasis on information acquisition, distribution and storage fit in with the information processing ontology of the management science discipline, and its focus on the process of interpreting data and shared meaning contributes to the human development ontology of psychology and organisational development.

3.7.4 Kim's OADI SMM
Kim's (1993) OADI-SMM (observe, assess, design, implement - shared mental models) model of organisational learning proposes how individual learning may be transferred to the organisation through mental models. His work draws on research by March and Olsen (1975), Argyris and Schön (1978), Kolb (1985), Senge (1990) and Koffman (1992). The model, as illustrated in figure 3.14, has a big disadvantage in that it is very difficult to explain and it is time consuming to understand. It is substantive and builds on the empirical and theoretical work of others, which is sometimes a weakness in contributions to the field. There are four progressive stages to the model. Individual learning and mental models, shared mental models, applying March and Olsen's OL cycle, and incorporating Argyris and Schön's single-loop and double-loop learning.

Kim constructs his integrated model around four processes. The first is the process of individual learning. His work draws from the experiential learning theory of Kolb et al (1985) and Koffman (1992). Reflecting back to the discussion of Koffman's OADI cycle in section 3.4.5, it is shown as a four-stage process. observe, assess, design and implement (see figures 3.9 and 3.14). Kim argues that even though the OADI cycle makes a valuable contribution in understanding the learning process, it neglects to address the role of memory. Kim uses mental models as a means of appreciating the role of memory and in his model and shows Koffman's OADI cycle linking to individual mental models (frameworks and routines). I am not completely convinced that accounting for individual mental models of learning will subsequently account for
the role of individual memory. I feel that mental models are more than just memory, and memory is more than mental models.

Figure 3.14 An Integrated Model of Organizational Learning: OADI-Shared Mental Models (SMM) cycle taken from Kim (1993:44)

In a draft version of this chapter, I spent a number of pages describing the model and how it was put together. I have decided to omit this now, as it is not relevant given the findings of my research. For a fuller explanation on the mode please visit the originating article. Rosengarten (1999) further criticises the model for its lack of consideration of team learning. This said, the model draws on respected theory, and
when relating it to Easterby-Smith's (1997) disciplines of organisational learning I feel that the model lends itself to several ontological perspectives. Its application of both March and Olsen’s (1976) and Argyris and Schön’s (1978) models of learning contribute towards the information processing ontology of management science. Its careful consideration of both individual and organisational mental models contributes greatly to the disciplines of psychology and organisational development. Moreover, through its consideration of collective and shared mental model, it contributes to cultural anthropology.

3.7.5 Crossan, Lane and White’s 4I Framework

The 4I framework (see Figure 3.15) was developed by Crossan, Lane and White (1999) and links four micro processes (intuiting, interpreting, integrating and institutionalizing – the 4I’s to three levels (individual, group and organisation). Crossan, Lane and White (1999) view organisational learning as the principle means of achieving strategic renewal within an enterprise and their interest in strategic renewal is the underlying reason for the development of their 4I framework.

Four key premises form the foundations of their framework (1999:523). Firstly, organisational learning involves a tension between assimilating new learning (exploration) and using what has been learned (exploitation). Secondly, OL is multi-level (individual, group and organisational). Thirdly, the four social and psychological processes of intuiting, interpreting, integrating and institutionalizing link the three levels of OL. Finally, cognition affects action and vice versa.

Figure 3.15, overleaf, describes the four processes identified by Crossan, Lane and White (1999) and shows at which levels they occur and the input and outcomes of the learning processes. As shown, intuiting and interpreting occur at the individual level. Intuiting is the beginning of new learning, and appears to be a largely subconscious process. Crossan et al (1999:527) emphasize that the subconscious process is particularly prevalent in entrepreneurial intuiting. Furthermore, they highlight that since no language exists to describe the insight or to explain intended action at the intuiting
stage of learning, 'imagery sometimes called 'visions', and metaphors aid the individual in his or her interpretation of the insight and in communicating it to others'.

**Figure 3.15 Learning in Organisations: Four processes through Three levels adapted from Crossan et al (1999:525) and Crossan and Hulland (2003:1090)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description of Process</th>
<th>Inputs/ Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td><strong>Intuiting:</strong> The preconscious recognition of the pattern and or possibilities inherent in a personal stream of experience. This process can affect the intuitive individual's behaviour, but it only affects others as they attempt to (inter) act with that individual.</td>
<td>Experiences Images Metaphors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td><strong>Interpreting:</strong> The explaining of an insight, or idea to one's self and to others. This process goes from the preverbal and requires the development of language</td>
<td>Language Cognitive map Conversation/ dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td><strong>Integrating:</strong> The process of developing shared understanding amongst individuals and the taking of coordinated action through mutual adjustment. Dialogue and joint action are crucial to the development of shared understanding. This process will initially be ad hoc and informal, but if the coordinated action taking is recurring and significant it will be institutionalised.</td>
<td>Shared understandings Mutual adjustment Interactive systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Institutionalizing:</strong> the process of ensuring that routine actions occur. Tasks are defined, actions specified and organizational mechanisms put in place to ensure that certain actions occur. Institutionalizing is the process of embedding learning that has occurred by individuals and groups into the institutions of organization including systems, structures, procedures and strategy.</td>
<td>Routines Diagnostic systems Rules and procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreting begins picking up on the conscious elements of the learning process. It is through this process that individuals develop cognitive maps (or mental models) about the environment in which they exist. Crossan et al (1999) state that language and dialogue play an important role in this process, as it enables the learner to communicate and explain what were once hunches, sensations or feelings. As interpretive processes move beyond the individual, and becomes embedded within the work group or team, it becomes integrative.
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The focus on integrating is coherent, collective action (Crossan et al, 1999). This requires shared understanding between group or team members, and continuous conversation plays an important role in producing this.

Institutionalizing sets OL apart from individual learning. Crossan et al (1999) agree with many researchers, in that OL is more than just the sum of its members learning. Here Crossan et al (1999) focus on the ‘learning that becomes embedded in the systems, structures, strategy, routines, prescribed practices of the organisation, and investments in information systems and infrastructure’ (1999:529). Institutionalizing provides a means of leveraging the learning of individual members.

Figure 3.16 illustrates how the four micro processes link to the three levels of learning within organisations through the feedback and feed forward loops.

Figure 3.16 The 4I model of Organizational Learning as a dynamic process, taken from Crossan, Lane and White (1999:532)
Crossan et al (1999) state that the processes are progressive and sequenced, through each level, but not every process occurs at every level within an organisation. As one moves through from the individual level of intuiting/interpreting, through group integrating to organisational institutionalizing, the process of learning becomes less fluid and incremental. Organisational Learning is described by Crossan et al (1999) as occurring over time and across levels. A tension is created between producing new learning (feed forward) and exploiting or using what has already been learned (feedback). Crossan et al describe the tension creating process as follows (1999:532).

'Through feed forward processes, new ideas and actions flow from the individual to the group to the organization levels. At the same time, what has already been learned feeds back from the organization to group and individual levels, affecting how people act and think. The concurrent nature of the feed-forward and feedback processes creates a tension, which can be understood by arraying the levels against one another.'

A very interesting and relevant point made by Crossan et al (1999) is the problems that arise between interpreting and integrating (feedforward) and institutionalizing and intuiting (feedback). Highly institutionalized organisations (e.g. large, bureaucratic, corporations) may drive out the individual intuiting process (e.g. individual intrapreneurs). As Crossan et al (1999) explain.

'The language and logic that form the collective mindset of the organization and the resulting investment in assets present a formidable fortress of physical and cognitive barriers to change. Further, members of the organization must step back from proven, objective successes and allow unproven, subjectively based experimentation.' (1999:533)

This is particularly interesting and relevant to this research project, because it provides a framework (through its examination of feedback from institutionalizing to intuiting) for exploring the barriers to entrepreneurial activity within large organisations. Since a defining point of this model is that it explores both feedback and feed-forward, then the model should provide insight into factors that encourage entrepreneurship within large organisations.
The 4I framework is unique compared with the other models that have been described so far, in that it connects individual, team and organisational learning with strategic renewal. Referring back to Easterby-Smith’s (1997) typology of organisational learning disciplines, it is clear that the 4I framework spans a number of fields. With its consideration of cognitive maps, shared values and beliefs it fits into the cultural anthropology discipline identified by Easterby-Smith. The consideration of different levels of learning contributes to the field of psychology and organisational development. With its focus on feed-forward as an essential element of transferring learning up the organisation from the individual level, and its focus on feed-back in transferring learning from the organisational level, it contributes to management science. With its underlying objectives of achieving strategic renewal, the model contributes to the competitive ontology of strategy.

3.7.6 Rosengarten’s Cycle (1999)

Finally, Rosengarten (1999) offers a ‘comprehensive organizational learning cycle’ in his postdoctoral thesis. In this model, learning is performed with the support of organisational knowledge. Rosengarten’s (1999) model is illustrated in Figure 3.17.

Figure 3.17 The Comprehensive Organizational Learning Cycle taken from Rosengarten (1999:82)
The model suggests that when individual learning is achieved, what is learned is codified therefore making this available to teams for team learning. Rosengarten argues that the learning that has been codified by individuals is available to the whole organisation, therefore codification can lead to organisational learning. The model reflects this by the thin arrow to from codification to ‘organisational learning.

Once team learning occurs so too does the generalisation of knowledge. This allows what has learned through team learning to become accessible to the whole organisation. Therefore generalization of team learning can also lead to organisational learning. When organisational learning occurs, knowledge becomes institutionalized. This can mean that what has been learned becomes set in organisational policies or part of the organisations standard operating procedures. Rosengarten’s organisational learning cycle completes when what has become newly institutionalised into the organisation is learned at the individual level. This newly institutionalised knowledge acts as a revised framework for individuals within the organisation to develop their individual learning further.

Rosengarten demonstrates that individual, team and organisational learning can take place at single-loop, double-loop and deutero level by the circles surrounding each learning level (as shown in figure 3.17). Through his model, Rosengarten argues that even though there is a route to bypassing team learning and generalization, from individual codification, this route applies predominantly to the non-complex ‘explicit’ knowledge as discussed in Nonaka’s (1994) work on the knowledge creating company.

‘As a consequence, this plain model of the comprehensive organizational learning cycle can cope not only with the vast amount of complex knowledge, but also tacit knowledge, which could hardly be transferred without team learning.’ (1999:82)

Rosengarten extends the model, to explore the possibilities for incomplete organisational learning. Figure 3.18 illustrates the six circumstances identified that may cause incomplete organisational learning.
There can be a break between:

1) Individual learning and codification. This means that an individual has been deficient in some way in codifying newly acquired knowledge. (They may not be capable, may have forgotten, or may have no incentive to do so.)

2) Codification and team learning. This is when codified individual knowledge is not made accessible to teams, who may require the knowledge. Rosengarten suggests missing organisational incentives in an organisational culture or structure, which prevent the individual from passing on information, or an individual placing too little significance on the quality and importance of the information as reasons that may cause this cut-off.

3) Team learning and generalization. This is where the new knowledge of a team cannot be generalised, in order to be accessible to the whole organisation. Missing skills and training, organisational structure and/ or values that provide little incentive for generalization may be reasons for this occurring.

4) Generalization and organisational learning. This may occur when the organisation is unwilling to take up the generalisation of team learning, due to it
conflicting with the dominating organisational culture, or the team generalising the knowledge, may not have enough persuasive impact to facilitate change at organisational level.

5) Organisational learning and institutionalization. This occurs when generalized knowledge is not stored in the organisation’s memory. Causes for this proffered by Rosengarten (1999) are lack of experience, resources or systems to store information.

6) Institutionalisation and individual learning. This occurs when the organisational learning has no effect on the individual learning. This may occur if the individual concerned is new to the organisation, and has had little time to acquire the institutionalised organisational knowledge. It also may be the case, that the individual concerned does not know how to retrieve the organisational knowledge, or where or what information is stored.

Rosengarten’s (1999) model synthesises much of the earlier literature discussed in this chapter on organisational learning. Even though a criticism of his model is that it implies organisational learning is a simple cycle, through reducing the complexity, it provides a useful research model for developing an understanding of the contextual realities of organisational learning more completely.

3.8 The Learning Organisation

The focus now shifts from the field of organisational learning to that of the learning organisation. As discussed earlier, the literature on the learning organisation is ‘more committed to the achievement of a desirable end state’ Easterby-Smith (1997:1103) than its organisational learning counterpart. However all of the key learning organisation contributions discussed in this chapter fit with Sun’s (2003) a learning organisation – that is they describe models or frameworks of organisations that possess some major characteristics or salient features of learning organisation.

Literature on the learning organisation is frequently criticised by many academics within the field of organisational learning, for its lacking in sound empirical support. This said, best sellers such as Senge (1990) and Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell (1991) have
successfully managed to communicate learning organisation to practitioners working within the organisations, and have raised the profile of this field at a practical level. As with organisational learning, I will discuss the key theories on the learning organisation in chronological order, beginning with the work of Senge (1990) on the fifth discipline.

3.8.1 Senge’s Disciplines

Senge’s (1990) text is one of the most well-known texts to come from the field of the learning organisation. Senge’s five learning disciplines are: personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning, and the fifth discipline is systems thinking. Senge proposes that systems thinking acts to integrate all of the other four learning disciplines as illustrated in Figure 3.19.

**Figure 3.19 Senge’s Five Disciplines of Learning**

- **PERSONAL MASTERY**: Personal mastery goes beyond competence and skills, though it is grounded in competence and skills. It goes beyond spiritual unfolding or opening, although it requires spiritual growth. It means approaching one’s life as a creative work, living life from a creative as opposed to reactive viewpoint (1990:141).

- **SHARED VISION**: A shared vision is not an idea. It is not even an important idea such as freedom. It is, rather a force in people’s hearts, a force of impressive power. It may be inspired by an idea, but once it goes further – if it is compelling enough to acquire the support of more than one person – then it is no longer an abstraction. It is palpable. (1990:206)

- **SYSTEMS THINKING**: The essence of systems thinking lies in a shift of mind. Seeing interrelationships rather than linear cause-effect chains and seeing processes of change rather than snapshots. (1990:73)

- **TEAM LEARNING**: Team learning is the process of aligning and developing the capacity of a team to create the results its members truly desire (1990:236)

- **MENTAL MODELS**: Mental models are deeply held internal images of how the world works, which have a powerful influence on what we do because they also affect what we see. (1990:191).
It appears that Senge holds rather contradictory views on whether the status of 'learning organisation' is achievable. Initially, he appears to support the notion that achieving the status of learning organisation is achievable (1990:4):

‘Learning organizations are possible because, deep down, we are all learners. Learning organizations are possible because not only is it our nature to learn, but we love to learn.’

However, Senge also then argues that it is non-achievable and he implies it is more idealistic (1990:11):

‘To practice a discipline is to be a lifelong learner. You “never arrive”. You spend your life mastering disciplines. You can never say, “We are a learning organisation, any more than you can say, “I am an enlightened person”.’

He proposes that systems thinking is central to the overall change in thinking that is required in learning organisations. Using cyclical cause-and-effect diagrams Senge demonstrates how all things are inter-connected and inter-dependent. He suggests that if the system of the events are understood, then their inter-connectedness will be understood. Senge applies this supposition to react to business problems. He proposes that a central part of what is involved in the development of the learning organisation is the elucidation of total systems.

3.8.2 Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell's Learning Company

Pedler Burgoyne and Boydell (1991;1996) offer eleven characteristics of the learning company. Their use of the term company is deliberate and is a revival of the old usage of the term company, which is suggestive of 'a body of persons assembled for a common object' (The Oxford Popular English Dictionary, 2000) rather than the name given to an organisation because it is a separate legal entity, such as a limited company (Ltd) or a public limited company (PLC) (Dodge, 1994).

The authors offer descriptions of the eleven characteristics of the learning company from the perspective of the ideal learning company, which are as follows (1996:15-17):

1) A learning approach to strategy (Policy and strategy formation are deliberately structured for learning).
2) Participative policy making (Where all of the organization's stakeholders are able to contribute and participate in policy making).

3) Informating (Information technology is used for making information widely available to all members of staffing to empower them to act on their own initiative).

4) Formative accounting and control (Systems budgeting, reporting and accounting are structured to assist learning for all members about how money work is in the business).

5) Internal exchange (All internal units and departments see themselves as customers and suppliers in a supply chain to the end user or client. Contracting with and learning from other departments is normal).

6) Reward Flexibility (Flexible and creative rewards, alternatives in both monetary and non-monetary rewards to cater for individuals needs and performance)

7) Enabling structures (Roles, departments, organization charts and even procedures and processes are seen as temporary structures that can be changed to meet job, user or innovation requirements).

8) Boundary workers as environmental scanners (Environmental scanning is carried out by all people who have contacts with external users, customers, suppliers, clients, business partners and so on. Processes are in place for bringing back and welcoming the information into the company.

9) Inter-company learning (through joint ventures and other learning alliances, the organizational learns from other companies and meets with them for mutual exchange)

10) A learning climate (In the learning company all managers see their primary task as facilitating company members' experimentation and learning from experience, through questioning, feedback and support. The company seeks to export this learning climate to its context and business partners).

11) Self-development opportunities for all (Resources and facilities for self-development are made available to all members, especially those in front line with users or clients. People are encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning and development).
Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell, developed their eleven characteristics into a diagram (as illustrated in figure 3.20).

Figure 3.20 Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell's (1996:37) Cluster Analysis & Blueprint Categories of the 11 characteristics of the Learning Company

As Figure 3.20 illustrates, characteristics are clustered around a central pivot of structures. To the left, looking in describes internally oriented characteristics, and mirroring this, looking out describes those externally-oriented characteristics. Strategy tops the clusters, whilst learning opportunities form the ground on which all else is built.

Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell's work is typical of that of the literature on the learning organisation, in that its use of case studies and supportive examples is not as academically rigorous as the methodology coming from the organisational learning literature. This said, Pedler Burgoyne and Boydell’s text, provides a useful interactive ‘tool-kit’ for practitioners within the field. Using various formats of questionnaires, practitioners are able to determine to what extent their organisation is a learning one (as defined by Pedler et al, 1996) and how to go about becoming an increasingly ‘learning organisation’.
3.8.3 Rosengarten’s (1999) Ten Characteristics

Rosengarten (1999) does not offer a model of the learning organisation per se, but his study into the characteristics of the learning organisation provides ten characteristics based upon empirical exploration. The ten characteristics identified by Rosengarten in the literature review are the results of quantitative analysis (correlation and regression of seventy questionnaires and four in-depth interviews) of car component manufacturers within the UK. From the examination, Rosengarten found that three of the characteristics were regarded as more important for creating a learning organisation. His work has been developed by Birdthistle (2003) to include the models offered by Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell, and Simons. Both Rosengarten and Birdthistle’s review lead to the same ten characteristics being identified. Birdthistle’s (2003) adaptation is illustrated in Figure 3.21.

**Explanation of numbers on the top**

1 = Teamwork and team learning  
2 = Systemic thinking and mental models  
3 = Free vertical and horizontal flow of information  
4 = Education/training of the whole workforce  
5 = Learning reward system for employees  
6 = Continuous improvement of work  
7 = Flexibility of company strategy and employees  
8 = Decentralised and participative management  
9 = Learning laboratories & experimentation  
01 = Dialogue  
02 = Shared interpretation of reality  
03 = Shared vision of the future  
04 = Openness and trust  
05 = Commitment and tolerance  
06 = Risk taking and responsibility

**Figure 3.21 Rosengarten (1999) and Birthistle (2003)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyris &amp; Schön</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedberg</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrivastava</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiol and Lyles</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pautzke</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senge</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirkin and Stalk</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klimecki et al</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquard and Reynolds</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonaka</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawlowsky</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probst</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schein</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevis et al</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedler et al</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossan and Huland</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The most important characteristic identified was 'systemic thinking and mental models'. The second most important was 'continuous improvement of work' and thirdly 'supportive corporate learning culture'. Rosengarten discussed the remaining seven characteristics as being 'necessary but not sufficient' (1999:373).

3.9 Conclusion

Chapter 3 explores the second field of interest to this research that is organisational learning. The reasons why this field appears attractive to practitioners and interests academics are similar to those reasons for corporate entrepreneurship. In order to remain competitive, organisations need to continually anticipate and adapt to their changing external environment. The field of organisational learning is extensive and it is more mature in terms of the quantity of contributions compared with that of corporate entrepreneurship. My review of the organisational learning literature revealed a similar pattern as with the corporate entrepreneurship literature, where learning can be grouped into the individual, group and organisational levels.

I highlighted some inconsistencies in the existing theoretical literature, such as the many different definitions of organisational learning and the mis(use) of the terms organisational learning and learning organisation. I briefly explored the research literature on group learning and queried some issues that had possible implications for both team learning and team entrepreneurship. I felt that there were many areas within group learning that 'deserved' further theoretical and empirical explorations. Addressing these issues, such as the role of trust and emotional intelligence in group learning, could inform organisational practice and any organisations that are involved with group learning, such as Higher Education and Further Education institutes.

By means of this literature review, I have observed that the models of organisational learning and learning organisation are generally theory based rather than empirical (although there are exceptions to this). The models can be simplistic or complex, but generally awkward to explain. This said, there are models that are very insightful and will be helpful in the development of this research. for example, during the preliminary
stages (such as the development of the conceptual framework and when formulating research questions), and during the latter stages when I will be comparing and contrasting my data and results to existing theory. The 4I Framework offered by Crossan Lane and White (1999) lends itself to the 'process' of corporate entrepreneurship very appropriately, as its labels 'intuiting', 'interpreting', 'integrating and 'institutionalising' translate simply.

The next chapter explores the final field that underpins this research, organisational change.
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Chapter 4 - Organisational Change

4.1 Introduction

When I first started my literature review, I had only intended to explore the research literatures of corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning. The first paper that was published as an outcome of the initial literature review (Sambrook and Roberts, 2005) hardly mentions organisational change. In retrospect the significance of organisational change for both learning and entrepreneurship seems obvious, as change is the essence of each, and without change a learner/organisation will not have learned and an entrepreneur/organisation will not have been entrepreneurial. I had become increasingly aware of the importance of organisational change within my research after having taught on a Leadership, Quality, Innovation and Change module on the MSc in Health and Social Care Leadership. In parallel to my teaching activities I attended a HRD Conference in Limerick (Sambrook and Roberts, 2004) and presented my first attempt at a theoretical model of corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning (see Chapter 5). Another delegate enquired why I had not reviewed the literature on organisational change as it featured so clearly in my models. So this chapter explores organisational change in terms of types of change, levels of change, change tools and the different perspectives of organisational change research.

Based upon my argument in Chapter 1 that this thesis has been written in a way that demonstrates the actual progression of my PhD journey, through authentic generation, this chapter should technically appear after Chapter 5, however, I feel that this would do more to hinder the narrative rather than support it and hope that this introductory explanation goes some way to maintaining the authentic generation of my learning whilst facilitating the readability of the narrative.

As with the previous two chapters, some of the existing research literature can be separated into different levels, such as individual, team and organisational. The organisational change literature appears to be much more fragmented than the other two, and describing change in terms of levels is useful but it does not capture all of the research within the field. Therefore I have taken a 'two-pronged' approach to this
chapter and I will discuss key contributions using a framework that has been adapted from Iles and Sutherland (2001:23) and then summarise, compare and contrast all three fields using an organisational level approach.

4.2 An Overview of Change

Iles and Sutherland's work (2001) reviews many key change theories and models but focuses on the broad prescriptive question 'what tools can we use to manage change?' This is a sound practical question for its target audience, namely health care professionals, but for the purposes of this review I have attempted (through adapting their model) to place an emphasis on addressing investigative questions, such as 'what is change?', 'who drives change?', and 'how does change happen?'. Once fundamental questions have been considered, I will explore some of the models within the literature. Iles and Sutherland's framework includes a substantial list of different organisational models and tools that have been and are currently used within the management of change in organisations. I am not able to explore all of these in depth as it would take up too much space, and I feel there would be a diminishing return on the value that this would add to my understanding and readers' understanding of organisational change in relation to this project.
4.3 Describing Change

The Oxford Popular English Dictionary (2000) defines change as ‘to make or become different, to pass from one form or phase into another’. Change can occur from and affect many different levels, within the ‘self’, within formal and informal groups, within societies and the world. Within the context of an organisation, change can occur at the individual, group, organisational or environmental level. As McKenna (1994:493) describes.
'Change is omnipresent in society, and is reflected in many forms. We find change in values and tastes in society generally having an impact on markets.... Likewise, these are changes within organisations brought about by the application of new technology to work processes and products. All of these are examples of organisations responding to events in their environment. Organisations can also influence their environments by internally generated changes such as innovations that command wide acceptance in the external world.'

4.3.1 What is Change?
There are a number of different forms of change that are differentiated within the management literature. The following discussion introduces many of the different typologies within the literature, but is by no means exhaustive. Stewart (1996) looks at managing change through training and development, and emphasises that change is not a new phenomenon. He explores how change operates on species, individuals and organisations and observes the following (1996:14).

- Change is a natural phenomenon.
- Change is continuous and ongoing.
- The purpose of change is to aid survival and growth.
- Survival and growth are dependent upon adaptation to a changing environment.
- The environment can be and is influenced and by the decisions and actions of the organization.
- Learning from experience is essential for successful adaptation and change.
- Individuals and organizations change in both common and unique directions.'

I feel that these observations fit with 'natural' unplanned change, but planned, intentional change may require a different set of statements to fit with their different determinants and properties.

4.3.2 Forms of change
In Stewart's statements above, he emphasises the essential relationship between learning and successful change. Change may be planned change or unplanned. That is change can be deliberate or not. Unplanned change is also referred to as accidental (White, 1988. Senior, 2002), change by drift (White, 1998. Morris, 2003) or emergent
Weick and Quinn (1999) differentiate between the frequency, accumulation and size of change. Episodic change is 'infrequent, discontinuous and intentional', and is also referred to in the research literature as 'radical' or 'second order' change. Continuous change is 'ongoing, evolving and cumulative' and is also referred to as first order or incremental change. Morris (2003:142) characterises continuous change as 'people constantly adapting and editing ideas they acquire from different sources. At a collective level these continuous adjustments made simultaneously across units can create substantial change.' Planned/ unplanned and episodic or continuous change may be found throughout all levels within the organisation.

Change can also be understood in relation to its extent and scope. Grundy (1993) defines three types of change in relation to its extent and scope over time. Smooth incremental change is change that evolves slowly in a systematic and predictable way (illustrated by a horizontal line in figure 4.2). Smooth incremental change occurs at a constant rate in relation to time, hence the line being in figure 4.2 being horizontal. Bumpy incremental change is characterised by periods of relative tranquillity interrupted by acceleration in the pace of change. Grundy suggests that the trigger for this type of change is likely to include those from the environment in which organisations operate as well as internal changes. Finally, Grundy's third variety of change, discontinuous change is defined as (1993:26) 'change which is marked by rapid shifts in either strategy, structure or culture, or in all three.'
Grundy's three varieties of change provide us with insight into possible types of change. It is helpful in understanding the nature of change in organisations, although it may provide an overly simplistic perspective neglecting the complex and interdependent nature of change. Could all or some of these types of change occur simultaneously? Similarly, Stacey (2000) identifies three types of organisational change. Closed (predictable), contained (less predictable) and open-ended (unpredictable, ongoing).

Grundy's observations are supported and developed from the empirical work of Ackerman (1997) and Tushman, Newman and Romenelli (1998).

Ackerman (1997) has distinguished between three forms of change, namely, developmental, transitional and transformational (see figure 4.3). Developmental change may be planned or unplanned and is continuous. Morris (2003:142) describes it as 'change that enhances or corrects existing aspects of an organisation, often focusing on the improvement of a skill or process.' Transitional change is planned and episodic. It seeks to achieve a desired state that is different from the current one. The model of transitional change underpins much of the organisational change literature (see for example Kanter, 1983. Beckhard and Harris, 1987. Nadler and Tushman, 1989). Transformational change is radical and requires a shift in assumptions made by the organisation and its members. Reflecting back to the literature on corporate entrepreneurship, organisational transformation (Thornberry, 2001), or frame-breaking
change (Stopford and Baden-Fuller, 1994) was described as involving 'transformational behaviour' which is based around the Schumpeterian Innovation Concept. Transformation can result in an organisation that differs significantly in terms of structure, processes, culture and strategy. It may, therefore, result in the creation of an organisation that operates in developmental mode – one that continuously learns, adapts and improves (Morris, 2003).

**Figure 4.3 Ackerman (1997) Chart Comparing the Definition, Examples, and Characteristics of Different Types of Organisational Change taken from Proel (2001:44)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>Making incremental improvements over what currently exists.</td>
<td>Implementing a new state, which requires dismantling the present ways of operating and introducing new ways of working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
<td>Team building</td>
<td>New services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality improvements</td>
<td>Reorganisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and development activities</td>
<td>New procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Least threatening</td>
<td>Somewhat threatening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easiest to manage</td>
<td>Usually occurs over a set period of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usually a specific goal has been set although you may not know how to get there!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tushman et al (1998) suggest that organisational life consists of phases of incremental change (or convergence) interrupted by discontinuous changes. Two types of converging change are proposed: fine tuning, which is aimed at doing better what is already done well, and incremental adaptation which involves small changes in response to minor shifts in the organisational environment. A really interesting outcome of their study is the conflict between change and the internal support systems in the organisational change process. Tushman et al (1998) found that both fine tuning and incremental adjustments to environmental shifts allow organisations to perform more effectively and enable synthesis between strategy, structure, people and processes.
The interesting point revealed in their empirical study is that those internal forces that are developed by growing organisations (which help support organisational stability and synthesis) also act as resistance to converging change. Given this, Tushman et al conclude that incremental adjustments will not overcome the resistance created by internal support systems so most organisations will be required to undergo discontinuous, or frame-breaking change during periods of major change.

Dunphy and Stace (1993) define the scale of change in terms of four levels. Fine-tuning, incremental adjustment, modular transformation and corporate transformation, as shown in Figure 4.4.

Figure 4.4 Dunphy and Stace (1993) in Senior (2002)

In their article on the strategic management of corporate change they highlight the characteristics relating to each level. These have been summarised in Figure 4.5

Figure 4.5 Dunphy and Stace (1993) Four levels of Change, pp917-918

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale type of change</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine tuning</td>
<td>Ongoing process characterised by the fit between organisation's strategy, structure, people and processes. Typically manifested at departmental/divisional levels.</td>
<td>Refining policies, methods and procedures. Creating specialist units and linking mechanisms to permit increased volume and increased attention to unit quality and cost. Promoting confidence in accepted norms, beliefs and myths. Clarifying established roles, and the methods for allocating resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental adjustment</td>
<td>Characterised by incremental adjustments to the changing environment. Involves distinct modifications (but not radical change) to corporate business strategies, structures and management processes.</td>
<td>Expanding sales territory. Shifting emphasis among products. Improved production process. Technology. Articulating a modified statement of mission to employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular transformation</td>
<td>Characterised by major realignment of one or more departments or divisions. The process of radical change is focused on these subparts rather than on the organisation as a whole.</td>
<td>Major restructuring of particular departments or divisions. Changes in key executives and managerial appointments. Reformed departmental/ divisional goals. Introduction of significantly new process technologies affecting key departments or divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate transformation</td>
<td>Change that is corporation (or organisation) wide. Characterised by radical shifts in business strategy and revolutionary changes throughout the whole organisation.</td>
<td>Reformed organisational mission and core values. Altered power and status affecting the distribution of power in the organisation. Reorganisation – major changes in structures, systems, and procedures across the organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having a number of different typologies of change within the research literature (for example: Grundy, 1993: Ackerman, 1997: Tushman, Newman and Romenelli, 1998: Dunphy and Stace, 1993) suggests that change is a complex and multi-faceted phenomenon. However, these typologies can also make it difficult to be clear about where each one fits in relation to the other.

Senior (2002) begins to map out the similarities and the congruencies between these typologies by comparing them to typologies of environmental drivers of change. Senior's chart (see figure 4.6) introduces three typologies that describe the
environmental forces for change. In the first column of figure 4.6, five types of environmental force identified by Ansoff and McDonnell (1990) are listed:

- Predictable (the future is expected to be the same as the past).
- Forecastable by extrapolation (Complexity increases, but future can still be confidently predicted, from the past).
- Predictable threats and opportunities (future can be predicted with some degree of confidence, but the ability to respond becomes more problematic).
- Partially predictable opportunities (Increasing turbulence due to global socio-political changes. The future is partially predictable).
- Unpredictable surprises. The future is almost entirely unpredictable, and increasingly turbulent).

Strebel’s (1996) three environmental forces for change (weak, medium and strong), and Stacey’s (2000) two states of certainty are both compared with Ansoff and McDonnell’s five types of environmental force.

**Figure 4.6 Senior (2002:58) Environmental conditions and types of change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental forces for change</th>
<th>Types of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictable</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecastable by extrapolation</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictable threats and</td>
<td>Close to certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td>Converging (incremental)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially predictable</td>
<td>Far from certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surprises</td>
<td>Discontinuous/ frame-breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansoff and</td>
<td>Stacey (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tushman et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Converging (fine-tuning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunphy and Stac (1993)</td>
<td>Fine-tuning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy (1993)</td>
<td>Smooth incremental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey (2000)</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey (1993)</td>
<td>Contained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy (1993)</td>
<td>Bumpy incremental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey (2000)</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the three typologies above (that describe environmental forces for change) help form an understanding about the nature of forces, they reveal little about the source of these forces. From reviewing the change literature further, it becomes clear that these external forces may be political factors, economic influences, sociological trends, technological innovations, ecological factors, or legislative requirements (Illes and Sutherland, 2001:29).

In addition to the aforementioned external 'drivers of change' different internal agents may also initiate change, as Proehl (2001:37) explains:

'In today’s organisations we use the term change to describe activities ranging from transforming the organisation’s basic culture and values to introducing a new policy or system. Change can refer to external shifts in technology, political climate as well as to internal modifications in structure, policies, or personnel. Change can be initiated from the top or can sell up from front-line employees. it can be viewed as positive and exciting or negative and threatening.'

White (1998) identifies five types/ drivers of change that occur within Health Care Organisations: Technological Change, Product or Service Change, Administrative Change, Structural Change and Attitude (or Value) Change.

### 4.4 Organisations and Change

As White (1998:179) states 'change is neither good nor bad. it is inevitable'. Organisational change will always occur. Subsequently organisational change needs to be viewed as a challenge for management and needs to be managed. Mullins (1999) suggests that the management of organisational change is important as the people within organisations tend to be resistant to it:

'It is important therefore, for management to adopt a clearly defined strategy for the initiation of change' (Mullins 1999:825)

Further to this Mullins proposes that in order to manage change a clear understanding of human behaviour at work should be worked towards, and also that the style of management behaviour should be in keeping with the type of change required (sometimes autocratic, coercive, but mostly participative).
4.4.1 Organisational Complexity and Interdependency’s effect on change

In order to begin to appreciate the complexity of organisational change it is useful to understand the complex nature of the organisation and its environment first. Figure 4.7 taken is a basic systems model (input/ output) of an organisation adapted from Morris (2003)

Figure 4.7 The organisation as a System taken from a handout by Morris (2003)

INPUTS
Materials
Resources

OUTPUTS
Organisational Goal achievement
Employee/ Customer Satisfaction

Figure 4.7 highlights some of the formal and informal sub-systems that are present within the organisation and that can impact upon and be affected by any change. Extending some of the principles from this systems model is the 7S or McKinsey model developed by Peters and Waterman (1982) as illustrated in 4.8. The model starts on the premise that an organisation consists of seven elements distinguished by so called hard ‘S’s and soft ‘S’s. The hard elements (green circles in figure 4.8) are more visible within
the organisation. They can be found in strategy statements, corporate plans, organisational charts and other documents.

The four soft 'S's are more subtle, not as easily visible and not easy to describe since capabilities, values and elements of corporate culture are continuously developing and changing. They are determined by the people within the organisation and subsequently it is much more difficult to plan or to influence the characteristics of the softer S elements. Although the soft factors are below the surface of the organisation, they can have a great impact of the hard structures, strategies and systems.

All of the 7 'S's in the illustration are linked to one another. This is to symbolise that if one S changes then this will affect all the others. For example, a change in HR-systems like the Agenda for Change pay re-structure in the National Health Service (NHS) will have an impact on organisational culture (management style) and thus will affect structures, processes, and finally characteristic competences of the organisation.
Peters and Waterman argue that many organisations focus change management efforts on the Hard 'S' whereas there is greater value in shifting that focus to the softer 'S's. The soft factors can make or break a successful change process, since new structures and strategies are difficult to build upon inappropriate cultures and values. The 7S Model is a useful change management tool in that it facilitates consideration of the hard and soft organisational elements and their interdependencies with each other.

Probably the most significant model within the change literature is Lewin's (1951) Force Field Analysis (Figure 4.9). Lewin's force field analysis includes problem solving and decision making in the process of change. Lewin views behaviour as a set of forces that are dynamic, in delicate balance, and working in opposite directions. These forces are driving forces and restraining forces. Driving forces assist and support the change in occurring whilst restraining forces prevent or hinder the change. As long as the driving forces equal the restraining forces, the status quo is maintained. If disequilibrium is created with one of the forces gaining strength over the other, a change may occur.

Lewin suggests that there are three phases in the change process. The first phase is called Unfreezing. Usually, people are very comfortable with what they are familiar with, and the first phase of the change process must introduce doubt or discomfort with the current state of things or how things are being done. People must become uncomfortable enough with the status quo to want to change it. The second phase of the change process is called Changing or Moving, which is the actual change or implementation phase of the change process. During the moving stage, the driving forces have overcome the restraining forces and the change moves ahead. During Refreezing, the final phase of the change process, the change has been implemented and needs to be stabilised.
A criticism that is sometimes made of Lewin’s model is that in reality the refreezing stage is not permanent. ‘Refreezing’ suggests that the new state achieved is one of permanence. This may not be the case in reality, particularly within the context of a complex and dynamic organisation, such as the National Health Service. This said, Lewin’s model is acclaimed within the research literature for having such a profound influence on organisational development (French and Bell, 1999. Senior, 2002). Lewin’s model is extremely versatile, and has been used across disciplines to help describe, analyse and plan for a number of different micro and macro ‘change’ situations. The model also has relevance to this research project as it could be used during data analysis to help identify forces that support and hinder corporate entrepreneurship and learning at individual, team and organisational levels within rural Welsh NHS Trusts.
A fourth, more recent model found within the research literature helps develop an understanding of organisational complexity and interrelatedness in managing change. The model is described as a content, context and process model (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1991) and has been developed from large scale empirical research into health care organisations. Unlike many of the change tools, this model has sound empirical underpinning and is descriptive rather than prescriptive. Eight interlinked factors were found to differentiate between higher and lower performers:

- Quality and coherence of local policy.
- Key people leading change.
- Co-operative inter-organisational networks.
- Supportive organisational culture including the managerial subculture.
- Environmental pressure, moderate, predictable and long-term.
- Simplicity and clarity of goals and priorities.
- Positive pattern of managerial and clinical relations.
- Fit between the agenda and the locale.

Pettigrew and Whipp reported a pattern of association between the eight factors but no simple cause-and-affect relationships as shown in figure 4.10.

Figure 4.10 The eight factors taken from Pettigrew and Whipp (1991)
In this next section I try and make sense of the effect that change has on the individuals and group/teams that work within organisations. I explore contributions from Organisation Behaviour, Psychology and Sociology literatures to try to begin to understand this. I also explore the effect of change on the organisation as an entire 'entity' and some of its 'soft S's and 'hard S's such as structure and culture.

4.5 Individuals and Change

There is comment within the change literature that the contributions that explore individual change focus on the psychology of the individuals and appear to neglect the organisational context in which individuals are placed. Katz and Kahn (1978) have labelled it the psychological fallacy and they argue that trying to change an organisation solely through changing its individuals involves a series of assumptions that are 'impressive and discouraging' (1978:659):

- 'That the individual can be provided with new insight or knowledge or attribute personality.
- That these will produce some altered pattern of motivation with respect to the organisational role.
- That these insights and motivations will persist even when the individual leaves the special circumstances in which they were acquired and returns to his or her accustomed role in the organization.
- That they will be adapted as necessary to that role (or it to them). that coworkers [sic] will be persuaded to accept the changes in behaviour that confront them.
- That they will be persuaded to make complementary changes in their own expectations and behaviour.'

I agree with Katz and Kahn's criticisms and the points that they have made. Organisations are complex structures, technologies, embedded cultures and interrelated systems. Organisations consist of many different people, with different agendas, different aims, different perspectives and different levels of self-awareness and learnedness. All of these soft and hard organisational, group and individual facets could impact upon individual change within the organisations context and therefore they
cannot merely be ignored. I adopt a pluralist perspective which is that our understanding of all of the different and dynamic forms of change within an organisational context will be enriched through developing our understanding of all of the different perspectives of change including psychological change (what I prefer to call inner-change, more simply) contextual change (individual, group and organisational) and the effect of change on and by the soft and hard organisational S’s.

The rest of this section explores individual change mostly in terms of inner-change, although there is some discussion of context. Toffler (1970) introduced what he described as a disease of change which he labelled ‘future shock’. Future shock is a phenomenon which occurs because individuals are subjected to unhealthy, stressful and disorienting levels of change in short spaces of time and in the 1970s Toffler predicted future shock being a disease of the millennium.

4.5.1 How do individual cope with change?

Figure 4.11 introduces two coping cycles. Kubler-Ross’s (1969) focuses on five moods during times of perceived trauma or loss and Carnall’s synthesises previous work by de Vries and Miller (1984) and Adams et al (1976) to provide 5 stages of coping with change in the workplace. Kubler-Ross’s cycle is not rigid in that the individuals experiencing the loss or change may visit stages in different orders, some stages may be omitted and some revisited. Through comparing the two typologies it can be observed that steps two and three of Kubler-Ross’s model are different to Carnall’s, but the mood of anger and behaviour of bargaining links to Carnall’s defence. Carnall’s three final steps, discarding, adaptation and internalisation, can be linked with Kubler-Ross’s acceptance stage. Building upon this, Carnall (2003) proposes four main categories of need for individuals during times of organisational change:

- The need to understand changes
- The need for information
- The need to develop new skills
- The need of support to help them deal with problems
### Figure 4.11 Kubler-Ross versus Carnall (2003) Coping Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>&quot;This is not happening!&quot;</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>&quot;We have always done things this way!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>&quot;Why is this happening to me?&quot;</td>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>&quot;There's nothing wrong with the way we do things&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>&quot;What if I do it this way?&quot;</td>
<td>Discarding</td>
<td>&quot;Well it's here let's get on with it and see how we can contribute&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>&quot;There's nothing I can do - it's hopeless&quot;</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>&quot;It doesn't work well this way, let's try another way&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>&quot;What can I do about this and how can I move forward&quot;</td>
<td>Internalisation</td>
<td>&quot;This is our new way of doing things around here&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5.2 How does Pressure affect change?

Researchers within the field have also explored the relationship between the pressures induced by organisational change onto the individual and the effect of this on individual's performance. The Yerkes-Dodson law (1908) is from the early psychology literature and has been applied to the organisational context to help understand individual change overload, burnout and initiative fatigue (Doyle, Claydon and Buchanan, 1999). The law (illustrated in figure 4.12 as an inverted U) suggests that work performance is likely to increase at a constant rate to individual arousal (interest) in the work. However, once arousal has increased to the optimal performance, the individual can no longer cope with further arousal, and performance begins to decline at a constant
rate until exhaustion is reached. At the point of exhaustion the individual will suffer a breakdown and performance decreases rapidly.

Figure 4.12 Yerkes Dodson Inverted U
Adapted from Doyle, Claydon and Buchanan (1999)

The Yerkes Dodson inverted U is helpful to practitioners, scholars and in particular the individuals experiencing the change in that it raises attention to the damaging consequences of exceeding the threshold of optimal performance. However, the theory has two key limitations. Firstly, individuals have differing levels of optimal performance and secondly, an individual's state of arousal may be situational, depending on the complexity of task in hand and the environment in which the task is being performed.

4.5.3 Why do individuals resist change?
Huczynski and Buchanan (2004:617) argue that individual resistance to change may emerge through fear of the unknown.

'Change has both positive and negative aspects. On the one hand, change implies experiment and the creation of something new. On the other hand, it means discontinuity and the destruction of familiar arrangements and relationships. Despite the positive attributes, change can be resisted because it involves confrontation with the unknown and loss of the familiar.'
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Resistance to change is discussed widely within the management and Organisational Behaviour literature and further, empirical exploration of this problem will enable academics and practitioners within the field to work towards managing resistance through education and leadership.

There are numerous pieces of empirical research within the organisational change literature that contribute to our knowledge of individual resistance to change, for example, Adams et al, 1976. Zaltman and Duncan, 1977. Bedeian, 1980. McKenna, 1994. Drawing upon some earlier work, McKenna (1994: 495) offers six sources and explanations of resistance to change:

- **Habit.** change may create individual resistance when the individual is familiar with the current system/process in place.
- **Security.** associated with habit and familiarity is the notion of security. People are more likely to resist change if they feel that their security is threatened by the change.
- **Economic considerations.** the individual fears that change could threaten the existence of their role(s) within the organisation and subsequently may lose employment and income.
- **Fear of unknown.** an individual may fear anything unfamiliar or unknown. This could be any small or major disruption within the organisation, from changes in reporting relationships to changes in the technology used. McKenna (1994) suggest that the fear of the unknown may stem from an individual perceiving that their flow of work will not be as smooth or as fast as it previously was because they believe it will take time to become familiar with the new arrangements.
- **Lack of awareness.** Deliberate or accidental ignorance of the change such as not completing new paperwork correctly. The result is no change in the individual's behaviour and therefore no change perceived by the individual.
- **Social considerations.** This idea is based upon group theory. The motivation and pressure not to change may develop from group resistance.
Similarly, other work by Bedeian (1980) provides several common causes of resistance to change.

- Parochial Self-Interest. Individuals may have a vested interest in maintaining a status quo. Reasons could be related to resist shifts of power, relocations, or breaking up of informal social networks.
- Misunderstandings and lack of trust. Resistance may emerge from individuals who do not understand what the change involves, or may not trust what it is likely to lead to, particularly if there is a climate of mistrust.
- Contradictory assessments. Different individuals may have different opinions on the pros and cons of the change.
- Low tolerance of change. Individuals tend to have different tolerances of the uncertainty and ambiguity associated with change.

Both McKenna’s (1994) and Bedeian’s (1980) work share common themes and such work helps to inform the management of change and planning for change management.

4.5.4 How do individuals react to Change?

Rogers (1962) explores ‘diffusion of innovations’ in terms of social systems (see Chapter 2 and Figure 4.13). Rogers’ work has implications for a number of areas within business research including change. His work introduces five ‘adopter’ categories of individuals within a social system based upon their innovativeness and the time at which the innovation is adopted. Morgan (2003) has adapted Rogers’ work for managing change and uses his five categories to describe different degrees of employee responses to organisational change and change managers (or change agents).
Figure 4.13 Rogers’ ‘Bell-Shaped’ Adoption Curve (1962)

- Innovators: Those who will leap with enthusiasm at the change agent’s proposals. They will support it strongly and will expect to be active in pursuing the objectives inherent in the proposed change.
- Early Adopters: These are people who will be persuaded rapidly, especially by an early success. They are likely to want to adapt the proposals to their own circumstances.
- The ‘Majority’: These people will fall into two categories.
- Early Majority: These are people who will want to see tangible outcomes to the change agent’s proposals.
- Late Majority: The second subcategory consists of those who tend to follow the lead of powerful organisational members and their support for the change is probably based on wider political considerations.
- Resisters: These people will need considerable persuasion before they can be mobilised away from their current methods and preferences. As a group, this category could be classed as risk-averse.

4.6 Groups and Organisational Change

As with individual change, group change may be taken to mean two things. either using groups to create organisational change, or changing within the group itself. For either
meaning the fundamental purpose of group change is 'the use of the group as a means of learning and heightening commitment to things learned' (Katz and Kahn, 1978:667). It is worthwhile pausing here to raise a question relating to Katz and Kahn's statement above in relation to corporate entrepreneurship. If learning is a central input to and outcome of group change and if certain types of group corporate entrepreneurship (e.g. internal venture groups) create change, then is learning a central input to and outcome of group corporate entrepreneurship? The research literature spanning all three fields of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change are full of examples of links between corporate entrepreneurship, learning and change. Furthermore, it is difficult to find a text written on change that does not mention learning and vice versa. Texts on group change often include group learning.

4.6.1 Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing, Adjourning
A group links the individual to the organisation. A group contains individuals, but also has smaller-scale structures, cultures, networks and power relationships present that are abundant within the larger and more complex organisation. Understanding group change therefore provides valuable insight into understanding organisational change. Tuckman and Jensen's (1977) five stage model of group formation provides insight into how groups are formed, how they develop from being largely inefficient into (but not always) efficient and effective entities, and also how they break-up and separate.

- **Stage 1: Forming.** This stage occurs when the individuals first come together. It involves the individuals getting to know each others' attitudes, personalities and backgrounds. This is a time of anxiety when group members attempt to define their positions within the group and the hierarchy and roles within the group begin to take shape.

- **Stage 2: Storming.** This is a time when the individuals begin to feel more confident within the group and with their position. This brings about conflict as individuals bring their own agendas into the group. Individuals battle for power, boundaries are tested and pushed. As the group storms its way towards the next stage roles and hierarchy are shaped and established. Not all groups survive this stage of group formation resulting in the group breaking down.
• Stage 3 *Norming*. This stage is where all of the shared group norms and values are established and individuals no longer act as in isolation but as a group entity.

• Stage 4 *Performing*. Once the first three stages have been completed, the group can then begin to perform as an efficient and effective group (subject to the capability and capacity of those making up the group).

• Stage 5 *Adjourning*. This stage involves the dissolution of the group, having achieved its objectives.

Morris (2003) has tabulated this and other group development theories (see figure 4.14). In essence the models contain stages which are very similar in their characteristics, but are referred to by different labels. For example Tuckman and Jensen’s *Forming* is very similar in its description to that of Bennis and Shepard’s (1956) Dependence, Schuts’s (1982) *Inclusion* and Yalom’s (1970) *Orientation and hesitant participation*.

**Figure 4.14 Group Development Theories from Morris (2003)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages Theorists</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuckman &amp; Jensen (1977)</td>
<td>Forming</td>
<td>Storming</td>
<td>Norming</td>
<td>Performing</td>
<td>Adjourning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennis &amp; Shepard (1956)</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>Counterdependence</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuts (1982)</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Openness/Affection</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beon (1961)</td>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>Fight/Flight</td>
<td>Pairing</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibb (1964)</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Data Flow</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalom (1970)</td>
<td>Orientation and hesitant participation</td>
<td>Conflict dominance and rebellion</td>
<td>Intimacy, closeness and cohesiveness</td>
<td>Termination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many other contributions to the sub-field of group change, but I feel that these contributions are out of the scope of this particular research and have therefore not been included.
4.7 Organisational Level Change

The typical organisation consists of a complexity of different individuals each with their own cultural beliefs and values and motivations. These individuals 'exist' on their own and within a range of formal and informal groups. It is fair to say that the typical organisation is a buzz of individual and group activity set within formal and informal culture structures and processes. So how does change impact on the organisation as a whole entity? Russell Consulting (2005) have proposed a model that illustrates the ability to influence or change the infrastructure of the organisation and the durability of each respective change (see figure 4.15).

Figure 4.15 The Affect of Change on the Organisation
(Russell Consulting Incorporated, 2005)

The model indicates that the cultural component of the organisational infrastructure is the most difficult to change, however, if this is changed it is sustainable, long term change. The physical components of the organisation are the easiest to change, but the change may only be for the duration of a shorter period of time.
4.7.1 Barriers and resistance to Organisational Change

Another insightful piece of research at the organisational level is a study conducted by Price Waterhouse Coopers and Market Opinion Research International (1996) on the top ten barriers and top ten success factors for organisational level change. As figure 4.16 demonstrates ‘change management’ skills features in the top three barriers to change and ‘sponsorship’ is the top success factor to change.

Figure 4.16 Price Waterhouse Coopers and Market Opinion Research International Study
adapted from Galpin (1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten barriers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Top ten success factors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competing resources</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ensuring top sponsorship</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional boundaries</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Treating people fairly</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change management skills</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Involving employees</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management skills</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Giving quality communications</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long IT lead times</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Providing sufficient training</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Using clear performance measures</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee opposition</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Building teams after change</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Issues (people, training)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Focusing on culture and skill change</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative fatigue</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rewarding success</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealistic timetables</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Using internal champions</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Katz and Kahn (1978:714-5) note six different sources to organisational change, which are as follows:

1. Enduring systems are over-determined in that they have more than one mechanism to produce stability. The structure of the organisation is designed so that it procedures and practice can be managed and regulated. The organisation is over-determined in the sense that lesser control or safe guards could achieve the same outcome. As a result procedures and rules in place could become an impediment to change.
2. There is an error of local determinism in assuming that one piece of a system can be changed without affecting the rest of the structure. The larger system can nullify local changes.

3. There is both an individual and group inertia in that established ways have the ease of habits and require little new adjustment. Even when single individuals might change some behaviour they encounter the difficulty of little modification in the complementary and reciprocal activities of the others.

4. Changes in organizational patterns may threaten the expertise of specialized groups. For example, job enlargement for rank-and-file workers can mean an invasion of some of the tasks of skills and specialists.

5. Changes in organizational patterns may threaten the established power relationships in the system. If some decisions are to be made down the line, for example, then managerial personnel may fear intrusions of their own authority.

6. Finally, changes may threaten those groups in the system that profit from the present allocation of resources and rewards. This applies not only to vertical strata of worker and supervisor but also to horizontal divisions of function.

The research that explores change at the organizational level is more generally quantitative in its methodology and positivist in its epistemology. There is less literature that explores organizational level change compared with that of individual and group level change. It is an area that would benefit from further empirical research, particularly set within the qualitative domain. Research into change at the organizational level may be difficult, due to the sheer size of the organisation and the change researched. Furthermore it may be difficult to examine an organizational change in isolation thus making the job of the researcher a very complex one indeed.

4.7.2 Who and what drives Organisational Change?

A Change Agent is the person who plans and works to bring about a change. Buchanan and Huczynski (2004:634) define a change agent as 'any member of an
organisation seeking to promote, further support, sponsor, initiate, implement or help to deliver change. The change agent plans, guides, encourages, and controls the change through adaptation and facilitation. If the change is mandatory, the agent must develop specific strategies to make the necessary change successful. A change agent can also anticipate a needed change by identifying trends and forces both internal and external, sorting out and evaluating information, and recognising the need for change.

Figure 4.17 highlights the characteristics of leaders and managers that were identified by White (1998:180) as necessary for an effective change agent. As White demonstrates change agents require a combination of those attributes necessary for leaders and managers. Huczynski and Buchanan (2004) point out that change agents need not be senior managers or do not need formal job titles. As with White (1998), Kanter (1989), Marquis and Huston (2000), Buchanan and Huczynski (2004) appreciate that change agents require a number of key interpersonal and managerial skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of a Leader</th>
<th>Attributes of a Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Human relations skills</td>
<td>• Group Process skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpersonal relationship skills</td>
<td>• Problem-solving skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear thinking</td>
<td>• Planning Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Articulation</td>
<td>• Organisational Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility</td>
<td>• Co-ordination skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confidence</td>
<td>• Controlling and directing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vision</td>
<td>• Ability to handle conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trustworthiness</td>
<td>• Conflict resolution skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expertise</td>
<td>• Evaluation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education Skills</td>
<td>• Motivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, Katzenbach et al (1997) have devised a table of ‘good managers’ (GMs) versus ‘real change leaders’ (RCLs), which is illustrated in figure 4.18. This table conveys similar themes to that devised by Pinchot (1985) (and the later work of Jones-Evans (2000)) on managers versus corporate entrepreneurs (see Chapter 2). Katzenbach
distinguishes between good managers who analyse, organise, monitor and control from change leaders who create, innovate, experiment and take-risks.

Figure 4.18 Good Managers (GMs) versus real change leaders (RCLs) by J. Katzenbach & The Real Change Team, taken from and adaptation by Buchanan and Huczynski (2004:635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issues</th>
<th>GMs</th>
<th>RCLs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Mindset</td>
<td><em>Analyse, leverage, optimise, delegate, organise and control it – I know best</em></td>
<td><em>Do it, fix it, change it – and do it all over again, no one person knows best</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-game assumptions</td>
<td>Earnings per share, Market share, Resource advantage, Personal promotions</td>
<td>Value to customers, employees and owners, Customer loyalty, Core skills advantage, Personal growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership philosophy</td>
<td>Strategy driven, Decide, delegate, monitor and review, Spend time on important matters, Leverages his/her time, A few good people will get it done for me</td>
<td>Aspiration driven, Do real work, Spend time on what matters to people, Expand leadership capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of productivity</td>
<td>Investment turnover, Superior technology, Process control, Leverage people</td>
<td>Productivity, Superior people, Process innovation, Develop people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability measures</td>
<td>Comprehensive measures across all areas, Clear individual accountability</td>
<td>A few critical measures in the most critical areas, Individual and mutual accountability, We hold ourselves accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-reward trade-offs</td>
<td>Avoid failure and mistakes at all cost, Rely on proven approaches, Limit career risks, Analyse until sure, I cannot afford to fail, or leave</td>
<td>Expect, learns from, and builds on failures, Try whatever appears promising, Take career risks, If in doubt, try it and see, I can work here, or elsewhere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kanter (1989:361) identifies seven essential change agency skills:

- The ability to work independently, without management power, sanction and support.
- An effective collaborator, able to compete in ways that enhance cooperation.
- The ability to develop high trust relationships, based on high ethical standards.
- Self-confidence, tempered with humility.
- Respect for the process of change, as well as the content.
- Able to work across business functions and units ‘multifaceted and ambidextrous’.
- The willingness to stake reward on results and gain satisfaction from success.

As with Katzenbach et al’s (1997) work, Kanter’s skills echo key themes in relation to the skills of the corporate entrepreneur. Given the similarities of the themes emerging from the research literature on change agents and corporate entrepreneurs, it would make interesting research to empirically explore the links between the two. It is fair to say that corporate entrepreneurs are change agents, but I would be interested to learn whether change agents are entrepreneurial and if not, what constitutes the differences between those change agents who are entrepreneurial and those who are not?

4.7.3 What do we need to change and when should we change?

In order for an organisation to identify what planned changes it should make simple tools such as SWOT analysis can be used. A SWOT analysis is an acronym for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. Strengths and Weaknesses are usually internal organisational factors, for example strength for an NHS Trust may be its portfolio of world class surgeons and a weakness may be a clinic’s culture of bed-blocking. Opportunities and Threats are typically determined by external trends such as the Government increasing its investment into Welsh hospitals or an increase in smoking related deaths in Wales.

In order to determine the most appropriate timing for these changes previously described tools such as Roger’s Innovations Theory (1966) can be used when dealing with
individual change and Tuckman and Jensen's (1977) 5 Stages of Group change when planning for group change. Janssen's (1975) Four Room Apartment model is a useful tool when planning for organisational level change. Illustrated in 4.19, the model describes four 'rooms' or organisational states.

**Figure 4.19 Janssen's (1975) Four Room Apartment in Weisbord (1987)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTMENT</th>
<th>RENEWAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation is in a state of contentment working efficiently and effectively.</td>
<td>This organisational state is one of great energy and change and if led and managed correctly should lead to a new state of organisational contentment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for change arises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFUSION</td>
<td>CONTENTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here the organisation is in a state of confusion whilst old processes, routines and beliefs are unlearned and new ways are learned.</td>
<td>The organisation is in a state of contentment working efficiently and effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions are raised. there is ambiguity, suspicion and rumours. Good, strong transformational /transactional leadership and an effective communication strategy is critical advancing from this room to 'renewal'.</td>
<td>A need for change arises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Janssen's model is useful in helping to anticipate the correct timing of planned organisational change and in managing unplanned change. The model is simplistic in its view of organisational change, assuming that only one change is planned or faced by an organisation at any one given time. The reality is that an organisation may be in each of these rooms at any one given time due to a multitude of different changes occurring within. The model is good in that it acknowledges the human and structural implications of change, for example drawing from the psychology literature i.e. Kubler-Ross' (1969) Bereavement Theory.
4.8 Tools and Techniques for Change

Many change management tools can be used to address a range of change management problems. For example, Lewin’s (1951) Force Field Analysis was introduced earlier as a means of exploring the affect of the complex, interdependent organisational context on change. It can also be used to help manage for planned change by enabling managers to anticipate driving and restraining forces and plan contingencies for these forces. Other tools that can help manage planned organisational change include the Five Why’s, Kipling’s List, Soft Systems Methodology, and SWOT analyses.

There are also several of change management, improvement and quality techniques that can help manage planned change, for example:

- Innovations research.
- N-Step Guides.
- Action Learning.
- TQM (Total Quality Management).
- BPR (Business Process Re-engineering).
- Six Sigma.

Given the parameters of this research project, it is not practical to discuss these techniques and programmes.

4.9 The Challenges of Continuous Change

The organisation is a complex, adaptive system and the organisational environment may qualify as falling within a chaotic concept (Martin, 2005). Given this, how can continual change be managed and planned for? There is a large school of thought within the organisational behaviour literature that organisational learning and learning organisation philosophies are a means of successfully managing continuous change, encouraging innovation, corporate entrepreneurship and corporate renewal. As Mullins (1999) explains, a central theme of the learning organisation is that learning is an essential ingredient of organisational performance and effectiveness. It is therefore often associated with Organisational Development (OD).
Kreitner, Kinicki and Buelens (1999:599) describe the characteristics of a learning organisation link this directly to organisational change.

'First new ideas are a prerequisite for learning. Learning organizations actively try to infuse their organisations with new ideas and information....Second, new knowledge must be transferred throughout organization. Learning organizations strive to reduce structural, process and, interpersonal barriers to the sharing of information, ideas, and knowledge among organizational members. Finally, behaviour must change as a result of new knowledge. Learning organizations are results oriented. They foster an environment in which employees are encouraged to use new behaviours and operational processes to achieve corporate goals.'

In the passage cited above, Kreitner et al (1999) not only link organisational change to organisational learning, but also there are clear linkages made with new ideas and new behaviours – these being fundamental constructs of corporate entrepreneurship.

It is only very recently that researchers are beginning to focus efforts on understanding further the possible relationships that lie between corporate entrepreneurship, organisational change and organisational learning. Zahra (1999:1) suggests that

'some of the most profound contributions of corporate entrepreneurship activities may lie in its links with the organisational learning processes that increase an organisation's competencies in assessing its markets or creating and commercialising new knowledge-intensive products, processes, or services.'

Here Zahra is alluring as to the importance in understanding the linkages between the three organisational 'processes', most explicitly corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning. A few researchers have offered conceptualisations to help try to describe possible interrelationships, and it is these and some proposals of my own that will be introduced and discussed in chapter 5.

4.10 Conclusions

Having explored the fields and processes of corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning, I focused on organisational change in this third review. I wrote
this chapter a while after writing the ones on corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning, and, as naive as it may sound now, I did not make an immediate connection between the significance of organisational change in relation to the other two. Its inclusion was largely driven by the production of the theoretical models. I attended a HRD Conference in Limerick (Sambrook and Roberts, 2004) and presented the theoretical model of corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning. Another delegate provided me with useful feedback and enquired why I had not reviewed the literature on organisational change as it featured so clearly in my models (see Chapter 5).

I struggled with how to structure this chapter, more so than with the others, as the literature didn't seem to fit quite as inclusively into the organisational level structure I had adopted for the previous chapters. So I complimented the organisational level framework with an adaptation of Iles and Sutherland's (2001) overview of change. Using these, I have explored reaction to change, resistance to change, drivers of change and tools and techniques of change.

Having reviewed the change literature, it seems that organisational change is unavoidable and inevitable. The themes from this chapter emphasise the synergies that change has with learning and entrepreneurship at the three organisational level. It seems to be inextricably interwoven into facets of organisational learning and corporate entrepreneurship, and it appears that there is a possibly co-dependency between the three. without one can there be the others? If there is one, do the others 'appear'?

The organisational change research literature is as mature as that of the organisational learning literature, but I have learned that the nature of contributions is more heavily slanted towards prescriptive change management tools over the descriptive, contextual and processual models. Much of the substantive work has been developed from classic Change Management theory such as Lewin (1951), which has roots firmly embedded within 'quantitative science'. I feel that there is a distinct shortage of empirically robust
contributions that are set within the social constructivist paradigm, and suggest that future contributions should attempt to fill this gap.

Now that I have explored intra-relationships within each field, Chapter 5 explores the inter-relationship between the three, through reviewing the research literature on what I call 'intraprelearning'. I propose a model that conceptualises my understanding of the inter- and intra-relationships between the three fields based upon my understanding of the existing literature.
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Chapter 5 - Intraprelearning: Towards a Theoretical Framework

5.1 Introduction

Chapters 2, 3 and 4 provide us with an indication of the sheer volume of theoretical and empirical contributions within each of the three fields of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change. Each has a variety of different perspectives, arguments, interpretations, conceptualisations and empirical findings. However, the overlap or inter-relationships between these three fields has received very little research attention, and thus provides academics with opportunities for developing understanding through further theoretical and empirical contributions. This chapter explores the possible interrelationships between corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change by first summarising some of the key findings from my previous literature reviews and then through exploring some of contributions that partially explore the interrelationships. I then introduce the term intraprelearning which is my name for the overlapping processes and I provide a summary of attributes from the theoretical models that have been described so far. Following a discussion of strengths and weaknesses, I introduce and describe the development of a set of two Inside-Outside models of Intraprelearning. I argue that two models are more helpful than the one, as I can show more detail, which is more useful at this stage of my research. The models serve as the foundations for my empirical research and will be used to inform the development of my research questions.

5.2 Comparing and Contrasting Corporate Entrepreneurship, Organisational Learning and Change

Following my review of each of the three fields in chapters 2, 3 and 4, I have observed that they share similar characteristics. In addition to this they appear to have what I can only describe as a form of synergy with one another. The first similarity is that each respective literature can be separated (some more inclusively than others) into three organisational levels: individual, team/group and organisational. Figure 5.1 provides some examples of the different types of each process found within the research literature and relates them to the level at which they are said to occur.
Figure 5.1 Levels and Labels of Corporate Entrepreneurship, Organisational Learning and Organisational Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCURRING LEVEL</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Team/ Group</th>
<th>Organisational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Intrapreneurship</td>
<td>Venture Groups</td>
<td>Organisational Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative from Below</td>
<td>Skunk Works</td>
<td>New Strategic Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Spin-Offs</td>
<td>Intrapreneurship</td>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry Rule Bending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Spin-Offs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mergers &amp; Acquisitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Action Learning Teams</td>
<td>Single/Double/ Deutero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogic</td>
<td>Parallel Learning</td>
<td>Organisational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Reflective</td>
<td>Cross-Functional Teams</td>
<td>Organisational Scanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
<td></td>
<td>TQM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scanning and Noticing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Six Sigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarious/experiential/co</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Process Reengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngenital</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Process Redesign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Individual Change</td>
<td>Team Change</td>
<td>Business Process Reengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrepreneurship</td>
<td>Group Change</td>
<td>Business Process Redesign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Learning Teams</td>
<td>TQM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross Functional Teams</td>
<td>Six Sigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lean Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mergers &amp; Acquisitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1 does not offer a complete overview of all of the different types found. However, what it does is highlight some of the intra-field and inter-field overlap. For example *intrapreneurship* is a corporate entrepreneurship and organisational change activity (we observe that the term is spelt intrepreneurship within the organisational change literature (see, for example, Dawson, 2003). *Action-learning teams* are organisational learning and organisational change activities (and although not illustrated in figure 5.1 in some cases may be corporate entrepreneurship activity). Some of these ‘types’ are descriptive labels i.e. intrapreneurship, dialogic learning and industry rule bending and some are labels for prescriptive frameworks or activities i.e. business process reengineering and Total Quality Management (TQM). In addition some labels can represent both descriptive and prescriptive activities i.e. action learning teams and venture groups. Finally corporate entrepreneurship and organisational change activities may be externally oriented (e.g. independent spin-offs), with many examples found of
this at the organisational level (e.g. mergers). I could not find any examples of externally oriented organisational learning activities, although I realise that activities such as mergers provide an indirect form of organisational learning at all levels.

Another set of similarities found between the three fields are the organisational factors that are common to facilitating all three processes. From an extensive literature search I have identified a number of similar supporting factors and present themes in figure 5.2.

Figure 5.2 Facilitating Conditions for Organisational Learning Corporate Entrepreneurship and Organisational Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitating conditions for:</th>
<th>OL</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial/ Prospector/ Analyser mode</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial /Prospector mode</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Prospector/ Analyser mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Flat/ matrix structure Decentralised management Adaptive/ organic adhocracy Structural integration</td>
<td>Flat/ Matrix structure High/low centralisation Structural integration Flexibility Adaptive/ organic adhocracy</td>
<td>Matrix Structure High centralisation Structural integration Flexibility Adaptive/ organic adhocracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Open communication systems</td>
<td>Open communication systems</td>
<td>Open communication systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Design</td>
<td>Autonomy Multi-disciplinary Teamwork</td>
<td>Low formalisation of roles High specialisation Flexibility Multi-disciplinary Teamwork</td>
<td>Flexibility Multi-disciplinary Teamwork Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Champion/ Sponsor</td>
<td>Change Agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.2 reiterates earlier observations that the three processes share similarities. Mintzberg’s (1973) entrepreneurial mode of strategy and Miles and Snow’s (1978) prospector and analyser describe the strategic approaches that facilitate organisational learning, corporate entrepreneurship and organisational change. As described in Chapter 2, a firm that follows the prospector strategy is highly innovative and constantly seeks out new markets and new opportunities and is oriented towards growth and risk-taking (Griffin, 1999). The defender strategy is a strategy in which the firm focuses on protecting its current markets, maintaining stable growth, and serving current customers. The analyser strategy is ‘a unique combination of the prospector and defender types’ Miles and Snow (1978:68). ‘A firm employing this strategy attempts to maintain its current business and to be somewhat innovative in new business’ (ibid).

Structural themes for facilitating each process are also very similar: Flat, matrix structures (Kanter 1983: Covin and Slevin 1991: Lysnkey 2002) with high centralisation. Some corporate entrepreneurship literature argues towards low centralisation (Lynskey 2002). Other facilitators include: structural integration not segmentation (Kanter 1988) and adaptive (Bennis, 1969) organic (Burns and Stalker 1994) adhocracies (Toffler, 1970).

The literature is full of examples reaffirming the need for communication to flow openly up and down organisational levels and across divisions, departments and teams in order for each process to flourish. The matrix structure is often cited as supporting open communication systems in organisations (Davis and Lawrence, 1977. Kanter 1983, 1988).

As with the other factors in Figure 5.2, role designs that facilitate the three processes are similar including flexibility, autonomy and multi-disciplinary team work. Drawing from the work of Martin (1992) the desired facilitating culture is the same for each process (Martin identifies three types of culture. fragmentation, integration, or differentiation). However in terms of a typology offered by Schein (1985) who proposes four different organisational cultures (power, achievement, support and role) there seem to be
differences between what is desired in each instance. Finally, in terms of support, the research literature describes and prescribes middle-to-senior leaders as being critical in supporting the individuals or teams behind the process, and therefore the process itself. The research literature provides many examples where corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change (and their components) are discussed together, in synergy with one another. At the individual level a corporate entrepreneur is a change agent and an active learner. A change agent may be a corporate entrepreneur and may be a learner. A learner may be a corporate entrepreneur and a change agent. So how do these interrelationships work in practice, at the organisational (macro) team and individual (micro) levels?

5.3 Intraprelearning

Supported by all of the evidence gathered from my critique of the research literature I set out to explore if there was any research that attempted to describe or conceptualise the links between all three processes. I introduced the term intraprelearning to describe the possible interrelationships between the three processes of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change at all organisational levels. Intraprelearning has been derived from an abbreviation of the term intra-corporate entrepreneurial learning and (drawing from my literature review) describes a set of interrelationships that may occur at the individual, team or organisational level. Intraprelearning may be formal (and officially recognised by the organisation in question) or may be informal (unofficial or unrecognised by the organisation). Furthermore, intraprelearning may be externally oriented, or may be internally oriented. In all of these contexts intraprelearning incorporates change. Change may be the trigger to intraprelearning, it may be the result of intraprelearning, it may be incorporated within the corporate entrepreneurship and learning itself. Intraprelearning can be a complexity of any and many different combinations of the above. Change may be individual, team or organisational. At each of these levels, change may be planned or unplanned, and may be incremental or radical. I will use the term intraprelearning throughout the remaining thesis as a simple way of referring to the interrelationships between the three processes of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change.
As stated previously, there is very little research that focuses discussion or empirical research on the interrelationships between corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change, or ‘intraprelearning’. From my desktop and library research I found three key contributions, each of which I will introduce and discuss within this chapter. As a response to the findings (or lack of) I propose a conceptualisation of my understanding of intraprelearning.

In my search for research that explores the interrelationships between the processes I found only three contributions that incorporated all three processes in some way. McKee (1992) does not examine corporate entrepreneurship and organisational change directly, but links product innovation as an organisational learning process. Even though his research does not examine corporate entrepreneurship and organisational change directly, his hierarchical framework focuses on innovation (which is an essential component of corporate entrepreneurship) and learning (a driver of organisational change) so his research is a good starting point from which to begin exploring the intraprelearning processes.

Zahra, Nielsen and Bogner’s cyclical (1999) and Dess et al’s feedback (2003) models focus more specifically on corporate entrepreneurship and knowledge or corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning respectively. Neither models make explicit reference to organisational change, but there are implicit references throughout both their discussions. In addition, neither pieces of research have been supported empirically.

5.4 Models of Intraprelearning
The following section introduces and describes McKee’s (1992) hierarchical, Zahra et al’s (1999) cyclical and Dess et al’s (2003) feedback frameworks and models. I begin with the hierarchical framework offered by McKee, move on to the rather linear and processual model discussed by Zahra et al, and conclude my review with the more cyclical feedback oriented model conceptualised by Dess et al.
5.4.1 Hierarchical Framework of Innovation and Organisational Learning

The earliest contribution identified in the research literature, is a framework of innovation and organisational learning offered by McKee (1992). He explores and discusses product innovation as an organisational learning process and argues that it ‘allow[s] managers and scholars to relate product-innovation learning skills to organisational goals.’ (1992:232)

Even though McKee's (1992) research does not focus directly on corporate entrepreneurship per se, his work is based on key empirical contributions from the organisational learning literature, and provides insight into intrapreneurship. Drawing from the learning levels described by Bateson (1973) and Argyris and Schön (1978), McKee links up single-loop, double-loop and meta-learning with three hierarchies or levels of innovations. Single-loop learning is linked to incremental product innovations, double-loop learning to discontinuous product innovations and meta-learning (or deutero learning) to institutionalising innovations. These learning and innovation levels are then associated with four different types of skill, interpersonal, analytic, organisational and ecological interfacing (as illustrated and described in Figure 5.3). McKee defines these skills as ‘reflecting the capabilities necessary to enhance organisational learning and strategic action.’ (1992:237).

For incremental innovation—single-loop learning, McKee describes interpersonal learning skills as having ‘inter-functional contact’. This involves the efficient communication between different groups, for example, departments or divisions within the organisation. He argues that flexible matrix structures and project teams are conducive to generating incremental innovation as they promote interfunctional contact.
McKee argues that with incremental innovations, analytical skills (those that are highly specific to a particular product or technology) are said to ‘trade off breadth with depth’ since learning occurs more readily in areas related to what is already known rather than in innovative areas. The learning skills identified by McKee at the incremental innovation level are described as ‘organisation maintenance’. This label is intended to capture an organisational culture and strategy of maintaining and efficiency in using the organisation’s existing technology base. McKee gives examples of when employees...
may create problems within this level because of their desire to maintain a state of status quo. Such employees may hide, disguise or camouflage problems making these problems unidentifiable, therefore not correctable. Incremental innovation also leads to depth of contact with a selected environment.

'This may be fostered by (1) increasing the number of contacts the organization has in a given environment (2) increasing the velocity of information between these contact points and the organization and (3) increasing the reliability of information obtained by the organization.' (1992:239)

The next innovation - learning level identified by McKee is discontinuous innovation-double-loop learning. McKee suggests that 'as an industry approaches diminishing returns from a particular technology, innovative firms must be prepared to engage in another level of learning' (1992:239). The context of discontinuous innovations is rather unpredictable, compared with the stable product-market and technical domains of incremental innovation. Interpersonal contacts in a discontinuously innovating organisation are often external, as the organisation attempts to redefine the way it fits into its environment. The learning goal of the discontinuously innovating organisation is 'to convert new environmental opportunities into new organisational norms and technologies' (1992:240). Analytic breadth characterises the changes made to the organisation and its environment, as it requires techniques that enable employees to explore and experiment. McKee suggests confrontational techniques (such as dialectical inquiry and Devil's advocacy) to facilitate organisational thinking outside of existing frameworks. Drawing from the work of Kasl et al (1993), I suggest that encouraging teams to reframe themselves as learning teams could facilitate the development of continuous learning and subsequently discontinuous innovation. Finally, in a discontinuously innovating organisation, McKee proposes that contact breadth is required, since diverse points of reference help in interpreting the ambiguous environment.

'For this reason, firms engaged in discontinuous innovation may increase (1) the diversity of information obtained from the environment. (2) the capacity of feedback systems and (3) the sensitivity of the organisation to remote signals.' (1992:241)
The final innovation–learning level identified by McKee is *institutionalising organisations*. McKee argues that the essence of institutionalised innovating is learning to learn at an organisational level. Reflecting back to Chapter 3, 'Learning to learn' has underpinned several contributions within organisational learning:

- Individual learning (e.g. Harrison's (1988) self-reflective learning).
- Team learning (e.g Kasl et al (1993) third proposition of team learning, see Chapter 3).
- Frequently implied in definitions of the learning organisation (e.g. Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell, 1996).

McKee argues that team learning must be shared and teams should be linked together within the organisational in order for the organisation to learn how to innovate. Institutionalising analysis describes how top management should create an analytical framework within which to develop innovations. McKee (1992:241) depicts this framework, as being built by:

'(1) Cultivating particular technical skills within the organization. (2) encouraging an innovative mindset among particular employee groups and (3) sponsoring ongoing new product experiments and linkages among experiments.'

Meta-norm creation describes an *organisational culture* where innovation is as much as a core value as the route to profit. Finally domain selection describes management as setting 'a direction for organisational learning by establishing boundaries' (ibid:243). These boundaries are expressed through decisions to fund or not to fund particular projects.

McKee's (1992) persuasive discussion on the different levels of learning-innovation and learning skills builds on some key contributions from the organisational learning literature. Furthermore some similarities can be highlighted between aspects of his framework, and those offered by key organisational learning and corporate

A criticism of the framework is that McKee’s association of the three different levels of learning (single-loop, double-loop and meta-learning) with three types of innovation (incremental, discontinuous and institutional) is untested. Secondly, McKee does not differentiate between the various types of innovation that may occur within an organisational setting i.e. formal, informal, and individual, team or strategic level. Similarly he does not explore the different levels from which learning may occur from, and the context within which it occurs. This said, the relationships identified within the framework provide a strong theoretical foundation from which to build empirical research.

5.4.2 Cyclical Model of Corporate Entrepreneurship, Knowledge and Organisational Competence Development

Zahra, Nielsen and Bogner (1999) offer a cyclical model of corporate entrepreneurship, knowledge and organisational competence development. So, as with the other two models, this is only a partial model of intrapreneuring. It sits within the field of knowledge management more than in that of organisational learning resulting in a greater emphasis on literature underpinned by positivist philosophies and an exploration of learning outcomes (i.e. knowledge) rather than the learning process itself. Subsequently, Zahra et al argue that formal and informal corporate entrepreneurial
activities can enrich an organisation’s performance by creating new knowledge. This knowledge in turn becomes a foundation for building new competencies or revitalising existing ones.

Figure 5.4 Corporate entrepreneurship, Knowledge, and Organisational Competence Development adapted from Zahra, Nielsen and Bogner (1999:172)

Zahra et al’s model (illustrated in Figure 5.4) shows the external environment, and internal organisational variables as impacting on both formal and informal corporate entrepreneurship activities. I observe that this model extends some of the ideas initially offered by Gautam and Verma (1997:284) as described in Chapter 2. The formal and informal corporate entrepreneurship activities are shown to lead to two types of organisational learning, acquisitive and experimental. Acquisitive learning is described as when an organisation acquires already existing external knowledge and internalises it, whereas experimental learning is generated internally and the knowledge created is distinctive to the organisation.

Zahra et al propose that it ‘is within experimental learning that corporate entrepreneurship activities may have the greatest potential to create or reinforce the firm’s competitive advantage' (1999:173). Following from this, the organisational learning gained through corporate entrepreneurial activities can be incremental, radical or both. The authors introduce three characteristics of knowledge (knowledge
outcomes) that they propose is generated from learning in corporate entrepreneurial activities. *technical*, which is specialised and specific, *integrative* which combines both tacit and explicit knowledge of many knowledge components within the organisation, and *exploitative* which is new ways to exploit the technical and integrative knowledge components.

A cycle is completed, when new knowledge outcomes lead to a new competence, which, integrated with an organisation's existing knowledge base, can effect and change organisational performance in both financial and/ or non-financial terms. This change in organisational performance should lead to a change in the external and/ or internal environment, subsequently beginning the cycle once more.

I note two observations of this preliminary, theoretical paper. Firstly, the cyclical model introduces two labels for different forms of learning that sit within the field of organisational learning (acquisitive and experimental), however, these labels are not familiar to this field, even though the definitions of acquisitive and experimental organisational learning seem to be valid and make sense. The model neglects to account for key contributions within the organisational learning field, such as the three levels of organisational learning from key theorist such as Bateson (1973), Argyris and Schön (1978) (single-loop learning, double-loop learning and deutero-learning). It is felt that integration of more notable organisational learning theory into the model, such as the three learning levels, may be more complex and problematic, but could provide a more useful and developmental insight into intrapreneurship.

The model focuses on the learning outcomes and new knowledge created from experimental learning, largely neglecting the impact of acquisitive learning. Zahra et al.'s rationale behind this is that this type of learning is more likely to increase an organisation's competence, and therefore competitive advantage. Since this model is purely theoretical, it is felt that this assumption should not be made at the expense of neglecting the complete picture, at least until some empirical work has been conducted to support that argument.
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Finally, Zahra et al's model theorises how corporate entrepreneurship may impact on organisational learning, but it is felt that due to its positivist influence, it neglects to explore how individuals' and groups' social constructions of the organisation in which they exist may impact on this relationship. I suggest that adopting an approach where the interrelationships between the individuals and groups contributing to corporate entrepreneurship and subsequent organisational learning activities are explored may provide a more comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the processes involved in this complex and dynamic relationship.

5.4.3 Feedback Model of the Relationships among Corporate Entrepreneurship, Organisational Learning and Implementation

Dess et al (2003) propose a feedback model that explores the relationships among corporate entrepreneurship, strategy, organisational learning, knowledge and implementation. This model draws heavily from that of Zahra et al's (1999) model, even though this model has not been empirically tested. In this model, corporate entrepreneurship is considered a strategic approach to management, rather than autonomous, unofficial behaviour.

Figure 5.5 Relationships among CE, Organisational Learning and Implementation

As shown in Figure 5.5, the model identifies four kinds of corporate entrepreneurship that are taken from the typology proposed by Covin (1999) (see Chapter 2 - sections 2.3
and 2.4). As with Zahra et al's (1999) model, Dess et al (2003) define organisational learning formed through corporate entrepreneurship activities in terms of acquisitive learning and experimental learning. They propose that the different types of corporate entrepreneurship have different relationships with acquisitive and experimental learning but this is not discussed in any great depth. The two types of learning are linked with new knowledge components and focus. As with Zahra, Nielsen and Bogner (1999), the two types of organisational learning are said to create new knowledge components. Dess et al (2003) suggest that acquisitive learning creates technical and integrative knowledge, whilst experimental learning creates integrative and exploitative knowledge. Following from this, implementation focuses are described for each knowledge component. Technical knowledge being responsible for leveraging knowledge, integrative knowledge recombining and extending knowledge and exploitative importing new knowledge to value creating activities.

The model is completed with a feedback loop at each of the different stages. This model is theoretically based and therefore the relationships and causalities between each of the 'components' incorporated have not been tested. Little discussion is given to support the rationale behind the positioning of the arrows in the model, and no explanation is given for the dashed arrows. it could be that weak relationships are shown with dashed arrows, but this is not made explicit in their work. However they do suggest that.

'indirect relationships between variables are not as strong as the direct relationships. For example, sustained regeneration's relationship with acquisitive learning is stronger than its relationship with experimental learning.' (2003:357)

The three models that I have introduced in this chapter are partial models of intraprelearning. McKee's model draws upon the key organisational learning literature, and is an insightful model of innovation and organisational learning. Dess et al (2003) and Zahra et al (1999) theorise from within a scientific paradigm, tending to neglect the substantial literature on organisational learning (as per Chapter 3) an adopting a knowledge management approach to their theorising.
5.5 Towards a New Research Agenda

So far, I have presented key research findings from my review of the corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change literatures and the limited research exploring the relationships between the three processes. I have noted similar key factors, such as structure, culture and Human Resource practices that might influence the three processes both positively and negatively. I have also introduced the philosophical and methodological limitations of existing intrapreneurship contributions.

Following a review of the substantial literatures in Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5, Figure 5.6 provides a summary of the key theoretical and empirical models that have been discussed in terms of methodological approach, type of model, the processes, the antecedents, and the organisational contexts and orientations.

Figure 5.6 Summary of Models within the Research Literature

Figure 5.6 provides an overview of the key theoretical contributions from each chapter and the elements of each. Models are a mixture of linear, feedback, hierarchical and...
cyclical descriptions. Those models that explore corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning omit internal and external organisational change. Aside from Pedler et al's (1996) model on the Learning Company, the other contributions to the organisational learning literature do not consider internal factors (such as strategy, structure, culture, reward and management support). At the start of this chapter I identified such internal factors as being similar for all three 'processes' of organisational learning, corporate entrepreneurship and organisational change and thus, I would argue that it is important to account for these in a theoretical model.

Some models such as the 4I framework (Crossan et al, 1999) incorporate the organisational levels (individual, team and organisational) along with a sense of learning feeding forwards and backwards in an organisational cycle. The labels used in the 4I framework translate particularly well into the process of corporate entrepreneurship (Intuiting/ Interpreting/ Integrating/Institutionalising).

Burgleman's model (1984) of autonomous and induced strategic behaviour suggests that corporate entrepreneurship could be theorised in terms of its official/ formal or unofficial/informal nature, something that the other models within the Corporate Entrepreneurship literature do not consider. Both the Horsnby et al (1993) and the Guatam and Verma (1997) models omit culture in their internal processes, which I feel is a weakness that should be addressed in future models. Drawing from Figure 5.6 and the discussion that has taken place within this and the previous three chapters, a model of intrapreneurship should contain the following attributes:

- Illustrate intrapreneurship in terms of organisational hierarchy (individual/group and organisational).
- Show the significance of feedback/ feed-forward/ cycles.
- Map the different labels used within the literature (e.g. intrapreneurship, corporate ventures, spin-offs, mergers).
- Show levels of different sub-processes (e.g. single-, double- and meta- loop learning/ induced, autonomous entrepreneurship).
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• Incorporate internal change drivers as per Organisational Change literature (McKinsey 7S, 1982).

I will now describe the development of the conceptual framework that forms the basis of this research. A conceptual framework is defined by Miles and Huberman (1994:18) as follows:

'A conceptual framework explains, either graphically or in narrative form the main things to be studied – the key factors, constructs or variables – and the presumed relationships among them. Frameworks can be rudimentary or elaborate, theory-driven or commonsensical, descriptive or causal.'

'Conceptual framework issues are unique to any particular study and may be approached either 'loosely or tightly. in either case, initial design decisions nearly always lead to redesign.' (ibid)

I have adopted a qualitative methodological approach to this research project. In order to introduce my conceptual framework it is important to outline some discussion from the qualitative inquiry literature about how conceptual frameworks can be formed and the shapes that they may take. As indicated above, Miles and Huberman make the case that conceptual frameworks within 'qualitative research' tend to sit between tight pre-structured designs and loose emergent ones.

'Something is known conceptually about the phenomenon, but not enough to house a theory. The researcher has an idea of the parts of the phenomenon that are well understood and knows where to look for these things - in which settings, among which actors. And the researcher usually has some initial ideas about how to gather the information.' (1994:17)

My initial attempt in forming a conceptual model for this research resulted in a rather linear framework consisting of what Miles and Huberman label as 'bins' (1994:20).
This linear model listed aspects within each of the processes of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change, however it did not capture the levels at which the processes and sub-processes may occur and the potential barriers preventing interactions between them. I was not satisfied with the linear model and decided to experiment with a cyclical model inspired by the work of Kolb (1985) and Rosengarten (1999) but one in which I could recognise the dynamic of different organisational 'levels' such as individual, team and organisational based on work such as Crossan, Lane and White's 4I Framework (1999). I began to look for tools and models that could help me to describe what I wanted to describe more completely.

I came across the Yin Yang symbol which is an ancient Chinese conceptualisation of how things work. I felt that the Yin Yang symbol described the essence of the interdependent and synergistic relationships between corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning. Using the Yin Yang metaphor as inspiration, I reworked my initial cyclical conceptualisation into two models3 which enabled me to incorporate the detail that I sought as an outcome to the development of the summary in Figure 5.6.

I now refer to the set of models as Inside-Outside models of Intraprelearning. more specifically I have labelled the first model as Intraprelearning Outside-In (I-OI), and the second Intraprelearning Inside-Out (I-IO). Both models show different, yet interrelated, relationships between four key constructs and draw from the literature reviews as per summary in Figure 5.6.

- Organisational learning
- Corporate entrepreneurship

3 During my Viva a problem concerning the use of the Yin Yang metaphor was highlighted in that I have used it rather superficially here, but if a reader were to take the metaphor and interpret it more deeply other meanings of Yin Yang can be applied to my models that I had not intended. For example, Yin links to femininity, winter, interior activity, darkness; Yang links to masculinity, summer and exterior activity. It was agreed that the use of this metaphor may lead to confusion and distorted meanings and so it has been replaced with Inside-Outside models from here. However, it is important to note that using the Yin Yang metaphor was helpful in constructing my initial two models, although it is no longer appropriate.
• Changes in the external environment: for example, changes in the wider cultural, economic, political or technological environment, or in the more specific market environment.

• Changes in the internal environment: for example, changes in strategy, structure, reward, resources, and culture.

5.6 A Theoretical Model of Intraprelearning

The first model (I:O-I. see figure 5.7) shows organisational learning [OL] (2) in its centre and corporate entrepreneurship (CE) on the outside. I propose that the organisational learning in the centre represents the hub for all types and forms of organisational learning activities. For example, in this centre, organisational learning may represent individual, team or organisational learning. The organisational learning may be intuiting, interpreting, integrating or institutionalizing (Crossan, Lane and White, 1999). Learning could be single-loop, double-loop or deutero learning (Argyris and Schön, 1978) and may involve the many different processes identified by Huber (1991) in his processual model. The learning at the centre accounts for the learning skills identified by McKee (1992) in his Innovation Learning Skills framework, interpersonal, analytic, organisational and ecological interfacing.
There are two paths mapped out in the model. The black lines denote the path for official strategic innovation, whilst the grey path denotes the unofficial innovation, or autonomous strategic behaviour (Burgelman, 1983).

To explain the model, I will begin the cycle when a change occurs in the external environment (1), although this may not be the start of the cycle in reality. A change may be a political, economic, socio-cultural or technical change. I propose that an organisation will have to learn about a change before it can react to it (2). In the case of official corporate entrepreneurship [CE] (3), once organisational learning has occurred,
corporate entrepreneurial activities may be oriented externally (5) – such as merger or joint venture - or may be oriented internally (6) – such as venture groups. In the case of unofficial autonomous corporate entrepreneurship (4) these changes may also be externally oriented (8) – such as independent spin-offs - or internally oriented (9) – such as skunkworks.

If the corporate entrepreneurship is externally oriented, then this will have an obvious effect on the present market environment, and subsequently cause a change in it (1) through the introduction of a new product or service. So the cycle would begin again. If the corporate entrepreneurial activities are internally oriented, then this will cause changes in the internal environment (7), such as job redesign, restructure, new reward system or revised learning and development activities, for example. Changes in the internal environment could incorporate any of the hard or soft 7S’s that I introduced I Chapter 4. I argue that these changes would require further organisational learning support (2), and then the corporate entrepreneurship spiral would begin again (3) or (4).

The dashed lines in the model represent my acknowledgment that these cycles could not run as smoothly as described above. For example, externally oriented corporate entrepreneurship activities would probably also induce changes in the internal environment, and vice versa. I also recognise that the act of organisational learning (2) itself may cause internal changes (7), without the interaction with corporate entrepreneurship activities.

My second model (I:I-O illustrated in figure 5.8) shows corporate entrepreneurship at its centre (4). Inverting the I-OI model this way enables the detail of the model to be shifted from a Corporate Entrepreneurship focus to that of Organisational Learning. In Figure 5.8 feed forward and feedback loops have been mapped onto the model, thus enabling the pathway from intuiting (individual) to institutionalising (organisational) to be demonstrated.
I propose that corporate entrepreneurship represents all of the different types of corporate entrepreneurship (such as intrapreneurship, mergers and acquisitions and venture groups), and can be official or unofficial in nature. As with the first model, there are two main paths, and we will begin by assuming a change in the external environment (1), although again, this may not be the initial trigger in reality.

A change in the external environment (1) may be learned at the organisational level (2) or at the individual/group level (3). Changes could be political, socio-cultural, technical or economical. I have indicated the path for organisational level learning with the black line, and individual level learning with the grey line.
Organisational level learning will 'cause' organisations to react through corporate entrepreneurial activities (4). As the I-I-O model illustrates, these activities will most likely be formal and official in nature, whereas individual/group level learning will most probably induce autonomous corporate entrepreneurial behaviour (Burgelman, 1983). Whatever type of corporate entrepreneurship behaviour is created, my model shows that this will lead to both internal change (5) and external environment (possibly market) change (1).

Drawing from Crossan, Lane and White (1999), the dotted straight lines in the model show how learning may progress from the individual level up through the organisation (intuiting to institutionalizing, through feed forward) and how learning can progress from the organisational level through to the individual level (institutionalizing to intuiting, feedback).

As with the first model, I acknowledge that in reality the overall process is more complex. OL (2) and individual/group learning (3) may create changes in the internal organisational environment (5), without the intervention of corporate entrepreneurial activities. The dashed arrows illustrate this. For both models I argue that organisational learning activities could not directly lead to changes in the external market environment per se, since a change in the market environment would require some form of corporate entrepreneurship intervention. However, organisational learning activities may create changes in the external environment, including cultural, political, economical and technological change.

5.7 Conclusions
This chapter has explored the possible interrelationships between corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change through a new, more succinct label, 'intraprelearning'. I define intraprelearning as:

any learning (individual/team/organisational) that facilitates corporate entrepreneurship (individual/team/organisational) through triggering change
Intraprelearning may be tacit or explicit, may be single-, double- or meta-loop and may be formal or informal.

I have 'pulled together' themes from chapters 2, 3 and 4 and have observed that organisational learning, change and corporate entrepreneurship share similar characteristics. They appear to have a form of synergy with one another. Each of the literatures lend themselves to being described (some more inclusively than others) via three organisational levels: individual, team/group and organisational. From an extensive literature search I have identified a number of similar supporting factors and present themes between the three fields, including structure, communications, reward and resources, and culture.

Finally I have introduced and described two Inside-Outside theoretical models of Intraprelearning that illustrate my understanding of how corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change may interrelate with each other. The models have been developed from key contributions and themes from existing literature and I have attempted to address any weaknesses that I have noted through their development. The models serve as the foundations of my empirical research and will be used to inform the development of my research questions. The Intraprelearning: Outside-In and Intraprelearning: Inside-Out are conceptualisations for the private sector organisational context. Chapter 6 introduces the context of this research project which is NHS Trust hospitals (public sector organisation). Therefore, as part of the methodology I have had to re-conceptualise the models to reflect the unique set of circumstances of public sector NHS Trusts, which I present next in Chapter 6.
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Chapter 6 - Context and Cases: 
Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts

6.1 Introduction
This chapter introduces the context of my research within two National Health Service (NHS) Trusts in Wales. For much of this thesis, I have not differentiated between the public and private sector, and much of my discussion has been private-sector oriented. Even the construct 'corporate entrepreneurship' is concerned with entrepreneurship within a corporation, which suggests a private sector organisation. There is no public sector equivalent. I have decided to continue to use the label 'corporate entrepreneurship', but I do interchange between this and 'Trust entrepreneurship' throughout the rest of this research. Trust entrepreneurship seems more fitting, but I am reluctant to add 'yet another name' into a relatively immature field that already has an abundance of labels within it.

So this chapter introduces the NHS context and explores the implications of public versus the private organisational context. I redefine intrapreneuring and propose a working model of intrapreneuring, which will act as the basis for my empirical research into the NHS Trusts. The overarching research strategy is introduced, that is the case study method and then the two cases, Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts, are introduced. I begin the narrative of my research method and explain my contingencies for attracting participants to get involved with my research.

6.2 The Context: NHS Wales
My field notes tell me that it was when my first supervisor left the university in January 2004 that the context of, or where to conduct my research became an issue. Up until this point I had rather neglectfully spent very little time considering the different large company contingencies open to me as I did not feel that it was a matter of concern. I think that this 'false sense of security' had arisen because my first supervisor was well networked into a number of key large companies within North Wales and across the
borders into the North Western counties of England. On broaching the issue of access with my supervisor, I was confidently assured by him that it would not be a problem.

This first supervisor left a year-and-a-half into my research and when Sally took over the role of supervisor, one of her first questions to me was ‘where are you going to collect your data?’ The problem as it stood was that there were not very many examples of large companies within our immediate locality. It was during a meeting in this initial ‘hand-over’ period that Sally suggested exploring a National Health Service (NHS) Trust or several Trusts within the area. Sally made her point on two grounds, firstly that she had a strong network of associates working within the local NHS trusts which could facilitate access and secondly the NHS was a strong example of a large, complex and bureaucratic organisation within our area, an area that was distinctly lacking private sector examples. Initially I felt daunted by this prospect because the NHS seemed completely alien to me and I worried that my lack of familiarity within this industry may hamper the quality of my research, yet I agreed to explore the prospect further. Reflecting back to this period, I think that I behaved very dependently on both my first supervisor and then on Sally for obtaining access into organisations. In a quantitative study on the supervisor dependency factor Kam (1997) found that a native English speaker from the ‘soft’ sciences, like myself, is statistically more likely to be more dependant on my supervisor for problem-solving support. The study tests hypothesised variables rather than looking for emerging themes and the issue of access is not directly explored, although trying to get-in to an organisation is in a sense a problem that requires solving.

In order to familiarise myself within this field and to explore for possible synergies between my interest in corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change, I undertook a review of the NHS research literature. I attempted to familiarise myself with key historical events, and key issues currently affecting NHS stakeholders including its staff and patients. So how could research within the fields of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change be useful and meaningful to and be enriched an NHS Trust context?
NHS Wales was previously part of the same National Health Service as England but is now devolved. It is operated and managed by the Health and Social Care Department of the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG), and NHS Wales consists of twelve regional NHS Trusts (WAG 2007). NHS Trusts in Wales are different to Trusts in England. The focus in England is on primary care and this is delivered through Primary Care Trusts. Primary Care Trusts are undergoing strategic change and a split is being developed between commissioning services and providing services. There are no Local Health Boards in England, as in Wales, who commission services.

A Welsh NHS Trust will typically administer all hospitals in a region, as well as all community care and mental health functions. There is usually one District General Hospital (sometimes called Main Acute Hospital) in every NHS Trust. District General Hospitals provide a range of services on an outpatient, inpatient and day case basis, with some providing specialist services. NHS Trusts also provide community services such as district nurses, health visitors, midwives and community based speech therapists, physiotherapists and podiatrists.

In order to develop an understanding of the vast entity that is the NHS and the complex web of Trusts, Local Health Boards and District General Hospitals within, I began to read around the ‘subject’. From the start, it was clear to me that the literature on the NHS was abundant and varied. My literature review strategy was to focus on issues that may be relevant to intraprelearning. From this, I noted that there were many examples that emphasised the NHS’ inertia and inability to keep up with a changing society. For example, a key strategic report called the NHS Plan (DH 2000:2) highlighted the difficulties that the NHS has had in being able to ‘keep pace with changes in society’. The Plan even refers to the NHS being a ‘1940’s operating system in a 21-century world’.

‘The NHS is too much the product of the era in which it was born. In its buildings, its ways of working, its very culture, the NHS bears too many of the hallmarks of the 1940s. The rest of society has moved on.’ (DH 2000:29, underline added)

Continuing to read around the subject, but taking more detailed note of those articles, books and white papers that had key words relating to the antecedents of
intraprelearning (corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change), I came across several articles that recognised the value of learning and its role in realising potential to achieve improvements in quality and service deliver. An example of such literature was that on the Agenda for Change (A4C). The A4C is a recently implemented NHS pay-scheme. A key tool within the A4C is a career framework called the Knowledge Skills Framework. It describes the:

‘Knowledge and skills which NHS staff need to apply in their work in order to deliver quality services.’ (DH: 2007, underline added)

I noted that a key purpose of the Knowledge Skills Framework was to:

‘Facilitate the development of services so that they better meet the needs of users and the public through investing in the development of all members of staff.’ (DH: 2007, underline added)

For me, this quote captures key concerns within today’s NHS in terms of corporate entrepreneurship (better meeting the needs of users and public), organisational learning (development of all members of staff) and organisational change (development of services).

Looking for signs of intraprelearning activity beyond the paper literature, I found websites for schemes that actively promoted the benefits of fostering corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change philosophies in today’s NHS. Since 1998, NHS bodies have had the power to exploit Intellectual Property (defined. Intellectual Property is an idea or a concept, or any other intellectual work that has ‘commercial value’ (UAII, 2007)) to make more income available to improve health services. These powers have now been extended to those Intellectual Properties that have emerged from outside the formal R&D departments within Trust hospitals, such as unofficial entrepreneurship (DH 2002). In England, NHS Innovations was established in 2001 to encourage and support NHS Trusts, Primary Care Trusts and their employees in identifying and developing innovations. This was merged into the NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement in 2006.
The NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement's mission is to:

'Improve health outcomes and raise the quality of delivery in the NHS by accelerating the uptake of proven innovation and improvements in healthcare delivery models and processes, medical products and devices and healthcare leadership.' (DH 2005 accessed January 2007)

Similarly in Wales the National Leadership and Innovations Agency for Health Care (NLIAH) was set up in 2006. Finally I came across the following extract in the NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement website (DH 2005):

'Building capacity and capability in innovation and improvement is an overarching priority that aims to develop the NHS at a system level, by means of introducing radical new ideas and enabling individuals, teams, and organisations to develop, accept, and benefit from better ways of doing things.' (Accessed March 2007)

I feel that the above not only emphasises a common purpose between my research interests and current NHS priorities, it also demonstrates how insightful and beneficial research into NHS intraprelearning could be in building capacity and capability. The next section explains how I have adapted my previous private-sector oriented framework of intraprelearning and its underpinning definitions for public sector research.

6.3 Adapting the Theoretical Framework

In chapter 5, I introduced a working definition of intraprelearning borne out of my need to describe the overlap between corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change levels and characteristics within an organisation. The definition of intraprelearning was developed from literature exploring the private sector. One of the challenges of my research was to identify whether this definition applied to public sector organisations, in particular NHS Trusts, and if not provide a contextually appropriate definition.

At this point in my PhD study, I had the opportunity to get involved with facilitating around twelve students on a MSc module called 'Leadership, Quality, Innovation and Change'. A high proportion of the students on the course were from the Trusts in which my data was collected. It was during one of the teaching sessions that I asked the class to
work with me in finding a mutually agreed working definition of corporate entrepreneurship within the NHS. I presented the class with the definitions of corporate entrepreneurship as in Chapter 2 and opened the debate. I did not have enough time to work out a definition of corporate entrepreneurship, but the class addressed the issue of the nature of risk in NHS Trusts with gusto. Students were not comfortable with ‘taking risks’ as they felt that this may lead to patients being harmed. The following discursive constructs were suggested by class members: managed-risk, safe-risk, guarded-risk, risk-without-harm, continuously-assessed-risk. Mutual agreement was reached on ‘guarded-risk taking’ as being the most suitably representative antecedent of corporate entrepreneurship within the context of an NHS Trust.

6.4 NHS Corporate Entrepreneurship

Drawing from Thompson and McNamara’s (2001) definition of private sector entrepreneurship, from Greenhalgh et al’s (2004) definition of innovation in the NHS and from the students understanding of risk-taking in NHS Trusts, I developed a working definition of NHS corporate entrepreneurship (NHS CE):

It is the process of proactively engaging in creative, ethical and guarded risk-taking behaviours, routines and ways of working that seek to create entrepreneurial behaviour that is:

(a) Perceived as new by a proportion of key stakeholders
(b) Linked to the provision or support of health care
(c) Discontinuous with previous practice

which facilitates organisational redefinition and rejuvenation through improving: administrative efficiency, cost effectiveness, the user experience, and ultimately leads to enhanced patient care.

NHS CE is engaged in by individual (or team of) corporate entrepreneurs and supported by a sponsor or champion. NHS CE may be formal and official, may be informal and unofficial or both. Activities may be oriented within the Trust or externally to the Trust.
6.5 NHS Intraprelearning

From my definition of NHS CE, the term intraprelearning can be defined more specifically in terms of the NHS as *any learning (individual/team/organisational) that facilitates NHS CE (individual/team/organisational) through triggering change (individual/team/organisational)*. Intraprelearning may be tacit or explicit, may be single-, double- or meta-loop and may be formal or informal.

As with private sector organisations, NHS Trusts face a multitude of external and internal forces that drive change. This is complicated even further due to the unique relationship that Trusts have with their customers.

6.6 Public Sector versus Private Sector Organisations

Once I had adapted my working definitions of NHS CE and NHS Intraprelearning, I then revisited the theoretical models which were based on private sector conditions. The conceptual framework did not account for the dynamics of the public sector. I struggled quite a bit with trying to understand why a public sector organisation would be different and the impact that this would have on my models. I shifted the focus of my literature searches to locating contributions exploring public versus private sector dynamics. Drawing from electronic articles and a well resourced Health library, I was able to begin to compare and identify the differences between the private and public sectors. I found some literature that compared the difference between public and private sector organisations, and a smaller selection of literature that explored this in terms of innovation in healthcare. This enabled me to adapt my models to allow for the healthcare context.

There are several contributions in the research literature that attempt to outline key differences between a public sector NHS Trust and a competitive firm from the private sector. Naschold (1996) summarises the differences as follows:
Similarly, Roste and Miles (2005) provide a chart of differences (see figure 6.1 for adaptation), but more relevantly they propose differences in terms of their possible relationships to innovations.

**Figure 6.1 Archetypal Features of Private and Public Sectors and their possible relations to the Prosperity and Direction of Innovation adapted from Roste and Miles (2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organising Principles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enactment of Public Policies.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuit of Profit, of Stability or of Growth of Revenues.</td>
<td><em>- New and Changing Policies may require Innovations of many kinds</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changing market conditions may require innovations to enhance perceived value for money or generate new products. Market as a selection process for innovations: business cycles create periods of relative austerity and prosperity for many firms, and can be related to investor willingness to support innovative sectors and start-ups.</td>
<td><em>Often the problems with which these policies are meant to contend are highly complex, not always well understood, and policies may thus have contradictory effects. The political cycle as a selection process debates alternative policy directions, and opportunities to restructure public organisations.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Structures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complex system of organisations with various (and to some extent conflicting) tasks.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firms of many sizes, with options for new entrants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Metrics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multiple performance indicators and targets.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>While there are efforts to emulate private sector management practice, managers are typically under high levels of political scrutiny. Successful managers likely to receive lower material benefits than comparable private sector managers.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some managers have considerable autonomy, others constrained by shareholders, corporate governance, or financial stringency. Successful managers liable to be rewarded with substantial material benefits and promotion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with End Users</td>
<td>Markets may be consumer or industrial ones, and firms vary in the intimacy of their links with the end-users of their products, but typically market feedback provides the verdict on innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with Supply Chain</td>
<td>Most firms are parts of one or more supply chains, with larger firms tending to organise these chains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with Employees</td>
<td>Nature of workforce varies considerably, and relations between employees and management range from fractious to harmonious. Efforts are made in some firms to instil company loyalty and/or a customer-centric approach, but employee motivations are often mainly economic ones of securing a reasonable income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with Sources of Knowledge</td>
<td>Companies have considerable flexibility in sourcing innovation related information from consultants, trade associations, and public sector researchers, but many smaller firms have limited resources to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Horizon</td>
<td>Short-term in many sectors, though utilities and infrastructural services may have very long horizons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More generally, Heffron (1989) outlines three key differences between public and private sector organisations: environmental factors, internal structures and processes, and personnel:

**Environmental factors**

Public sector organisations:

- Are less market oriented therefore may have lower incentives for efficiency.
- Depend on revenues that are based on political decisions rather than market performance.
- Function under more formal legal conditions and respond to a more diverse group of clients and interests.

**Internal structures and processes**

Public sector organisations:
• Often have multiple goals that are difficult to measure and that can conflict with each other.
• Authority is likely to be fragmented and weak in terms of quick decision making.
• Decisions are sometimes characterised by caution with innovations.

**Personnel**

• The nature of public sector organisations makes it more difficult to measure the performance of employees. Public sector employees may have a stronger need for flexibility according to the nature of the task.

The contributions above do not differentiate between type of public sector organisation (i.e. university, police force, council, trust, hospital) and the themes might be too general to be meaningful to a particular public sector organisation. A key difference between a public sector NHS trust and a private sector firm that I think has been largely overlooked in the examples above is the nature of the external environmental forces that can drive change and innovation. There are a number of external forces that can impact upon a NHS Trust and drive change. External forces may be political factors, economic influences, sociological trends, technological innovations, ecological factors, or legislative requirements (Illes and Sutherland, 2001:29). White (1998) identifies five types/driver of change that occur within Health Care Organisations: Technological Change, Product or Service Change, Administrative Change, Structural Change and Attitude (or Value) Change.

Halvorsen et al (2005) identify five external ‘pushes for innovation’ and four factors ‘creating a pull for innovation’ in their discussion paper on innovation in the Public Health sector:

**Pull**

• Policies and political targets (government driven)
• Popular opinion (media/patient driven, and can lead to policy and political targets).
• International agreements, laws, regulations and standards (e.g. European Working Time Directive).
• Technological and scientific developments
• ‘Other’ societal developments (demographical/ increased migration/ catastrophes).

_Pushes_
• User needs and preferences (customer/ employee driven).
• Organisational overstretch or frustration with status quo (employee driven).
• Lobbyism (employer driven).
• Technological dependencies (innovator driven).

6.7 A Working Model of NHS Intraprelearning
Once I reviewed this literature, I was able to adapt my original theoretical models of
intraprelearning from a more informed perspective. Whereas private sector service
industry counterparts promote some form of unique selling point or competitive
advantage in order to win profits and market share, NHS Trusts are focused on meeting
numerous standards and targets focused around providing a high quality of care to its
patients. Thus, in the external environment, we can focus on political factors, economic
influences, sociological trends, technological innovations, ecological factors and
legislative requirements. Internally, we can focus on strategy, structure, systems,
culture, role, responsibilities and resources. Also, formal corporate entrepreneurship
activities can be broken down into different levels within the Trust – Trust, Divisional
and Directorate.
Figure 6.2 shows the Intraprelearning: Inside-Out model that has been adapted from Chapter 5. I used two models in Chapter 5 as I was not able to incorporate all of the labels from the reviewed literature in the one model. It is not as necessary to show both sets of models here as the changes driven by the public sector context affect the external change and internal change constructs rather than the organisational learning and the corporate entrepreneurship constructs. This working model (Figure 6.2) now illustrated possible intraprelearning relationships within an NHS Trust context, and could act as the basis for developing my case studies of two NHS Trusts, namely Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts. I could use the working model in the design of my research to help inform the development of my research questions and once my data has been analysed to inform
an actual model of intraprelearning. I feel that this narrative will flow best if I introduce my overarching method of study at this point, that is the exploration of intraprelearning into two NHS Trust cases.

6.8 The Case Study as a Research Strategy

A substantial amount has been written about the case study (or case studies). It is not particularly useful to review this in-depth for the purposes of this project, however, I will summarise the main characteristics and arguments. An important differentiation to make right from the outset is the difference between method and methodology.

'Methods are the techniques used in collecting data. Methodology, on the other hand, refers to the assumptions that you have as a researcher, which can be epistemological or political in character, or mean that you support the view of the world promoted by a particular theoretical tradition.' (Travers: 2004, p vi)

A case study or set of case studies therefore, is an umbrella technique used in collecting data. In this research my methodology is an autoethnography (social constructivist) and my method is two case studies. Within these case studies I have used a range of different 'sub'-methods (or tools), such as semi-structured interviews, observations, notes, desktop research and historical evidence. As Stake (1998:86) wrote the 'case study is not the methodological choice, but a choice of object to be studied' and this is a very important distinction that is often confused by laymen. Yin (1994:13) defines a case study as an empirical inquiry that:

'Investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.'

And, as Hartley (1994) emphasises, a case study is of interest because the phenomenon is not isolated from its context, it is researched in relation to its context.

Yin (1994) frames case studies as a research strategy (Yin, 1994:13) and it is generally agreed amongst contributing authors that case studies are particularly useful for exploring and responding to 'how' and 'why' questions (for example Yin, 1994: Stake, 1998: Travers 2004: Flyvbjerg, 2006). In my research I will be drawing from Yin
and using the case study as a research strategy. There seems to be consensus in that a study of a case may comprise of a single ‘case’ unit or several cases. Data collected to build the case can be quantitative, qualitative or ‘triangulated’ between the two. The case in the research (or unit of analysis) may be an individual or some event or entity (Yin, 1994). In this research my unit of analysis is a Welsh NHS Trust, and I will be describing, exploring and comparing two cases.

I notice that there is a degree of fragmentation in the way case studies are categorised, this I feel is caused by researchers not developing upon the work of their counterparts. Yin differentiates case study by content. He identifies three types of case study strategy: Exploratory, Descriptive, Explanatory. Conversely Stake (1998) differentiates case study by purpose. He identifies three types: intrinsic (to form a better understanding), instrumental (to understand or provide insight into an issue or refinement of theory) and collective case studies (inquiry into a phenomenon, population or general condition). Flyvbjerg (2006) categorises case studies into Extreme (dramatic), Critical (of strategic importance) or Paradigmatic (exemplar or prototype). There are other types of case study that appear in the research literature such as prospective case studies (for example Trochim, 1989) and embedded case studies (Yin, 2002).

With respect to the content of a case study, my observations echo that of Meyer, (2001:329) in that:

‘As opposed to other qualitative or quantitative research strategies, such as grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) or surveys (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981), there are no specific requirements guiding case study research. Yin and Eisenhardt (1989) give useful insights into the case study as a research strategy, but leave most of the design decisions on the table. This is both the strength and weakness of the approach.’

An important part of any research is trying to assure those reading it of its academic credibility and rigour.
Traditional measures of case study rigour and quality include trustworthiness, credibility, confirmability, and data dependability (US General Accounting Office, 1990). This language is more akin to positivist science. In Chapter 1, I introduced the quantitative quality indicators of construct validity, internal validity, external validity and reliability and then the qualitative indicators of persuasiveness and plausibility, correspondence, coherence and pragmatism.

Yin (1994) provides tactics for social science tests (see Figure 6.3). I feel that his suggestions are still entrenched in the values of positivist epistemology and are not very meaningful or useful in terms of qualitative ‘testing’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Case Study Tactic</th>
<th>Phase of Research in which tactic occurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct validity</td>
<td>-use of multiple evidence sources</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-establish chain of evidence</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-have key informants review draft case report</td>
<td>Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal validity</td>
<td>-do pattern-matching</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-do explanation building</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-do time-series analysis</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External validity</td>
<td>-use replication logic in multiple-case studies</td>
<td>Research design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>-use case study protocol</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-develop case study database</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yin (1994, 2002) lists a further three traditional research concerns associated with the case study:

1. Lack of rigour:
   Caused by: Researcher allowing equivocal evidence or biased views
   Confusion between case study research and case study teaching
   Bias entering research strategies within the case, e.g. in interviews.
2. Little basis for scientific generalisation:

Caused by: Like experiments case studies are generalisable to theoretical propositions (analytic generalization) not to populations or universes (statistical generalization).

3. Time consuming:

Historically case studies have been carried out over long periods of time, although this is changing.

It is suggested (Flyvbjerg 2006) that the issue of rigour can be overcome through using academically rigorous research design, methods and techniques during and when writing up the research. I have read that case studies lend themselves to being generalised suitably with a technique called 'falsification' (Popper, 1959 – all swans are white - until a black one is found) which according to several within the social science field is critical to reflexivity.

'Falsification is one of the most rigorous tests to which a scientific proposition can be subjected: If just one observation does not fit with the proposition it is considered not valid generally and must therefore be either revised or rejected.' (Flyvbjerg 2006: 226)

As my research is a qualitative enquiry the issues of validity, reliability and generalisability do not lend themselves as useful ways of assessing the quality of a case study. In Chapter 1, I have introduced those for qualitative research, such as Reissman's (2002): persuasiveness and plausibility, correspondence, coherence and pragmatic use. I have also listed Silverman's (2005) ten key questions as criteria for evaluating qualitative research. I will draw from such contributions to ensure that my case studies are qualitatively sound.

Now that the key issues concerning case studies have been described, I introduce the units of analysis for this case study.
6.9 Introducing the Cases

This research is a comparative case study of intraprelearning in two NHS Trusts, both based in Wales. The trusts are located in servicing regions that are adjacent to each other. Yin (1994:23) calls for caution in determining the unit of analysis of the case study. He illustrates his argument using a case about the development of a new microcomputer by an engineering team.

'[there is ] a fundamental problem in doing case studies....that of defining the unit of analysis. Is it the case of the minicomputer or is it about the dynamics of a small group – the engineering team? The answer is critical if we want to understand how the case study relates to a broader body of knowledge- that is whether to generalise to a technology topic or to a group dynamics topic.'

The unit of analysis for this study is intraprelearning in an NHS Trust, of which there are two comparative cases. Yin (ibid) also highlights that a case should clearly:

- Outline what is the immediate topic for the case study and distinguish this from the context for the case study.
- Give specific time boundaries are needed to define the start and end of the case.
- If the case is set within a particular geographical area, decisions should be made whether or not to include those that may be relevant/important but that fall outside of the area.

Addressing each of Yin's points above in turn, the immediate topic for the case study is intraprelearning in two NHS Trusts. The context for the case study is rural trusts in Wales. The research explores intra-Trust, and compares and contrasts data collected from two Trusts over a time period of one year from July 1st 2004 until July 1st 2005. The cases are set within a particular geographical area, which is each Trust's operating region as set out by the Welsh Assembly Government.

For this research the Trusts have been given a pseudonym of: Aberash NHS Trust and Brynbeth NHS Trust. The following introductions to each Trust are based on official
documents and therefore portray the official 'corporate' image and positioning of each Trust. The introduction describes each Trust in terms of its Structure, and I have deliberately been imprecise in my referencing as a key concern is to respect the wishes of anonymity from both Trusts.

6.8.1 Aberash NHS Trust
Aberash NHS Trust was established as the result of a merger in 1999. Its services span more than one county in Wales and serves around 250,000 permanent residents. The Trust employs just under 5000 staff and has a revenue budget of around 200 million pounds per annum. It is led by a Board (see Figure 6.4) comprising of a Chairman, Chief Executive, four Executive Directors and seven Non-Executive Directors (Internal document).

Figure 6.4 Organisational Structure of Aberash Trust

The Trust is responsible for two acute hospitals, nine community hospitals and clinics, two mental health hospitals and three support units. All are supported by an extensive network of community, mental health and learning disability services. Services within the Trust are arranged into seven directorates: Surgery, Medicine, Community, Diagnostics/ Clinical, Women & Family, Mental Health, and Quality & Clinical Assurance (Internal Document). At the time of the interviews, the Trust was involved with four main capital projects: a new community hospital, the redesign of a department,
the reconfiguration of a few hospitals and the development of a clinical school (Internal Document).

6.8.2 Brynbeth NHS Trust

Brynbeth NHS Trust came was established in 1999 when two former Trusts merged. The Trust services around 390,000 people, employs just over 5000 staff and has an annual turnover of around £180m (Appendix 10). The Trust consists of 10 acute and community hospitals and clinics, and five units specialising in various mental illnesses and learning disabilities and several health, six community mental health teams and nearly 30 health centres, clinics, children's units and dental centres. (Internal Document). The Trust Board comprises of a Chairman, CEO, seven Non-Executive Directors and five Executive Directors (see Figure 6.5).

![Organisational Structure of Brynbeth Trust]

Having addressed where the 'data' for this research was collected, I had to determine what type of data I planned to collect, how I intended to collect this data and who I would collect the data from.

6.10 The Research Questions

Yin (1994) argues that case study research should have study propositions:
only if you are forced to state some propositions will you move in the right direction...at the same time, some studies may have a legitimate reason for not having any propositions...every exploration, however, should still have some purpose...as well as the criteria by which an exploration will be judged successful...even if [an] initial assumption might later be proved wrong...without such propositions and investigator might be attempted to collect “everything,” which is impossible to do.’ (adapted from Yin (1994:22)

I found it very burdensome to come up with my research questions for this study. I felt a pressure to ‘get it right’, as ‘getting it wrong’ could jeopardise the overall quality and usefulness of my research project. Using the model of intraprelearning to keep my questions focused, I developed eleven research questions that I felt would enable me to put together a case of intraprelearning within each Trust.

My research questions were as follows:

1. Who are the corporate entrepreneurs within the Trusts?
2. How are they entrepreneurs?
3. Why are they entrepreneurs?
4. Who has supported and/or hindered them (individuals/ groups/ culture/ leadership/ power)?
5. What organisational conditions have supported/ hindered them (strategy/ structure/ reward/ resources/ culture)?
6. How, where and when are they learning?
7. How are they agents of change and learning?
8. How has learning and change supported corporate entrepreneurs?
9. How are Trusts and the individuals and teams within intraprelearning?
10. What are the implications of the above for, training, HRM, and Strategic Policy?
11. What is the best way to tell the story of this research?

The questions become broader in their scope as you move from number one to eleven. Also, I decided to split intraprelearning into its antecedents for several of the questions,

4 The eleventh question was developed in retrospect following advice given during my Viva
as I would be identifying corporate entrepreneurs and exploring their learning – so using
the antecedents of learning, corporate entrepreneurship and change fitted more naturally
with this.

6.11 The Interviews
One of the most important sources of case study information is the interview (Yin, 1994,
Travers, 2004). Yin differentiates between three forms of case study interview: open-
ended, focused and survey. Due to the emergent nature of intraprelearning, I selected
the open-ended interview for my research, enabling me to explore respondents’
descriptions, opinions and insights into intraprelearning. The interviews would also
provide me with the opportunity to visit sites within each Trust and for me to directly
observe the respondent in his or her own environment. In addition I could explore the
intraprelearning culture of the Trust through observing signs, symbols and physical
artefacts. Finally, I also intended to collate and analyse archival records from each Trust
to help build a picture of the formal/official intraprelearning strategy and informal/unofficial
Trust strategy and culture.

Before beginning the data collection, I had to come up with a strategy to manage the size
of the research project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placing posters around each Trust calling for CEs to contact me</td>
<td>CEs would be self-selecting = insight into what CE means to participants Cheap</td>
<td>May exclude people who do not perceive themselves as being CEs Poster’s may not been seen/ read by all CEs throughout the Trust Quality versus Quantity (how can I identify ‘good’ cases?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including a note &amp; invite on pay slips</td>
<td>Reaches every Trust employee CEs would be self-selecting</td>
<td>Cost attributed to this service Quality versus Quantity (how can I identify ‘good’ cases?) Only one Trust offering this option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Intranet/ E-mails to attract</td>
<td>Cheap CEs would be self-selecting</td>
<td>Many within the Trusts do not have access to e-mail or computers Quality versus Quantity (how can I identify ‘good’ cases?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obtaining access into both Trusts was time consuming, involved a large amount of administration on both my part and the parts of the respective Research and Development Managers for each Trust and also required several meetings with groups and individuals. It was during the Research & Development and Ethical approval process that the issue of how I would locate and attract corporate entrepreneurs arose. Initially I proposed to identify the corporate entrepreneurs using the poster system, as detailed in figure 6.6. Some members of Brynbeth R&D committee suggested that I use the e-mail system as described in 6.6. In a separate meeting, the R&D manager from Aberash Trust suggested that I arrange to have an invitation distributed with employees’ payslips: however, the R&D manager from Brynbeth was not convinced of the feasibility of using this technique. Finally a deputy Director of Nursing from a third Trust, Llanlyn, recommended that I locate entrepreneurs through tracing a driver of change down through the Trust. She recommended either the European Working Time Directive or the Agenda for Change.

I decided to trace corporate entrepreneurial activity down through each Trust using a the European Working Time Directive following additional advice given to me from two strategic leads based in Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trust. This would enable me to identify formal top-down CE activities and any informal bottom-up activities created by this driver of change. I would do this by snowballing down through each Trust as data collected would be more meaningful and insightful. Snowballing is a technique where no planned structure or frame exists. Initial strategic participants would identify
entrepreneurial participants, who would then be invited to take part. Snowballing would provide me with insight into what intrapreneurial learning and its antecedents mean to different participants within each Trust and provide me with insight into sub-cultures. Furthermore, snowballing could act as a way of drilling-down into each Trust from the formal strategically-oriented entrepreneurial activities to more informal entrepreneurial activities.

The European Working Time Directive itself is driven by political factors, and sociological trends. The basic aim of the directive is the protection of employees' health and safety and it lays down minimum standards to protect the workers against the damaging effects of prolonged night work and shift work. In May 2000 the EU Member States agreed a staged implementation of the hours limits of the Working Time Regulation for junior doctors.

‘Compliance with the directive should be seen as a major driver for change ...The EWTD, and junior doctor's compliance with it has provided the impetus for change and gives rise to the opportunity to redesign service delivery and improve the work/life balance for NHS staff.’ (Aberash NHS Trust, 2004:15)

Phasing in of this has already begun, and should be complete by 2012. The hours limits of the EWTD will not become limits on the hours of actual work for resident junior doctors but on the hours of actual duty. This therefore has implications on the Trust workforce as a whole, and Trusts are using the directive as an opportunity for service appraisal, and developing new working practices and innovative approaches to working patterns.

Using the EWTD as a means of locating entrepreneurial activity partially addressed the problem of who to collect the data from, as identifying the source entrepreneurial activity would also identify the entrepreneur behind the activity. However, I still needed to locate those that had responded entrepreneurially to the EWTD. I came up with several options for tacking this as highlighted in Figure 6.6.
A number of journals within the health sector recommend that theoretical saturation be a criterion with which to justify interview numbers in a qualitative inquiry. Guest et al (2006) define saturation as 'the point at which no new information or themes are observed in the data'. Ryan and Bernard (2004) state that how and when data saturation is reached depends on three things: the number and complexity of the data, investigator experience and fatigue, and the number of analysts reviewing the data. So for this research project, participant interviews would continue down and across each Trust until some common themes appeared repeatedly (data saturation).

6.12 Conclusion

In this chapter, I set out the context and introduce my cases. The context is NHS Trusts in Wales and I provide a brief summary of the current NHS Wales climate, as it is very different from that of England. I have adapted my definitions of corporate entrepreneurship and intraprelearning so that they are NHS oriented:

NHS Intraprelearning is as any learning (individual/ team/ organisational) that facilitates NHS CE (individual/ team/ organisational) through triggering change (individual/ team/ organisational). Intraprelearning may be tacit or explicit, may be single-, double- or meta-loop and may be formal or informal.

I have briefly compared and contrasted the public and private sectors, and following from this I reworked the theoretical model from Chapter 5 to a working model illustrating a possible NHS Intraprelearning. In terms of my research method, I begin to make explicit my research decisions, starting in this chapter with my choice of research strategy (the case study), how I determined my research questions and what they were, and how I attracted research participants to become involved with my research.

In Chapter 7, I continue the narrative of my method, using evidence collected (see the appendices) and critically explore and reflect upon these experiences.
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Chapter 7 - Method

7.1 Introduction
In this chapter I narrate the story of my research method. I do this on two levels: firstly I tell my story of and critique my PhD experience and secondly I describe and make sense of the more focussed data collection activities from within Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts. I try to describe the journey, including all of the highs and lows. In trying to understand my experiences of the research and as the researcher, I have identified moments in my learning that I felt were critical to the development of my understanding of myself and my research and the PhD process.

I hope I have provided an open and honest account of my experiences, thus enabling readers to understand and make their own informed opinions concerning the quality of my work, my choices and my conclusions. I begin with exploring access into the NHS Trusts and from there introduce the two cases of Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts. I provide readers with an overview of Aberash and Brynbeth based on the official presentation of each Trust. Finally, I discuss those moments that I feel have been critical to my learning.

7.2 Access
The story of my research method begins with the story of my ‘getting-in’ (Buchanan, 1988: Sambrook, 1998) or getting access into the NHS Trusts. The charts in appendices A1, A2, A3 and A4 include the chronology of the tasks and processes involved in getting-in and the detail of the method for years 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006 respectively. Easterby-Smith et al (2003) identify two kinds of access. There is the formal access or permission from senior management to gather data from within the Trust. There is also the informal process of gaining access to the ‘data’: the participants and the documents. Furthermore, Easterby-Smith et al (2003) highlight that both of these processes are seriously underestimated in term of the time and patience that can be required, a point that I would agree with and a shortcoming that I would admit to having had at the start of this research project. The method of my PhD started in April 2004 when I was put in touch with the Director of Human Resources of Aberash NHS Trust via an e-mail from Sally (see Appendix A5). Sally was also instrumental in me getting access into Brynbeth Trust and accompanied me
when I met her contact, the Training Manager in May 2004, and it was Sally who put me in touch with the Deputy Director of Nursing from a third Trust, Llanlyn who we met up with in August 2004. This highlights the degree to which I was dependent on my supervisor for obtaining access into the Trusts. I have briefly noted the issue of student-and-supervisor dependency in Chapter 6.

All three Trusts responded differently to my request for support for my research project. In Aberash Trust, the Director of Human Resources offered her full support and put me in touch with the Director of Research and Development to see if I would have to go through the Local Regional Ethical Committee (LREC) and R&D approval channels.

7.3 Ethical Considerations

Iphofen (2005) discusses the ethical issues in qualitative health care research. In his text he identifies five sub-headings that if attended to provide a 'key to how participants are ethically accessed and then protected,' (2005:28). He frames research as the giving of a gift and the researcher's ethical responsibility being associated with how the sharer of the gift and the gift shared is cared for. The five concerns are:

- Seeking informed consent
- Eliciting 'data' and knowledge production
- Ensuring anonymity and confidentiality
- Developing and maintaining rapport and involvement
- Facilitating participants' withdrawal from the research process.

These five factors have been implicit throughout the research process, and I will attempt to describe these in this next section. Because of the nature of this narrative, it is difficult for me to describe each consideration in turn, as in reality they do not happen linearly in any hierarchical order, moreover they are dynamic concerns that interweave within the meta-narrative throughout the research process.

The nature of my project was unsettling for both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, who I felt, were not accustomed to research requests wishing to explore employees rather than patients. Because of this, concerns were raised at the strategic level in Aberash Trust. The concerns were centred upon whether my project would be detrimental to
Intellectual Property by revealing the nature of entrepreneurial activities explored and whether my project would harm the reputation of the Trust if barriers to entrepreneurship were highlighted. It was made clear to me that the Trust did not mind such barriers being highlighted, but they were keen to be seen to be learning from this. I felt that they wanted to have some control over what was made public.

Following two meetings with the Director of R&D, one of which included the Head of Modernisation and a meeting between the CEO and Director of R&D, all concerned were happier for me to continue as I assured them that I would not be revealing the nature of the entrepreneurships and that the Trust would be anonymised. The Head of R&D was pragmatic concerning the degree to which I could ensure Trust anonymity and was of the attitude that if a determined someone wanted to learn about the identity of the Trust, it would not take a lengthy deduction to establish which one it was given the limited size and scope of NHS Wales. In light of this I agreed that if any findings emerged that may be of concern to the Trust, I would seek their guidance prior to publishing my findings.

Meanwhile in Brynbeth Trust, I had had a meeting with the Training Manager and my supervisor Sally. The Training Manager was extremely enthusiastic and agreed to speak with the Director of Nursing about supporting my project. The Training Manager recommended that I begin with the Trust R&D and the Local Research Ethical Committee (LREC) approval process whilst I was waiting for her to respond. I was informed that all research had to go through this panel regardless of the nature of the research. This appeared to be a blanket statement that applied to all three Trusts at the time.

I was put in touch with the R&D Manager for the Trust who e-mailed me with applications for Trust R&D and LREC Approval. In order to apply for Trust Management R&D approval I was required to provide the following documents to the R&D Committee:

- A covering letter to the Chairman of R&D Committee (see A6 for example).
- A letter of support from a sponsor employed by the Trust (see A7 for example).
- A copy of the University's Indemnity Insurance.
I had my first, and what turned out to be my only, R&D Panel Interview with Brynbeth Trust in September 2004. I found the session quite intimidating. My PhD supervisor was not able to attend this session and this could have affected my confidence. I explained my research to the multidisciplinary panel\(^1\) and following this there was a question and answer session (see appendix A8 for an example of the handout issued to panel members). My records show that there were a wide variety of questions posed to me:

"Why have you picked the Working Time Directive, surely this just means that people's hours are cut, so they work less, so we employ more people. How can innovation occur from this?" Management Accountant. [I explained that I had been advised/ recommended to by senior leads from three trusts.]

The Management Accountant asked me a number of critical questions:

"How practical is shadowing. Won't this involve a lengthy amount of time and disrupt the employees' work?....How can you justify taking employees from their work for these interviews, will they want to do this?" Management Accountant. [I explained that shadowing was non-invasive, by definition and I said that I hoped that the character of entrepreneurs might make the prospect of talking about their entrepreneurship exciting]

There were similar fears shared by the R&D panel in Brynbeth Trust as there had been in Aberash, concerning the making public of any discovered barriers to corporate entrepreneurship, but a general acceptance of the realities of attempting to ensure complete anonymity:

"What are the implications if barriers are found to creativity and innovation? What if employees notified the Union of their grievances?" Risk Manager. [I asked them what they

---

\(^1\) Members consisted of: R&D Director (consultant), Clinical Trials Researcher (nurse), Management Accountant, Pharmacist, Risk Manager, Research Methodologist – Statistician, R&D Manager.
would hope I would do in such an instance and agreed to contact the Head of Research and Development if I felt that such an issue might arise."

Because both Trusts expressed that they may wish their identity to remain confidential, I obtained agreement from both Trusts that if one Trust desired confidentiality, the other Trust would oblige and remain anonymised also.

I found that the Risk Manager did ask some thought provoking questions, but she also did try to be helpful as well:

"Wouldn't the Agenda for Change be better (driver to follow to locate CE activity), staff are not going to remember what the WTD is, now that the Agenda for Change is being implemented?" Risk Manager.

The European Working Time Directive driver was chosen as the driver to follow based upon the direction of two strategic advisors from Llanlyn and Brynbeth. Quite soon into the data collection, I decided that this was not as effective as I had hoped and I opened up the remit to following any entrepreneurship driven by any driver. I liaised with the R&D Manager in Brynbeth concerning this and she was happy to let the research proceed given that I had spoken to the LREC and R&D committee about the inductive and incremental nature of my research and that I would be analysing and making decisions as my research proceeded.

The Director of the R&D Panel was also slightly aggressive in his questioning:

'So why apply here first?.. Define Corporate Entrepreneurship?..Have you ever done research in the NHS before?....Have you any previous research experience? ..'

Director of R&D.

I felt his questions were valid, but they made me feel that I may not be experienced enough to carry out this research within the Trust. I felt that I could have benefited from having Sally with me in this interview. My notes tell me that the last question and the way it was posed by the R&D Director upset me a little:

this one made me feel a bit upset! I told them I was doing a PhD, and I had been studying now for 2 years, and had presented my work at conferences (excuse the plural!) Felt
really crap after this question! I should have said ‘No, but I’m being supported by Dr Sally Sambrook, who has many years of research experience within both business and the NHS.’

The question may have upset me, but it is a valuable one in that it may be more difficult for a novice researcher to be ‘permitted’ access to key personnel within the Trusts. As I had the support, experience and ‘insider’ knowledge from my supervisor, who was familiar with the Trusts in question, I felt somewhat reassured that if any problems were to arise because of my inexperience, Sally would be able to identify this and we could try to address this together.

What the R&D panel experience did make clear to me that ‘corporate entrepreneurship’ was not a term that was clearly understood. This is an issue that Iphofen (2005:31) highlights:

‘To ensure participants’ continued understanding of how their contribution extends theoretical knowledge it might be necessary to ‘translate’ the research products for their benefit. There is clearly a danger of either demeaning the participants or of limiting their contribution by the inaccessibility of the terminology’

I revisited the academic literature and redefined CE as ‘creative, innovative and (guarded) risk-taking activities or behaviour’. I also referred to recent literature (DH, 2000) and borrowed terms such as new and better ways of working.

In order to apply for Trust Ethical approval, I had to be approved by the Local Regional Ethical Committee in each Trust. To support my ethical approval, I was required to complete and submit 15 copies of:

- A covering letter to the Chairman of the LREC Committee.
- Parts A, B and C of a COREC Ethical Application form.
- A Research Proposal (see A9 & 10).
- An Invitation to Participate into Research (see A11 (Strategic) & A13 CEs).
- A Participant Consent Form (see A12).
- A copy of mine and my PhD supervisor’s Curriculum Vitae.
- Copy of any posters that I may have used to attract participants (see A13).
- A letter of University Ethical Approval.
The ethical application process was extremely rigorous and I was required to apply to each Trust for LREC approval. I found that much of the documentation that I had to complete was geared to those R&D projects with a clinical and patient focus rather than a non-clinical and staff focus. I would only be required to attend one LREC Committee meeting for an interview, this was held in Brynbeth Trust and Sally came with me this time. The LREC committee experience was much more positive than the meeting that I had with the R&D panel of the same Trust, however, I felt that many members of the Brynbeth's Local Regional Ethical Committee struggled with having to think about possible ethical implications of a 'staff-oriented' project. I did have some very constructive criticisms during this meeting, and my proposal was accepted on the basis that I provide written confirmation that:

- I would not interact directly with any patients, if an interview were to take place on a ward.
- I would consult with my University to ensure that my home computer was sufficiently protected against my files being accessed via the internet.
- That I revised my consent form to state that all interviews would be anonymised to help protect any Intellectual Property emerging as a result of the study.
- That the title of the study be modified so it is more easily understood.

Even though the R&D and LREC processes were time-consuming and rather bureaucratic, I found that they made me think about the detail of my research. I was unconditionally approved by the Brynbeth LREC committee in late October 2004 and approved by their R&D panel mid December.

Throughout this PhD I have taken steps to ensure that I have I have attended ethically to this research and 'cared for' the gifts given to me. All of the names used in this research project are pseudonyms: the names of participants, the names of the Trusts, names of any persons mentioned during the interviews. Throughout PhD related conversations with my supervisor, we have used the pseudonyms, particularly given the location of her office within a School of Nursing for the main part of this project. As has been recognised by the Trusts, a keen and determined someone could reveal

---

2 Members consisted of: Lay Member, Consultant Radiologist, Consultant Psychiatrist, Pharmacist, Paediatrician, Consultant Nephrologist, Lay Member, Senior Research Officer, Theatre Practitioner, Pharmacy Technician, Ethics Administrator.
the identity of these Trusts. Since some of the participants' roles have been entrepreneurial and therefore unique to the Trust or the locality, I have taken extra care to keep descriptions of these roles or the clinical procedures used deliberately vague. I have steered away from attributing gender to senior roles, where it may be more unusual to find a female or male in a particular post. Once interviews were conducted, I allocated a label to the interview, and associated case notes and this became my working pseudonym for the participant in question. Interview transcripts used the pseudonyms rather than actual names and any references to other people in the interview transcripts were allocated pseudonyms as well.

It was not until mid-August 2004 that Sally managed to secure a meeting with a contact in a third Trust, Llanlyn. The Assistant Director of Nursing met with us. The ADN recommended that I locate entrepreneurs through tracing the effects of a driver of change. The ADN also suggested that I e-mail her a brief proposal, with which she would approach the Executive Nurse for support. In the meantime, I should contact the R&D Manager to arrange both R&D and LREC approval.

On the way back from this meeting my supervisor and I had a 'brainstorm' on the train. Looking back at this, I felt that it was a critical moment of my research. We explored how we could compare and contrast the (then) three NHS Trusts by different factors at different organisational levels. We constructed a model similar to the one in figure 7.1. Figure 7.1 provides an example of factors cited within the literature that are supportive of intraprelearning antecedents. As you work your way down, the factors move from being strategically-oriented to individually-oriented. A similar matrix could be drawn up to include those factors that are said to inhibit intraprelearning.
Figure 7.1 Intraprelearning Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor (+ve)</th>
<th>Aberash</th>
<th>Brynbeth</th>
<th>Llanlyn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic support for change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic support for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic support for entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No blame culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions/ Sponsors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy to change/ take risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual development plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effect of this matrix was quite dramatic, because at this particular time I was having trouble sorting out how I could best structure my literature review, and plan for my data collection. The concept of levels in the matrix seemed to unlock this problem for me and helped me to address some of the issues that I had come to a bit of a standstill with.

Once I had been approved on LREC grounds by Brynbeth, the LREC approval for the other two Trusts was merely a matter of some minor paperwork, providing I had a lead within each Trust that was supportive of my research – which I had secured through Sally's contacts. The R&D approval process was similar, with the other two Trusts requesting evidence that I had been approved by Brynbeth. I was finally approved on both LREC and R&D grounds by all three NHS Trusts by January 2005.

The final barrier to accessing each Trust was the need for an Honorary Contract of Employment from each. To obtain a contract, I was required to submit:

- An application for Honorary Employment.
- A Confidentiality Responsibility for Users of Trust Information.*
- A Police Crime Check.
- An Occupational Health Check and attend a Health Check Appointment.*
• An application for a security card.*³

The processing of these final documents was extremely slow, and I was advised by Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts to commence my data collection to avoid delays to my research. I started collecting my data in January 2005 in these two trusts. I received my honorary contracts from Aberash and Brynbeth in January and February 2005 respectively, and my Police Crime Check was processed by mid-April 2005.

Following LREC and R&D approval from Llanlyn NHS Trust, I sent an e-mail requesting an honorary contract in January 2005, I received a response saying it had been passed onto the relevant department for issuing, but I did not receive any contracts in the post. I sent another e-mail in the February but received no response. I became concerned as the 'clock-was-ticking' in terms of my PhD deadline and following no further response in March I decided to drop the Llanlyn Trust from my research. The decision to exclude the Trust from my research was based upon my initial experiences of trying to contact, arrange interviews, and carry out interviews with strategic-level employees within the other two Trusts – which is what I was doing from late mid January through to May 2005.

I found this process time-consuming, employees were difficult to contact, the turnaround time from sending an invitation to hearing a response was often over two weeks, meetings were sometimes cancelled and in a couple of cases, participants forgot to turn up. I was very aware of the right of the participant to refuse to participate (Iphofen, 2005) and was careful with the way I managed missed appointments, in case participants had changed their minds and felt too uncomfortable to tell me directly.

Based on the lead time from initiating contact to conducting the interview, I decided that it was too late in the day to start interviewing in Llanlyn given my PhD deadline. Also, by this point I had a feel for the amount of data that I was collecting from the other two Trusts and was concerned that collecting data from Llanlyn as well, might just be too much to manage, transcribe and analyse given the time-frame that I was working within.

---

³ *I only had to complete these for Brynbeth NHS Trust
7.4 Pilots

Through scanning the ‘interview’ research literature, I found several articles and texts that highlight the importance of practising and testing the interview. Trialling questions, practising being the interviewer (active verbal and non-verbal listening) and managing the interview (Gillham, 2000) are all ways that can help to improve the quality of the data collected. Between November 2004 and January 2005, I conducted a series of pilot interviews to test the user friendliness of all of the documents I planned to use in each interview (Invitation to Participate, Consent Form and Patient Information Sheet) and the interview ‘script’ itself. I contacted friends and colleagues who had experience of the public sector and/or health care industry and asked them if they would participate in a mock interview. I conducted five strategic-level pilot interviews and six pilots with the ‘corporate entrepreneurs’. I asked participants if they could take on a persona based upon Kvale’s (1995) roles: the Tacit Oyster, the Nonstop talker, the Intellectualising Academician or the Power Player who tries to take control of the interview.

The pilot interviews helped in three ways: firstly they helped me familiarise myself with the interview script and I had the opportunity to practise ‘thinking on my feet’ in terms of body language, active listening and commenting in ways which encouraged deeper and more meaningful responses. Secondly, piloting the interviews highlighted questions that were (or were not) clear, how the question order flowed (or not) in practise and questions that were redundant. Thirdly, the pilots helped me prepare for my role as managing the interview, setting of the interview environment, helping the respondent to feel comfortable and safe, ensuring that I felt at ease and calm, and establishing the most appropriate times for sorting out the administration of consent forms. Once I had carried out four pilot interviews, I felt a sense of familiarity and routine with the script and the interview felt like it flowed more naturally, enabling me to focus on the interviewee’s responses.

7.5 Data collection

At the beginning of this chapter, I discussed how I had made first contact with each of the Trusts. In the case of Aberash Trust, it was through the Director of HR, then the Chairman of the R&D panel and the Head of Modernisation. In the case of
Brynbeth Trust it was through the Training Manager, with lots of support from the R&D Manager and a letter of support from the Deputy Director of Nursing.

My strategy was to use purposive sampling and to snowball down and across each Trust guided by the recommendations of the research participants. Once access had been obtained, the purposive sampling began with the Chairman of R&D (from Aberash Trust) and the Deputy Director of Nursing (from Brynbeth Trust). Figures 7.2 and 7.3 illustrate the interview paths that followed.

The reality of organising and conducting these interviews was not as linear and as organised as the flow charts in Figures 7.2 and 7.3 may make them appear. As I have alluded to earlier in this chapter, making contact with participants can in itself be a hurdle. Once first-contact has been made there then flows a necessary stream of e-mail communications and/ or phone calls to set a mutually convenient date. Sometimes meetings would be postponed by the participant (sometimes repeatedly), other times participants would not turn up. In an extreme occasion one participant from Aberash did not turn up and then failed to answer any further e-mails. This highlighted how busy these individuals and organisations were, and the sheer work loads that staff may have had.

Once a date and time had been agreed with a prospective participant, I would send out an Invitation to Participate (see A11), a Consent Form and a Briefing Sheet (see A10 for copy sent to strategic participants). In most instances this would be done via e-mail (appendix A15 provides an example of the e-mail script for the corporate entrepreneurs) and in a few instances I sent them through the post.
As the flow charts suggest, the strategic participants were identified by other strategic participants in each of the Trusts. The corporate entrepreneurs were sometimes identified by strategic participants, sometimes by other corporate entrepreneurs and sometimes by both. In my opinion this technique of iterative
snowballing using the recommendations of participants has provided much insight into individual and strategic viewpoints and lenses of intrapreneuring. This will be discussed further in Chapter 9.

7.6 Collecting Strategic Data
I interviewed 21 strategic participants in total (see Figure 7.4 later for roles of all participants). Interviews lasted for around half an hour and were semi-structured. An example of the script used can be found in the appendix A16. Interviews were tape recorded using an analogue tape recorder and notes were also taken to complement the recordings. Using the analogue tape recorder and transcription kit was not the best decision in terms of getting the highest quality of playback (and therefore transcribing the interviews), but it was the only option offered to me by my department. The better quality digital kits were much more expensive at the time.

The key goal of the strategic interviews was to locate entrepreneurship driven by the EWTD. It was also an invaluable opportunity to gather rich data on formal and informal culture, power and leadership structures within each of the Trusts. Furthermore, the sheer act of entering the Trusts for each interview provided me with informal, almost covert opportunities to visit different sites and observe the many different signs and symbols of culture, learning, corporate entrepreneurship and change. The strategic level interviews enabled me to enter the offices of some of the key decision makers, some of the senior nurses and some of the inspirational leaders and mentors within each Trust.

After the first interview in Aberash I had a slight suspicion that tracing the CE effects of the EWTD down through the Trust may not lead me to the pockets of corporate entrepreneurs that I was hoping to be lead to. After my third interview in Aberash and second interview in Brynbeth this suspicion had become more confirmed. Following consultation with Sally, I made the decision to change tack and from this point onwards I asked that participants to recommend someone that they thought was entrepreneurial using the appropriate discursive constructs (creative, innovative, guarded risk-taker) or that had behaved entrepreneurially (regardless of the force driving the entrepreneurship). The outcome of this was that it opened up the scope of the research and I was able to ‘catch’ more entrepreneurs from both Trusts. As I had
snowballing using the recommendations of participants has provided much insight into individual and strategic viewpoints and lenses of intrapreneuring. This will be discussed further in Chapter 9.

7.6 Collecting Strategic Data

I interviewed 21 strategic participants in total (see Figure 7.4 later for roles of all participants). Interviews lasted for around half an hour and were semi-structured. An example of the script used can be found in the appendix A16. Interviews were tape recorded using an analogue tape recorder and notes were also taken to complement the recordings. Using the analogue tape recorder and transcription kit was not the best decision in terms of getting the highest quality of playback (and therefore transcribing the interviews), but it was the only option offered to me by my department. The better quality digital kits were much more expensive at the time.

The key goal of the strategic interviews was to locate entrepreneurship driven by the EWTD. It was also an invaluable opportunity to gather rich data on formal and informal culture, power and leadership structures within each of the Trusts. Furthermore, the sheer act of entering the Trusts for each interview provided me with informal, almost covert opportunities to visit different sites and observe the many different signs and symbols of culture, learning, corporate entrepreneurship and change. The strategic level interviews enabled me to enter the offices of some of the key decision makers, some of the senior nurses and some of the inspirational leaders and mentors within each Trust.

After the first interview in Aberash I had a slight suspicion that tracing the CE effects of the EWTD down through the Trust may not lead me to the pockets of corporate entrepreneurs that I was hoping to be lead to. After my third interview in Aberash and second interview in Brynbeth this suspicion had become more confirmed. Following consultation with Sally, I made the decision to change tack and from this point onwards I asked that participants to recommend someone that they thought was entrepreneurial using the appropriate discursive constructs (creative, innovative, guarded risk-taker) or that had behaved entrepreneurially (regardless of the force driving the entrepreneurship). The outcome of this was that it opened up the scope of the research and I was able to ‘catch’ more entrepreneurs from both Trusts. As I had
made the emergent nature of my research clear during the LREC process, the R&D Managers were happy for my research to proceed with the new sense of direction, and this was explained to participants before they were asked to sign the consent forms.

7.7 Collecting Entrepreneurship Data
As with the strategic participants, I experienced some hurdles contacting a few of the corporate entrepreneurs, too. Some were difficult to ‘get hold of’ to make the first contact with and when communications had begun it sometimes flowed slowly. Given the ‘hands-on’, often chaotic and unsociable-hour duties of NHS Trust employment it was understandable why this may occur. I began the strategic interviews in January 2005, by February I had started interviewing the corporate entrepreneurs and by the end of May 2005 I felt that I had some key themes emerging from the interviews, and given the sheer volume of data that I had overall, I made the decision to end the data collection.

I was referred to 68 employees from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts who were perceived by others to be entrepreneurial in their work. By the time a degree of data saturation had been reached, I had conducted 29 interviews with corporate entrepreneurs (15 Aberash Trust and 14 from Brynbeth Trust). All of the 68 employees recommended were contacted some by telephone and some via e-mail (see Appendix A14 and A15 for an example of the Invitation to Participate and introductory e-mail send to the corporate entrepreneurs). A few did not respond and some cancelled meetings that had been arranged, meetings were generally cancelled as participants were ‘too busy’ or another important meeting had come up. In most cases I made the effort to try to rebook another date, but did not push the issue if there seemed to be a reluctance to commit to another date. As discussed earlier, I adopted discursive constructs such as creative, innovative and guarded-risk taking and new and better way of working to represent the term corporate entrepreneurship.

Figure 7.4 gives an indication of the roles of corporate entrepreneur interviewed from both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. The style of interview structure and questioning was very different between the senior level participants and the corporate entrepreneurs. Whereas the key goals of the strategic interview was to locate
entrepreneurs and understand the organisational culture, the key aims of the interviews with the corporate entrepreneurs were more associated with understanding the individual entrepreneur and those things/individuals and aspects of the ‘self’ that could enhance or inhibit entrepreneurship.

**Figure 7.4 Participants and their roles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aberash NHS Trust</th>
<th>Bryn Beth NHS Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Participants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Senior Participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 1-Chief Executive</td>
<td>SP 1- Head of Modernisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2- Head of Modernisation</td>
<td>SP 2- Deputy Medical Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 3- Human Resource Director</td>
<td>SP 3- Director of Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 4- Head of Training</td>
<td>SP 4-Head of Podiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 5-Deputy Director of Nursing</td>
<td>SP 5-General Manager of Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 6-Head of Nursing 1</td>
<td>SP 6-General Manager of Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 7-Head of Nursing 2</td>
<td>SP 7-Intellectual Property Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 8-Head of Nursing 3</td>
<td>SP 8-Research and Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 9-Research and Development Manager</td>
<td>SP 9-Head of Nursing 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 10-EWTD H@N Co-ordinator</td>
<td>SP 10-Head of Nursing 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 11-EWTD Medical Lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist Nurse</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specialist Nurse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN 1-Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>SN1-Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN 2-Accident &amp; Emergency</td>
<td>SN2-Day Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN 3-Accident &amp; Emergency</td>
<td>SN3-H Grade Nurse Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN 4-Acute Pain</td>
<td>SN4-Intensive Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN 5-Midwife</td>
<td>SN5-Nurse Practitioner on Secondment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN 6-Thrombolysis</td>
<td>SN6-G Grade Nurse Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN 7-Cardiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN 8-Midwifery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN 9-Night Nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN10- Coronary Care</td>
<td><strong>Ward Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Manager</strong></td>
<td>WM1-Day Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM 1- Day Surgery</td>
<td>WM2-Trauma &amp; Orthopaedics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM 2- Theatre</td>
<td>WM3-Care of Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative</strong></td>
<td>WM3-Care of Elderly &amp; Renal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1-Librarian</td>
<td><strong>Allied Health Professional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nurse</strong></td>
<td>AHP1-Podiatry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 1- Coronary Care</td>
<td>AHP2-Physiotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 2- Surgical Assistant</td>
<td><strong>Medical Consultant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 Senior Participants</strong></td>
<td>MC1-EWTD Medical Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15 Corporate Entrepreneurs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nurse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26 TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>N1-Community Psychiatric Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Senior Participants</strong></td>
<td><strong>14 Corporate Entrepreneurs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24 TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interview questions for the strategic participants (see A16) were much more direct and focused compared with those asked to the corporate entrepreneurs (see A17, and A18 Interview Plan).

The primary objective with the corporate entrepreneur interviews was to learn more about the nature of intrapreneuring and to explore further the realities of the working model of intrapreneuring.

I used the working model of intrapreneuring to help me put together (see chapter 6) a set of interview questions. The model helped me to focus my questions on the key themes emerging from the literature reviews. The interview sessions for the corporate entrepreneurs were divided up into three sections (see Appendix 16 and 17 for examples). The first section was purely administrative (Alias name/ Trust/ Location) for my use later on in the analysis.

The second section of the interview began with a brief introduction to the interview. I deliberately did not share any issues that I hoped to 'uncover' with the participants as this would be leading them, however, I did explain to them that I was interested in learning about creative and innovative behaviour, and that they had been identified as being creative, innovative and taking guarded-risks. I then opened out the interview using an unstructured question, inviting the participant to share with me 'their story', why they thought they were entrepreneurial. Kvale (1996) classes this as an 'introducing question'. I tightened the interview structure slightly using semi-structured questions which enabled me to home in on any key comments that the participant made in the first section (associated with (individual/ group/ organisational) barriers to, and facilitators of, innovation, learning and change). I used 'direct questioning' (Kvale, ibid) and some 'probing questions' for this.

Prior to beginning the third section of the interview, I asked for a 2 minute break so that I could make some notes. I hoped that this would also provide the participant with a moment to reflect upon anything that had been said, make associations and perhaps come up with some new significant information. The third section of the interview extended this further and I explored the participant's career and development history, and their strengths and weaknesses. In this last section I used a
mode of questioning called 'indirect questioning'. These questions are projective in that they ask the respondent to imagine how others would feel/act or learn. As Kvale (1995:134) states:

'The answer may refer to the attitudes of others; it may also be an indirect statement of the pupil's own attitude, which he or she does not state directly'.

As with the senior level interviews, I met with the corporate entrepreneurs at their place of work. Some meetings were held in the busy ward environment, some in a meeting room and others in the private or shared offices. Some staff worked in the main acute, and others worked in community hospitals or clinics. All meetings were held during times that best suited the participants, sometimes in the morning, sometimes early evening and once on a bank holiday.

Interviews generally lasted for an hour and I taped most of them and took notes. On one occasion (SP8 – Aberash) the batteries ran out at the start of the interview and I had forgotten to bring spares. During a second interview (SP2 – Brynbeth) the quality of the recording was poor as a background noise was prevalent. Unfortunately, in the second case in particular, my notes were not extensive enough to capture a lot of interesting points that had been made. I learned from this interview to make sure that my notes captured the essence of what was being said and to ensure that any quotes that well-represented any emerging themes were written down as completely as possible.

After the first two strategic interviews, I started to type up the transcriptions. For me this task was the most laborious and therefore difficult part of my whole research experience. To start with I was not a very fast or efficient typist unable to touch-type. So, after taking two days to type out one half an hour interview, I decided that it would be better to try and learn to touch-type (was this an avoidance tactic at the time?). I am not sure whether I had made a good decision, because as I shifted my focus from typing up the transcripts to learning to touch-type, the tapes began to pile up. After completing my final interview in May, my touch-typing had improved a little, but I was faced with just under fifty interviews to type up. Mentally, this was the most difficult part of the entire research experience. From the end of May until September 2005 I carefully typed out all of recordings of the senior participants.
interviews. I made the decision that I would type out the interviews verbatim, but I would not include very detailed sociolinguistics (Kvale, 1996). I did include general modes of expression such as ‘ummm’s’ and long pauses particularly if they represented a participant’s overarching way of communicating.

I made a decision in the September to outsource the transcribing of the interviews from tape to text. This decision was taken for two reasons: to speed up my progress as I was falling behind schedule, and to relieve some of the pressure I was experiencing. I found a Secretarial Services that was a minimum of forty miles away from the closest Trusts’ perimeter. I briefed her on the confidential nature of the material and the way in which I wanted the taped transcribed. She began transcribing for me early in November. The first couple of transcriptions were not done quite how I wanted (in terms of layout and formatting), but following discussing this with her further, the transcriptions that followed were fine. Outsourcing the transcribing proved to be particularly helpful to me as I took on a full-time job in December 2005.

Kvale (1995, 170) highlights that in most cases interviews are typed out by a secretary, who is likely to be more efficient at this process.

'The decisions about the style of transcribing depend on the use of the transcriptions. If they are to give some general impressions of the subjects views, rephrasing and condensing of statements may be in order. If, however, the transcriptions are to serve as material for sociolinguistic or psychological analysis, they need to be in a detailed, verbatim form.'

Once a transcribed interview arrived in my e-mail inbox, I could print off the twenty or so pages and begin analysing. There is a growing literature on case study data and interview analysis (for example Miles and Huberman, 1994: Silverman, 1993, 2005: Tesch, 1990: Wolcott, 1994: Kvale, 1995; Gillham, 2000). Kvale (1995: 198) argues that the analysis does not begin at this point of the research, but begins when the subjects first describe their lived world during the interview. However, there is little

\footnote{In their book on ‘how to get a PhD’ Phillips and Pugh discuss how taking up a new job before finishing is ‘how not to get a PhD’. Unfortunately, I did not have the luxury of choice on this matter, it was a decision made due to financial necessity. I am in agreement with Phillips and Pugh (1993) that working in a full-time position and trying to complete my PhD has stretched me emotionally (working during the day, at evenings and at weekends) intellectually (switching from commercial oriented report writing to academic writing) and demanded a lot of perseverance and sheer stamina.}
interpretation or explanation from either the interviewees or the interviewer at this stage. He identifies another five steps of analysis, as follows (underline added)

- Subjects themselves discovering new relationships during the interview, free of interpretation by the interviewer.
- The interviewer condenses and interprets meaning during the interview, enabling the interviewee to respond.
- The transcribed interview is interpreted by the interviewer. This is done through structuring the interview material for analysis, clarifying the material making it amenable to analysis, and analysis proper which involves developing the meanings of the interviews. Five main approaches to the analysis of meaning are: condensation, categorization, narrative structuring, interpretation and ad hoc methods.
- The researcher re-interviews to enable the subjects to comment of the interview interpretations as well as to elaborate on their own original statements.

During the course of the interviews for this research project analysis did occur during the interview by both the interviewer and the interviewee, but I would differentiate this from the later forms of analysis because of its almost unintentional and naturalistic nature. The following is an example taken from an interview with a male Podiatrist in Brynbeth Trust.

“What are your personal strengths and weaknesses and what part of your personality do you think has helped you with [being creative and innovative and taking guarded-risks]? Well, the weakness would be hating failure, I mean an obvious one that everybody does, but deeply hating it, if I try something and it really does not work and it falls flat, that would really hit me for six...but that in itself you make sure it doesn’t happen...I’m a bad looser...um..... this is very difficult...I don’t know the woods for the trees, y’know... it’s trying to look at yourself from the outside, it’s weird..I am enthusiastic... but that enthusiasm is probably driven by I just want to change things, ok, which is not answering your question at all, but I have a fair idea that I do see the world fairly differently from a lot of people I know”
['That's interesting, how do you see it?']
I see a lot, I don't know... but for a start, my sense of humour will be one where... I will find things funny that other people don't... but I have this ability to find a funny bit of a situation and make other people laugh... let's say at a staff meeting, but where everybody is stilted and orderly, I would go out of my way to not be [stilted and orderly], not for any rebellious reason or anything like that, just because I feel that this is not the way it should be... I would see myself as a good people's person, yes! A people's person...”

Podiatrist, (AHP2), Brynbeth

This example shows the podiatrist attempting to understand his strengths and weaknesses as he is talking to me. He appears to feel uncomfortable talking about himself initially, perhaps self-reflection is something that he does not actively do. He then identifies something that he feels makes him different, he has a different world view ‘seeing the world differently’. He begins to almost ‘muddle through’ some sense-making of his world view, highlighting some effects, he ‘find[s] things funny that other people don’t’, he is ‘not rebellious’. Then he is able to answer the question that was first posed, i.e. what are his strengths, he’s a ‘good people’s person’.

I conducted the intentional analysis, using the transcripts (and other documents collated during the data collection), using a blend of Kvale’s (1996) condensation and interpretation methods, depending on which best fitted the text being analysed at the time. In order to achieve some level of organisation with the analysis I followed advice given by Miles and Huberman (1994) and I drew up an interview analysis summary sheet (see A19 for an example).

I printed out each transcript, and literally went through it with a highlighter pen and a biro, highlighting any themes and noting my descriptions for these themes in the margins. I then transferred these notes to a summary sheet which was filed with the participant's interview transcript. The first summary sheet that I put together, did not work as well as I had hoped with the analysis and the themes that were emerging. I felt that it was not allowing me to record them effectively, so I revised the sheet and produced another (A20), that I felt worked better with the strategic interview data.
and in helping me explore links and themes, but it still didn’t work as well as I hoped with the corporate entrepreneur interview data.

After having had my data transcribed, a senior colleague encouraged me to explore NVivo (a qualitative data analysis IT package). My intention had always been to analyse my data manually, but I decided to explore the package to see whether it could support me and perhaps make the analysis process quicker. I am not sure why I decided to explore using NVivo particularly given I had completed my data collection and that I had always intended to analyse manually and with hindsight I do feel that this decision was rather impulsive. Because I had not set out to use the NVivo package, my data did not organise easily into the more user friendly frameworks and after a moment of clarity, I reverted back to manually sorting through the transcripts.

The NVivo experience was not completely wasted, in that I had put together a second version of my transcript that was ordered by question, rather than as questions were addressed on the day. This raised my attention to a few more themes that I had not been aware of. As different themes emerged, I reflected back on my literature review and focussed in on areas that were coming up. This helped to refresh my awareness of themes and develop my ability to understand relationships and identify further themes. I subsequently revisited the interview transcripts with a third version of a summary sheet based on the observations from my NVivo experience (A21). This time I decided to explore the transcripts in reverse order, so that I was not continually analysing the same transcripts first and the same transcripts last. New themes emerged that I had not explored in the initial literature review, and so I used the electronic and library resources to explore these further.

The data collection, preparation and analysis period was long, arduous and drawn-out. In January 2006, my new job had started to dominate my time (as Phillips and Pugh (1994) had warned). I started finding it difficult to find the time, and the self-motivation, to prepare and analyse the data. However, by March 2006, I had become more comfortable in my work and I slowly managed to reclaim my spare time for my research. I became more motivated to, and more effective at, working on my data analysis in the evenings and at weekends.
All of the interview transcripts were analysed in terms of emerging themes and these were noted onto the analysis sheets. Then I compared and contrasted all of the analysis sheets to identify some core themes. From this point I was able to scrutinise the detail in the transcriptions, exploring for any themes in the discourses used. Following the analysis of the interview transcripts I then explored all of the ‘other’ paper data that had been collected from each of the trusts. See Appendix A22 for an inventory of the internal documents I collected and explored as part of my analysis.

7.8 Critical Moments of the Research Project

Reflecting back through my research there were a number of critical moments that I felt were key to the development of my PhD, be it that the moment bought some clarity of thought to a problem, or that it inspired me, or that it instilled me with confidence. The standard approach to writing a PhD dissertation does not really allow much scope to present such moments, particularly if the moments fall outside the realms of the ‘positivist’ idea of what a research ‘method’ should consist of, what it should include and what it should disclude in terms of the total PhD experience. Many of my critical moments occurred during these peripheral tasks and events, such as when I started teaching and when I received some feedback from a paper that I presented at a conference.

In chapter 1, I take Horsfall et al’s (2001:4) definition of a critical moment as ‘the messy, unspoken, complex, and disturbing moments in [a] research process’. I wanted to extend the notion of what a critical moment means to me, for the purposes of this research project. To try and understand what a critical moment actually does mean to me, I found myself revisiting the literature on epistemology and I ended up thoroughly engrossed in philosophy and perception theory. Realising that I had neither the time nor the space to be introducing such literature I have carefully redefined critical moments of this PhD to mean:

‘the messy, complex, difficult yet always insightful moments that I have experienced during this PhD that have shaped my perceptions and what I know; that have made meaningful my knowledge of, and understanding of myself, my research and the PhD ‘process’.
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Using appendices A1 to A4 as the chronological guide to the critical moments that helped to shape my research, I have summarised each critical moment I experienced in Figure 7.5 in terms of whether it was a personally oriented moment (p), or a task oriented (t) moment. I have described each moment and explained why it was critical to the shaping of my PhD.

**Figure 7.5 Critical Moments of my Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/ brief Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Why I felt that this was a critical moment, as defined above.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2003 –CH quit her PhD</td>
<td>My best friend (and study partner) decided to quit her PhD studies</td>
<td>I had become dependent upon CH for the softer ‘of my PhD emotional’ PhD support. I felt a sense of loss. I was behind schedule, partly because I was matching my PhD input to that of CH’s and she had been mentally winding down for a couple of months, partly because my first supervisor was very inaccessible in terms of the ‘technical’ support and guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2003- Meeting with Sally</td>
<td>Sally had offered to look through my first attempt at a literature review in an ‘unofficial’ capacity. We met up so she could give me her feedback.</td>
<td>The meeting was insightful yet difficult, because I realised the ‘masterpiece’ that I had written was not a masterpiece at all – far from it. It made me aware about how much work I had to do, about how much work I hadn’t done, and raised lots of questions in relation to the tasks involved in the PhD and the quality of my ‘official’ supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2003- Met a PhD student at Conference</td>
<td>Met with NB at the ISBA conference and we discussed the PhD process at quite a length. NB had recently had her viva, so she was at the other end of her PhD. Following the conference, NB sent me an example of a chapter she had written</td>
<td>Prior to meeting NB, I felt largely under supervised, quite lost and unconfident in my ability to do this research. NB improved my confidence, self-belief and subsequently my motivation. From looking at her work, I not only thought, but I believed that my PhD was achievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2004 – New supervisor</td>
<td>Sally came on board as my new supervisor following the departure of my first supervisor from the university</td>
<td>The issue of where to conduct my research came up, and it highlighted how dependent I had been on my first supervisor for getting access into a large organisation. I became just as dependent on Sally for access into the NHS Trusts. Sally provided me with both the harder ‘technical’ support and softer ‘emotional’ support that I had previously received from my first supervisor and CH respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2004- Presented paper at Conference in Limerick</td>
<td>Presented paper Sambrook, S. &amp; Roberts, C. (2004) ‘The interrelationships between corporate entrepreneurship and organisational learning: A review of literature and recommendations for future research’ at the 5th International Conference in HRD Research &amp; Practice across</td>
<td>Following the presentation of this paper, I asked Sally for feedback. Giving and receiving feedback proved to be particularly stressful and upsetting for the both of us. This moment was critical in that after having discussed our feelings and had sought to understand what had happened and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe in Limerick 27th-28th of May 2004</td>
<td>why, the student-supervisory relationship became much stronger. The co-dependency of the student-supervisory relationship was identified as a possible factor intrinsic to this critical moment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2004 – Presented paper at Workshop in SBARD (t)+(p)</td>
<td>Presented paper “The interrelationships between organisational learning and corporate entrepreneurship” at the School for Business and Regional Development (SBARD) Research Workshop in Bangor 12th-13th of July 2004</td>
<td>This was a critical moment as I had felt rather heckled whilst presenting this paper by some lecturers who were more positivist in their research epistemologies. This impacted upon my self-confidence, and I felt for sometime that my research was not worthwhile and academically rigorous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2004 – Brainstorm (t)</td>
<td>Returning from a meeting in Llanlyn NHS Trust, Sally and I had an impromptu brainstorm about ways in which I could structure my PhD findings</td>
<td>The effect of the brainstorm The models that were developed in this session helped to move my thinking forwards and helped me to structure my literature review better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2004 Paper models (t)</td>
<td>Using paper, glue, sellotape and card, I tried to make 3D models that described the relationship between CE, OL and OC</td>
<td>This was a critical technical moment of my research because I came up with the Yin/Yang models that underpinned the whole project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005 – Teaching NHS staff (t)+(p)</td>
<td>Teaching with Dr. Sally Sambrook on the Leadership, Quality, Innovation and Change module of MSc in Health Care Leadership</td>
<td>This teaching improved my confidence in presenting to a class, and it also provided me with an informal means of learning more about the NHS and of familiarising myself with NHS discourses, thus making me feel more confident during interviews and collecting my data in the Trusts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005 – Conference in Leeds (t)</td>
<td>Presented paper Roberts, C. &amp; Sambrook, S. (2005) ‘An investigation into the relationship between Corporate Entrepreneurship, Organisational Learning and Organisational Change within Welsh Trusts hospitals: A top down perspective’, at the 6th International Conference on HRD Research &amp; Practice across Europe in Leeds 25th - 27th of May 2005</td>
<td>I had some extremely useful feedback from this conference, from another delegate. He inspected my model of CE, OL and OC and critiqued the external change constructs. He also asked whether my model was an input-output model. His feedback and comments enabled me to develop my thinking much further and this is why I feel that it was a critical moment. Furthermore, the presentation itself went well and my confidence improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>Teaching with Prof. Pete Barrar 'Interviewing Workshop' at EPSRC Research Methodology Workshop on 27th-28th March 2006 at Wolfston College, Cambridge</td>
<td>This teaching session made me aware of how much I actually knew about my research methodology and it made me feel really confident and that I was learning something from the PhD experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2006</td>
<td>Findings Preliminary thematic analysis of the interview data</td>
<td>This was critical to my research in two ways. Firstly in that I actually had found some themes, and secondly that finding the themes made me feel that I was 'nearly there now' and it motivated me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2006</td>
<td>Epiphany: Autoethnography Due to a personal crisis I had what Denzin (1988) describes as an Epiphany. An event 'which individuals are so powerfully absorbed that they are left without an interpretative framework to make sense of their experience'.</td>
<td>In order to try to unpick, make sense of and understand this crisis, I started reading literature, some of it heavily posited in social constructivist epistemology (narratives, autoethnographies) and it is through this reading and sense-making that the 'what I know' matched up with 'what I believe' in terms of my world view. It made the power of and value of social constructivism (most particularly narratives, reflexivity and autoethnography) very real and meaningful to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2007</td>
<td>Links between researcher and researched: generalisability Compiling this chart</td>
<td>My final critical moment occurred so recently that I am not sure whether it is a critical moment or not yet, only time and further analysis will tell. Through compiling this chart of my critical moments, I have noted its themes are similar to those initial finding from my research: that is confidence, dependency on the supervisor (PhD)/champion (NHS) and critical learning moments. The PhD is by definition an innovative output, so does this make me an entrepreneur of sorts, and if this is so, then if what I am learning about myself mirrors what I am learning about NHS Trust entrepreneurs, what does this mean about the transferability of my research? This could be a lovely finding that links the method, with the methodology and the experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.9 Conclusions

Through this chapter, I hope to have detailed the story of my data collection within both Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts. I have described the difficulties that I faced in getting in and getting LREC approval. I have explored my dependency on my supervisor for practical tasks such as access, and for other psychological support such as instilling confidence. I have discussed the ethical implications of my study and have provided a frank and honest account of my experiences collecting my data.
I have described the reality of the interview process including how to access, who to access and converting appointments into interviews. The process of conducting the interviews and analysing the data has been described, including the transcription process, the thematic analysis of the interviews and document analysis. I have concluded this chapter with an interesting exploration of my experiences in terms of 'critical moments' using a spreadsheet with a month/ year overview (Appendix A1-A4) to highlight key activities and critical learning moments.

As will have become clear by now, I have found it difficult to completely separate my 'Method Chapter' from my 'Results and Analysis Chapter', as I have already started the process of reporting some results and attempting to make sense of them, internalising and externalising them. The next two chapters explore the key results of my research and completes the case of intraprelearning in two Welsh Trusts.
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Chapter 8 Results and Analysis: Strategic Level

8.1 Introduction
In Chapter 6, I introduced the two cases of Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts through describing an overview of their respective structures and using information collated from different media sources within the public domain. This chapter develops the tale of both Trusts through describing, exploring and comparing this 'official' and other lenses or perspectives from the Strategic level. By means of this discussion I hope to either confirm consistencies or reveal inconsistencies between official/espoused and 'actual' realities in each Trust case (Watson, 1995; Sambrook, 1998).

As stated earlier, I interviewed 21 strategic participants in total (see Figure 7.3 for roles of participants) 11 from Aberash and 10 from Brynbeth. The main aim of the strategic interviews was to locate the corporate entrepreneurs within each of the Trusts. However, these interviews have also provided me with an opportunity to identify other themes within and between Trusts.

It may be that research findings are situational, that is only 'true' or 'real' to a particular moment in time, to a particular period in one's life or to a particular organisational phase. Given this, I have attempted to build up a picture of both Trusts through those documents written around the interview data collection period which is 2004-2005. In some instances, I collected documents in 2004-2005, and others I have collected retrospectively, whilst writing up.

8.2 Aberash: Viewing Strategy through Espoused and Actual lenses
With this guiding philosophy (of comparing espoused and actual realities) in mind, I have found it very difficult to find any statement or form of words that explain the 2004-2005 mission statement of Aberash Trust. I have also had problems in locating other strategic information for Aberash Trust for this period. The 2005 Annual Audit Letter (Internal Document) sent to the Trust Board confirms a root cause to the problem that I have experienced:
'The Trust’s website was substantially out of date at the time of our audit, and provided very little information the Trust’s policies, Board meetings or other key information.'

8.2.1 Corporate Strategy

More recently, whilst in the write-up stage of my research I have revisited the Trust’s website. There is now a clear definitive statement of the Trust’s mission and objectives for the present year, but still no record of what it was in 2004-2005. This more recent mission statement is to: ‘improve health and well being through working together’ (Aberash Trust website, accessed 2007). This suggests that the Trust may value creativity and innovation and that it may also value the role of staff in making improvements through ‘working together’. This more recently iterated mission is underpinned by eight principles, which are as follows:

- To provide high quality care:
  ‘We are fully committed to improving the standard of care for all our patients and clients. The Trust supports an environment where clinical excellence can flourish, with staff supported to develop through training and education to provide first class care to patients.’

- To attain, or surpass, government and local targets.
- To achieve financial targets and contractual relationships.
- To foster partnership working to achieve objectives.
- To be an exemplar employer.
- To communicate and inform effectively:
  ‘The Trust recognises that effective communication is vital in the delivery of high quality health care. We seek to ensure that we have appropriate strategies for swift and comprehensive communication through all levels of the organisation, which is appropriate for its purpose.’

- To be a learning organisation.
- To create an environment that is fit for user needs.

These principles make the mission statement more meaningful and provide an indication of the strategic direction set by the CEO and the Board of Directors. It
would be interesting and insightful to understand what 'to be a learning organisation' means to the Trust. Perhaps this next section goes someway in answering this.

8.2.2 Human Resources and Development
There are a number of 'clues' within the formal literature as to the overall quality and focus of HR and HRD in Aberash Trust, even though I was not able to locate a definitive statement of the Trust HR strategy. The Trust has several endorsements that suggests its Human Resources function operates effectively and to high standards of practice. A CHI assessment (Internal Document) conducted around the time of the research period concluded that staff 'generally feel supported by the trust'. The Trust (Internal Document) takes the view that workforce capacity is about developing the capacity of the organisation to ensure that healthcare needs are met effectively. Based upon the Trust Annual Report (Internal Document) key HR issues identified by Aberash Trust include:

- Equal opportunities and race equality.
- Health at Work.
- Welsh Risk Standard 28\textsuperscript{5}.
- Emergency Preparedness.

8.2.3 Training and Development
The official literature indicates that the Trust actively encourages the education, training and development of a number of roles at various organisational levels within the Trust.

- Managers within the Trust are encouraged and supported to attend conferences, seminars and visits to other organisations to further their knowledge of risk management and clinical governance.
- All non-training grades of medical staff are supported in their continued professional development and continuing medical education.
- Senior House Officers and Pre Registration Medical Staff training is a statutory requirement, supported by educational supervisors.

\textsuperscript{5}Welsh Risk Standard 28 states that: Healthcare organisations: a) ensure that the principles of clinical governance underpin the work of every team and every clinical service; b) have a cycle of continuous quality improvement, including clinical audit; and c) ensure effective clinical and managerial leadership and accountability.
• All newly appointed medical staff are provided with an induction programme appropriate to their needs, including an induction to the Trust.

• The local university, a wide range of skills based study sessions, external education providers and in-house training course attempt to meet the CPD needs of registered nurses, midwives and health visitors.

• All staff are appraised and have a personal development plan in place via the 'Knowledge Skills Framework'.

This espoused support is confirmed from the interview with the Head of Training for Aberash NHS Trust who discusses a vision for training and development within the Trust:

"I think that we could be very creative in terms of teaching people or training people in teams. I think that we could also do a lot more shared learning so you know not running a management course purely directed at doctors but it is directed at everybody and let everybody take part. I think in this department we try and be creative in what we do and think of different ways of doing things. We've got a nursing cadet scheme we attract, well we've got a target actually of 90% recruitment of Welsh speakers."

Aberash's Board of Directors make a powerful cultural statement in their determination that ‘not only will the organisation learn from mistakes as identified through its adverse incident reporting, complaints and litigation systems, the organisation will adopt a proactive approach to learning’ (Aberash Trust website, accessed 2007). It will be interesting to see if my research corroborates with this official line and unpicks what the reality of a ‘proactive approach’ to learning may be. Also it will be interesting to see whether the bottom-up view of ‘learning from mistakes’ is as clear as this top-down espoused view.

In terms of the strategic interviews the CEO of Aberash hints as to what a learning organisation may mean to him:

"If you look at organisations now the ones who are successful are fairly nimble on their feet and able to meet challenges fairly quickly, so once we’ve got that established the next phase of the
development of the organisation was to move it into a learning organisation and also developing things like a no-blame culture...so there’s two things in that; people were prepared to take risks and the organisation needs to take risks without being blamed, but you can’t make cock-ups continuously ..it can’t be a free for all but people need to have a climber by which they are able to move the organisation forward and challenges...” CEO, Aberash

The CEO also highlights the tension between working towards a no-blame culture, taking risks and making mistakes.

8.2.4 Modernisation

Aberash views modernisation as a way of ‘see[ing] and do[ing] things differently to improve performance by developing capabilities and culture to improve the change process’ (Internal Document). As has been the case with other strategies, I could not find a clear statement of the Trust’s Modernisation Strategy. A report (ibid) indicates that the Trust had a strategy in place at the time of this data collection phase as it ‘sets out the agreed direction and priorities of the modernisation programme and includes national initiatives supported by the Welsh Assembly Government, local health community projects and Trust led schemes.’

In its Annual Report Aberash (Internal Document) identifies five areas of development and modernisation:

- Modernisation (examples here included the adoption of a statistically-based quality system, integrated care pathways and guide to good practise).
- Information Management and Technology Developments (included a successful bid for funding to increase the number of networked computers around the Trust).
- Supplies Development (examples provided by the Trust include a change in ‘purchasing’ procedures and savings identified by supplies staff).
- Service Developments (included new wards, units and clinics, investments into new equipment and facilities, bursaries for clinical students).
• Finance Developments included changes in internal ways of working and working with financial institutions.

The statistically-based quality system is interesting in that it seeks to improve the Trust through instilling 'bite-sized' changes and then filtering them down through the Trust. From my strategic interviews, it seems that this quality system has triggered some insightful learning moments:

"One of the things that we have learnt...you've an emphasis on learning...one of the things we've learnt very quickly about ourselves when we went into the first stage of training, is that as people working in the health service we are incredibly hard-wired, that is the phrase I think I have taken..

[What do you mean by this phrase?] ‘We are incredibly hard wired to do solutions, its almost an instinctive reaction – see problem – find solution...The danger of course is if you don't [go away and collect some data and find out what the issue really is and how it manifests itself] you jump straight into putting solutions... you can end up putting solutions to problems that you haven't really got.” Head of Modernisation, Aberash

8.2.5 Leadership

Finally, Aberash was reported as having effective leadership and a commitment to clinical governance at all levels (Internal Document). The Trust describes itself as ‘dynamic’ and ‘progressive’ (Internal Document). The CEO of Aberash came across as being a strong leader, along with a Head of Nursing that was interviewed:

“You have to be able to understand the behaviours that you witness here everyday, and match... if somebody came in here, one of the surgeons... it happens fairly often, in an absolutely blinding rage about something, the behaviour that you see around you on a day-to-day basis take a different type of handling...I'm interested in winning hearts and minds a lot of the time because you need to get people to actually do what they need to do and that's quite a challenge with interpersonal skills everyday, and you have to use different skills with different
people and in different situations. ‘Cause they talk about what is your style of leadership, and I haven’t got a particular style that fits because everyday...some of the time you’re involved in transformational leadership other times its transactional depending on the situation...” Head of Nursing, Aberash

8.3 Brynbeth: Viewing strategy from espoused and actual lenses

At the time of this data collection, Brynbeth Trust was undergoing a number of capital projects: two theatre upgrades at one of its main acute hospitals and a centre for adult mental health rehabilitation had opened. The development of a new medical unit and another specialist unit had also just begun on the main acute site.

Contrary to Aberash Trust, I found it much easier locating strategic information about Brynbeth Trust. The Trust website was easier to navigate and information seemed more out in the public domain. Brynbeth Trust appears to be open about its strategic mission and its various strategies.

8.3.1 Corporate Strategy

The mission statement of Brynbeth Trust is simply ‘to provide the highest quality of care for the population’. The mission is underpinned by three factors, which makes it more meaningful (Internal Document):

- Dignity: Placing a high value on respecting the patient and the individual.
- Valuing staff: As individuals and developing their skills appropriately.
- Efficiency: Pursuing efficiency and effectiveness in delivering services.

It is clear that strategically, Brynbeth Trust recognises the importance of investing in staff development in order to improve upon the quality of patient care. Furthermore, there are elements of corporate entrepreneurship in providing more efficient and effective service delivery.

Brynbeth Trust also has a Code of Conduct (Internal Document). I have underlined discourse in the Statement of the Code that may say something of the Trust’s espoused culture:
• Accountability – **everything** done by those who work in the Trust must be able to stand the test of Government scrutiny, public judgements, proprietary and professional codes of conduct.

• Probity – there should be an absolute **standard of honesty** in dealing with the assets of the NHS: **integrity** should be the hallmark of all personal conduct in decisions affecting patients, staff and supplier, and in the use of information acquired in the course of NHS duties.

• Openness – there should be **sufficient transparency** about NHS activities to promote confidence between the Trust its staff, patients and public.

From my initial efforts in locating and collecting strategic documents, I feel that there is a sense of openness about Brynbeth Trust. Information is not only available to the general public, but it is offered through the website, it is easy to locate on the website, and easy to download or listen to via the website. This appears to contrast quite dramatically with the availability of and accessibility to Aberash's strategic information, particularly during the data-collection period (2004-2006), perhaps less so now.

**8.3.2 Human Resources and Staff Development**

The Human Resources Directorate in Brynbeth Trusts has three strategic goals (Internal Document):

- To recruit, retain and develop a highly competent and motivated workforce through:
  - Attracting and retaining the staff needed to deliver operational and service objectives.
  - Developing excellence in people management policies and practices.

- To ensure the Trust manages its staff fairly, efficiently and effectively through:
  - Working in partnership with staff and their representatives.
  - Developing performance management and employee development processes.
  - Building management capacity and competency to manage change.
To ensure staff act at all times with ethical integrity to meet public service values through:
  - Compliance with statutory and other policy requirements.
  - Promoting dignity at work.

The key issues for HR in Brynbeth are as follows (Internal Document):

- Pay Modernisation, and transferring staff onto the Agenda for Change terms and conditions.
- Electronic staff record and a computer-based Learning Management module.
- Recruitment and retention, in-particular an on-line application facility.
- Occupational Health.
- Sickness and Absence Management.
- Equality and Diversity.
- Training and Development, including a five-year plan to support a Learning and Development Strategy.
- Health and Safety.
- Library Services and the promotion and provision of information skills sessions to help familiarise Trust staff to the HOWIS e-library so as to increase knowledge and inform practice.

8.3.3 Training and Development

The Organisational Development Strategy (Internal Document) for Brynbeth emphasises the importance of organisational culture and the communication of values down through the Trust. It highlights that a strategic action is required to develop effective leadership skills at all levels, and states that a review of management structures and elimination of some administrational and managerial practices is on the strategic agenda. Most significantly to this study is the development of a strategy for a learning organisation 'at its core the learning organisation commits to improving service by continuous learning and development'. The Trust strategy which outlines the necessary steps required to achieve a 'learning organisation' status provides the following core elements (Internal Document):
  - Knowledge management and sharing (O/G).
• Information management and sharing (O/G).
• Self-directed learning (I).
• Equal access to CPD opportunities (O).
• Facilities for encouraging learning as well as traditional training (O).
• Developing reflective learning and evaluation as part of management activities (G/I).
• Developing learning networks with strategic partners (O/G)
• Encouraging individual learning networks (I/G).

These core elements provide a clear indication of the Trust’s strategic interpretation of what it means to be a learning organisation. As with my review of the literature, Brynbeth appears to have described activities in terms of organisational levels. I have marked those I think describe actions at the organisational level with (O), those that are group-oriented with (G), and those that are individually-oriented with (I), and some may be a combination of two, such as (G/I).

There are numerous examples of ‘organisational learning’ practice within the strategic interviews from Brynbeth Trust, most notably a Director of Therapy:

“Ever since I qualified I’ve kept a professional portfolio, and when I came here I tried to engage my staff in developing their portfolio, so I actually issued my staff with two Fundamentals of Education: one is Protected Time, um around four hours per month to do CPD, and also I issue them with a standard portfolio something like this (shows a large colourful file). I think that the big thing that I’m interested in with lifelong learning is not the sole territory of the qualified professional staff, so we had quite a lot of work developing our admin staff, and also our technical staff..so that’s why we developed our courses so that we could generate a culture of learning for the Welsh speaking population...” Director of Therapy, Brynbeth

8.3.4 Modernisation
Brynbeth Trust’s strategic view of modernisation is that it is about ‘developing care that delivers for patients’. It is about breaking the ‘we’ve always done it like this
culture’, encouraging both patients and staff to challenge and change healthcare services for the better.’

The modernisation strategy for Brynbeth is as follows (Internal Document):

- Safety – no needless deaths.
- Effectiveness – no needless pain.
- Patient centred – no helplessness.
- Timeliness – no unwanted waiting.
- Efficiency – no waste.
- Equity – for everyone.

In its Annual Report (Internal Document) Brynbeth identifies four areas of development and modernisation:

- Modernisation (examples here included the adoption of a qualitative quality and safety system, care pathways information technology and guide to good practice).
- Information Management and Technology Developments (including new equipment).
- Supplies Development (examples provided by the Trust include a change in ‘purchasing’ procedures and savings identified by supplies staff).
- Service Developments (including new specialist nurse posts, new clinical school and greater access to more specialised patient services, and a joint venture with Aberash Trust).

Interestingly, Brynbeth Trust is using a qualitative safety and quality improvement initiative to instil change through ‘testing the form’ of small tasks and spreading them through ‘bubbling them up’ throughout the Trust. (Aberash is using a quantitative system).

8.3.5 Leadership

Finally, Brynbeth Trust has a draft Leadership Strategy outlined (Internal Document) that focuses in particular on the building blocks of a Leadership and Management Development pathway.
'Strong leadership is needed to create and achieve the vision of how services can be developed and modernised, and to harness the enthusiasm and commitment of staff to bring the necessary changes about' (Appendix 6.1: P23).

BrynBeth Trust currently provides three leadership development programmes in-house and works with a number of regional and national providers.

The purposive sampling led me to several dynamic leaders within BrynBeth Trust. A number of these leaders were actively supporting entrepreneurial activities through championing and mentoring the entrepreneurs.

"I'm in a pivotal position within the organisation, where I can influence across the profession, but those individuals are few and far between... the tall poppies... have you heard of them? [No, could you explain..]

I think I read it the other day, a nursing leader who talked about the Tall Poppy Syndrome and that was basically that the tallest brightest poppies stand out amongst the field and they're chopped down, and that's what nurses do to each other if you put your head above the parapet, they're ready to criticise, but I'm looking for these tall poppies now and some of them I've managed to bring into this department"  Head of Modernisation, BrynBeth

The ‘Tall Poppy Syndrome’ that the Head of Modernisation introduced in the interview is discussed in a paper by Farrell (2001). It is not something that I explore in the initial literature review, Chapters 2-5. In his paper the problem of Horizontal Violence (HV) is discussed in terms of a number of interesting perspectives:

- Micro – the individual determinant of aggression (a nurse chooses to act in a way that affirms or denies another’s worth.)

- Meso – This examines the organisational structures including disenfranchising workplace practices.

- Macro – This looks at nurses’ perspectives vis-à-vis powerful others and the marginalisation and disempowerment that results.
• Interconnectedness – This is recognition of the enmeshment and interconnectedness that occurs between each of the three levels of analysis.

In terms of this research project and the interview with the Head of Modernisation it is the first level ‘micro’ that matches with what is described by this participant and this behaviour can lead to lowering of self-confidence. As with other themes that have emerged from interviews from the senior interviews, it will be interesting to see if the Trust entrepreneurs build upon any of these themes

8.4 Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts: Strategic comparisons

Figure 8.1 A summary of Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts’ Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aberash</th>
<th>Brynbeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves</td>
<td>250,000 residents</td>
<td>390,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue budget</td>
<td>£200mn per annum</td>
<td>£180 mn per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Directorates</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Difficult to access documents &amp;</td>
<td>Accessing information was very easy, either using the web or via strategic leads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Observations-actual)</td>
<td>locate strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>To improve health and well-being through working together</td>
<td>To provide the highest quality of care for the population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Strategy/ goals</td>
<td>Could not find information about this</td>
<td>Recruitment, retention &amp; development: fair management: ethical integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key HR Issues</td>
<td>Equal Opps, Health at Work,</td>
<td>Electronic Staff Record, Recruitment &amp; Retention, Health at Work, Sickness, Equality &amp; Diversity, T&amp;D, Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welsh Risk Standard 28, Emergency preparedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD Themes</td>
<td>Proactive approach to learning, learn from mistakes.</td>
<td>Working towards Learning Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modernisation</strong></td>
<td>Seeing and doing things differently to improve performance by developing capabilities and culture to improve the change process</td>
<td>Developing care that delivers for patients, breaking the ‘we’ve always done it like that’ culture, encouraging both patients and staff to challenge and change healthcare services for the better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernisation Themes</td>
<td>Statistically-based quality system, integrated care pathways &amp; guides to good practice</td>
<td>Qualitative-oriented safety and quality system, integrated care pathways, guides to good practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Leadership | Describes itself as dynamic and progressive. | Strong leadership is needed to create and achieve the vision of how services can be developed and modernised and to harness the enthusiasm and commitment of staff to bring the necessary changes about.
---|---|---
Culture | Power-oriented/ Masculine | People-oriented/ Feminine

From this initial exploration and analysis, Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts are shown as quite different in terms of their culture, structure and strategy. Aberash being a power-oriented, competitive and more closed, whilst Brynbeth appears as a people-oriented, feminine and open Trust.

8.5 Aberash and Brynbeth: a cultural lens

What stands out as being more significant is the difference between the availability and accessibility of strategic documents and the cultural inference. Aberash seems to be more closed with its strategic information. Brynbeth Trust appears to offer such information openly to the public through their website and other NHS information portals. This observation is supported in some of the strategic interviews:

“I suppose I had a game plan in my mind, um which I didn’t necessarily... some people knew what I was doing, I suppose... but I didn’t shout it out” CEO Aberash

“The CEO is a competitive animal, I mean part of my role was to try and work across the silos...we’ve still got people that are fairly ingrained in their silos, so whether part of competitive is fear of letting other people know about the things that you’re doing ...cause people maybe see sharing an innovation as loosing it." Senior Lead Aberash

However, there are examples that do not fit within this mould:

“I can’t think of anything more productive than sharing, I’m not a competitive person, I get turned off totally by competition, I don’t like it so my approach is to say ‘yep, if
you’re doing something good over there, tell the world, y’know... don’t keep it a secret” Senior Lead, Aberash

The strongest contrast between both Trusts that emerged from the strategic interviews is concerning their culture. Drawing from Harrison (1972), Handy (1979) and Williams et al (1989), Aberash’s actual culture seems to show more signs of being power-oriented:

“From a Chief Executive’s point of view I’ve got an organisation that I want to be at the cutting edge...” CEO, Aberash

Whilst Brynbeth’s seems to be more people-oriented:

“We as a Trust have always been quite relaxed in terms of competition, we’ve always been ... y ‘know, I’d say we’ve never been watching over our shoulders, we’ve always been quiet comfortable where we sit... but Aberash... Llanaber are very good at sharing, but Aberash, are very competitive...” Senior Lead, Brynbeth

“...if you want people to have a vision you have to share it and own it as well, not just be given it... this is why we do all the things like rumour busting, partnerships forum and we also run a new starters day” Senior Lead, Brynbeth

In the research literature power-oriented cultures are described as competitive, entrepreneurial and risk-taking, whilst people-oriented cultures feature consensus, mutuality and trust. If people-oriented cultures are not entrepreneurial and risk-taking, this might have important implications for corporate entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship in this context.

The data collected does not provide insight into whether being ‘closed’ and ‘power-oriented’ is necessarily a positive or a negative attribute. Similarly, it does not tell me whether being more ‘open’ and ‘people-oriented’ is a positive or negative
attribute. Furthermore, I found examples within Aberash of people-oriented sub-
cultures, although they were not as powerful as those in Brynbeth.

What the interview processes have revealed is that both Trusts have been able to
provide me with examples of successful corporate entrepreneurship, examples of
effective transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) and examples of effective
transactional management regardless of their power or people orientation.

I tried to find examples of power-orientation within the strategic level Brynbeth
interviews, but to no avail. There could be a number of reasons for this: for example,
the CEO from Brynbeth declined to be interviewed for this research project, and he
may have had stronger power-oriented opinions. The ‘fact’ that the CEO of
Brynbeth Trust declined to be interviewed, whereas the CEO of Aberash accepted
may be symbolic in itself. Did the Aberash’s CEO feel that the topic of this research
was more important, and worthy of an interview compared to the CEO of Brynbeth?
It may be that the CEO of Aberash has desire for a tighter locus of control with
regard to ‘potentially sensitive information’ than that of Brynbeth’s. Saying this,
both Trusts were equally as ‘nervous’ about potential weaknesses emerging from this
research project (see Chapter 7 for my narrative of ‘getting-in’ to both Trusts).

Another similarity that emerged between the cultures of Aberash and Brynbeth
Trusts was the seeming reluctance to publicise or celebrate entrepreneurial
achievements. The Head of Modernisation highlighted Aberash’s problem:

“One of the things I think for us as an organisation, it may well
come out with other people that you discuss with, there seems to
be a tendancy in the Trust for us to be, I don’t know, a bit
reticent about making a noise about the things that we do, and
there’s a lot of things where we go to...we go to conferences in
Wales or whatever, where people are telling you about all of
these things that they are doing and we are thinking we did that
three years ago..”

The HR Director at Aberash had conducted some internal research that highlighted
this issue. She discussed her findings with me:
"I've tried working with the Directorates to try and find new areas of innovation, so I have actually produced a table... but... its strange... In terms of Welsh Trusts I think that we are actually quite an innovative Trust but when I actually asked the question 'can you give me examples of a new way of innovative projects and new ways of working?' a lot of them didn’t put things forward and then when we compared... but they thought 'this is something we’ve been doing for years and years and years which was something quite interesting and then when we looked at what the other Welsh Trusts were doing, they ended up putting forwards lots of things that we were already doing but we hadn’t put it forwards as being innovative.'

Human Resource Director, Aberash

Similarly, the same problem is highlighted by a General Manager for Brynbeth Trust:

"The thing with Gail is as well she is the first nurse to be doing this like this, but that is not innovative... just to this Trust... I mean there are lots of other Trusts that do that, but she is the first in this Trust and she has been the driver making the change... the problem with all of these things is the NHS we kind of do things all of the time, but we don’t say what a wonderful thing it was. I mean I've seen an article the other day in A Journal ... we probably do compare in parts of it we just don’t call it that."

General Manager, Brynbeth

More specifically, the Intellectual Property Manager of Brynbeth identifies a difference in the type of role that comes forward with innovative ideas and links this to self-confidence:

"I have to say that consultants are better at coming forwards than nurses....cause they are probably...well they’ve got to be fairly pushy haven’t they to become consultants here?..and they’re not backwards in coming forwards, whereas nurses y’know are a bit more shy” Intellectual Property Manager, Brynbeth
Some interesting issues relating to perceptions of power emerged during the course of my interviews with the senior leads from both Trusts. One of the first interviews I conducted was with a Head of Modernisation from Brynbeth:

"You've got a bit of a debate about that Clair, because nursing as a profession is eighty percent of the workforce, you know we should be out there leading the way, innovating and taking everybody with us, but for some reason we haven't got the powerbase and we don't recognise our own power and I think we wait to be directed rather than be directive, and I think sometimes we're taking on additional roles, not because we are truly innovating and taking the role forwards as a nurse, it's because we are getting the pickings of the pickings of Doctors' what they can't achieve... I think that nurses have a long way to go but we've got tremendous power bases if we recognise it." Head of Modernisation, Brynbeth

Similarly a Head of Nursing from Aberash highlights a sense of a subordinate culture in nursing:

"We've no strategy for EWTD for managers and everything, we've been so busy trying to sort out everything else... but obviously for the Junior Doctors primarily and certainly regarding the nursing staff, because that has been a particular challenge over the past three months as we try and support the waiting list targets of the Assembly. Our staff, as you've probably heard me on the phone, we've had to cancel three waiting list initiatives this weekend, because of the Easter staff who were going to do those lists in their own time have gone off sick, because they're so tired... everybody is so tired after three months of working their days off and annual leave just so we could hit the targets... but the silent group who've been constantly in breach of the EWTD are nurses, certainly in my career..." Head of Nursing; Surgery, Aberash

Perhaps the quote below elucidates why this is so amongst nurses:
"We have a [nurses] training rule and the rule is that you don't do anything until you have been told to do it, it is like the military, and what I would like to get is the junior Doctor's demanding to make things different.." Deputy Medical Director, Brynbeth

The Deputy Medical Director went on to tell me about the history of nursing and how its roots are firmly entrenched within the Military custom and ranking. Unfortunately, the recording of this interview was very poor as some background noise interfered with the vocals, so my transcript is extremely patchy and not reliable in many parts because of this.

8.7 Looking through a nursing lens - Nursing Stretch

My findings also highlight an emerging theme associated with a problem in nursing created by two drivers of change and perhaps compounded by a reticence within nursing. The problem is the 'stretch' or tension created from the EWTD and the Fundamentals of Care (WAG, 2003). The Fundamentals of Care is a Welsh Assembly Government initiative, similar to the English 'Essence of Care' (DH 2001). 'Fundamentals of Care' presents twelve fundamental aspects of health and social care that aim to improve the quality of care for adults (WAG, 2003). However, this legislation requires nurses to focus on their basic tasks.

"No financial support has been given to nursing to achieve compliance with WTD. Nurses have been encouraged to be more innovative and creative, however are being encouraged to get back to basics. Nurses are being stretched like elastic" Head of Nursing, Brynbeth

"You're being asked to drive Fundamentals of Care, when you're asked to go back to basics, but on the other hand we've got no junior doctors, so the ward staff are doing bloods, ECG's, they're trawling through lab results to make sure that when the consultants come they are there with all the information at their tips...so we have created an absolute monster in all of this, so now we are been heavily criticised for not being at the patient's bedside" Head of Nursing, Brynbeth.
Figure 8.2 illustrates the emerging problem in nursing that requires nurses to stretch their skills towards both ends of their competencies. At one end there is the EWTD which pulls nurses competencies towards taking on more advanced roles, traditionally associated with basic junior doctor tasks, the other end is the Fundamentals of Care, which pulls nurses towards improving upon their basic beside skills. There are couple of questions that emerge because of this problem of stretch. Using the analogy of an elastic band being stretched, at what point of stretch provides optimum learning, creativity and innovative output? And at what point will the elastic snap? I have not been able to address this issue within this study, but it would be insightful to current nursing practice to explore this, and this could be a topic of further research.

8.8 The Champion's lens

One of the strategic leads from Aberash and one from Brynbeth were actively championing corporate entrepreneurs within their respective Trusts. Champions are defined as:

‘Individuals who informally emerge in an organisation and make a decisive contribution to innovation by actively and enthusiastically promoting its progress through the critical organisational stages’ Howell et al (2005:643)

Aberash’s champion described:

“I've got my senior nurses who I would say are involved on a daily basis with innovative practise, In the Day Surgery unit I've got one who is one of my senior nurses. She has come
from a general nurse background... and she was persuaded to take on a senior role in Day Surgery cause it was clear to me that she had the skills that we needed to manage and more importantly change the culture... they needed somebody who could give them the vision and take them forwards and develop the service for everybody... " Head of Nursing: Surgery, Aberash

In the above, the Head of Nursing has clearly had to persuade the entrepreneur to take up the post. I actually interviewed the entrepreneur that is being discussed, and it is really interesting to note here that the entrepreneur felt that her ‘champion’ had encouraged her through increasing her confidence. I will explore this in more depth later on in this chapter.

In Brynbeth, the champion described how she searched actively for talent, another supportive behaviour that I discuss later on in this chapter:

“It would be about, well, if this were three or four years ago in my career I would be what you are looking for, I would imagine as an innovator ..I actually was ..that was my background, y'know and I didn't go along with what was happening from the top. I wanted to seek better ways of doing things and I read around and looked at ways of bringing in changes just out of interest ..I would have been perfect ..but obviously the learning stays at the other end now, because of the work I did in my early career, I was recognised and led a different career path, and now I’m obviously in a pivotal position within the organisation where I can influence across the profession ..and I think now that I’m in this position I’m looking for these individuals myself, some of them I’ve managed to bring into this department, so we’ve got some innovators and new project managers who might be these kind of individuals that you can talk to.” Head of Modernisation, Brynbeth Trust

In the last quote I have underlined a section of text. This is relevant in that it indicates what entrepreneurship means and involves to this particular senior lead.
There is a sense of rebelliousness in the description and perhaps a rejection of a ‘top-down’ approach.

8.9 Viewing Corporate Entrepreneurship through other Senior Leads’ lenses

Other senior participants have different lenses through which they view what corporate entrepreneurship is:

“It’s about doing things differently and doing a different thing” EWTD Medical Lead, Aberash

“Enhancement of roles” (Head of Nursing; Surgery, Aberash)

“Toolkit for improvement” (Head of Modernisation, Aberash)

Some interpret corporate entrepreneurship (or is antecedents) based upon their own context:

“The skill of being entrepreneurial in a Health Care environment is being very very politically aware and having high levels of Emotional Intelligence, so you don’t go stamping over peoples’ values and beliefs and you’re not threatening to people, you know, discussing and y’know finding there’s a way...” General Manager for Mental Health, Brynbeth

“Innovation everyday is to make sure that the people who are there waiting for either clinics or surgery or reviews um that need to, go ahead” Head of Nursing, Aberash

“The key to corporate entrepreneurship in Mental Health is living with uncertainty, being brave and knowing who your allies are” General Manager for Mental Health, Brynbeth

Others associate it with personal characteristics, such as ‘bravery’:

“Other people that I could think of is that we have a specialist nurse...now that’s a very brave post... its a place where you actually take on practical procedures that the doctor’s used to do...” Head of Modernisation, Brynbeth
Key themes appear to be use of power/politics, emotional intelligence and bravery, traits often linked with leadership. Other personal characteristics associated with corporate entrepreneurship included: full of ideas, creative, wacky, innovative, take risks, someone who does it before you tell them to, lateral thinker, and visionary. It will be interesting to see whether my data reveals consistencies between what the strategic leads view in the entrepreneurs and how the entrepreneurs view themselves. What would a difference between the two mean?

Finally, many of the senior leads discussed corporate entrepreneurship in terms of tasks, such as ‘to pinch’ as highlighted in the quote below:

"We introduced Hospital at Night which we pinched...we are happy to pinch ideas for other things and then put our own version to it" CEO Aberash

Other tasks mentioned include: scan, benchmark, revamp, enhancement of roles, pathways and to improve.

8.10 EWTD

After conducting interviews with the strategic participants it became clear that the EWTD was not going to lead me to a rich selection of corporate entrepreneurs so I decided to open up the parameters of the research to include corporate entrepreneurship that had not necessarily been driven by the EWTD. This also enabled me to explore autonomous (bottom-up) corporate entrepreneurship.

The initial analysis of strategic interviews revealed a degree of ambiguity concerning the EWTD and its purpose, including:

1) The impact that the EWTD has had or will have had on organisational-wide change.

2) The impact that the EWTD has had on staff other than the junior doctors within the Trust.

3) The impact the EWTD has had on driving corporate entrepreneurship.

Further to this, participants had different interpretations regarding the Hospital at Night (H@N) scheme, which was developed through the Department of Health's Modernisation Agency (MA) to help address EWTD issues.
‘H@N aims to redefine how medical cover is provided by hospitals during the out-of-hours period. The project is national, and requires a move from cover requirements defined by professional demarcation and grade, to cover defined by competency’ (MA 2003. accessed online)

H@N is versatile in that it provides numerous solutions and tools that Trusts can ‘pick and mix’ from. The scheme has been adopted differently by Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts to help solve their EWTD problem.

As stated previously, senior participants interpret and understand the H@N scheme differently. Some perceive their use of the Hospital at Night scheme to be entrepreneurial, and I would, too, given my definition of NHS CE. Reflecting back this highlights corporate entrepreneurship to be (a) perceived as new by a proportion of key stakeholders and (c) discontinuous with previous practice.

“We moved on a number of ways of working and we introduced the Hospital at Night which we pinched, we’re happy to pinch ideas for our other things and then put our own version of it…”
CEO, Aberash

“The H@N project has been around for the last three or four years, and what we’ve been doing is taking up which is really quite a dry concept and starting to bring it alive” Deputy Medical Director, Brynbeth

Others within the Trusts did not link the H@N scheme with creative, innovative and risk-taking behaviour:

“The Hospital at Night is a concept which facilitates our compliance with the EWTD and New Deal for junior doctors.” HR Director, Aberash

These findings suggest that strategic employees need to develop a clearer, mutual understanding of what NHS CE and innovation is. If there is lack of clarity at the senior level then this may cause ambiguity when it is filtered down to operational levels.
8.11 Mapping Senior leads and Corporate Entrepreneurs

To complete the discussion on my findings from the interviews held with the senior leads, I would like to present a ‘map’ highlighting a number of characteristics (see figure 8.3).

- The types of establishment that respondents are based in (i.e. hospital, clinic or office).
- Where the senior leads are based.
- Where the corporate entrepreneurs are based.
- My gauge of participants’ organisational status (based on job title and my perceptions of the legitimate power associated with this role. i.e. a Director would be higher up the organisational hierarchy ‘triangle’ than a Manager would be).
- The distribution of organisational establishments. Circles represent sites that are in different cities/towns/villages. Several organisational triangles in the same circle are establishments on the same site. Sites can be very large areas or small areas.

Figure 8.3 A Map showing where the participants were based within the two Trusts
In the map I use the term 'legitimate power'. Legitimate power, French and Raven (1959), refers to power of an individual because of their relative position and duties within an organisation. Legitimate power is the formal authority delegated to the holder of the position. It is one of five forms of organisational power identified by French and Raven in their study on social power, other forms being: referent, expert, reward and coercive.

I found this map useful as it helped me to visualise and compare inter and intra-Trust characteristics more easily. Aberash Trust respondents appear to be more clustered around the main acute, whilst Brynbeth Trust respondents appear to be more spread-out and fragmented. What I cannot demonstrate via this map is the actual distances of the ‘other’ sites from the main acute. In Aberash’s case the sites are ten minutes and thirty minutes away from the main acute (in driving time), whist in the case of Brynbeth the closest site is five minutes away and then all of the others range from being at least thirty minutes to one-and-a-half hours away. Earlier on in this chapter, I considered whether there was a tighter locus of control from Aberash Trust’s CEO. It could be that a Trust with a tighter locus of CEO control might have the main thrust of its entrepreneurial activity emerging from the main acute. Analysis of the corporate entrepreneurship data and comparison of those corporate entrepreneurship activities occurring within the main acute with those occurring on other sites would be an area of further research and could yield some interesting findings.

8.12 Conclusion
In this chapter I have described my key findings and themes from the data that I have collected at the strategic level from both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. Data includes strategic documents, observations and interviews. I have compared and contrasted the empirical data and have attempted to describe Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts in terms of espoused and actual strategies. My findings suggest that Aberash is a power-oriented culture, highly competitive but paradoxically secretive and closed. Brynbeth is a people-oriented culture, which is more open with its strategic information. I then present some emergent findings in terms of various lenses, including: culture, power, nursing, champions, looking at entrepreneurs and the EWTD. I have completed the chapter with a map of the location and legitimate
power of senior leads and entrepreneurs from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, which supports some initial observations concerning the power-oriented culture of Aberash and the people-oriented culture of Brynbeth. Respondents within Aberash are within close proximity to the main acute hospital, whilst those in Brynbeth are spread out into the community. Chapter 9 shifts the focus from the strategic-level to the operational-level and explores the various lenses of the entrepreneurs that are active within Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts.
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9.1 Introduction

This chapter is the second of two that attempts to describe and analyse the data collected from two Welsh NHS Trusts. The focus of this chapter is the data collected from the Trust Entrepreneurs. It aims to address the research questions that were introduced in Chapter 7 and explores the working model of intrapreneurship along with other models in the research literature. The results are taken from the themes that have emerged primarily from the thematic analysis of my interview transcripts and observations made during the interview events. I have presented these results in a variety of ways, using:

- Tables that enable comparisons at the individual and Trust level results (such as Figures 9.1, 9.5 and 9.8).
- Forms of Venn Diagrams that illustrate strong 'repeated' and weaker 'one-off' themes shared by and unique to the two Trusts (such as Figure 9.4).
- Force Field Analyses (Figure 9.6) presenting the strong themes that have emerged as facilitators and barriers acting towards and working against entrepreneurship within each Trust (although these were essentially the same for both Trusts).

I have also started making sense of and exploring the results by reflecting back and drawing upon, models from the existing research literature. Some of these models have provided me with a means of summarising overarching findings and themes:

- Pinchot's (1985) table comparing entrepreneurial characteristics (Figure 9.5).
- Roger's (1969) adoption curve (Figure 9.7).
- Pedler et al's (1996) Characteristics of the Learning Company (Figure 9.9)
- The model of Intrapreneurship (Figure 9.12).

Whilst others have provided me with an alternative lens and a means of helping me further explore my results:

- Huber's (1986) processual model (Figure 9.10).
- The 4I Framework (Crossan et al, 1999) (Figure 9.11).
Exploring the results through different models was part of my process of making-sense of and analysing the themes that have emerged. I conclude the chapter with an empirical model of intraprelearning, highlighting similarities and differences between the two Trusts.

9.2 Corporate Entrepreneurs
I was able to interview fifteen corporate entrepreneurs from Aberash Trust and fourteen from Brynbeth, although I did invite another ten from each Trust to be interviewed (who declined or couldn’t be interviewed within the timeframe). As I have stated earlier in this narrative, these entrepreneurs were identified by means of purposive sampling that is through being recommended by (in most cases) senior leads from within their Trust. Figure 9.1 (see over) provides details in terms of the following:

- The roles and grades of the corporate entrepreneurs.
- Where they are based [the code that I have used here is MAIN ACUTE= main acute site, HOSP = hospital not on the main acute site (estimated driving distance away) in brackets].
- A description of the entrepreneurial activity (descriptions are deliberately non-specific to preserve participant anonymity).
- Details of ‘enforced’ or ‘empowered’ entrepreneurial activities drawing from Davidson and Martinsons (2002).
- The driving force or factor behind the entrepreneurial activity as indicated by the respondents in their interviews.
- The benefits and outcomes of the entrepreneurial activity (positive or negative) as highlighted by the respondents.

Figures 8.3 (Chapter 8) and 9.1 illustrate that I was directed to a cluster of corporate entrepreneurs within the Main Acute, and a few from external hospitals and clinics. The purpose of my research was not to identify and quantify the number of corporate entrepreneurs and their location, however, insight into where those identified are based could have implications in terms of their formal and informal power, autonomy to be entrepreneurial, or the empowered/ enforced nature of the entrepreneurial activity.
There were varied mixes of corporate entrepreneurs, but predominantly nurses in both Trusts. The senior participants in Aberash Trust directed me to corporate entrepreneurs that were mostly nurses, and one administrative entrepreneur. These nurses ranged from an E grade, 5 F grades, 6 G grades and 2 H grades. In Brynbeth eleven of the corporate entrepreneurs were nurses, ranging from 1 F grade, 6 G grades, 3 H grades and 1 'unknown'. Other participants included a Medical Consultant, and two Allied Health Professionals.

As a brief summary: of the 29, 7 entrepreneurs were located 'off-site' of which 5 were 'empowered/ bottom-up' and 2 'enforced/ top-down' which I will explain below. Of the 18 who were 'empowered/ bottom-up,' 8 were from Aberash and 10 from Brynbeth. All 6 'enforced, top-down' were from Aberash. Of the 5 who experienced both, four were from Brynbeth. In addition, the drivers can be categorised as at individual/group/ organisational level (internal) or external (eg WAG).
Figure 9.1 Chart of Entrepreneurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF CE</th>
<th>ENFORCED/EMPLOYED</th>
<th>DRIVER</th>
<th>BENEFITS/OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1-1</td>
<td>F HOSP 2DIMINS</td>
<td>Development of a new post Specialist Nurse Practitioner</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Identified from national research</td>
<td>Provides patients greater access to the care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2-2</td>
<td>F MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Reduction of patients waiting time for treatment for 4 hours</td>
<td>Enforced, top-down</td>
<td>WAG Four Hour Wait target</td>
<td>Patients get faster access, increased employee stress and sickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-3</td>
<td>T MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Change in who administers care (nurse vs SHO)</td>
<td>Enforced, top-down</td>
<td>WAG Four Hour Wait target &amp; GP out-of-hours</td>
<td>Patients get faster access, new role not fitting neatly into nursing or SHO roles, so nurse feeling stretched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4-4</td>
<td>G MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Change in nursing practice soft pain management</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Identified from internal research</td>
<td>Patient’s pain gets managed more rigorously and effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5-5</td>
<td>K MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Change in who administers care (Nurse vs Junior Doctor)</td>
<td>Enforced, top-down</td>
<td>WAG would penalise Trust if this post not developed</td>
<td>24 hours worked by Junior Doctors, patients getting more ‘specialist’ care, Junior doctor’s missing out on learning on the job opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6-6</td>
<td>G MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Change in who administers care (Patient self administers and Nurse)</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Patient: Purchased equipment that spurred on the development of this idea</td>
<td>Patients active participants of care: independent, fewer hospital visits, reduction in waiting list times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7-7</td>
<td>H MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Change in who administers care (Nurse vs Doctor)</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
<td>Identified from national research</td>
<td>Patients get faster access to certain drug. Helps to achieve government target. Relieves doctor of specific task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8-8</td>
<td>G MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Change in who administers care (Nurse vs Junior Doctor)</td>
<td>Enforced, top-down</td>
<td>WAG would penalise Trust if this post not developed</td>
<td>24 hours worked by Junior Doctors, patients getting more ‘specialist’ care, Junior doctor’s missing out on learning on the job opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9-9</td>
<td>H MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Development of a new post Specialist Nurse Practitioner</td>
<td>Enforced, top-down</td>
<td>Benchmarking from National Pilot</td>
<td>24 hours worked by Junior Doctors, better communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10-10</td>
<td>0 HOSP 2DIMINS</td>
<td>Change in who administers care (Nurse vs Doctor)</td>
<td>Enforced, top-down</td>
<td>National Service Framework</td>
<td>Patients get faster access to certain drug. Helps to achieve government target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMG</td>
<td>F MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Improvement in culture towards employee sickness and attendance</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Trust Board: High sickness rates</td>
<td>Sickness rates reduced, attitudes towards sickness changes and form working and sickness provision improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMC</td>
<td>F MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Change in working structure and culture of theatres</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Identified from benchmarking</td>
<td>Patients get faster access, waiting lists &amp; times reduce, more opportunity for staff to utilise their specialist skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>A1-1</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Improvement of library systems are processed</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Identified from internal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1-1</td>
<td>G MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Change in who administers care (Nurse vs Doctor)</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by senior nurses evolved</td>
<td>Patients get quicker access to procedure. Share of procedure between doctor and senior nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2-2</td>
<td>E MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Improvement of clinical practice</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by this E grade nurse from internal observations</td>
<td>Patients get a higher level of expertise during recovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 9.1 Chart of Entrepreneurs, continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakout Team/Ch</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF IT</th>
<th>ENFORCED/EMPOWERED</th>
<th>DRIVER</th>
<th>BENEFITS/OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Nurse</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CLINIC (6MINS)</td>
<td>Change in staff working structure</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by G this grade nurse, observations due to lack of resources</td>
<td>Patients get care from MH specialists who are more available, with fewer waits, reduced waiting list and times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBD Day Surgery</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Development of a new unit</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
<td>Driven by multi-disciplinary team (Directorate Level)</td>
<td>Better utilization of beds, reduced wait times and efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW/C Grade Nurse Practitioner</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OFFICE (5Min)</td>
<td>Development of a new role, Specialist Nurse Practitioner</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
<td>Driven by sponsoring consultant, long queues</td>
<td>Reduce waiting list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMF Intensive Care</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Development of a new procedure</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by this G grade nurse following a conference</td>
<td>Improve patient outcomes, length of stay of patient reduced, charge bill is reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW/C Grade Nurse Practitioner on Secondment</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>This is a starting point for a new role</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by this H grade nurse following a conference</td>
<td>Improve nursing practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW/C Grade Nurse Practitioner</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Change in who administers care</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by this G grade nurse benchmarked from England</td>
<td>Reduce waiting list &amp; waiting time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Manager</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Development of a new unit</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
<td>Driven by Trust and this H grade nurse, Capital project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW/2 Trauma &amp; Orthopaedics</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Development of a new staff working structure</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by this G grade nurse, Observations whilst working</td>
<td>Improve nursing practice, reduces handover time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW/C care of Elderly</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Improvement of administration processes within patient care</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by this G grade nurse, Observations whilst working</td>
<td>Improve nursing practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW/C care of Elderly &amp; Neonatal</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Improvement administrative processes within patient care</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by this G grade nurse, Benchmarking other internal wards</td>
<td>Improve nursing practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP1-Hospital</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HOSP (4MINS)</td>
<td>Change in service administration, eligibility</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by the Allied Health Professional following patient complaint</td>
<td>Provides patients with more access to the service, reduced waiting lists, and complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP2 Physiotherapy</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>HOSP (4MINS)</td>
<td>Improvement in physiotherapy technique &amp; practice</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by the physiotherapist as a response to long waiting times</td>
<td>Make more efficient use of time, reduces waiting lists, provides more effective patient care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Consultant</td>
<td>H/C</td>
<td>MAIN ACUTE</td>
<td>Development of newways of working (work in progress)</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
<td>Driven by European Legislation, interpreted by this consultant</td>
<td>Not completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated by Consultant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated by Consultant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CLINIC (6MINS)</td>
<td>Development of new staff working structure</td>
<td>Empowered, bottom-up</td>
<td>Driven by this Mental Health nurse and her champion due to minimal resources</td>
<td>Improve teamwork and team effectiveness, thus improving waiting lists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9.3 Types of corporate entrepreneurship

My research has identified some preliminary themes in terms of the types of corporate entrepreneurship generated within NHS Trusts. In the case of Aberash these could be categorised as:

1. Change in who performs a clinical task:
   “So far I am an emergency nurse practitioner. An emergency nurse practitioner intends to do the job that the SHO is doing. We see to minor injuries, minor ailments and we will be able to see them and give them the treatment.” Nurse Specialist from Aberash

2. Change in (an aspect of) the culture:
   “When I first came here I had to tackle the high sickness absences that were running in the unit. This was one of the most difficult things I had to do when I first came here was dealing with members of staff who were on long term sick leave” Ward Manager from Aberash

3. Change in staff working structure:
   “So we decided then to look at...because the culture had been so stagnant, I suppose for such a long, long time, we looked at different ways of working and the DGM at the time had thoughts about introducing a team culture into the wards...” Ward Manager from Aberash

4. Improvement of administrative processes:
   “So we made this registration database, and we changed the form because all we were keeping before was like the doctor’s [names], these were like systems that had been in place for years and years and years, you know before...so we made a new form and this became the basis of the database...” Librarian from Aberash

5. Development of a new post:
   “So from the result of that course we realised that nurses could be, you know if a nurse was specialist trained then that was it really...” Nurse Specialist in Aberash
In terms of Brynbeth Trust the types of corporate entrepreneurship could be categorised as:

1. Change in who performs a clinical task:
   “My role here is a new role really to the Trust so I have very much built it up to my own specification really which is quite nice” (Nurse Practitioner from Brynbeth)

2. Change in (an aspect of) the culture:
   “Patients hate change and that’s a hard balance and it is something that you learn is that changes that you make you have got to apply those delicately to patients...” Podiatrist in Brynbeth

3. Change in staff working structure:
   “No, what happened is it is the reconfiguration of a service, it is developing out of an existing intensive support service” Mental Health Nurse from Brynbeth

4. Improvement of administrative process:
   “Then we actually changed the handover, the handover was taking an hour and a half in the afternoon which was a waste of nurses time really...” Ward Manager from Brynbeth

5. Development of a new post:
   ‘It is a new role within this area...it is just the beginnings really of the role, now we are pushing to extend the role..' Nurse Practitioner from Brynbeth

6. Development of a new unit:
   “I started this post in January of this year and the job was to help to plan and recruit and manage that for this unit which was due to open in November...” Ward Manager from Aberash

7. Development of a new procedure:
   “Now I am changing practice, I am actively seeking to improve patient care, the first thing that I started off with was called [names technique] which is evidence based practice...I went about it by not implementing it until I had educated every single
Brynbeth only differs from Aberash on points 6. and 7. These ‘types’ are an interesting emerging outcome and further empirical research could provide academics and practitioners within the field with an understanding of the nature of corporate entrepreneurship within NHS Trusts or even within the service/ healthcare industries in general. I have not compared the Trusts in terms of the actual examples of entrepreneurship, as this was not an objective of the study. For a more detailed analysis of examples of entrepreneurship within Healthcare refer to Casebeer, Harrison and Mark (2006).

9.4 Enforced versus Empowered Entrepreneurship

Another emerging theme which overlaps nicely with a possible future research agenda highlighted above is that of whether corporate entrepreneurship activities are empowered or enforced. These two concepts are introduced by Davidson and Martinsons (2002) although they use the terms empowerment and enslavement. Reflecting back to Chapter 2 on corporate entrepreneurship, these two terms are not too dissimilar from Burgleman's (1983) induced strategic behaviour and autonomous strategic behaviour, respectively. Burgleman's work sits more comfortably within a positivist epistemology, however, whilst Davidson and Martinsons constructs are from developed from social constructionist theorising. Essentially, empowerment and enslavement entrepreneurship is brought about by organisational change or organisational development. The authors argue that prescriptive change or development can often result in employees’ physiological enslavement, thus something which was intended to empower has a negative ‘enslavement’ outcome.

For the purposes of this research project, I have changed the emphasis on these two concepts slightly. Here, empowerment means corporate entrepreneurship that has emerged and been driven horizontally or upwards from the corporate entrepreneur or his/ her team.
"I guided the meetings to suggest that our main goal for the next year to 18 months was to dramatically reduce the waiting lists... we discussed how we were going to do this...the first thing we had to do was get everybody on board, all staff including receptionists and the helpers at our main desk..." Physiotherapist (AHP2), Brynbeth

Conversely, enslavement (or enforcement as I prefer to label it) describes corporate entrepreneurship activities that have been prescribed by a powerful other (this could be the Trust Board, Welsh Assembly Government, EU or even the Media). In such a case the Trust may be told to implement an entrepreneurial activity or develop an entrepreneurial role:

"Well the role is called Specialist Nurse and it was brought in because of to try and cut Junior Doctor's hours so that they weren't working as many hours in a week, so that's why this role and as I understand that they are being paid by the Welsh Office and It is, if the Trust didn't put these places in post that they would be penalised in some way or other so that's how the posts came into being..

Specialist Nurse Aberash

There may be scope within enforcement for empowerment, as my results have shown, for example a Specialist Nurse Practitioner (enforced entrepreneurial activity) could be entrepreneurial within his/her role having seen a gap in service provision (empowered entrepreneurial activity).

Interestingly enough, 6 of Aberash's entrepreneurial activities exhibited stronger signs of being enforced, 8 showed stronger signs of being empowered and 1 exhibited both. However, all of Brynbeth's entrepreneurial activities were more empowerment oriented (although four of these had emerged from enforced activities). Given that my preliminary findings suggest that Aberash's culture is more power-oriented and that Brynbeth's culture is more people-oriented, it would be interesting to build on this, perhaps through some quantitative research to determine if there is a casual relationship between the Trust culture
and the nature of corporate entrepreneurship that is being produced. Does a power-oriented culture drive enforced corporate entrepreneurship, does a people-oriented culture 'drive' empowered corporate entrepreneurship? As social constructs 'enforced' and 'empowered' sound rather repressive and less effective – but is this the case in reality, can/ does enforced entrepreneurship produce the same benefits to a Trust. How do they differ?

9.5 Corporate entrepreneurship lenses of Corporate Entrepreneurship

Based on these initial findings it was not very surprising to find a range of different descriptions of corporate entrepreneurship within my interview data. Figures 9.2 and 9.3 provides descriptions of the activities that the 'corporate entrepreneurs' have been involved with, have driven or have been directed to work with. These descriptions provide me with an understanding of how the corporate entrepreneurs themselves define corporate entrepreneurship. I have themed quotes based upon the essence of why the interviewee thinks s/he is a corporate entrepreneur (or not). The themes are as follows:

** Corporate Entrepreneurship is something that is the first of its kind (in this location).

3 entrepreneurs from Aberash and 2 from Brynbeth

 Corporate Entrepreneurship is about practice development.

4 entrepreneurs from Aberash and 2 from Brynbeth

 Corporate Entrepreneurship is putting theory into practice.

2 entrepreneurs from Brynbeth

 Corporate Entrepreneurship is improving patient care/outcomes.

3 entrepreneurs from Aberash and 5 from Brynbeth

** Corporate Entrepreneurship is not doing the same thing in a different place.

1 entrepreneur from Brynbeth

Figure 9.2 Aberash Corporate Entrepreneurship: Different meanings and social constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code/Trust</th>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>** Interpretation of Corporate Entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1/ Aberash</td>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>[Why do you say that?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowered</td>
<td>I don’t know, perhaps people stay longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[What people?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think staff stay longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[and how do you think that helps innovation?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because I think patients are not just patients with a label of appendicitis or something, these people are here for life, we are with them all of the time...people I don’t know they care more, in that way, they become more involved and I think that you are genuinely looking for better...its the drive, its not just going to work and doing your job, you come because you want to...you enjoy being trained to do more for them, and you know that they are not going to go home and get better it becomes more personal...

| SN2/ Aberash | A&E | Enforced | --No example found—Improve patient care |
| SN3/ Aberash | A&E | Enforced | So we are trying to work, so we are not going over the boundaries but trying to strive forwards as well and making our mark as well... |
| SN4/ Aberash | Acute Pain | Empowered | The job entails the freedom to practice, the fact that it was a completely new role nobody had been there before, so it was your role to develop in a way that best suited patients, so you could really get in there and look at where we are at now, what needs to be done and how we are going to achieve it, and actually design things to suit the clinical needs. |
| SN5/ Aberash | Midwife | Enforced | I think that this role is not innovative, but I think that patient care is maybe enhanced by our role... |
| SN6/ Bryn Beth | Thrombolysis | Empowered | We took it over from the medics and took it forward to be nurse led...now it’s a nurse thing! I feel that the innovation is part of my of my practice assessment and it’s the development of a patient self-testing programme. I developed this to give patients the choice and control... |
| SN7/ Aberash | Cardiology | Enforced & Empowered | --No example found—Improve patient care |
| SN8/ Aberash | Midwife | Enforced | --No example found—Improve patient care |
| SN9/ Aberash | Night Nurse | Enforced | Mandy has got loads of ideas about different things and she is quite forward thinking...I think nurses, the role for nursing will progress because of Mandy... |
| SN10/ Aberash | Coronary Care | Enforced | We have what is called National Service Framework, which is stipulated the areas that need improvement so people get best care...so I generally in order to change practice within the area is to look at what the delays in the service are, how that can be overcome and to develop a new way of working so that the delays have been overcome where we have identified really... |
| WM1/ Aberash | Day Surgery | Empowered | We need to look at new ways of working and how we can make the team work better... |
| WM2/ Aberash | Theatre | Empowered | We really looked at how we would modernise the way theatres are. I was helped along obviously because of the modernisation agency launched all of these innovative ideas and new ways of working and things like that, and there was a theatre modernisation project that was part of the innovations in care team, so I went to meetings and bought back ideas...so we are looking at new ways of working... |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code/Trust</th>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>** Interpretation of Corporate Entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sp4/ Brynheth</td>
<td>Senior Participant</td>
<td>Ours is a new model cause no other service in Wales does this you see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn1/ Brynheth</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>What I was trying to do was develop a plan of care service and as I was not given any extra funds to do that I had to sculpture is out of existing resources so existing staff, existing buildings you know, there was nothing new, so it was developing something out of something old, developing a brand new service..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn2/ Brynheth</td>
<td>Day Surgery</td>
<td>So it's really about understanding a document and taking out the necessary bits and applying them into practice..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn3/ Brynheth</td>
<td>Nurse Practitioner</td>
<td>It's a new role within this area, but there are nurses in England as they are always ahead of us – there's lots of nurses in England and in Scotland who are doing the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn4/ Brynheth</td>
<td>Intensive Care</td>
<td>It started off just teaching and improving the knowledge of more junior staff, but it developed into practice development and now I am actively seeking to improve patient care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn5/ Brynheth</td>
<td>Nurse practitioner on secondment</td>
<td>It's to do with anything that covers improvements to patient care, including leadership, communication, team-working in clinical areas and getting evidence into practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sn6/ Brynheth</td>
<td>Nurse practitioner</td>
<td>He was quite innovative and wanted to move things forwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm1</td>
<td>Day Surgery</td>
<td>I can see why people would think that I am innovative but</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.3 Brynheth Corporate Entrepreneurship: Different meanings and social constructions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WM2</td>
<td>Trauma &amp; Orthopedic</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM3</td>
<td>Care of Elderly</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM4</td>
<td>Care of Elderly</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP1</td>
<td>Podiatry</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP2</td>
<td>Physio</td>
<td>Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC1</td>
<td>Medical Lead</td>
<td>Enforced &amp; Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Community Psychiatry Nurse</td>
<td>Empowered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I don’t think it’s innovative at all. I started this post in January of this year and the job was to help to plan and recruit and manage that for this unit. My experience prior had been predominantly A&E experience and in the last 3 or 4 years in a hospital where I was developed towards leaderships which is a national initiative really in England so coming here to help to set up an assessment unit like this I felt work had all been done in England and there was chapter and verse documented on how to achieve that, and I can see that because I have got clarity on that in my own mind and experience of it that coming here I would have seemed quite innovative. The difference is that Wales is not governed by England so they are actually a few years behind. Now that’s not innovative...

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WM2</td>
<td>Trauma &amp; Orthopedic</td>
<td>--No example found—Reduce handover time = practice development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM3</td>
<td>Care of Elderly</td>
<td>--No example found--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM4</td>
<td>Care of Elderly</td>
<td>--No example found--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP1</td>
<td>Podiatry</td>
<td>When I came here I found it very old-fashioned, very out-dated practice, no evidence based practice at all, very task oriented, no patient-focused care...I started changing things...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP2</td>
<td>Physio</td>
<td>I have implemented changes into specific roles, and each one has been from my own ideas, because of my own experience through the years...therefore I changed the way those certain aspects work or some aspects of how they work as based on my own experience and try to improve the service...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC1</td>
<td>Medical Lead</td>
<td>What I have been doing since November is familiarising myself with the concept and taking what was really quite a dry concept and starting to bring it to life...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Community Psychiatry Nurse</td>
<td>--No example found—Improve patient care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having looked at the forms of entrepreneurship that I was led to in each Trust, I now turn to looking at the entrepreneurs themselves, and I hope to build on the basic information that I have already tabulated (roles, grades and location of the entrepreneurs). As an outcome of my interviews some strong themes have emerged in terms of the characteristics that the corporate entrepreneurs feel that they have.
9.6 Looking at CE characteristics through the lenses of corporate entrepreneurs

Figure 9.4 summaries the corporate entrepreneurial characteristics that have emerged from this research project in terms of strong themes (at least five - this figure emerged as characteristics were either: only mentioned once, twice, five times or more) corporate entrepreneurs have highlighted this characteristic as being a personal attribute) and weak themes (less than five, in many cases just one person has cited the personal attribute). Figure 9.4 does not differentiate whether a certain attribute is negative or positive. Such detail is contextual, and thus subjective, and I have neither the space nor the time to explore these in-depth in this research project. However, further exploration and detailed comparisons, such as comparing those characteristics intra-Trust, i.e. community versus main acute would be a useful contribution towards understanding those attributes particular (or not as the case may be) to corporate entrepreneurs. There are 9 strong themes that are found in corporate entrepreneurs from both Trusts, and 8 weak ones. All of the other themes, identified in either Aberash or Brynbeth, are fairly weak in that only one or two corporate entrepreneurs described themselves as having this attribute.

Figure 9.4 Strong and Weak Emerging themes of Personal Characteristics common/exclusive in the Corporate Entrepreneurs of Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts
Figure 9.4 starts to provide us with interesting detail about the personalities of the corporate entrepreneurs that have been identified in the NHS Trusts. It does this on two levels, firstly through the strong and weak common characteristics listed it starts to build up a typology towards an NHS entrepreneur. Through the strong characteristics listed it also reveals subtle indicators of what the senior corporate entrepreneurs (who after all recommended these corporate entrepreneurs) denote to be a sign of a 'corporate entrepreneur'. If the differences between the Trusts had been stronger themes, it could have told us something subtle about the culture pertinent to that particular Trust, and what it is to be entrepreneurial in that particular culture, but given that the differences are weak, I do not think that this assumption can be made, without further empirical exploration. Selected examples of the strong themes are:

Determination:

"It would be very easy to just be knocked back and think 'we'll I'm never going to be able to work this way, so you have to really keep battling on, battling on..'" Senior Nurse (SNS), Brynbeth

Likes/loves change:

"And I think that I am a very adaptable person and I like new ideas, I love change, I love the newness of things" Community Mental Health Nurse (SN1), Brynbeth

Active learner/Likes learning:

"I think, I can go back to when I converted, when I did this conversion course.. I feel that the conversion course opened up a whole new way of learning for me, because it introduced me to research, it introduced me to the library, to other peoples articles and there so much more out there, whereas I think before I was just generally learning within my environment it opened up the world to me really. And research has been a huge influence I think in the way I work. I mean I have just been doing it before you came actually, I have been on the internet and I am looking up a particular subject
that I have got to write on a patient. I have been asked to write an
information leaflet up on this subject...I need to learn more about it.
I am now going to research articles ...do with this particular subject,
any patient information leaflets and stuff like that”  Senior Nurse
(SN3), Brynbeth

The ability to communicate at all levels:

“I am very observant and I am able to think quite quickly on my feel
really, and I know I can be quite articulate. I am not an articulate
person, but I can articulate the need, the extent that somebody who
is not clinical [would understand]”  Ward Manager (WM2),
Brynbeth

Low or increasing level of confidence:

“My weakness is that I am not very confident, I suppose. I think that
comes from the fact that I started off as an enrolled nurse and it takes
you a long time to get over that, but there again it ink it gives you
some skills. I think that if you have been in this position you have has
to work twice as hard to get to be in a different position, so you never
take things for granted, you will always take the opportunity to
learn..”  Senior Nurse (SN10), Aberash

Actively reflects:

“If I had my time again, I would definitely do it differently, no doubt
about that, I would still look at the same problem about assessing the
patients....”  Nurse (N3) Aberash

Enthusiastic:

“I am enthusiastic, but I am otherwise I wouldn’t do it..but that
enthusiasm is probably driven by... I just want to change things ok!”
Podiatrist (AHP1), Brynbeth

Actively Promotes (entrepreneurship not self):

“I think that you have to keep plugging away don’t you? Even if it is
a bit at a time, find some people who are sympathetic to you, get
other people on board and things will move forward..” Senior Nurse (SN1), Aberash

Intuitive:

“..but I'm not scared of taking..y'know? it might sound like a daft idea but you have a gut feeling that it will work..” Ward Manager (WM3), Aberash

These characteristics are very different to those from the strategic lens, and it would be insightful to explore why this is so, although my research has not been able to examine this. However, the characteristics do not seem surprising to me in that they make sense given the highly bureaucratic and complex nature of large, public sector organisations, such as Aberash and Brynbeth. What I was not expecting was the prevalence of low self-confidence with the Trust entrepreneurs.

“I think one thing that I think is quite important to describe to you, I don’t know whether other people feel this, other people see me but I don’t see myself as they see me. Now I don’t know if you have heard that before, people see me as very confident, very driven which I am very driven and I could not tell you why, but they see me as very confident and very driven, very clued up and what have you, but I am a very harsh critical of myself, I don’t see myself as other people see me... I do often stop and think, you know should I, my inner voice is very cautious and should I do or shouldn't I. There's an opportunity to develop another service on top of what we are doing now, and could I do it or couldn't I do, and think go for it what have you got to lose and then the next thing should I put myself through all this stress...” Community Psychiatric Nurse (NI), Brynbeth

There are other issues that have emerged associated with self-confidence and I will return to this issue several times during this chapter.
Another finding from Figure 9.4 that was surprising to me was that risk-taking and creativity were weaker themes. This said, intuition (which arguably is a form of risk-taking) is a strong theme. Revisiting a previously quoted text:

"...but I'm not scared of taking... y'know? it might sound like a daft idea but you have a gut feeling that it will work." Ward Manager (WM3), Aberash

It is interesting how the Ward Manager starts to say something ‘taking..’ taking what? In my opinion I think she is going to say taking risks here, but then stops herself. So why does she stop herself? Is she not comfortable using this construct? Would this be perceived by others as being dangerous as it could it suggest that her patient may be at risk? Having found this example, it is useful to revisit some other examples in my data.

"I think the role that we do is...there is nobody else in the hospital that does anything like we do, it is something that the doctor's do, it does carry substantial risks, but it is recognised around the country that it is a role that is recognised." Nurse Practitioner (SN3), Brynbeth

Again, the Nurse Practitioner here seems a little uncomfortable talking about taking risks and appears to 'defend' her risk taking by highlighting it is done by doctors (so that is okay? Doctors can take risks?) Furthermore, that this risk-taking is allowed because it is a recognised role. Although not all nurses are reluctant to use such discourse:

"When these posts were first advertised, people that could have gone for them didn't go for them because they didn't know what it was going to involve, but sometimes you have to take a risk and take a chance ...." Midwife (SN5), Aberash

The next quote is taken by a male consultant that I interviewed during the course of my study (the only consultant entrepreneur that I interviewed). The difference in perspective and confidence is dramatic:

"I would say as a doctor... we take risks all the time, if we don't take risks, if we don't believe were taking the risks we simply don't understand it. We are risk managers and there are some doctors
that may not understand that's what they actually do but for example if you come to me and you have got a cold and I prescribe you antibiotics or not a cold if you have what I suggest is a bacterial infection, I give you an antibiotic I don't know whether that is going to be the appropriate antibiotic, I can guess that is going to be the appropriate antibiotic but I don't know and I hope that the risk of you taking that antibiotic is worth - the benefits are worth it. So you come to me you have got a bit of a cold you are asthmatic I give you the antibiotics you feel better, fabulous, I hope that happens 99 times out of 100. One time out of 100 you may not respond you may have to come for another antibiotic, one time out of 1000 you may end up with anaphylactic reaction an allergic reaction and then end up in casualty, so we are risk managers.

[So has that helped you within this role?]

I would not say it has helped me, I think my understanding of it, you see I don't think many doctors understand I don't know about many doctors but certain junior doctors don't understand that they are risk managers or an element of their work is risk management. I think it's just an understanding when you start off, any learning curve you're told stuff that you are meant to know you're not necessarily told the reasons for knowing, and even if you are you may not believe it, I mean how many times have you attended a course or even your degree, and its only later with hindsight that you recognise the value of what you have learnt, and yes my medical background gives me massive leverage in communicating and understanding the systems but I don't know whether my understanding of what I know has been helpful. I suspect it has because I do tend to abstract a great deal and play with the size of
the pictures, simply because like I say it gives me more information about a system.” Medical Lead (MC1), Brynbeth

The difference between the nurse’s and the consultant’s confidence in talking about risk is quite clear. This should not be surprising given the deeply rooted military traditions which the medicine and nursing professions have grown out of and, according to some participants are finding difficulties in coming out from. Within this traditional culture the nurse is often seen as a ‘subordinate’ hand-maiden to the consultant.

The Senior Nurse (SN2) shares her views of this traditional perspective of nursing:

“A lot of it’s historical you know, I mean I have got some nurses who want to remain in that role, they quite enjoy being the hand maiden, but I would say seventy per cent of them don’t, they want to do more. Because what is happening in other professions and I have always said this, other professions are moving on and taking on more, and if nurses don’t get moving we will be guardians of the orifices and this is where it will end..’ Senior Nurse (SN2), Aberash

A Senior Nurse (SN6) from Brynbeth talks about some difficulties she has practicing her new role and reveals an implicit hierarchy concerning access to resources, in her case, rooms.

“I mean the department here has four rooms and a treatment room and very often in a clinic there will be four Doctors taking up those rooms, so I am sort of hopping between rooms and the treatment room because I am the last priority really..I mean I am writing out my notes now in the treatment room anywhere I can find, but I have not got an actual base..” Senior Nurse Practitioner (SN6), Brynbeth

This next quote is interesting as the senior nurse identifies the role of the doctors as being male dominated, and they are more confident and more comfortable at taking-risks. She
sees nursing as a female majority profession, and associates the female gender with being under confident and almost risk-averse.

"And the differences as well you know in males and females how they learn as well, men are very confident that they can do, whereas nurses mainly female oriented they are a little bit hung back until you know properly that you can do...but yes males are in the higher jobs and it is not because they are better it is because they are more confident and that is something you find... Men take more risks, they are like more 'I can do', and a lot of females you find you know that they will make sure that they can do first, before they put themselves forwards, instead of I think I can do bit whereas men are, and that's what you find, and I think that's something that holds me back. You know in most cases I will be able to do it, but until I know I can possibly do it I won't... it has to be 99 per cent to 100 per cent before I can put myself forward for that job..." A&E (SN3), Aberash

Again, these observations that I am making are emerging and preliminary and this area provides fertile ground for further empirical research.

Figure 9.5 Empirical falsification of Pinchot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURS AS PER PINCHOT (1985)</th>
<th>CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURS BASED ON THIS EMPIRICAL STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude to organisation</td>
<td>Dislikes the organisational system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial satisfaction</td>
<td>Pleases self, customers and sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Motives</td>
<td>Wants freedom and access to corporate resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with others</td>
<td>Transactions within organisational hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td>More patient and willing to compromise than entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of action</td>
<td>Gets hands dirty – can do work but knows how to delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management attention</td>
<td>Both inside-management-and outside of firm- focus on customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td>Does own market research and intuitive market evaluation like the entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving style</td>
<td>Works out problems within the system, or bypasses it without leaving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Skills
Very like the entrepreneur, but situation demands greater ability to prosper within organisation
Often clinical-based, lacking in business-oriented skills. Lots of learning on the job in relation to entrepreneurship. Good people managers and politically aware.

Personal Attributes
Self confident; courageous-cynical about system but optimistic about ability to outwit it
Low levels of confidence, but this is developed through champions and experience. Determined, good communicators, and advocates of their projects. Fear stagnation enjoys challenge of providing better care to patients

Education
Often highly educated, especially in technical fields
Often educated to degree level (usually in clinical discipline), active learners, actively reflect, learn-on-the-job

Failure and Mistakes
Attempts to hide risky projects from view so can learn from mistakes without public failure
Champions take onus of failure and mistakes away from the corporate entrepreneur

Family history
Entrepreneurial small business, professional or farm background
Not explored in this study

Risk
Likes moderate risk – unafraid of dismissal so little personal risk
Takes guarded risks, often with support of champions. Take risks, but not comfortable with the social construct due to its potential impact upon patient safety.

Status
Dismisses traditional status symbols of freedom
I am not sure what the meaning of status in this context means, so am unable to complete

In terms of the anecdotal model (Chapter 2) of managers, entrepreneurs and corporate entrepreneurs first introduced by Pinchot (1985) and later adapted by Jones-Evans (2000) I have some empirical findings that ‘falsify’ some of the assumptions made concerning corporate entrepreneurs. Figure 9.5 compares a summary of my findings based upon the findings that have been introduced so far in this chapter with those proposed by Pinchot. I have used those findings that have emerged as strong themes from both Trusts.

In my opinion there are two significant differences between what Pinchot hypothesises and what my data suggests; that is

- High (Pinchot) versus low levels (my findings) of confidence in Corporate Entrepreneurs
- The role of champions as a ‘protector’ from the adverse consequences of failure, making mistakes and taking risks

Both of these findings are significant and will be discussed in detail later on in this chapter under ‘Champions’.
9.7 Barriers and facilitators to corporate entrepreneurship

Another key set of findings from this research are the possible facilitators of and barriers to corporate entrepreneurship within Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. Figure 9.6 uses the Lewin framework of change (introduced in Chapter 4) to illustrate the facilitators of and barriers to corporate entrepreneurship found. I have not illustrated the Trusts separately in this instance, as I have been guided by emerging themes which in many instances have been similar for both Trusts (but not in all cases). Figure 9.6 shows eight organisational facilitators and barriers to realising corporate entrepreneurship in the two NHS Trusts. As you will notice, most of these themes are present as both facilitators of and barriers to corporate entrepreneurship (except for champions and sickness). Where a theme is relevant to one Trust only, I have indicated which Trust using A (Aberash) and B (Brynbeth). The size of the arrows indicate the strength of the force, therefore the larger arrow, the more powerful a barrier or a facilitator it is.

Figure 9.6 A Force Field Analysis of the facilitators and barriers to realising Corporate Entrepreneurship within NHS Trusts
9.7.1 Champions, senior staff and subordinates

The role of staff in the Trust: as champions, as supporters or as blockers to corporate entrepreneurship were the most significant enhancer/inhibitors found from within my data. Many of the different stories of entrepreneurship that I have listened to, recorded and analysed reveal the role of the champion (in many cases) as being critical to the progression of the entrepreneurial activity and the success of the entrepreneur.

The Champion is usually a consultant, or sometimes a very senior non-clinical colleague (such as a Director, Head of):

"About 18 months ago we approached the Cardiology Consultant and asked if he would be happy for myself and my colleague who is the sister in Coronary Care to undertake this procedure and have it nurse led, he was very supportive, this passed it through the management here and there was no opposition at all with this" Senior nurse (SN7), Aberash

"Well in Aberash Trust the Head of Nursing was very very very supportive but she said to me ‘I don’t care what you do if you can support the nurses, if you can help them to identify their practice and improve it, I’m happy.. and to a certain degree in this role my current boss in Brynbeth is the same” Practitioner on Secondment (SNS), Brynbeth

I was not expecting the dynamic of ‘other’ supporters and resistors/blockers to be as I found them to be. ‘Other’ supporters tended to be either one or two senior colleagues (sometimes consultants, often other sisters/specialist nurses) with strong individual power bases, or a group of lower graded nurses (such as D and E grades) who had a strong power-base when grouped.
"I went to speak to the sister within casualty, she was very very supportive that there was a need to be a change."

Senior Nurse (SN10), Aberash

Similarly resistors were either one or two senior colleagues or a group of subordinate colleagues:

"Another major constraint that we had was related to nursing staff more than medical staff...nurses were very keen to either hold onto patients, they didn’t want to send them home, through lack of education and lack of knowledge they felt — the nursing staff— that they wanted to have some form of ownership over the patients and so would keep them in and look after them...and they also utilised patients as bed blockers."

Senior Nurse (SN2), Brynbeth

"I remember going on a huge study thing, and he was the sort of guru if you like, he is an American Doloriert Macedo... that was his name, he is a therapist and has written all the books you know he is the first one, and identified this years ago...and at this study day, it was a huge conference with hundreds of people there and he said are you all therapists and most of them must have been nodding and he said are there any nurses here, and I think two of us put our arms up and he said well, there is only two at this conference but I would be careful all of you therapists or they are going to end up stealing your jobs...

Learning Disabilities Senior Nurse (SN1), Aberash

In this research, the ‘blockers’ identified were always one senior colleague, and in both the Aberash and Brynbeth cases the blockers had been working in the NHS for a long period of time, often nearing their retirement.

"The Service Manager in Llandon was against it really, which has really slowed it down, although I have been making progress and it
is getting there now but I definitely think that the Service Manager wasn’t on board..

[how did you overcome this barrier?]
Well luckily he has retired within the last couple of months, but if he hadn’t done, things were moving, just very slowly and the top Manager above these two would have to lean on this service manager slightly..” Mental Health (SN1), Brynbeth

The only variance from this was in one case from Aberash, it seemed a patient had acted as a form of champion and catalyst to an entrepreneurial activity

“"I developed this patient self testing programme to give people the choice more than anything..I had a young chap who had recently had a valve replacement...he had just come back from Manchester after having this new valve..and I thought he would be a prime candidate to do this self testing so I thought that I am just going to touch on it..and then he was really keen on the idea and before I had the chance to develop any paperwork, education, protocols anything he bought a machine and I was faced with the problem of having to do it, which was good for me because it pushed me on to developing..” Nurse Practitioner (SN6), Aberash

Figure 9.7 shows an adaptation of the Rogers’ model (1962) of Adoption of Innovations (which is first introduced in Chapter 2). It has been adapted to describe and present the phases of support and resistance to corporate entrepreneurship within Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts.
The following excerpt from my data guided me to revisiting Roger’s model in the context of champions, supporters and resisters. The Nurse Practitioner (SN6) from Brynbeth is talking about three consultants that she worked with:

"We have got three consultants here, we have got one older one who is very traditional and very much the consultant’s role as it has been for a very long time, we have got this innovative one that has been in the Trust for 4 years - I think.. so he is bringing new, especially with nurses fair play, he has supported the nurses an awful lot, and then we have got a middle one who has been here a few years but waits for the innovative one to do a little bit to see if it works and then joins in”

A Senior Nurse (SN2) from Brynbeth suggests that resistance from some nurses may be down to their lack of education and lack of knowledge (see previously section in his quote). From my preliminary research is seems that forms of learning, training and or education may facilitate the movement of staff from the blockers/ resisters side of Rogers’ chart to the supportive side, as highlighted by this Ward Manager from Brynbeth.
"How am I going to deal with this person, how do you think I could
because she has been here for donkey's years and this problem has
always been here and nobody has been able to win her. What we have
actually done with her is sent her on the RCN Leadership course. To
start with it had an impact but she is reverting back to her stroppy self,
right initially you try to give her a job, try to give her a leadership job
one that has worked, I have been on the internet and looked up conflict
management and used an awful lot of different strategies and I have
tried every model possible..I have got the Management Institute
involved as well, I have had them try and help, obviously going on a
HNC, what other can I do to get this lady on board type of thing..and
we have come to the conclusion that we need to wait until she leaves.."

Ward Manager (WM4), Brynbeth

It appears that learning is used to try to (re)-educate resistors and blockers in various ways,
be it through informal mentoring or learning-on-the-job, through more formal training
packages such as Leadership modules or HNC's. The next quote shows how new nurses
who are further left (supportive) along Rogers' chart may start moving towards the right
(resistive), due to institutionalisation. It also highlights that learning on-the-job can effect
entrepreneurship negatively (through learning bad practice) as well as positively (through
learning good practice).

"So your staff nurses are E grades, and your very junior staff nurses
are D grades, so your D grades have been qualified a year, two
years, E grades qualified 5 to 6 years, and so on, now I thought
implementing this day case surgery that the sisters and junior sisters
would be my allies because of their experience their knowledge that
they would work with me on this.. Boy was I wrong! It was the sisters
and the junior Fs, they were the restraining factor within all this
because they were so entrenched in their practice, whereas the D
grades which were the newly qualified staff they were the ones that
were so keen, so open, and so wanting to move it forward and we kept saying ‘that’ll be beaten out of you’ that these poor junior nursing staff will be taught not to do, not to think for themselves, and I thought that was quite sad really. I had couple of junior staff nurses who had qualified for 6 months, they were so onboard, they could see what the patients wanted, they wanted to send the patients home, they didn’t have any hang-ups about responsibility regarding patient discharge. Its all very much to do with learning and having an open mind. What I basically did was I empowered these two groups the Ds and the Es because generally you only have one Sister and one Junior F and you’ll have 5/6 Es, and 5/6 Ds so the Ds and Es are doing the majority of the work and the Fs Gs are the supervisory capacity. So I utilised the Ds and Es basically and used them to implement and empowered them. So gave them the information saying this is what you’re doing right – so we had to work from the bottom up and show these guys at the top what we’re doing is OK and you staff are doing it right. I have found the consultant surgeons supportive, the biggest problem again is that our junior staff would feel very afraid to go and approach these people because of the hierarchy system - its almost like being in the Army. These are the key people you need to speak to really. Yeah it will be ‘beaten out’ of them, so to speak, you’re not allowed to think for yourself” Senior Manager (SN2), Brynbeth

Re-education seems to be more effective with subordinates as my research shows that some senior colleagues have not always been won over. In these cases the entrepreneur waits for the senior colleague to leave or retire. These themes are still very emergent, but if further, more focussed empirical analysis could be conducted, this could have some valuable implications for the training and development of consultants, and nurses/ champions and resistors/ blockers working within the Health Service.
My data suggests that supporters and resistors are able to be supportive and resistant because they have some form of power or influence which act as leverage in entrepreneurial situations, be it that this leverage is directed towards supporting, resisting or blocking the entrepreneurship.

“People sometimes do resist... I mean in a small way that happened in Caerem actually ... there were people who held opposition to it ... I just work with the people that really, you know, that I sold it to and that bought in really and thought ‘yes this is really a good idea’ and gradually over time the others saw, and its a bit infectious as well when people are enthusiastic, I remember one girl who opposed to it she saw this other girl say right I’m going to start it next Monday and we arranged to go to a G.P. surgery and actually talk about this is what we want to do are you on board, and when she came back and she was all excited and talked about how the G.P. had been with her, this other girl was like, ‘oh alright then which surgery shall I go to?’ It was a bit like infectious.

[Were there any particular people that just ignored it?]
Yes, probably yes. The two people who you have made me think about, one was a woman... and the other was Matthew... both of them have been qualified nurses for a long long time, very enigmatic powerful, influential people and neither were terribly educated or the brightest but have a wealth of experience and respect from my colleagues and quite a heavy amount of influence, they are vocal in meetings and they are very quick in expressing their opinions and are opinionated people, I think they were challenged that I was younger, I was female.. I think a bit of that was going on, even though they say it doesn’t.

[So did you manage to get them on board?]
Yes, I think mostly it was that and at the beginning stage when I was asking them and I think that what helped as well was and I wished I was able to do this in Llyn but this Manager blocked what I was
doing. It was like a Delphi study it was just down with them and it looked for themes and it was just asking them 'What do you find difficult about your job', and I got them to explore it so I had a couple of interviews with each of them right at the beginning so they felt that they were being listened to I think, that's what won them eventually, because they felt that this person that has come along talking about change had actually listened to them first and recorded what their opinions were and actually the changes that we bought in reflected what they said with difficult or at least the themes I pulled out you know not all there. I think that was quite, I felt that was key in winning them over in the beginning" Senior Nurse, Mental Health SN1, Brynbeth

My research did not set out to explore why NHS colleagues could/ would resist the corporate entrepreneur and his or her activities. Some anecdotal evidence was suggested by the corporate entrepreneurs themselves, through their lens, but no primary evidence was collected from those actually resisting the changes and developments, for example:

"He likes it in theory but not in practice.. he cannot bring himself to make that leap, into allowing us to do it in practice even though he knows we are doing it with the other consultant and the other consultant is supporting us in that..I think it is down to insecurity, he doesn't trust – and I'm sure if it is just the nursing it may be he does not want anyone to take the full responsibility because at the end of the day he is ultimately responsible for the patient, because I come under his name ..." Nurse Practitioner (SN3), Brynbeth

The reasons underpinning resistance may vary from entrepreneurship to entrepreneurship, from the different individuals, groups and roles involved, and more focussed research exploring such dynamics would enrich our understanding of corporate entrepreneurship within Health Care.
9.7.2 Finance, HR, IT, Time and Training as facilitators and inhibitors

Reflecting back to Figure 9.6, the Force Field Analysis of facilitators and inhibitors of corporate entrepreneurship, the remaining sources are:

- Financial resources
- Human Resources & Sickness
- IT resources
- Time
- Training

These are separate, yet often inter-related.

**Financial resources**

I was expecting difficulties in accessing financial resources to be a major barrier to corporate entrepreneurship within the NHS. My preconceptions may have been shaped by a number of factors including: media/ political sensationalisation and stories and hear-say from family and friends. However, my results paint a different picture with Trust entrepreneurs from both Trusts citing that initial access to financial resources is a major facilitator to starting corporate entrepreneurial activity. However, some of these corporate entrepreneurs found accessing further funding to sustain their ventures much more problematic.

“So when the Innovations in Care money came out I had a chunk of that money to start as a Nurse Practitioner.....

[later on in the interview]

[What about the things that have hindered or hampered you?]

Funding was a bit of an issue, you know after the 12 months came to an end, I struggled a little bit because I had to prove to them really that the job was worthwhile and even though I think they understood, the numbers were there and everything, it was a case of where do we get the money from really?” Nurse Practitioner (SN6), Brynbeth Trust
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My research suggests that there is a perception that funding for initiating and sustaining projects is more difficult for those areas that do not feature heavily on Political agendas, most particularly in my research being Mental Health “It’s just not sexy and it doesn’t win votes” (SP6, Brynbeth).

**Human resources**

Staff sickness was a strong inhibitor to corporate entrepreneurship in both Trusts. The problem with sickness is that other staff have to fill the resource gap left by the absent colleague.

> “It has been a bit of hit and miss again depending on sickness and that kind of thing, but the idea is...” Ward Manager (WM1), Aberash

This can take the entrepreneur away from entrepreneurship, can make an entrepreneurial activity difficult to roll-out or can force a non-entrepreneur to lead an enforced innovation.

> “One lady arrived by default, and there has been a problem there..its been harder for her, because she’s been the second in command, and her senior sister is not here at the moment due to sickness –the senior sister had liaised with her second in command, but it was her initial prompting, so she’s well in the spirit of taking part, but I think in pure essence, the other ward sister is the one who said ‘yes!’” Practitioner on Secondment (SN5), Brynbeth

**Information Technology**

Within Brynbeth Trust IT was highlighted by a number of corporate entrepreneurs. Some highlighted it as a barrier and others as a facilitator to entrepreneurship, however, in Aberash it was an issue that was not brought up. This could be down to the geographical spread of the participants from each Trust: Aberash’s being centred within the main acute site and Brynbeth’s being more scattered throughout its Trust. My data suggests (see the quote from a Senior Nurse (SN1) from Brynbeth below) that isolation may be a facilitator to entrepreneurship (in terms of role) for Aberash Trust, and a barrier to entrepreneurship (in terms of location) for Brynbeth.
“The fact that Brynbeth is quite rural so it is like a drive you know each are all about half an hour apart at least..I think the people in those teams feel a bit isolated at times so what we are doing is having monthly meetings..and we are all e-mailing each other now..” Senior Nurse Mental Health (SN1), Brynbeth

Time
Not surprisingly lack of time was a barrier to corporate entrepreneurship within both Trusts. In terms of time as a positive, facilitator to corporate entrepreneurship, both Trusts provided some of the entrepreneurs with ‘protected’ time, for learning and other self-development activities.

“I have been doing a degree in Cardiff University, well they allow us one day per week and I travel to Cardiff, and I am getting to the end of it now, it is not as often as it was, they do a study day and home study time and things like that..” Surgical Assistant (SN2), Aberash

Training
Training was also a theme explicitly identified by entrepreneurs as both a facilitator and barrier to corporate entrepreneurship. The themes differed between Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts: for Aberash the lack of access to training (barrier) was the dominant emergent theme, whilst in Brynbeth access to training (facilitator) was the dominant theme (although there were examples of others in each). There were examples that did not fit within these themes see (SN2) above. In Aberash, a wide variety of reasons for this lack of access were given, including:

- Sickness cover.
- Time to learn.
- Availability of course within the area.
- Shift work/ nature of role.
- Financial cost of learning (to learner and to Trust).
“Finance is the biggest barrier, you see for me if I could have a dream come true I would say that every nurse...ten percent of her working time should be spent learning, that would be where we should be moving to...that. We should be saying to nurses, it’s a change in the role its is important, we don’t invest enough in learning, there is no doubt, and what happens is that back to the old issues of they are due to go on a course, it gets cancelled because there is two off sick, sickness that is a barrier. You know you go on a course, you finish your course and you have to cover the late-shift or the night-shift because somebody has gone off sick. Being creative, things like that can stifle creative people, you know I would like to run all sorts of courses and do all sorts of things but I have to prove what I have learnt is making me do a better job..They like feedback and I think that one of the greatest frustrations where there is this theory practice gap, is that I will go off on a course and numbers of staff and not just me, you go on the course, you all buzz and enthusiastic and you think when I go back I am going to do that, and you walk straight into the shift and there is two off sick and by the end of the week you thought, I started off so wanting to do that and that to me is a big frustration...” Senior Nurse A&E (SN2), Aberash

The Senior Nurse above, highlights the tension between sickness, training, funding and entrepreneurship. Her comments (and also the comments of others that I have used in this section) also highlight how many of these facilitating and inhibiting factors are complex and interrelated.

A number of other barriers to corporate entrepreneurship were found within the data, all of them useful in developing an understanding of Trust specific and NHS-wide culture, for example:
"I might be wrong in saying it, but I think the other departments unless they have used the library take the opinion 'oh, it's only the library' and that is our main barrier" Librarian (Al), Aberash

Due to time and space limitations I am unable to explore these in any depth.

9.7.3 NHS Champions

A major finding of my research is the importance of the NHS Champion throughout an entrepreneurial 'process' and for a corporate entrepreneur. Corporate Entrepreneurs from both Trusts appeared to benefit from the NHS Champion in similar ways:

- A champion is an inspirer
- A champion is a talent spotter
- A champion empowers
- A champion is a mentor
- A champion is a protector
- A champion is powerful

The NHS Champions that have been described to me have all been senior members of staff, often consultants, and sometimes 'Heads of' or Senior Managers. They appear to be successful at what they do as champions because of the formal and informal power-base that they have. Descriptions and accounts from the corporate entrepreneurs and senior participants from Aberash and Brynbeth have enabled me to build up a preliminary 'list' of what champions do when they champion a Trust entrepreneur. In some cases an entrepreneur will have two champions, each providing his or her own combination of support to the entrepreneur. Sometimes these can overlap with the other champion's skill-set, however, there was no sign of conflict between champions. The list below is not exhaustive and is just an initial attempt at outlining the characteristics of the NHS champion.

- A champion is an inspirer

In the interview data from both Aberash and Brynbeth entrepreneurs, the champion was always a person who the entrepreneur admires and looks-up to. My results do not tell me
whether someone could be a champion without being admired, but all of the entrepreneurs I interviewed spoke with varying levels of adoration for their champion.

“OK if I start with Sally, she was the one that sort of to my mind she was the one that gave us the initial push... She is very very dynamic, she takes over a situation in a really good and positive way, if you were in an arrest situation and she's there you can relax because you know that she is going to take control... I was once in an arrest situation with a young lady going down to Libra Ward and Sally walked in and this woman had become unwell only after she had given birth and on this day she'd become unwell – acutely, and Sally managed to walk into the room and into the cubicle and it was full of everybody. Now normally if you have that situation and the doctor wants to speak to patient or the relative she would have got rid of everybody and just would you please all go. Sally could have been in that room on her own and she spoke so sensitively to the husband about where we were with his wife, where we were going and how we were going to do it, in such a way that you felt privileged to be in the room with her, she has this amazing capacity I feel, to be able to not put people at their ease but to be able to develop a feeling of safeness, I think that's what it is, I think she can develop a feel of safeness so your able to tell her things that then she says ok we are going to do this, and then she is able to work out what we are going to do she has a plan and pushes it forwards, she is an amazing woman I think in my opinion.” Nurse Coronary Care (N1), Aberash

- A champion is a talent spotter

The champion as a talent spotter was a particularly strong theme for the enforced entrepreneurship within Aberash Trust. If the entrepreneurial activity was identified the most suitable entrepreneur was matched to this.

“When I first came into this post, the actual post has been vacant for about two years, although it has had a few temporary
managers, but when I first arrived here I came with no knowledge or experience of this specialism and my manager persuaded me almost to take this post” Ward Manager Day Surgery (WM1), Aberash

For empowered entrepreneurship the role of the champion appears to kick in at a later stage, when the entrepreneur approaches the champion with an idea and the champion empowers the entrepreneur, gives him or her the confidence/self-belief to take the idea forward. A point that was not addressed through my research which I think would be useful to explore through further research is whether the empowered entrepreneur actively selects their champion. A question that was triggered from reading this excerpt:

“It just made me think, I have got to work with people that want to change and want to work and I need to find champions who want changes and want things to improve whereas you know, I’m not going to fight with him.....” Senior Nurse, Mental Health (SN1) Brynbeth

It could be possible that entrepreneurs who hope to initiate empowered entrepreneurship actively seek their champion. If this possibility is the case, then it raises implications for management and leadership training: how do we support these entrepreneurs to select someone who will help them? What sort of qualities should an entrepreneur look for in a champion?

- A champion empowers

In both Trusts the champion seemed to support the entrepreneurs through helping to increase their self-belief, self-efficacy and self-confidence. Low/growing self-belief, efficacy and confidence were personal attributes frequently highlighted by many of the entrepreneurs from both the Trusts.

“Well one of my senior managers, Geoff, has been absolutely excellent, you know he is so approachable he is one of those people that you can ask the daftest question to ..he is excellent if you have got any issues that you are not quite sure of, or not sure of something........I think my other manager Geoff, again who I
have mentioned, he inspires you through confidence as well and he
taught me very much to look at other resources, if you cannot do
something there is always another way of doing it, so I think you
know it is mentorship as well..." Community Psychiatric Nurse
(NI), Brynbeth

- A champion is a mentor
The quote from the Community Psychiatric Nurse (as with many of the quotes that I have
used in this chapter) provide evidence of a number of themes. She identifies her champion
as a mentor. Similarly the Senior Nurse (SN5) below learned task-oriented skills with/
from her champion.

"We had to write the business case, we had to liaise with the
modernisation manager who acquired the funding for us
[Had you any previous experience in writing a business case?]
No I hadn't but the Head of Nursing and myself she took the lead
in writing the business case, but I think at the time it was a new
thing for her to do, so the two of us looked at the template that
we had to complete and she took the lead on it and I took part
and helped with it." Senior Nurse on Secondment (SN5),
Brynbeth

- A champion is a protector
This is an interesting attribute in that it conflicts with some traditional theory (such as
Pinchot 1985) which suggests that corporate entrepreneurs take risks. My findings suggest
that a Trust champion might shield the corporate entrepreneur from any adverse
consequences of risk-taking. So who is taking the risk? The Trust corporate entrepreneur
or the Trust champion? Do all Trust entrepreneurs take risk?

"We had some staff that were a little militant and things and they were
sort of ruling the roost with the older sister and I wanted to put a stop
to that because the morale was very very low because things were
unfair... I did have a few problems initially and I felt confident that Mr
Williams would stand by me because he did say that he would, and the Clinical Director, the guy that interviewed me said that they would stand by me so when I tried to rearrange things I had their backing I felt confident and this helped an awful lot” Ward Manager Care of the Elderly (WM3), Brynbeth

“The Doctor was fantastic, because we had to have a medic if there were any problems... because that’s if a potential complication we knew that the Doctor would have backed us all the way, so you could sort of relax, and we were able to discuss the patients with the Doctor before we took the procedure, so that made it easier, and then there were lots of little problems that we ironed out, such that patients would just be referred from anywhere, so we said look wouldn't it be better if all they all came through the Doctor so we did that.” Nurse Coronary Care (NI), Aberash

A champion has power (promoter, influencer and persuader)

Undoubtedly, the Trust champion has a strong power-base and may be well-positioned operationally, strategically and politically within the Trust, because of this s/he will have leverage to influence and persuade on behalf of the entrepreneur. This theme was strong for both Trusts

“My immediate manager here was really supportive and he made a big difference, because I didn’t have any sort of operational power, if you like, I didn’t have any authority to say to people you have got to do this. All I came along with was some good ideas and lots of enthusiasm and sort of an attitude to the staff for saying I know how difficult it is, I have been working with you, I have been doing the same job as you lets look at doing it differently, but I didn’t have any power to actually make them do it...” Senior Nurse Mental Health (SN1), Brynbeth
In their study on the champions of product innovations in US manufacturing firms, Howell et al (2005) determined a list of fifteen ‘champion’ behaviours. Their quantitative research prescribed thirty supportive behaviours whose presence was tested for, and the list was whittled down accordingly. Their findings are bound by the limitations within which the study was set, and because of the methodology the research did not identify any emerging themes. The behaviours that were verified as being present were:

- Enthusiastically promotes the innovation’s advantages.
- Expresses strong conviction about the innovation.
- Expresses confidence in what the innovation can do.
- Shows optimism about the success of the innovation.
- Points out reasons why the innovation will succeed.
- Keeps pushing it enthusiastically.
- Sticks with it.
- Shows tenacity in overcoming obstacles.
- Continues to be involved with the innovation until it is implemented.
- Knocks down barriers to the innovation.
- Does not give up when other say it cannot be done.
- Persists in the face of adversity.
- Gets problems into the hands of those who can solve them.
- Gets the right people involved.
- Gets key decision makers involved.

My first observation is that Howell et al's study is innovation-centric rather than entrepreneur-centric, in that they focus on the effect of the champion on the innovation rather than the person doing the innovating. This observation may not be surprising given that the study is set in a positivist paradigm. I think that my contribution adds value to our understanding as it explores champion behaviours through the multifaceted lens of the very different Trust corporate entrepreneurs of Aberash and Brynbeth. It does raise the question though, is the champion the champion of the innovation (entrepreneurship) or innovator (entrepreneur)? I would argue that the champion is championing a successful outcome which requires both.
9.7.4 Exceptions

Interestingly some of the corporate entrepreneurs that I interviewed (2 from Aberash and 5 from Brynbeth) did not describe to me a champion-like role that has supported them within their entrepreneurial activities.

Aberash

SN2 Senior Nurse A&E
SN4 Senior Nurse Acute Pain

Brynbeth

WM1 Day Surgery
WM2 Trauma & Orthopedic
WM3 Care of the Elderly
AHP1 Podiatry
AHP2 Physiotherapy

The next quote is taken from the start of an interview with one of the 'champion-less' ward managers listed above:

[So if you could first tell me a bit about what your job title is and what your job entails?]

I am Ward Sister and it is a busy 30 bedded ward, the main priority is patient care and ensuring that we meet the patients needs, I have to ensure that the ward is covered and that we can manage and cope with the workload, and also managing staff and make sure they are all kept happy with holidays and things like this. But there is a lot of other things that come in from that you know, on a day to day basis... it's a quite stressful trying to split yourself because you have the managerial side and you're also one of the girls as well sort of thing, so you are trying to do two things and a lot of the time you feel that you are supporting the staff and that's what you are trying to do.. But sometimes it doesn't feel like there's anybody there for you, do you know what I mean? ...... I have to protect the staff because they to tend to have lots of heavy dependent patients and not look at what we
are trying to cope with and nobody bothers to come down and see what we are doing you know” Ward Manager (WM3), Brynbeth

This quote suggests to me that this ward manager is feeling isolated and unsupported. It was said right at the start of the interview. On finding this quote, I searched the other 'champion-less' entrepreneurs to see if they had communicated anything to me that suggested they could feel more supported through having support from a champion.

"there have been many times where there haven't actually been arguments as such I have been in a lot of situations where I have had pressure, why don't you just, you could just, you should just you know and in the end I have sat there feeling absolutely withered and I thought am I pigheaded enough to sit here and just say, you know in front of a project board full of Trust level people, no I just don't agree or not? And nine times out of ten I have just sort of taken a deep breath and said no I don't agree, or whatever, and largely when I have done that I have got what I want, but I would really say it takes its toll, and I am getting to the point where I am sick of it actually, I am sick of arguing” Ward Manager (WM1), Brynbeth

The Ward Manager here seems exasperated and tired of arguing her case, a role that could be supported through the political power of a senior champion. Again, this evidence suggests that NHS entrepreneurs could be supported further by champions, but would require further exploration or piloting before any definitive statement could be made.

Reflecting back to my research questions, one of my aims was to explore the dynamics of learning and change with respect to the NHS Trust entrepreneurs and corporate entrepreneurship activities. I am not exploring the effectiveness of this learning (see for example Iphofen, 2000 for his exploration of effective learning in Health Care professional education). Figure 9.8 (later) provides an overview of education, learning and intrapreneuring of Aberash and Brynbeth Trust entrepreneurs. In this summary I have provided details of the level of education, propensity for learning and change. I have also
worked through the interview transcripts and captured descriptions of ways in which these Trust corporate entrepreneurs have said or suggested that they learn (in general and for corporate entrepreneurial activities). In general there is a high standard of education, with many of the Trust entrepreneurs having a degree or masters degree. Most are active change agents and learners, and like learning, although I have noted exceptions to this.

The Trust entrepreneurs seem to be very active in terms of their Continuous Professional Development, even those who do not enjoy the learning process or do not feel that they are 'academic', as highlighted in the following two quotes from Brynbeth and Aberash.

"I don't consider that I am a very academic person, I've never even finished a degree... well no – I've just studied two modules at degree level, but I have never been particularly academically ambitious at all and academic achievement has never been important to me actually in any way, or at any level actually.

[So do you think that you actually learn in other ways?]

Yes, I have done lots and lots of other training, I have done loads of other training and I have done lots of reading in all way.

[So can you give me examples?]

Over the years I have done loads of stuff, I have done my basic training was not a diploma level because I trained before that but even during that there was a very research and evidence based basic for the training even though it wasn't the project 2000 training. I have always been in A & E in the A & E speciality but I have moved kind of, I was here for 4 years within that I went over to Sheffield and did the A & E course which was a 6 months secondment, I think I have always been very motivated and I think I have always been motivated to learn but not for the academic achievements because I wanted to learn really, and when I look back I did not realise but when I look back at myself as a 23 year old here in a department where nobody had done that 6 months secondment for 4 years and.. only one person had anyway.. and
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when I look at how I jumped and eventually spoke to the Director of Nursing and you know I was determined to go and I had already got the information and when I look back at that and compare that to some other staff I have seen, I realised actually I was pretty self motivated actually, although I did not think it then. I would say, I have benefited whenever I have done any kind of learning I have benefited I always learn and I enjoy learning and I enjoy reading and I enjoy learning in a classroom. I am not very good at studying at home at all, I would say, unless I have got some kind of pressure, I will read at home and I have always have done but I would not, you know if I have got an essay to get done then I will do it. I mean I have every respect for learning and academia it's just to me the academic qualification has not been the driving influence at all, its always been I want to learn” Ward Manager Day Surgery (WM1), Brynbeth

“OK So from the age of 16, I did my O' levels and I had no enthusiasm at all I had no enthusiasm because I have an older sister, very intelligent and she was 2 years above me so she had done brilliantly in her O' levels and I just knew that I was not going to as well as her, and therefore I could not be bothered. ..... so [my mum] suggested nursing and I went to Cardiff, I did my training in Cardiff (RGN). From that minute I started my training I absolutely loved it, it was like this is what was made for me, because it was not academic, nobody in my family is a nurse they are all teachers, so I had no competition whatsoever, and I could do the work really, really easily I didn’t have to try and I absolutely adored having the patient contact and being able to make a difference.” Nurse Coronary Care (N2), Aberash
Many of the corporate entrepreneurs were enthusiastic about change, learning and their self-development:

"I do like teaching and I like learning so I am always involved in courses" Senior Nurse Acute Pain (SN4), Aberash

"I think I have always liked learning- you know since I was a student nurse, I have always felt that as a nurse you can extend yourself more maybe." Senior Nurse Cardiology (SN7), Aberash
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True/Code</th>
<th>Figure 9.8</th>
<th>EMpower</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Formal Learning</th>
<th>Informal Learning</th>
<th>Change agent?</th>
<th>Active learner?</th>
<th>Likes learning?</th>
<th>Intraprelearning activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASN1</td>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>RMN</td>
<td>Clinical Courses &amp; Workshops</td>
<td>Learning on the Job (LoJ) Multi-disciplinary Teamwork</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Searching Reading Attending Conferences Integrative working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN2</td>
<td>Team Leader A&amp;E</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Specialist Courses Diploma Management Leadership &amp; Change</td>
<td>LoJ Role Models Team</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Searching Reading Journals &amp; Research Attending Conferences Integrative working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN3</td>
<td>A&amp;E</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>ATLS Diploma Degree</td>
<td>Learning from mistakes LoJ Experiential learning Role Models</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ATLS course Working with Doctors Degree in Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN4</td>
<td>Acute Pain</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Specialist courses</td>
<td>Learns through doing Teamwork LoJ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Intensive Care course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN5</td>
<td>Midwife</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Converted - RGN</td>
<td>Active reflection LoJ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reads FDSA cycle Experience in private sector Experience working in another country Team effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN6</td>
<td>Thrombolysis</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Experiential learning Previous experiences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Conferences Newspapers Journals Nursing Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN7</td>
<td>Cardiology</td>
<td>ENEM</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>RGN Specialist Courses</td>
<td>LoJ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Politically aware Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:SN8</td>
<td>MIDWIFE</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Enrolled RGN Specialist courses</td>
<td>LoJ Learn by Doing With Team</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fears change</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:SN9</th>
<th>NIGHT NURSE</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Enrolled RGN</th>
<th>Learns from bad experiences</th>
<th>Learns from observations LoJ</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Leadership module</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:SN10</th>
<th>CORONARY CARE</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Not specified</th>
<th>Enrolled RGN Specialist courses</th>
<th>Learns from observation LoJ</th>
<th>Learns through teaching</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Child Protection course</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:WM1</th>
<th>DAY SURGERY</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>AMBA Management course</th>
<th>Learn from previous experiences</th>
<th>Learns through experience Team</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Conferences</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Mature entry into nursing</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:WM2</th>
<th>THEATRE</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>RCN</th>
<th>Management Course</th>
<th>LoJ</th>
<th>Teamwork</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Conferences</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>National Association</th>
<th>Learns from other hospitals</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Keeps diary</th>
<th>PDSA</th>
<th>Team effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:A1</th>
<th>LIBRARIAN</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>Thinking about HND</th>
<th>Self taught through interest</th>
<th>Experiential learning</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Private sector experience</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Experiments</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Multi-skilled Teamwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:N1</th>
<th>CORONARY CARE</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>RGN Training Degree</th>
<th>Specialist courses</th>
<th>LoJ Active reflector</th>
<th>Learns from Previous Experiences &amp; Bad examples</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Worked in Admissions</th>
<th>Nursing Pool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:N2</th>
<th>SURGICAL ASSISTANT</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>Doing degree</th>
<th>Some courses</th>
<th>LoJ</th>
<th>Learns from mentor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Mentors</th>
<th>Shadowing</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Research methods on degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>HSC</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>B:SN1</td>
<td>MENTAL HEALTH</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>National workshops</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Searching for information Reading policy documents Sense-making Short-term contracts in work Senior meetings Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B:SN2</td>
<td>DAY SURGERY</td>
<td>ENEM</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Learns from Previous Experiences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reading Skill mix at board meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B:SN3</td>
<td>NURSE PRACTITIONER</td>
<td>ENEM</td>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>Enrolled Converted Specialist courses</td>
<td>Leans through Observation Learns through mentor/role models Asks others for advice Learns from bad 'role' models</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Library Journal articles Observing business managers Mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B:SN4</td>
<td>INTENSIVE CARE</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>Diploma Enrolled converted</td>
<td>Learns through doing observation Learns from Management &amp; Staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Internet Library Conferences Networking Benchmarking Learning from colleagues who have worked elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B:SN5</td>
<td>PRACTITIONER ON SECONDMENT</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>Registered Mental Health Nurse</td>
<td>Learns from previous experiences Learns from observation Learns from working with others</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reads research Conferences Networks with junior &amp; senior staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B:SN6</td>
<td>NURSE PRACTITIONER</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Enrolled converted</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Learns by Observation Hands on training In-house training Team work</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Conferences Literature Diploma Conversion course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B:WM1</td>
<td>DAY SURGERY</td>
<td>ENEM</td>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>Worked in a training college Lots of training 2 modules of a degree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Practice benchmarking England/Scotland Conferences Reads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not academic likes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:WM2</td>
<td>TRAUMA &amp; ORTHOPEDIC</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>RCN Diploma</td>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>Specialist courses</td>
<td>LoJ</td>
<td>Learns from good/bad practice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Experiences with private sector Conferencing Networks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Confident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:WM3</td>
<td>CARE OF ELDERLY</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Enrolled - Converted RCN</td>
<td>Specialist courses</td>
<td>Integrated team Share bad-times Counselling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Conferences Networks Multi-cultural awareness Conferences Networking Integrated team Conversion course</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Confident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:WM4</td>
<td>CARE OF ELDERLY AND RENAL</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>RCN HNC management</td>
<td>Specialist courses</td>
<td>LoJ Learning is self-directive Lean by mistakes Teamwork</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Research Evidence based practice PDSA Cycle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Confident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:AHP1</td>
<td>PODIATORY</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Internal training Mandatory courses</td>
<td>Experiential learning Learned from bad experiences Teamwork</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PDSA cycle All Wales group Previous Entrepreneurship 'sme' experiences Teamwork</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Confident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:AHP2</td>
<td>PHYSIO</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Experiential learning (from Army) Team learning Team reflection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teamwork Working in different countries &amp; wide portfolio of roles in community hospitals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Confident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:MC1</td>
<td>MEDICAL LEAD</td>
<td>ENEM</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Neurolinguistic Programming Hypnotherapy</td>
<td>LoJ Actively reflects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Learned from other cultures in other countries 'sme' experiences Learned from NLP &amp; Hypnotherapy training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:N1</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PSYCHIATRIC NURSE</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Enrolled RGN Diploma Degree</td>
<td>Learns from observation Learns from working with senior people Learns from bad experiences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Learning Network Conferences Articles Colleagues Learned from Research Module (Masters)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F: Incomplete Learning

Increasing
9.8 Trust Entrepreneurs and self-confidence

Earlier in this chapter I reported that champions have supported many of the Trust entrepreneurs through increasing their self-confidence. Reflecting on my own research experiences, and in a different learning context, it is interesting to note how supervisors can enhance the confidence of their students (Sambrook, Stewart & Roberts 2005). Another theme that has emerged from this research is that learning also acts to increase the confidence of the Trust entrepreneur and higher confidence levels appear to encourage entrepreneurial activity.

This appears to be particularly relevant to the entrepreneurs that I interviewed, as many describe themselves as having or having had low levels of self-confidence.

There is an established research literature on self-confidence, self-esteem and self-efficacy. It is generally accepted that self-efficacy and self-confidence are the same terms, and therefore used interchangeably within the research literature.

'Another term for self confidence or beliefs about one's capability to perform a specific task is self-efficacy' (Maurer 2001, 124)

'Self efficacy (the academician's term for self-confidence)...' (Hollenbeck and Hall 2004, 254)

However, most within the field differentiate between self-confidence (or self-efficacy) and self-esteem:

'Self-esteem is recognised as a trait that may have short-term fluctuations but generally demonstrates long-term stability and hence would not be greatly affected by mentoring. Self-efficacy on the other hand, defined as one's judgements of 'how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations' is more malleable. According to the social cognitive view, self-efficacy is not a static trait, it is dynamic, directly changeable, and is linked to particular performance domains' (Day and Allen 2004)

Because of such differences, I think that it is important to establish what the communicator (the interviewee) is attempting to describe rather than the label he or she uses, and this is the stance that I have taken when exploring my data.

Bandura's (1977) contributions are well-known within the field and he defines self-efficacy as one's beliefs about one's capability to perform a specific task.
Hollenbeck and Hall (2004) define self-confidence as 'our judgement of whether we can do something' and from this make six statements:

1. Self confidence is a judgement, the result of thinking.
2. Self confidence is based upon perceptions of both our capabilities and what the task requires.
3. Self-confidence is task specific.
4. Self-confidence is something that can be changed.
5. Self-confidence is not self-esteem, the latter a judgment of self-worth.

Self-efficacy beliefs are usually determined and modified by four informational sources (Van Vianen, 1999):

- Performance attainment (personal accomplishments):
  
  *Based upon actual experiences, such as the Trust entrepreneur’s previous experiences and experiential learning.*

- Vicarious experiences (modelling/ observation):
  
  *Based upon watching others, learning through observation, role models and Champions who inspire.*

- Verbal persuasion and Social persuasion:
  
  *Being encouraged by champions (motivators), observing good/ bad practice, learning in the company of others enabling comparison.*

- Psychological states and reactions:
  
  *Based upon emotional arousal, about reflexive reactions of the mind/ body when performing or in anticipation of performing.*

Exploring Van Vianen’s four constructs in terms of:

- The informal learning and intraprelearning activities identified by each of the Trust entrepreneurs in Figure 8.11.
- The supportive behaviours of Trusts champions identified earlier on in this chapter.

It is clear to see why a Trust entrepreneur’s level of confidence can increase through entrepreneurial activities.
The presence of low-confidence in several of the Trust entrepreneurs is interesting and conflicts with traditional corporate entrepreneurship theory (see Chapter 2). Figure 9.8 provides details of my perceptions of the each participant level of confidence, based upon their interview transcripts and their confidence in communicating to me during the interview. There were entrepreneurs from both Trusts that were confident, of increasing confidence and of low confidence.

9.9 Critical Learning Experience

Many of the Trust entrepreneurs were able to recall a significant learning experience that they felt supported them in being entrepreneurial. This is significant and relevant as is possibly links learning with helping to unlock entrepreneurial capability. Experiences described were often very different and dynamic although some themes did emerge. When I asked the Trust entrepreneurs why they felt that this experience had supported their entrepreneurialism, the entrepreneurs described to me a change in their epistemological paradigm from which they viewed their world. This change in paradigm opened them to an integrative, ‘holistic’ worldview, multi-lens perspective. Kanter (1983:27-29) makes an association between innovation and integrative approach to problems:

‘I found that the entrepreneurial spirit producing innovation is associated with a particular way of approaching problems that I call “integrative” the willingness to move beyond received wisdom, to combine ideas from unconnected sources, to embrace change as an opportunity to test limits. In the integrative mode [people] aggregate sub problems into larger problem, so as to recreate a unity that provides more insight into the required action.’

Many of these learning experiences were different sometimes they were described as being a powerful learning moment, for other entrepreneurs a series of smaller, incremental events had led them towards this paradigm shift. Cope (2003) discusses similar episodes or events in terms of start-up entrepreneurship. He identifies that there is growing recognition that these events have an important role to play in entrepreneurial learning.

‘Entrepreneurship and the growth process is essentially non-linear and discontinuous. It is a process that is characterised by significant and critical learning events. The ability of entrepreneurs to maximise knowledge as a result of experiencing these learning events will determine how successful their firm eventually becomes.’ Cope (2003:431)
In the following excerpt, the consultant from Brynbeth introduces learning events that have influenced his multi-view perspective and he rationalises how this helps in his entrepreneurial problem-solving.

"I do tend to abstract a great deal and play with the size of the pictures, simply because like I say it gives me more information about a system... I think virtually everybody in the NHS does their best I'm aware that people, it's not that they have limited thinking but they often don't see the boundaries they impose on themselves they are not aware of them and I try very much to try and find my boundaries and always exceed them and that could be because I do have other areas of my background that are not typical. I have training in hypnosis, I have got training in neuro-linguistic programming, I have set up a couple of companies and I have also lived in a few countries as well, I mean these are all alternative ways of looking at life and I think because I have multiple de Bono–multiple caps I can naturally or more naturally than most look at many ways of seeing a particular thing and obviously the more ways you look at something the more likely you are to find the use or see a solution in it.

[If a colleague approached you, and said I hear you're very entrepreneurial in your role, and they asked you for advice of how they could be more entrepreneurial what sort of snap shot advice would you give them?]

OK I would say to them, the following I would like to ask you who are you to come to me to say that but I'm not, I'm going to ask who aren't you?

[Why would you say that to them?]

Because first of all its semi-hypnotic and it will throw them into a little bit of a trance and they will get a sense of an answer that through time they may start to understand themselves and because it has come through them they are far more likely to listen to it, so what I am actually telling them is,
I think the biggest source of innovation comes from yourself and the fact that it's not what you understand about yourself its what you don't understand about yourself. I am giving them a metaphor that directly relates to the pattern... I think you have got to understand that everything we see and everything that we believe is only a single view point”

Some Critical Learning Experiences emerged from experiential learning, such as learning on the job and through observation. In the next quote the Senior Nurse from Aberash talks about how her students provide her with different perspectives and how a Common Core Course that she went on helped to ‘open up a lot of things’:

“I love having students, you know, not everybody likes to have students, I like them I think they challenge you, I think they keep you on your toes, they see things that you don’t see sometimes, you know I have worked 36 years in [this speciality] and it is nice that people come in with new eyes and new ideas, and things that perhaps I don’t think of - I like to have students... when I came here after I have done three years part time everybody had to go on this Common Core Course so I thought well I will go on that then because I hadn’t done anything for a while and that opened up a lot of things for me, ... and when I realised that you could go to the library and you thought ‘this is great you know’ and that was quite good.....”

As with many Trust entrepreneurs, Critical Learning Experiences may be a blend of formal learning and experiential learning. The private sector has also been a source of Critical Learning Experience:

“The Clinical leadership programme that I did 12 months ago is run by the RCN which looks at roles, team building observations and I’m actually still trying to go Virgin Atlantic Airlines to see about their management structure and B.A.E systems because I wanted to look at the opposite, to see what is in the private sector... I found from
doing the leadership programme I actually got more support from my fellow ward managers throughout the Hospital, there was 14 of us and we actually get more support from each other by having our action learning days, where we got together, we don’t whinge but we discuss problems and we actually solve problems and give each other tips. Also alternative ways of getting the job done, being politically aware, that has been a big, what I never thought about until I came into this role that you really need to be politically aware. You need to be aware of what’s out there nationally political as well but because I think up until this role I was not really even though I had been involved in national projects and particularly even more so now being a project Leader on this initiative.. it has enabled me to look outside our box here to look further, that’s why I started looking a private industry for any answers.” Ward Manager (WM2) Brynbeth

There were clues that segmental working and working in isolation had caused a degree of naivety in some participants

“I was privy to be in the Business Managers’ Office for twelve months, and I was actually seeing how they work, I suppose really, although I wasn’t observing them, but you couldn’t help but notice.. I never knew that Business Managers did that before, all I knew was that they provided money. I didn’t realised that they managed staff, that surprised me, I thought it was manage money, so they managed staff at all levels really. I empathise with them now, now that I have seen what goes on in their world...throughout the twelve months, its not an easy job...I think that we do get trapped in our own little world, our own little unit, department, wards, and I think sometimes with stresses as they are I can speak from the managers point of view, you know. But I’ve seen outside the box really, in two ways, one as soon as I left that department
really, I went and sat in the business managers office, then I was opened up to other nurses on the surgical floor of the nurse practitioners in fact I sit with secretaries as well, so I see their side of things to. I have also got a colleague who is in the same speciality but from over the border's a different place really, different thinking....” Senior Nurse Practitioner (SN3). Brynbeth

The same Senior Nurse (SN3) describes another moment later on in her interview, she appears to be reflecting actively and trying to make sense of things that are becoming apparent to her during the interview:

“I am going back to my conversion course again, that was a big turning point for me I think and part of the conversion course because I was based in the Gastro unit where I worked I had to actually go onto a ward for a month, it was part of the conversion course because I had to fill in the patients care plans and things, and it was actually when I went onto this ward that was linked closely to our department that we always used to moan about them and then I realised the things that we were whinging and moaning about back in our own little box I could see why they were happening on the other side and that’s when it opened up for me and I came back and said that we shouldn’t complain about people you know other departments because this is my experience this is what I found, and I would encourage everybody really to go outside their department and go somewhere else, especially within their own hospital but then obviously it is bigger”

In terms of Critical Learning Experience some preliminary themes that have emerged which can be broadly categorised into ‘formal’ education, ‘informal’ learning at work’, ‘informal learning away from work’:
Formal Education

- Degree/Masters, in particular research modules
- Nurse Conversion courses

"Well I started off initially as an enrolled nurse, which not many of people around know, but I started off as that. Very quickly became disillusioned and dissatisfied with that because I obviously had more to give and I could not become promoted in that role, so sort to get a conversion course as it was called, and eventually got on one after struggling, and that was just the beginning of me developing then really, it just opened my eyes. So I did the conversion course, having been on an intensive care unit as an enrolled nurse and then very quickly did the intensive care course. The intensive care course was the thing that put all of the pieces of the jigsaw, I learnt lots of little fragments as an enrolled nurse but I never understood the whole theory behind everything and then suddenly doing the intensive care course, I spent the time going ‘oh oh’ because all those bits fell into place." Senior Nurse (SN4), Brynbeth

Informal Learning at Work

- Teaching students
- Attending conferences, multi-disciplinary meetings
- Working on the ‘nursing bank’
- Working in other hospitals

Informal Learning away from Work

- Working within the private sector
- Involvement with entrepreneurship
- Living in other countries

What struck me when I came to writing up my PhD narrative were the parallels between the experience of the Trust entrepreneurs, their Critical Learning
Experiences and my own Critical Moments of 'doing' a research project. In Chapter 7 I talk about how I have experienced Critical Learning Moments that provide me with a new/different perspective on the task in hand, and I describe the aftermath of a powerful personal event that happened in the final phases of my PhD process. This event was so powerful that the interpretative framework from which I viewed my world did not make sense and no longer 'fitted', and I had to muddle-through and make a new sense of things and this, in turn, opened up a new set of lenses from which I began to view my world. In a sense, the process of the Doctoral thesis is a form of entrepreneurship: making a new and useful contribution to knowledge. Is my recognition of a parallel between my experiences and those of Trust entrepreneurs merely coincidental or are critical moments/critical learning experiences a necessary developmental experience that entrepreneurs (and doctoral research students) have to muddle through?

With this focus on learning I would like to summarise Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts in terms of their propensity for Organisational Learning. Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell (1996) offer descriptions of the eleven characteristics of a Learning Company (introduced in Chapter 3) from the perspective of the ideal learning company, which are as follows:

**Figure 9.9 Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts as Learning Companies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedler et al's 11 characteristics</th>
<th>Aberash</th>
<th>Brynbeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Self-development opportunities for all (Resources and facilities for self-development are made available to all members, especially those in front line with users or clients. People are encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning and development.)</td>
<td>Self-development opportunities available for all. Few signs of protected time, and active CPD plans. Learning opportunities for managers being particularly difficult due to tensions created by increased administration from directives such as EWTD.</td>
<td>Self-development opportunities available for all. Protected time provided to some staff, which is honoured in practice. Therapy Services provides a benchmark for other divisions within the Trust to aspire towards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) A learning approach to strategy (Policy and strategy formation are deliberately structured for learning)</td>
<td>Not accessible</td>
<td>Yes, aspirations towards becoming a learning organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Participative policy making (Where all of the organization's stakeholders are able to contribute and participate in policy making)</td>
<td>Yes, based upon the standard practice for NHS Trusts.</td>
<td>Yes, based upon the standard practice for NHS Trusts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Informating (Information technology is used for making information widely available to all members of staffing to empower them to act on their own initiative)</td>
<td>Trust has an intranet that is used widely, and IT did not emerge as a facilitator or barrier to CE within Aberash. Innovations within the library improving access to information and knowledge.</td>
<td>Trust has an intranet that is used widely, and IT emerged as both a barrier and facilitator to CE within BrynBeth. Not all staff have access to computers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Formative accounting and control (Systems budgeting, reporting and accounting are structured to assist learning for all members about how money work is in the business)</td>
<td>Annual Audits and other key indicators all available within the public domain.</td>
<td>Annual Audits and other key indicators all available within the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Internal exchange (All internal units and departments see themselves as customers and suppliers in a supply chain to the end user or client; contracting with and learning from other departments is normal.)</td>
<td>High degree of customer (patient)-centric work ethos Quality Improvement project supporting a movement towards integration. Culture of competition creating levels of secrecy that may hinder integrated working and the sharing of knowledge, information and ideas.</td>
<td>High degree of customer (patient)-centric work ethos Rotation pilots supporting integrated working and values Quality &amp; Safety Improvement project causing a movement towards integrated working at both operational and ward levels. Culture of openness facilitates information sharing, knowledge and ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Reward Flexibility (Flexible and creative rewards, alternatives in both monetary and non-monetary rewards to cater for individuals needs and performance)</td>
<td>National pay structure implemented Agenda for Change</td>
<td>National pay structure implemented Agenda for Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Enabling structures (Roles, departments, organization charts and even procedures and processes that are seen as temporary structures that can be changed to meet job, user or innovation requirements).</td>
<td>Strong support for staff for the development of Clinical Pathways. Aberash seems to be moving towards a disseminate knowledge acquired from CE. This is moving towards a nationally-oriented competence.</td>
<td>Enabling network created from the Quality and Safety Initiative that the Trust is involved with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Boundary workers as environmental scanners (Environmental scanning is carried out by all people who have contacts with external users, customers, suppliers, clients, business partners and son on. Processes are in place for bringing back and welcoming the information into the company.</td>
<td>Active in scanning, &amp; benchmarking locally, nationally and internationally. Conference attendance is often supported. Competitive culture may hamper the dissemination of raw/useful information</td>
<td>Active in scanning, &amp; benchmarking locally, nationally and internationally. Conference attendance is often supported. People-oriented culture may support the dissemination of raw/useful information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) Inter-company learning  
(through joint ventures and other learning alliances, the organizational learns from other companies and meets with them for mutual exchange)

Working alliances are in progress, although there may be elements of competition and suspicion within such alliances

Working alliances are in progress, some appear to be built on open and safe foundations

11) A learning climate  
(In the learning company all managers see their primary task as facilitating company members' experimentation and learning from experience, through questioning, feedback and support. The company seeks to export this learning climate to its context and business partners)

Managers prioritise their tasks as meeting local and national targets and providing patients with better and safer patient care. Managers do facilitate members' learning from experience, through questioning, feedback and support. Experimentation is controlled through LREC Head of Nursing (surgery) is a charismatic leader/role model and champions for developing entrepreneurs. A benchmark for the Trust

Managers prioritise their tasks as meeting local and national targets and providing patients with better and safer patient care. Managers do facilitate members' learning from experience, through questioning, feedback and support. Experimentation is controlled through LREC Director of Therapy has created a 'Learning Directorate' within the Trust. A benchmark that should be celebrated and shared

Figure 9.9 does not provide us with a definitive statement as to whether Aberash and/or Brynbeth are indeed Learning Organisations. What it does is highlight some areas of particular weakness in both Trusts: Aberash's culture may not be as conducive to learning and sharing as that of Brynbeth's, however, Brynbeth lacks extensive computer and IT provision in its rural clinics although those that have managed to receive support have found it of significant benefit for entrepreneurial activity. It also highlights areas that are contributing positively towards a learning organisation. In terms of the most powerful sign of organisational learning, the Therapy Directorate in Brynbeth was something that stood out. Its internal policies, ways of working, staff development plans, rumour busting sessions, career progression, no blame culture certainly meet the criteria set out by Pedler et al and I would argue that this directorate is a form of Learning Company.

9.10 Intraprelearning

I have many examples of Trusts entrepreneurs making linkages between learning and entrepreneurship:

"First of all you have to train quickly, not stop learning, you have to carry on learning, you cannot do your nursing course and then that's it, you have to carry on learning,
you have to find an area that you are interested in, where you can develop your career and become an expert in that field, you have to concentrate on being innovative but it's all learning, all that you know has to be done by a constant learning, keeping yourself up to speed and it's not just about nursing, it's about the whys and the ways of what's going on politically as well, it's what's happening in the NHS... from my experience people who aren't innovative have no desire to learn” Senior Nurse Cardiology (SN7), Aberash

9.10.1 Links to Intraprelearning

One of the final questions that I posed to the Trust entrepreneurs was ‘what advice would you give to someone who wanted to be more entrepreneurial (creative innovative, and taking guarded-risks) within your Trust?’ Some of the responses were very insightful and emphasised the paradigm from within which the respondent viewed their world. Other answers were more specific and provided me with an understanding of the ‘process’, desired skills and characteristics:

“Well, I would ask them to do research first of all and background work which I suppose is what I am doing now, get information on what they want to do, is it happening elsewhere, get in touch with people where it is happening. From a management point of view if you are obviously looking for money towards developing something they need to do their homework and a business case really on why it is necessary and why it is needed. So they need the background knowledge on the subject, is it happening elsewhere, get in touch with people elsewhere, benchmark these and see what's happening out there, and then become more specific you know be knowledgeable and then actually sit down and discuss with management, you need to get on the management level then here... They need to be able to communicate, communication skills, I.T. skills and they need to be assertive I think and they need to
be knowledgeable about their subject” Senior Nurse (SN3), Brynbeth

“I think you need to identify if there is a need initially and if that need is there and then if you feel strongly about it, but you have to have your facts don’t you. I think you have to get everything you need to sort of back it up. I don’t know just go for it and keep on. I think you just have to keep plugging away don’t you, even if it is a bit at a time just keep plugging away don’t give up on it, find some people who are sympathetic with you, get other people on board and things will move forward you know. I mean I have to go and see the nursing team in Devonshire because the lady who initially let us know about it she has been taken away to Birmingham and they are left without anybody now in Devonshire Trust and they have asked me if I would go along and just let them know how we run the service here, so I think they are looking at it- so I suppose I would just say that to them you know if you feel the need is here and you see your patients that you are looking at are suffering, then you just have to say this is the service that we want and if they have got something now, they can say well look there is a service that is working, it does work, so why can’t we do it, and in a way they are fortunate...we have got a pathway and guidelines so they can take that and say the work is already done here, we don’t even have to reinvent it, it is all here and if that was me I would be, you know just saying we just need time we need to be doing this.” Senior Nurse, Learning Disabilities (SN1), Brynbeth

The ‘advice’ given to me echoed much of the my other findings from my data, including: Characteristics such as determination, communication, self-belief, the value of sponsors and supporters, ways and tools for intraprelearning including
reading, scanning, role models, teamwork, conferences, benchmarking, instilling self-confidence.

9.10.2 Model of Intraprelearning
In this final section, I work towards producing an empirical Intraprelearning model, based upon the two Inside-Outside theoretical models, proposed in Chapter 5 and which were 'tweaked' (as a single model) to illustrate the public Health Care context in Chapter 6. In an attempt to inform, analyse and make-sense of an empirically-based model of intraprelearning I have revisited some of the models and frameworks that have been introduced during the course of the literature reviews and started to 'play around with them' in terms of my empirical data. Which ones best fit my results? Which ones can be adapted to illustrate my findings? What should a model of intraprelearning include?

Figure 9.8 highlights modes of formal and informal learning of the corporate entrepreneurs. In terms of formal education, conversion courses, degrees, diplomas, masters and specialist courses feature highly. In terms of the more informal learning, on-the-job (experiential and learning by doing), observation, mentoring (role models), previous (good and bad) experiences/ reflection and teamwork are all modes that were described to me. However, it is helpful to relate these to other models introduced in the literature review.

9.10.3 Huber's processual model
These modes of formal and informal intraprelearning have been mapped onto Figure 9.10. Reflecting back to Chapter 3 this chart was an attempt by Huber (1991) to map out and 'order' the constructs and processes of organisational learning. My research clearly highlights that learning (individual, team and organisational) is not the neat, linear and ordered process that could be inferred by Huber's rather geometrical looking chart. People are not neat and linear and neither is learning nor entrepreneurship. I have mapped some of the stronger intraprelearning themes that emerge from both Trusts onto Figure 9.10. The model is restrictive in that I have not been able to differentiate between Trust level intraprelearning, team intraprelearning and individual level intraprelearning because of the limitations of the model itself. Used as a skeleton framework, it provides one way of viewing some of the key
themes and illustrates where they fit in terms of the organisational learning processes.

**Figure 9.10 NHS Intraprelearning adapted from Huber (1991:90) using empirical evidence collected from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs and Processes</th>
<th>Subconstructs and Subprocesses</th>
<th>Subconstructs and Subprocesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Acquisition</td>
<td>Previous experiences/education/Insight (of individuals/groups and Trust)</td>
<td>Pilots/Parallel systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential Learning</td>
<td>Formal organisational appraisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning through Observation/Mentoring/Role models</td>
<td>Accidental learning/Learning on the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Distribution (Internet, e-mail, reports, team meetings, posters, conferences)</td>
<td>Benchmarking/Head-Hunting/Trusts in England</td>
<td>Quality/Safety Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading (journals/newspapers) Attending conferences Networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Searching and noticing</td>
<td>Scanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Pathways/Learning Frameworks</td>
<td>Focused search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Interpretation</td>
<td>Information Overload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unlearning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Memory</td>
<td>Producing journal articles, policy papers, clinical pathways and white papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have used Huber's definitions of each construct loosely and focused more on illustrating my findings rather than fitting in within his definition of a criterion. Huber's framework is useful, and I think that it will be particularly useful when reporting back my findings to each of the Trusts, based upon their individual, Trust specific results. As a complete model of Intraprelearning, I am not able to build into it the role of the champion, the types of Trust entrepreneurship or the dynamics of empowered versus enforced entrepreneurship.

**9.10.4 The 4I Framework**

Another framework from the Organisational Learning literature is the 4I Framework that I introduced in Chapter 3. I recall being particularly 'impressed' with the completeness of this model when I discovered it, as it included the classic three
organisational levels. It also named the stages of learning at these levels and used social labels that seemed to translate well into the entrepreneurship field. Given this, I thought that the 4I Framework may provide a useful way of presenting the key themes from my empirical data. I have presented a view which shows those results shared by both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, rather than two separate models showing the details within each.

Figure 9.11 has provided a more inclusive means of summarising some of my empirical findings. Using the 4I Framework I have been able to show (in blue) some of the supportive behaviours of the champion (although my data has not specifically placed these behaviours against the different levels as I have, this would have to be explored in further depth). I have been able to list some of the modes of intraprelearning (as listed in Figure 9.8) and have recognised the importance of Critical Learning Experience(s) (yellow) in proving the entrepreneur with the integrative world-view. I have also managed to capture the enforced and empowered orientations of entrepreneurship (mapped onto arrows). There is potential for this model to illustrate further findings and I could have included barriers and facilitators.
at the different levels, and personal characteristics however I thought that this would have made the diagram busy and I preferred not to. This overview will be useful tool for describing how the Champion can help Organisational Learning and Intraprelearning move from the intuiting stage to the institutionalising stage. This could be used when feeding back the results to Trusts.

9.10.5 The Inside-Outs ide model of Intraprelearning
The Inside-Outs ide set of models were the ‘working’ conceptual models that underpinned this PhD research. The theoretical models were a set of two, whilst the working contextual model was reduced to a single model, because a single model was sufficient to demonstrate the contextual difference between the public and the private sector. Based upon the findings of my research I am now able to present this model as one model, because of the way in which the key themes have emerged, most notably that enforced and empowered entrepreneurship are not separate and enforced may actually drive empowered entrepreneurship, thus they are represented by an interconnected spiral in the middle rather than two separate constructs.

The reality of the original working model was that it was not able to effectively accommodate the key emerging themes using its former constructs. Subsequently, I have made changes to the model, these changes have been driven by my empirical results and I have constructed a new model, as illustrated in Figure 9.12, drawing upon the stronger themes from both Aberash and Brynbeth NHS Trusts.

The difficulty that I had with the ‘working’ model was that it differentiated between sub-processes within learning and entrepreneurship in terms of the organisational hierarchy (organisational, group, and individual). This perspective was useful in terms of presenting an overview of the research literature, but did not accommodate my empirical results. Trust entrepreneurship emerged as two distinct yet interrelated processes, empowered [6] which has emerged from the operational levels of the Trust and enforced [5] which is driven from the strategic level.

In Figure 9.12, the pathway for enforced entrepreneurship is denoted by the black line, whilst empowered entrepreneurship is denoted by the grey line. The solid lines
Learning at both the strategic level [1] and operational level [2] can occur from learning in environments external to the Trust (and can be formal or informal) or internal within the Trust (and can be formal or informal). External drivers of change are shown in [3]. External drivers can be Political, economical, socio-cultural and technological. From Aberash and Brynbeth's experiences, such environmental changes are driven by new legislation and policies from the European level (European Union, such as European Working Time Directive), UK level (Department of Health, such as Agenda for Change) and Wales-wide level (Welsh Assembly Government, such as the Fundamentals of Care, and Service and Financial Frameworks (SaFFs) target). By far the most emotive internal driver [4] for entrepreneurship and change is the improvement in the quality and safety of patient care. Achievement of targets and improving ways of working were also key drivers of change.
9.10.6 Enforced entrepreneurship

To explain the model, I will begin with assuming an external trigger in the external Trust environment [3]. There are a complexity of external triggers driving change in both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. There are two routes that information about drivers of change can take to enter the Trusts domain of knowledge, the strategic route [1] or the operational route [2]. Learning occurs through similar mechanisms at each of these Trust levels: conferences, reading literature (white papers, journal articles, newspaper articles, internet websites) networks, meetings and courses can all provide Trusts with new knowledge. From my data, organisational level learning (2) tends to be single-loop learning,

"I think that I have learned perseverance, and there was a point that I felt that the momentum had completely gone and I just felt, oh I don't know, what am I doing here anymore, I had just lost the plot, and I think you need to do at that point is go back to why you were doing it in the first place. Because quite often I was thinking, God, is this my vision is it my dream to get this done or is it actually somebody else's that I am following through" Ward Manager, Theatres (WM2), Aberash

Although I have found a few examples of double-loop learning

"There was registration, and what we were finding was with the circulation database that I had done was that we weren't actually tracking [reader's details], it didn't automatically bring up readers details you know, like when you used to join a library you are given a library card and a bar code and all the librarian has to do is type in the bar code and the person's details come up, well we weren't doing that we were just taking the persons name in so it needed updating. So what we did we made this registration database and we changed the registration form because all we were keeping before was the doctors' names, these were systems that had been in place for years and years and years you know before we had started here, and all that had been tracked of the doctors was their
name and the ward that they were on, so it was hard to .. you would get an overdue book from a doctor and they'd left a few years ago.. or they'd had moved wards, so it was hard to track them down, so we made a new registration form and that form became the basis of the database so we started to take their home address and stuff like that but following data protection laws and all of the rest of it” Librarian (A1), Aberash

Individual/team learning is derived from a mixture of tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka, 1991).

Once made aware of new information, the Trust will undertake further learning to try and find a ‘solution’ to the change driver, this can be formal learning or informal learning, but it is normally externally oriented. This further learning is similar at both strategic and operational levels and includes: benchmarking, reading (about pilots, projects). Once a strategic solution has been found, a champion [b] will identify a talented entrepreneur to lead that entrepreneurship [5] and empower him or her through instilling confidence, and assuring their protection from risk-taking, blame and failure. The Trust entrepreneur will have characteristics such as:

- Determination.
- Likes Change.
- Values Learning.
- Low or improving confidence.
- Able to communicate at all levels.
- Active reflector.
- Enthusiastic.
- Promoter.
- Intuitive.

The entrepreneurship is in effect enforced, although some empowered [6] entrepreneurship may emerge in parallel to this. The champion will be inspiring to the entrepreneur, provide mentorship and support entrepreneurship success through
his/her power relationships [c]. The entrepreneurship will result in one or a combination of the following:

- Change in who performs a clinical task.
- Change in (an aspect of) the culture.
- Change in staff working structure.
- Improvement of administrative process.
- Development of a new post.
- Development of a new unit.
- Development of a new procedure

The entrepreneur will have a certain world perspective brought about by one or a series of Critical Learning Experiences. This world view has given them a holistic view, making them holistic in their approach to seeking solutions to problems.

From the empirical data collected from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, entrepreneurial activities begin with internal changes, which are in many cases documented and formalised using Care Pathways, and through internal documentation. Such tools for capturing organisational learning can project Trust learning back into the external domain [3] and affect Wales-wide or UK wide policy and practice.

9.10.7 Empowered entrepreneurship

In terms of empowered entrepreneurship, the pathway is slightly different. Typically, a Trust member will experience a learning event (possibly at a conference, during a meeting, from reading a journal article or from a break-out session on an MSc) which provides them with an opportunity for improving patient care or meeting a Trust target. The entrepreneur will have those characteristics as that I have described above. The entrepreneur will achieve support from a champion. This champion will be inspiring to the entrepreneur. The champion will empower the entrepreneur [e] support through mentorship [f] and provide him or her with legitimate Trust power [d], and support the entrepreneur in driving the change forward. The entrepreneurship will result in one or a combination of the entrepreneurial ‘types’ listed previously.
The model of intraprelearning above is very useful in that it provides an overview of empirical data that is based on successful entrepreneurship within both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. Furthermore, it provides an overview of the 'sub-processes' of both empowered and enforced entrepreneurship, many of which are done implicitly during the course of entrepreneurship. There is also some useful detail within the model that has been guided by the empirical concerning the characteristics of the entrepreneur and the supportive behaviours of the champion.

9.11 Conclusion
In this chapter, I aim to address the research questions that were introduced in Chapter 7 and explore the working model of intraprelearning along with other models in the research literature. The results are taken from the themes that have emerged primarily from the thematic analysis of my interview transcripts and observations made during the interview events.

I have presented these results in a variety of ways, using Tables, forms of Venn Diagrams and Force Field Analyses. I start making sense of and exploring the results by reflecting back and drawing upon, models from the existing research literature: Pinchot's (1985) table, Roger's (1969) adoption curve, Pedler et al's (1996) Characteristics of the Learning Company, my working model of Inside-Outside Intraprelearning (Figure 9.12). I also explore other models in terms of an alternative lens and a means of helping me explore my results further: Huber's (1986) processual model and the 4I Framework (Crossan et al, 1999).

I start building up a picture of the two Trusts, highlighting differences and similarities. Emergent issues are discussed and I draw from new literature that was not included or not deemed as significant in the initial literature review: the differences between enforced and empowered entrepreneurship, the problem of low self-confidence in Trust entrepreneurs, talent spotting the 'tall-poppies' and the importance of the Trust champion. I complete the chapter with an empirical adaptation of the Inside-Outside model of Intraprelearning, which summarises those themes general to both Trusts.
An explicit awareness of the intricacies of effective empowered and enforced entrepreneurship within the two cases, and the significant interrelated role of learning throughout the entrepreneurship process provides academics (with an agenda for further research) findings of which can affect practice. Thus developing and improving the entrepreneurial capabilities of 'human' resources.

Through making explicit characteristics and behaviours it can be used as a platform from which to develop learning and development strategies for entrepreneurs and champions within NHS Trusts, public sector organisations and it also has implications for the private sector. Having presented my analysis of the empirical data and integrated these with key findings from my review of the extant literature, I have finally provided a working model of CE within the NHS, which makes an important and original contribution to knowledge. In the next and final chapter, I offer my conclusions and recommendations, discuss the limitations of this research and propose areas for further research.
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10.1 Introduction

This final chapter completes my PhD journey. In this chapter, I attempt to draw all of my theoretical and empirical findings together and explore the implications in terms of:

- The advancement this contributes to theory within the fields of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change.
- The new insight this reveals into the complex, dynamic and inter-dependant relationships between the sub-processes of corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and change.
- The more detailed picture this contributes to of the Trust entrepreneur and how HRM, HRD and Modernisation policy and practice can better support the realisation of entrepreneurial potential.
- The development of understanding into some of the organisational facilitators and inhibitors of intraprelearning in NHS Trusts and how we can utilise this new insight to effectively improve practice.
- The insight this provides in terms of HRD, HRM and in terms of the provision of Management and Leadership training and Development within FE institutions.

Wales has a Welsh Assembly Government and in the UK a Department of Health. Within the region, there are a large number of public sector organisations, a handful of large, well-established manufacturing firms and many micro-to-small sized organisations. The region has a number of Training and Development providers in various forms and guises, including sole-trader consultants, and FE and HE institutions. What implications does my research have for each of these? What about the entrepreneurs within these organisations and their champions and supporters? How is this research useful for them? How does it actually contribute to the development of theory? How does it inform and support intraprelearning practice/ in practice? How does it guide strategic policy?
Reflecting back, I found this chapter the toughest to write because I had to apply my findings and think about the theoretical and practical relevance and applications of my study. So this chapter is my attempt to capture the significance, usefulness and originality of this research and relay it in terms of its benefits to the region and its generalisability to the Wales/UK context.

10.2 Conclusions of the Research

The following section presents the conclusions to my research. Wherever possible I will summarise my conclusions in terms of the two separate cases of Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. This research project set out to explore intraprelearning within two Welsh NHS Trusts. Intraprelearning was a term that was used as a short hand for the possible inter/intra relationships between the three processes of Corporate Entrepreneurship, Organisational Learning and Organisational Change. The research has progressed from unpicking and organising three substantial literatures to the proposal of a set of theoretical Inside-Outside Models of Intraprelearning. From these two models a third adaptation was proposed that accounted for the public sector context of the Health Service and its affect on the Internal and External change constructs of the model. From these models 11 research questions were developed, and the qualitative research that was conducted in Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts set to address these questions to develop an understanding of them in terms on their own Trust contexts.

10.2.1 Who are the corporate entrepreneurs within the Trusts?

The purposive sampling led me to a wide range of different corporate entrepreneurs within both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts as shown in Figure 9.1.

In Aberash Trust, the majority of entrepreneurs were based in the main acute site. Only one participant was non-nurse (an administrator). Nurse entrepreneurs included Nurse Specialists, Nurse/Ward Managers and Nurse Assistants.

In Brynbeth, entrepreneurs were distributed more in the community hospitals as well as the main acute site. There were three non-nurse entrepreneurs (two Allied-Health Professionals and a Medical Consultant) and those that were nurses were Specialist, Ward Managers and Community/Mental Health nurses.
The Trust entrepreneurs are individuals who are (Figure 9.4) determined, who like change, who value learning, who have an improving sense of confidence, who are able to communicate at all levels and who are self and entrepreneurship promoting. In Aberash weaker themes include: adrenaline junkie, enjoys challenges, fear of unknown and shrewd. In Brynbeth weaker themes included: hates failure, bad loser, non-conformist and tenacious. Other weaker shared themes included: passionate, risk-takers, motivated. The entrepreneurs describe themselves differently to the strategic participants, who were asked to direct me to creative, innovative and guarded risk-takers. The research literature contains little empirical evidence concerning the attributes of the corporate entrepreneur. Pinchot's (1985) theoretical assumptions do not translate rigorously within the Trust contexts of Aberash and Brynbeth.

10.2.2 How are they entrepreneurs?
My research revealed five different types of corporate entrepreneurship within Aberash Trust and seven different types of corporate entrepreneurship within Brynbeth. The five types in Aberash were also present in Brynbeth. The different types can be described in terms of 'changes' 'improvements' and 'developments'.

- Changes in who performs a clinical task
- Changes in an aspect of the culture
- Change in staff working structure
- Improvement in administrative processes
- Development of a new post
- Development of a new unit (Brynbeth only)
- Development of a new procedure (Brynbeth only)

During the initial literature review of corporate entrepreneurship, a number of different typologies of corporate entrepreneurship were described and compared. Each of the models partially describes some of the entrepreneurship emerging from Aberash and Brynbeth, but none offer an all encompassing model. Schollhammer's classification system (1982), describes Aberash and Brynbeth's administrative and imitative entrepreneurships, whilst Covin's (1999) typology accounts fully for the various types of entrepreneurship, however as most can be fitted into the one type,
the defining features of the Trusts’ entrepreneurships (change/improvement/development) and constructs (tasks/structure/unit/procedure/culture) are somehow lost.

In both cases of Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, there appeared to be more internally oriented entrepreneurship (i.e. those associated with internal processes, roles, culture) rather than outward looking/externally oriented entrepreneurship (those associated with the patient or new product development).

10.2.3 Why are they entrepreneurs?
The introductory research literature suggests that corporate entrepreneurs are driven by: wanting freedom and access to corporate resources, and to please self, customers and sponsors (Pinchot, 1985, see Figure 2.5). This research has shown that Trust entrepreneurs want to provide patients with the best level of care and want to be respected by the hierarchy (see Figure 9.5). They achieve managerial satisfaction from pleasing patients, achieving targets and pleasing themselves.

The entrepreneurial activities of the Trust entrepreneurs can be described in terms of:

- Internal/external orientation
- Strategic/operational emergence
- Individual/team or organisational involvement

The strategic/operational emergence is driven by what Burgelman (1983) refers to in the Corporate Entrepreneurship literature as Strategic induced behaviour and Autonomous induced behaviour. During the course of my research I came across enforced and empowered strategies of innovation within the Health Care literature, thus linking to Burgelman's (1983) strategic induced and autonomous approaches. My research highlighted that some entrepreneurs (most notably those within Aberash Trust, in the cases of these two Trusts) can be identified by champions, which tends to drive enforced entrepreneurship. More empowered entrepreneurship, appeared to emerge from Brynbeth Trust and this tends to be driven by the entrepreneur/or from the operational level. A problem with Burgelman's model in the public sector context would be that it neglects the dominant presence of 'external' legislation as a
driver of induced strategic behaviour, something the enforced/empowered model accounts for.

10.2.4 Who has supported and/or hindered them?
This research provided some strong themes in terms of those that supported and those that hamper entrepreneurship within Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. The critical role of the 'middle-to-senior manager' as champion is supported (see Figure 5.2) within the interviews of many of the participants. Some significant themes emerged from the interviews in terms of the types of supportive role that these champions provided to Trust entrepreneurs. The champion is: an inspirer, a talent spotter, someone who empowers, a mentor, a protector and someone who is powerful. Most significantly, the champions take on the responsibility for and consequences of risk and failure within NHS entrepreneurship. All the champions described to me were senior members of staff, and often consultants.

Reflecting back to the literature on Corporate Entrepreneurship, champions have been identified as supporting through: reassuring investors, defending business proposals, ensuring appropriate incentives are available, and fighting internal issues (Jones-Evans, 2000). Quinn (1985) also identifies the valuable contribution made by champions in linking top management communications with lower-level employees. The private sector context of the existing literature makes them less transferable to the public sector context, although Jones-Evans' fighting internal issues links to the protector/power themes that have emerged from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. Quinn's idea that champions act as a communications link also fits with the findings that Trust Champions talent spot and drive enforced entrepreneurship. Quinn (1985) and Kanter (1983) highlight the importance for champions in informally encouraging unofficial innovation, again this ties in with my finding that Champions encourage through building increased self-confidence and mentoring. In Figure 5.2 I note the similarities between the 'change agent' the 'mentor' and the 'champion'. Champions from both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts are active mentors, something which is not reported in the Corporate Entrepreneurship literature.

The literature on Corporate Entrepreneurship does not explore the human barriers to entrepreneurship within the private sector, although contributions from Rogers
do position individuals in terms of their rate of adoption of innovations. Those who are laggards could potentially be resistors found in organisations. My research revealed some distinct groups who hindered/ blocked corporate entrepreneurship in both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. The results were concerned with legitimate power. Consultants and senior nurses were a powerful and significant source of resistance, particularly those who were near to retirement age. At the group level, resistance came mainly from groups of nurses, who collectively asserted power.

10.2.5 What organisational conditions have supported/ hindered them?

Chapter 8 explores the espoused and actual strategies and cultures of Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. Aberash is identified as masculine, competitive, power-oriented, closed with a high level of centralised control. Brynbeth is identified as feminine, people-oriented, open, with a more decentralised control. In Figure 5.2 the Entrepreneurial and Prospector strategic modes are suggested to be conducive to intrapreneuring: similar to Aberash competitive, power-orientation and Brynbeth's open decentralised-control.

The Force Field Analysis presented in Figure 9.6 is used as a tool to illustrate the findings from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts. The analysis shows finance, IT (Brynbeth only), time and training as both facilitators and barriers to entrepreneurship within both Trusts. Sickness was a barrier. For Aberash Trust isolation emerged as a facilitator to entrepreneurship, whilst for Brynbeth isolation was a barrier to entrepreneurship.

Reflecting back to the earlier literature reviews (Figure 5.2), flat matrix structures, and high centralisation are identified as facilitators to entrepreneurship. Aberash Trust shows signs of being more centralised than Brynbeth. The need for communication to flow openly and flexible autonomous roles are other facilitators to entrepreneurship. The results from Aberash and Brynbeth present a more simplistic model of money, time, people and for Brynbeth IT.
10.2.6 How, where and when are they learning?

In Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, learning occurs formally/ informally, in work and at work and appears to be continuous and ongoing. Themes on learning are as follows: Figure 9.8 highlights the different ways in which entrepreneurs from Aberash and Brynbeth learn. Findings can be summarised as the following:

Aberash

- Qualified up to Degree Level
- Two have a Masters
- Formal learning by means of specialist courses
- Informal learning on the job, in teams
- Reading (individual-level), integrative working (team/group level) and attending conferences/networks are activities that support intrapreneurial learning
- Working in the private sector, another country, on the nursing bank have provided experiential intrapreneurial experiences

Brynbeth

- Qualified up to RGN
- Two have Degrees, two have Masters and one has a PhD
- Formal learning by means of specialist courses
- Informal learning on the job, in teams and through observation
- Reading (articles/libraries), teamwork, conferences and networks are provide intrapreneurial activities.
- Conversion course, benchmarking other hospitals/countries and living in different countries have provided experiential intrapreneurial opportunities.

The existing literature on intrapreneurial learning has not explored the nature of learning within organisations. In case of Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts not all learning is learning that participants find important to their entrepreneurial activities. Much day-to-day learning consists of learning on the job or in teams or more formally on specialist courses. Entrepreneurial learning occurs through reading, teamwork, conferences and networks. Entrepreneurial learning occurs outside to work through experiencing other countries and cultures.
10.2.7 How are they agents of change and learning?
The corporate entrepreneurs from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts are agents of change because they like change, they dislike stagnation and they actively engage in learning, although they do not necessarily enjoy learning. The significance of the champion has emerged from this study, and champions in both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts acted as mentors and change agents: talent spotting, empowering, mentoring and encouraging. Both of these findings have implications for Human Resource Development. The literature on learning mentors was not explored in preparation for this study, but the literature on corporate entrepreneurship champions does not link the role of championing with the role of mentoring.

10.2.8 How has learning and change supported corporate entrepreneurs?
Learning has been identified as a key enabler for many of the entrepreneurs interviewed. Learning has provided some entrepreneurs with the power and confidence to challenge. Learning has also been used as a technique in overcoming resistance to entrepreneurship within Aberash and most particularly Brynbeth Trusts (as illustrated using Figure 9.7). Learning in many instances would be informal promotion of the benefits of the entrepreneurship or disseminating the results of successful pilots. This finding is not largely documented in the research literature. My initial review on organisational change described resistance to change, but did not highlight the use of learning and education as a means of overcoming resistance to change. A future research agenda should explore this, and it could span other disciplines such as marketing and consumer behaviour.

10.2.9 How are Trusts, and the individuals and teams within, intrapreneuring?
As stated previously, my research has identified: reading (individual-level), integrative working (team/group level) and attending conferences/networks as activities that support intrapreneuring. It has also identified: working in the private sector, another country, on the nursing bank has provided non-Trust related intrapreneuring experiences. Critical Learning Experiences have emerged as having an important role to play in Trust entrepreneurial learning. Critical Learning Experiences (Cope, 2003) and its integrative effects (Kanter, 1988) have been explored in the research literature in relation to start-up entrepreneurship, but up until this research has not been explored within the large organisational context.
10.2.10 What are the implications of the above for training, HRM, and Strategic Policy?

The main implications of the findings from the previous research questions are as follows:

- The findings inform the training and development of current and future entrepreneurs and champions.
- The findings are insightful in terms of the recruitment and remuneration of entrepreneurs and champions (what attributes and characteristics are recruited, and if pay is not as much of an incentive as providing high quality of patient care, how are these individuals incentivised?)
- The findings imply a use for education and learning in overcoming resistance to change/entrepreneurship.

The findings provide evidence of the different strategic and cultural directions of both Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts and how these have driven different forms of entrepreneurship. These provide indications at to the cultural and strategic levers required for promoting different forms of entrepreneurship in different areas. A power-oriented strategy and a competitive culture driving enforced entrepreneurship that possibly emerges within close proximity to the main acute, whilst a people-oriented strategy and an open culture encourages empowered entrepreneurship that is more decentralised within the community hospitals.

10.2.11 What is the best way to tell the story of this research?

As I progressed through my PhD I began to realise that my PhD experience was, as Pinn (2001:185) describes, a ‘messy, alive, risky and uncertain process’. Due to this experience, and the philosophical bounds within which I am positioned, I have deliberately tried to capture the reality of my PhD experience and my logic-in-use (Kaplan, 1964) through the organisation of my thesis and the style in which I have written it. I wanted to include my own personal experiences and journey of self-development that influenced and was influenced by the research. I wanted to reflect upon and analyse the critical moments that I experienced within my research. There are those that occurred in the background and were significant in the development of myself, my project and my worldview (meta-framework) yet are not traditionally
included in the final write-up. I decided to tell the story of my research through a narrative ethnography, in a style similar to that of Ellis and Bochner’s (2001) book chapter.

There is a seeming tension that is created when attempting to write an autoethnographic PhD thesis, reconstructing the logic of the self and the culture researched, and providing a meta-narrative of the PhD journey. This tension was made explicit to me through the Viva process, where the Internal Examiner raised an interesting question about the nature of the thesis. Is the thesis about the research or the doing of it? Is the thesis not a ‘report’ of the process and not the process itself?

There is certainly a conflict between the authentic reporting of logic-in use (Kaplan, 1964) and the thesis as a ‘polished’ report of the PhD process, an autoethnographic thesis may indeed be an oxymoron. Quintessentially a thesis is a very necessary yet positivistic way of reporting upon the findings of a large piece of research. Is the traditional view of a thesis an appropriate means of presenting research whose methodologies are grounded within nominalism? This research suggests that there is a definite conflict between the two, particularly with more contemporary approaches such as autoethnography.

10.3 Quality of Research

Having presented my conclusions, it is important to consider the quality of my research. Autoethnography is considered on the basis that its accounts are pluralist and persuasive narratives, that there is a sense of transferability from the narrative and that the accounts are written in a way that could support pragmatic use (Reissman, 2002). Silverman’s (2005:222) key questions were introduced in Chapter I as criteria for evaluating research and I will work through these in the context of this narrative.

My methods are appropriate to the nature of the question being asked, in that I am exploring intraprelearning using techniques from social constructivism. I have been very careful to include my experiences and those of the participants when co-constructing this autoethnography. I do not privilege my own voice over the voices
of other actors, but weave them together to provide an integrated, yet necessarily partial, story of intraprelearning.

Through my three reviews of the inter- and intra-relations between corporate entrepreneurship, organisational learning and organisational change, I have described, unpicked and explored many of the key contributions within this vast body of literature, making connections, identifying gaps and identifying areas for future research.

I have provided clear accounts of the criteria used for the selection of the two cases and given a personal and inside account of the realities of the complexities, and particularly the ethical issues, associated with data collection and analysis in this context. The appendices, and particularly 1 to 4, demonstrate my commitment to rigorous and systematic data collection and record keeping.

Drawing upon the literature reviews, and the data presented in chapters eight and nine, I compare and contrast emerging themes, highlighting similarities and particularly the exceptions/contradictions. I have employed and experimented with the various models to help provide alternative perspectives and insights into the complex activities associated with intraprelearning within these two Trusts.

10.4 Limitations
Selecting only two cases might be considered a limitation. However, I deliberately chose a strategy of depth over breadth in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities of intraprelearning – a new subject area generally, and particularly within the NHS. To enable further substantive research to be developed, I felt that this was the most appropriate foundation upon which to build.

Selecting two organisations has enabled me to adopt a pluralist perspective and the opportunity to explore this subject through multiple lenses. However, there is further scope to extend this research agenda to include other, possibly different, Trusts and thus generate new findings.
Related to this, a further limitation could be the lack of generalisability, yet this may be the wrong criterion with which to evaluate this study. I argue that the insights I provide here might be transferable to other similar contexts and thus help us begin to understand intrapreneurship within other Trusts. However, it is important to note the Welsh context, and obviously Scotland and England both have different structures, relationships and strategies that could profoundly influence intrapreneurship in these contexts. Further research is needed here.

In terms of the corporate entrepreneurs, I was guided to these individuals by strategic others within the two Trusts. This provides a strategically-centric view of who the corporate entrepreneurs might be and what they might do, and might be shaped by different strategic agendas, and potential conflict between espoused and personal perspectives. Shifting the focus to another lens, such as a bottom-up or side-on view, could provide us with a different set of individuals, themes, and what it is to be entrepreneurial.

Another limitation is my sole involvement as the researcher, and how as an individual my capacity and capability to collect and analyse the data might fluctuate, and is influenced by my workload and emotions (Sambrook, Stewart & Roberts 2005).

This thesis is based upon one moment of time within the NHS: it is a snapshot of social constructions, perspectives, attitudes and characteristics. Understanding such moments is valuable towards developing a better understanding of the dynamic and complex 'behaviour' of organisations and the people that bring them to life. This research has provided only a partial view of NHS intrapreneurship through the constructions of those that participated. In order to reach a point of shared meaning of entrepreneurship further constructions should be explored and understood, within the NHS and other private and public sector contexts.

10.5 Contributions
I believe I make four key contributions: theoretical, methodological empirical, and practical.
10.5.1 In terms of the theoretical contributions, I propose two models:

Types and forms of Corporate Entrepreneurship: this model is the result of an in-depth review of the research literature and it provides an overview of the many overlapping labels used within the literature and how they fit into the organisational context. This model provides a strong foundation for further theoretical and empirical research within the fields.

Inside-Outside model of Intraprelearning: this set of two models is an attempt to theorise the possible relationships and synergies between the constructs of organisational learning (individual/ team/ organisational), corporate entrepreneurship (induced/ autonomous) and organisational change (internal/ external). One model has an organisational learning centre/ focus and the other is an inside-outside version with corporate entrepreneurship as its central focus. Key contributions from the three fields have been mapped onto the set of two models.

10.5.2 This thesis contributes to the advancement in the structuring of methodology

The autoethnographic approach to a research project is by no means a new way of writing, but it is a niche within management research. I feel that through reading my autoethnography, research students to follow may be empowered through connections they make between my previous and their on-going experiences. I hope that this narrative will provide such students with an informative and realistic account of this type of research, as it discusses the difficulties of writing an autoethnographic thesis. The new contribution in terms of the methodological approach lies in the combined use of Critical Moment descriptions and a set of calendar overviews (A1-A4) to describe and illustrate the process of the method and the methodology. Enriching the autoethnographic meta-narrative with a visual chronology of the sequences and textual descriptions of the Critical Learning Moments that I experienced provides a new, meaningful and open way of telling the research story.

10.5.3 This research has contributed to new empirical knowledge across multidisciplines, the key contributions are as follows:

The final empirical model of Inside-Outside Intraprelearning that was presented in this thesis provides a useful presentation of some of the complex and interrelated
relationships within. The model shows the detail of three constructs: the levels (Organisational/Operational) of learning, the formality of entrepreneurship (enforced/empowered) and the orientation of change (internal/external). The critical role of the Champion is symbolised, connecting each of these constructs and enabling the flow from the internal to the external, from the operational to the organisational and from the enforced to the empowered (and vice versa). The model accounts for dynamics within an organisation that can be changed, or lead to change: strategy, structure, culture, human resources and it also accounts for those external forces that can drive change at the European, UK-wide and regional levels.

A significant finding of this research is the critical role of the Trust Champion in supporting the entrepreneur. In particular, the champion empowers the entrepreneur through improving his or her self-confidence, shelters the entrepreneur through taking the blame for failure and risks, and supports the entrepreneur in turning-around 'blockers' and resistors.

A strength of this research is concerning its enrichment of our understanding of intrapreneurial and critical learning experiences in Trust (corporate) entrepreneurship. This research has revealed that entrepreneurial learning activities within the two Trusts are different from general learning activities and include: reading articles, teamwork, attending conferences and networks. 'Other' learning activities range from learning on the job, to attending specialist courses. Critical Learning Experiences have been explored within the start-up literature, but have not been explored within a corporate/trust entrepreneurship context. This research suggests that CLEs may be less contextual and are a key enabler to entrepreneurship within the two Trusts. CLEs enable entrepreneurial vision and an integrative world view. Learning activates other than those in or related to working in the Trusts can promote CLEs, such as working in the private sector, experiencing other cultures and working on home projects/hobbies.

I recommend that it would be beneficial to both theory and practice to explore this finding further, so as to try to better understand the role of Critical Learning Experiences. If we can enrich our understanding of CLEs, we can seek ways of
unlocking and developing them through training and development programmes, thus enabling more people to realise their entrepreneurial potential.

This thesis has explored the characteristics of the Trust entrepreneur and has determined some key characteristics that support entrepreneurship within the context of the NHS Trust, including: determination, low-to-improving confidence, communicates at all levels, active reflector, enthusiastic, promoter and intuitive. It also revealed a gap between the strategic and entrepreneurial lenses of what characteristics constitute entrepreneurship. I recommend that further empirical research should explore the dynamics of these two different lenses. Such work could help to inform HRM and HRD practice and strategic policy, in terms of the recruitment of entrepreneurs and their training and development.

Through my narrative of this research and my exploration of my personal research experiences, I have observed parallels between the experiences of the Trust entrepreneur, and my experiences as an 'academic entrepreneur'. This suggests that there may be 'generic' themes that are transferable between different new knowledge creation activities regardless of their context or focus. This preliminary finding should be explored through more specifically targeted research.

Enforced and empowered entrepreneurship are not new findings in themselves as they have been mentioned within the research literature before (other labels for these types of entrepreneurship include autonomous and induced strategic behaviour, Burgleman, 1983).

10.5.4 The insight this thesis contributes to the practice of HRD, HRM, Management, Strategy and Education

These findings intertwined with some other emerging themes concerning the low-confidence levels of many of the Trust entrepreneurs and the perceived power inequity present in the Trusts (nurses feeling that consultants have more power, nurses feeling that they have little) contribute to both the theory and practice of managing change within the Health Care context. It would be interesting to learn whether low confidence is a characteristic unique to those entrepreneurs working in a health care context. This finding also has implications in terms of HRD and Leadership
Development Strategy in the NHS. How can leaders be better developed to support entrepreneurs?

My research has revealed that in the case of Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, a power-oriented culture appears to drive enforced entrepreneurship, whilst a people-centred culture engenders empowered entrepreneurship. Interestingly, both Trusts are effective at entrepreneurship, but the approaches are distinctly different.

If policy-makers are aware of what types of cultures drive or promote what type of entrepreneurship it could inform the strategic direction that is set and also it could enable the Trust or other organisation to target specific types of organisation. It would make interesting research to explore the characteristics of empowered versus enforced entrepreneurship and examine the financial and non-financial rewards of each.

This research has significant implications for the development of managers, entrepreneurs and champions:

- Developing courses that support entrepreneurs in realising their potential
- Developing the ‘supportive’ capability of champions
- Enabling entrepreneurs to actively reflect upon experiential learning and critical learning moments
- Implementing HR and Leadership and Development policy that promotes empowered and enforced entrepreneurship
- Driving cultures that are conducive to empowered and enforced entrepreneurship
- Increasing the self-confidence of Trust entrepreneurs through training and development and support, and enabling autonomy and decision-making through working towards breaking-down the historical power relationships with the sector.

This project has provided a range of new contributions to knowledge within a number of fields including HRD, Corporate Entrepreneurship and Organisational
Behaviour. It has contributed insight into academic theory and I hope that it will inform practice as well.

10.6 Conclusion
This chapter has attempted to draw together the research, summarising how it has addressed the original research question and the contributions it makes to theory and practice. I have summarised who the corporate entrepreneurs are from Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, and identified the dominance of nursing within my results. I have described how they are generally involved in making changes, improvements and new developments. I have explained the drive/focus motivating the entrepreneurs as a desire for an improvement in the quality of patient care. The significant role of the champion has been highlighted and confirms existing literature. Five key supportive Champion behaviours: talent spotting, empowering, mentoring, motivating and power have been identified which enriches the existing literature base. Links between the role of mentor, change agent and champion have been made and partially supported through this initial empirical exploration. Other facilitators and inhibitors have been identified enriching the existing field: Finance, Time, Training, IT, Location and Sickness.

I have revealed that general learning occurs formally and informally, internally and externally to the Trust. These findings agree with the existing literature and emphasise the value of previous contributions to the literature such as Sambrook's (2003) learning 'in' and 'at' work. My research has made a distinction between learning that supports entrepreneurship and suggests that not all learning is entrepreneurial learning: forms of entrepreneurial learning includes reading articles, group/team work, conferences and networks. Entrepreneurial learning appears to occur away from Health work: experiencing different sectors, cultures and home-based projects.

Trust entrepreneurs dislike stagnation, like change, are active learners but do not necessarily enjoy learning. I highlight the significance of the Critical Learning Experience for unlocking an integrative world view.
In terms of the case studies of Aberash and Brynbeth Trusts, I identify their clearly different cultures and strategic orientations, but emphasise how both are successful at entrepreneurship. I introduce empowered and enforced entrepreneurship and demonstrate how Aberash drives enforced entrepreneurship, whilst Brynbeth encourages empowered entrepreneurship. I suggest that their cultures (Power versus People, Competitive versus Open) are the levers for managing these forms of entrepreneurship. I propose that I make several contributions to knowledge: theoretical, empirical, methodological and practical and describe my reasons.

There is of course no 'concrete' end to this research, but this thesis does have to have an end point. Following my Viva Voce in May 2007 and the invaluable advice I received from both my internal and external examiners I have revisited my thesis and made alterations and corrections. The Viva experience itself and the learning generated from it has given me a new sense of perspective on my research which I hope to address through future publications. I will also be disseminating my findings and feeding them back into the Trusts who so kindly opened their doors to me, and to the entrepreneurs who shared their experiences with me.
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**Appendices**

1. An overview of my research experience and processes 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Best friend dropped out of PhD**
- **Critical moment**
- **Meeting with Supervisor 1**
- **Introduction**
- **Informal meeting with Supervisor 2**

*Sections of the schedule are labeled with comments.*
An overview of my research experience and processes 2004
An overview of my research experience and processes 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with SWITD Medical Lead</td>
<td>Interview with Intellectual Property Manager</td>
<td>Supporting with teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Begin transcribing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Deputy Director of Nursing</td>
<td>Interview with General Manager of Surgery</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Modernisation</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: AB</td>
<td>Supporting with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with CEO, Team Leader: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Paper for ANRO, invited to attend</td>
<td>Interview with Head of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Teaching NHS Trust staff on Leadership, Innovation and change module: Critical Moment</td>
<td>Critical Moment: Praise, group feedback, ideas for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4 An overview of my research experience and processes 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical Review: Anthropology and the organization of the past

Data Analysis
5 Getting in to Llanlyn NHS Trust.
Correspondence from my supervisor to her contact

S.A.Sambrook
To:

Cc: Roberts, Clair (abpc56@bangor.ac.uk)
Subject: Research opportunity

Dear [Name],

I hope you are well. As you will have seen from my previous message, I am delighted that we have recently received final approval for the new MSc - so thanks for all your help with that!

I now have another request! I am supervising a PhD student, Clair Roberts, who is exploring creativity, innovation and organisational learning in the NHS. To gather her empirical data, Clair is seeking access to NHS Trusts and I wondered if the [Name] might be interested in participating in this research. Clair would be investigating, for example, what types of creativity and innovation are occurring, where, and by whom, and hopes to identify supporting as well as inhibiting factors to help the Trust enhance its effectiveness in this important area. She would also examine the learning associated with this, such as formal or informal activities to support creativity and innovation. Clair's research could encompass various professions and areas within the Trust, and particularly nurses, which is why I am contacting you. If you are initially interested, I will ask Clair to send you a proposal and then perhaps we could meet to discuss how we might take this forward (e.g. would this require LREC approval?).

However, if you think it might be more appropriate to contact someone else, for example, the Director of HR, or the Training and Development Manager, then could you please provide their contact details.

Thanks, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sally
--
Dr Sally Sambrook
Programme Leader,
MSc Health & Social Care Leadership
BSc (Hons) Health Studies (Generic)
School of Nursing, Midwifery & Health Studies
University of Wales Bangor
My name is Clair Roberts, and I am in the process of doing PhD research at the University of Wales, Bangor.

My PhD is a joint collaboration between the School for Business and Regional Development and the School of Nursing, Midwifery & Health Studies, and my research will explore creativity, innovation and learning within NHS Trusts. The full title of my project is ‘An investigation of workplace changes in response to the European Working Time Directive in Welsh Trust Hospitals: How have Trust employees found new and better ways of working (through being creative and innovative) and what is the role of learning within this creative and innovative process?’

My research hopes to provide us (the Trusts involved, their communities and academia) with a greater understanding about the context and nature of creativity, innovation and learning within NHS Trusts. In other words, the research will attempt to identify who are the employees who have found different of new better ways of working more efficiently and effectively within each Trust. Further, secondary questions such as: Are these employees’ individuals, or teams? Why are these employees successful at this? What resources have supported them in this process and behaviour? How does learning support/ hinder employees working in new/different ways that are more efficient and effective? How can we use learning to develop and encourage this throughout the Trust?

I hope to address all of these research questions by ‘tracing’ major drivers of change that have recently affected NHS Trusts, and in particular their employees. I will begin by identifying some appropriate changes to follow, such as the European Working Time Directive, with the support from key senior leads within each of the Trusts (from Modernisation, Clinical Governance and HR, for example). I will then trace the impact of these changes from the top (such as new policies and guideline) down through to the bottom of the Trust. This type of study is called snowballing, and it involves finding things out as I’m going along.
16 November 2004

Ms Clair Roberts (Postgraduate)
School for Business and regional Development
University of Wales, Bangor
Hen Coleg
College Road
Bangor
Gwynedd
LL57 2DG

Dear Clair

Re: PhD in Business, University of Wales, Bangor

Thank you for your letter to the Executive Nurse, providing an outline of your proposed study. Mrs. is supportive of you undertaking your research within the NHS Trust and passed your letter on to me as we had previously met and discussed your research ideas and since then other issues via email regarding LREC approval, an honorary contract and access to staff.

If there is any help that I can provide with regard to contacts please do let me know. Meanvery success with your studies and look forward to hearing about your findings as you progress with your study.

Yours sincerely

Assistant Director of Nursing

Cc | Executive Nurse
The handout issued to Brynbeth NHS Trust R&D panel

Diagram of Proposed Data Collection

Please note the terms entrepreneurial, creative/innovative are used interchangeable to describe employees who have found new and better ways of working. These may be formal/official, informal/unofficial and may involve a change in technology, product, process or practice.

**Step 1**
Begin reviewing internal documents relating to EWTD, creativity, innovation & learning

Individual meetings held with key senior leads from Modernisation, Clinical Governance, R&D, HR, Training and Nursing to identify key groups within the Trust that have been affected by Working Time Directive. Meetings(s) guide me to employees who have found new & better ways of working (creative/innovative (entrepreneurial) employees) & pockets of creativity and innovation.

**Example outcome of Meeting:** 4 key groups were identified by senior leads: Doctors, Radiographers, High dependency care unit, Physiotherapists. Names of specific ‘entrepreneurial’ employees have been given to me and a three other ventures are highlighted that are unrelated to the EWTD, but may help my research.

**Step 2**
All leads from step 1 are followed up. Creative and innovate employees are contacted as a direct outcome of step 1. Others are contacted who have been identified by word-of-mouth referrals, or from targeted poster advertising. Up to 20 employees are invited to participate in a 1-hour interview, to discuss their entrepreneurial and learning behaviours.

**Step 3**
Any further entrepreneurial employees identified by participants in the initial interviews (in step 2), will be invited to participate in an interview (maximum of 20 employees interviewed in step 1+2).

Participants narrowed down to 5— who are asked to show their new/better way of working. Depending on complexity could take ½ an hour (show and tell) or up to 2 weeks (shadowing).

**Step 4**
From the interviews, 5 participants will be invited to demonstrate their entrepreneurial better way of working. Either shorter ‘show & tell’ or longer shadowing demonstrations.
The proposed research project will be undertaken by Clair Roberts from the University of Wales, Bangor. It will form the basis for her doctoral programme, which is run conjointly by the School of Nursing, Midwifery & Health Studies and the School for Business and Regional Development. Clair’s supervisor, Dr Sally Sambrook is from the School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Studies at the University of Wales, Bangor.

What are Corporate Entrepreneuring and Organisational Learning, and how could they benefit the NHS?

- Over the past two decades the benefits of harnessing and developing employee creativity, innovativeness and learning in the workplace have been increasingly documented. More specifically, research fields have developed that are dedicated to exploring the processes and benefits of creativity and innovation within larger organisations (referred to as Corporate Entrepreneuring or CE) and the nature of learning within and by organisations (referred to as Organisational Learning or OL). Many practitioners and researchers see the gains of fostering CE and OL ideologies as solutions to problems associated with the post-millennium organisational environment, such as continual changes and improvements in technology, competition growing on an international level and changing employee attitudes and motivations.

- Whilst smaller businesses are often more able to act and react quickly, innovate and take risks, in larger organisations these characteristics can slowly erode under their sheer weight of size, levels of bureaucracy, hierarchical structures and complex processes (Thomberry 2001). The NHS is a prime example of how increased size and complexity can lead to organisational staleness. The NHS Plan (DH 2000) frequently refers to the NHS being a ‘1940’s operating system in a 21-century world’.

- In order to remain competitive, organisations need to continually anticipate and adapt to their changing external environment. The capability of an organisation to learn faster or ‘better’ than its competitors is believed by many strategists to be the key to long-term business success (Collis, 1994; Grant 1996; Birdhistle 2003), and is the essence of OL. In support of this The NHS Plan recognises the vital role learning plays in supporting change and improvement.

Examples of support for encouraging CE and OL can already be found within today’s NHS. The Modernisation Agency provides many. Set up ‘to support the NHS and its partner organisations in the task of modernising services and improving experiences and outcomes for patients’ 1, to-date the Modernisation Agency has focussed on four issues: improving access, increasing local support, raising standards of care, and capturing and sharing knowledge widely. In order to tackle these and future issues the Modernisation Agency has four task areas; Leadership, Workforce, Clinical Governance, Innovation and Knowledge and Technology.

---

1 Taken from http://www.modern.nhs.uk in the ‘about us’ section. Last accessed 16/09/04
Underpinning the agency are the 3R's 'renewal, redesign and respect' and 5 'simple' rules; 'See things through the patient's eyes, find a better way of doing things, look at the whole picture, give front line staff the time and the tools to tackle the problems, take small steps as well as big leaps.' Such taskforces, frameworks and rules suggest the dawning of a new NHS era. One in which change is encouraged and supported through policies and task teams, and the importance of harnessing creative and innovative potentials from employees is recognised.

Much has been written on creativity and innovation within the NHS. However, the role that employee learning plays within this has largely been neglected. Research literature has explored how innovation and knowledge are spread and disseminated throughout NHS organisations, but the actual process of employee learning when finding better ways of working has not been explored. If we could understand more about the context of and relationship between the effective learning, creativity and innovation currently generated from Trust employees, then we could begin to appreciate how to cultivate the creative and innovative potential of all Trust employees; from top-down, to bottom-up. Cultivating and nurturing the innovative and learning potentials of existing employees could provide the Trust with invaluable access to developing unique processes and procedures that in turn can enrich the working environment for employees and, ultimately, enhance patient care.

**How would each Trust benefit from supporting this research project?**

To date, no research has been conducted in either private or public sector organisations that explores how learning processes may support and encourage individual employees and teams in realising their creative and innovative potentials. Likewise, no research has been conducted that explores how creative and innovative behaviour may support teams of, and individual employees in optimising their learning. If we could understand more about the context of and relationship between the effective learning, creativity and innovation currently generated from Trust employees, such as those within North Wales Trusts then we could begin to appreciate how to cultivate the innovative potential of all Trust employees; from top-down, to bottom-up.

In particular the research conducted will:

- Identify a key driver of change (Working Time Directive) that has had a (restrictive) impact on employee ways of working
- Identify how formal strategic policies have been changed or developed to support the key driver of change (WTD)
- Identify the formal procedures that have been developed and implemented throughout the Trust to support the WTD
- Identify which groups of employees have been significantly affected by the WTD (This could be determined by role, geographic location, status)
- Identify any creative or innovative behaviour that has emerged from these particular groups. (Which employees have found new/different better ways of working more efficiently and effectively as a result of the WTD?)
- Identify what has supported this creative and innovative behaviour and why
- Identify what may have hindered it and why.
- Explore the learning processes that have helped support these individuals/teams throughout this creative and innovative process

The proposed research will identify 'what', 'where', 'why' and 'how' creativity and innovation is actually working (or not) within each North Wales Trust, and by whom, and identify 'what type' of learning supports this. This objective investigation of creativity, innovation and learning within the Trusts will highlight its strengths and weaknesses, and will also provide an insight into how its employees have successfully learned as an outcome of, or as a requirement for, innovative and creative behaviour. The benefits of such an objective investigation are significant in supporting not only more effective formal training and development of Trust employees, but in supporting and developing a culture whereby creativity and innovation can flourish, supported by both formal and informal learning. Cultivating and nurturing the innovative and learning potential of existing Trust employees.
could provide the Trust with invaluable access to developing unique processes, procedures and technologies and subsequently achieving ‘competitive advantages’ in a public sector organisation that is operating in an area that is increasingly mirroring the competitive environment of a private sector market arena. This, in turn, enriches the working environment for employees and, ultimately, enhances patient care.

Methodology
This project will be approached from a social constructivist perspective. As a consequence of this data will be collected and analysed using qualitative methods. This approach has been specifically chosen to compliment the researchers philosophical background and the nature and situational context of the research. It is hoped that through the measures outlined below (see diagram), the researcher will be able to develop a deep understanding of employee creativity, innovation and learning through exploring and analysing the many different experiences and stories of employees who have found better ways of working within Welsh NHS Trusts, and observing their behaviour. The diagram below shows the expected progression of the research, which is described on page 4 of this proposal. (*DIAGRAM AS A8*)

From the initial meetings held with senior leads from various key departments within the Trust, I hope to identify how strategy has been changed to deal the WTD (I will also look at another key driver of change, if the Trust wishes). Also, as an outcome of these meetings, I hope to identify which groups of employees, the senior leads believe have been affected the most by the WTD (this could be role specific, based on proximity to the main acute hospital etc). From reviewing internal documentation, I also hope to identify the formal procedures that have been implemented at operational levels as a result of the WTD.

Once senior leads have identified specific groups (that have been affected by the WTD), I will then be able to advertise my research to them. This could be done through different communication methods including:
- E-mail
- Posters
- Word of mouth referrals

These employees will be invited to participate in my research and will be provided with a participant information sheet, along with a consent sheet to sign. Interviews will last for up to an hour, and any further names that emerge as an outcome of these interviews, will be followed up, and further invitations to participate will be issued (a method of research called snowballing).

Finally, I will focus my research on five cases. I will invite these five participants to either 'show and tell' their better way of working to me ask if I can shadow them for up to two weeks. This will help me to understand in much greater depth how and why this new way of working is better. It may also help me pick up on any learning activities/ processes that the employee has experienced, but perhaps they are not aware of, and therefore not been able to tell me about in the interview. I aim to analyse and evaluate my data, throughout the 6-month data collection period, so any interesting findings can be followed up immediately, whilst still on-site.

Ethical Issues (Data Collection and Analysis)
- This research excludes employees that are not on the Trust payroll (this does not mean that those who are not on the payroll are not of interest within this subject area, it is merely a measure to keep this research a manageable size)
- My research requires the involvement of employees only, and does not require the involvement of patients or other members of the public.
- As the researcher I will not have any direct interaction with patients in unrestricted areas during the course of my study.
I will not observe an 'employee at work' if the act of observation means that I will be interacting with vulnerable patients. In these instances I will invite the employee to attend a more in-depth interview, instead of observing their behaviour.

Consent will be obtained in writing from all participating employees. Consent forms will be bilingual (Welsh and English) and participants will be asked to sign three copies (one to be kept, one for the researcher, and one for the Trust - if they require a copy).

The participant will be sent (either through e-mail or internal post) an invitation and associated consent form two weeks prior to the interview sessions. The signed forms will either be collected, (or re-issued if participants have forgotten to bring their copies with them) on arriving at the initial interview. They will be left to read the form and offered an opportunity to ask any questions. If they are happy with everything, they will be invited to sign 3 copies of the consent form (if this has not already been done) and given a copy for their own records.

All transcripts will be anonymous (participants will be offered the opportunity to pick their anonymous name), and any direct quotations from participants may be published in either the report or the PhD thesis, but the participant’s anonymity will be strictly retained. These quotes will be kept strictly anonymous, if requested so by the participant. This code of privacy will be offered to each participant at the beginning of his or her communications with the researcher.

All data will be held on a password-protected home computer. Interviews will be recorded digitally on a Dictaphone. This interview will be stored immediately onto the home computer using a USB connection, and will be erased from the Dictaphone.

Any paper information relating to the study (any notes taken during interviews, any notes taken during observations) will be stored in a locked, fixed draw at the home of the researcher (myself). Once the PhD study is complete all paper notes will be shredded and bagged for recycling.

Once a session (1 day) of interviews has been completed, the electronic Dictaphone recordings will be downloaded immediately onto my home PC and will be deleted from the Dictaphone. Once the PhD study is complete all recordings will be deleted from the PC.

Professional advice has been sought with regards to the installation of encryption and other secure facilities onto my PC. The IT department at the School for Business and Regional Development at the University of Wales, Bangor will be ensuring that my PC is made as secure as possible.

All the electronic data collected at the interview stages, will be stored on a home PC. Each Trust will be allocated with an alias colour, 'Red', 'Blue' or 'Black' (these have been listed in no particular order). Data collected for each Trust will be saved within the appropriate 'Red', 'Blue' or 'Black' folder. Only my supervisor and I will know which folder represents which Trust. This will ensure that the data collected from each Trust cannot be attributed to any Trust in particular.

At the interview stage, the participants will be allocated an alias name, and either associated with the colour Blue, Red or Black depending on the Trust s/he is from.

Trust organisations will not be named if any one of the Trusts requests anonymity. Care will be taken when describing the geographical and demographical data surrounding each Trust, that it does not reveal the Trust's identity (i.e. it is not unique to that particular Welsh Trust)

It is emphasised that this research project does not seek to describe in full detail the 'end product' innovation which is the outcome of an employee’s creative and innovative behaviour. More specifically, it intends to analyse the creative and innovative behaviour (or process) itself (for example, how was the innovative idea initiated and taken forward within the Trust). Furthermore, it intends to look at the creative and innovative process in relation to any learning that has assisted the employee during this innovative period. It is therefore believed that Intellectual Property will not be an issue. However, if as an outcome of the research, an innovative practice, procedure or process emerges, which may be of financial asset to the Trust, then the researcher will advise the participant to contact his/her R&D department in order to protect the innovation, and the interest of the Trust.

Reporting the Results
The results and analysis of this research will be drawn up in three formats

A detailed PhD thesis
From this journal articles may be published, and conference papers may be presented (all strictly anonymous).

- An anonymous report exploring all of the Trusts will be drawn up for all of the participating Trusts.
- A confidential report will be drawn up for each Trust focusing on the results specific to each Trust.
An investigation of workplace changes in response to the European Working Time Directive in Welsh Trust Hospitals: How have Trust employees found new and better ways of working (through being creative and innovative) and what is the role of learning within this creative and innovative process?

My research will take place within the three North Wales Trusts. The primary aim of my research is to learn more about the relationship between employee learning and creative/innovative (or entrepreneurial) behaviour. The potential scope of my project is extremely large, as there is so much creative and innovative behaviour occurring throughout each trust. To make my project more manageable (especially since I have only six months in which to collect my data) I have decided to explore the creative and innovative behaviour that has emerged as an outcome of a large external driver of change. The driver I have selected is the European Working Time Directive (EWTD).

Using the EWTD as a driver and guide to pockets of creative and innovative activity, I hope to identify and interview creative and innovative employees so I can learn more about how the role of learning may help (and hinder) this process. Even though the EWTD is a guide to focus and help manage my project, I will also be interested to hear about any other examples of creative and innovative behaviour, particularly if they help me to understand more about the role that learning plays.

I do not want to locate ALL creative and innovative employees! I seek a number of examples, so I can explore in-depth the relationship between learning and creativity and innovation. Examples of the questions I will be addressing in my research are:

- What formal and informal training has supported the ‘entrepreneurial’ employee?
- How has the entrepreneurial employee’s learning developed with the creative/innovative process?
- What has supported the entrepreneurial employee?
- What has hindered him/her/them?
- How can we realise the creative and innovative potentials of more Trust employees through cultivating their learning?

The ultimate goal of this research is to provide recommendations and a framework which can be used and developed by the Trust to help realise the creative and innovative potential of its employees.

This research has significant implications for many key areas within NHS Trusts including Human Resourcing, Clinical Governance, Modernisation, Training and Research and Development. Realising the innovative and learning potentials of employees could also provide the Trust with invaluable access to developing processes, procedures and services. Such access could enrich the organisation, its employees and ultimately lead to enhanced patient care.
An Invitation to Participate into Research (for Strategic Participants)

Version 3 Step 1 interviews 22/12/2004

An Invitation to Participate into Research

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please contact myself, Clair Roberts (see contact details at the bottom of this form) if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part.

Thank you for reading this

Title

An investigation of workplace changes in Welsh Trust Hospitals: How have Trust employees found new and better ways of working (through being creative and innovative) and what is the role of learning within this creative and innovative process?

- My research will take place within the three North Wales Trusts.
- The primary aim of my research is to learn more about the relationship between employee learning and creative/innovative (or entrepreneurial) behaviour.

The potential scope of my project is extremely large, as there is so much creative and innovative behaviour occurring throughout each trust. To make my project more manageable (especially since I have only six months in which to collect my data) I have decided to explore the creative and innovative behaviour that has emerged as an outcome of a large external driver of change. The driver I have selected is the European Working Time Directive (EWTD)

Using the EWTD as a driver or guide to pockets of creative and innovative activity, I hope to identify and interview creative and innovative employees so I can learn more about how the role of learning may help (and hinder) this process.

Even though the EWTD is a guide to focus and help manage my project, I will also be interested to hear about any other examples of creative and innovative behaviour, particularly if they help me to understand more about the role that learning plays. I do not want to locate ALL creative and innovative employees! I seek a number of examples, so I can explore in-depth the relationship between learning and creativity and innovation.

Why have I been invited to take part?
You have been invited to participate in this study, as you have I have been recommended to interview you during the Internal Review Panel R&D process.

What will happen to me if I take part?
If you take part in this research I will invite you to attend an either a group interview or an individual interview, depending on your preference and availability. This interview will be held at a time and place convenient to you, and last for up to one hour.

The purpose of this interview will be to learn more about the following:
Who (individuals/ groups) have been affected by the WTD, and in what way?
Who (individuals/ groups) are being creative and innovative within the Trust?
Who (individuals/ groups) have found new and better ways of performing tasks/ their job?
(I will focus on those that have been affected also by the WTD, but I am open to hearing about other unrelated creative and innovative individuals)

The interviews will be recorded using a digital Dictaphone, and will be downloaded onto my computer until the end of the project.

Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?
All information that is collected about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential. Any information about you will have your name and address removed so that you cannot be recognised from it, and all interview recordings will be given a false name.

What will happen to the results of the research study?
The results of this study will be used as part of a doctoral thesis for the Business School at the University of Wales, Bangor. Also a report will be compiled for the Trust, which participants and the public will have access to.

Who is organising and funding the research?
The research is funded by the University of Wales, Bangor and is a joint collaboration between two academic departments; The School for Business and Regional Development and the School of Nursing Midwifery and Health Studies.

Who has reviewed the study?
The North Wales Central Research Ethical Committee has reviewed this study.

Contact for Further Information
For further information, please do not hesitate to contact myself, Clair Roberts on 01248 354930, or 07838 136429 or e-mail abpc56@bangor.ac.uk.

Thank you for your time
Clair Roberts BA(Hons)
PhD researcher,
University of Wales, Bangor

Supported by a joint collaboration between the School for Business and Regional Development and the School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Studies at the
Title of Project

'An investigation of workplace changes in response to the European Working Time Directive in Welsh Trust Hospitals: How have Trust employees found new and better ways of working (through being creative and innovative) and what is the role of learning within this creative and innovative process?'

Name of Researcher: Miss Clair Roberts

Please initial box

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet dated ......................... (version ............ ) for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my interview will be strictly confidential, and I will remain anonymous throughout the study.

3. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason, without my employment or legal rights being affected.

4. I agree to take part in the above study.

Name of Employee

________________________

Signature

Researcher

________________________

Signature

1 for participating employee; 1 for researcher
EMPLOYEES!*  

Have you found a new & better way of doing some aspect of your work in the last 6 months?  

If the answer is YES! Then I would like to hear about it - no matter how unimportant you feel it is!  

It can be anything!  

If you would like to tell me about this new way of working, and participate in my research into 'Creativity, Innovation and Learning within NHS Trusts'  

Please get in touch with me...........  

Just rip off one of the tags below, and contact me using the details shown!  

Look forward to hearing from you  

Clair Roberts  

School for Business & Regional Development-University of Wales, Bangor
An Invitation to Participate into Research (for Corporate Entrepreneurs)

Version 3.1 Step 2 interviews

An Invitation to Participate into Research

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please contact myself, Clair Roberts (see contact details at the bottom of this form) if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part.

Thank you for reading this

Title

An investigation of workplace changes: How have Trust employees found new and better ways of working (through being creative and innovative) and what is the role of learning within this creative and innovative process?

- This research will focus on individuals and groups of employees working within North Wales NHS Trusts.
- The primary aim of this research is to learn more about the relationship between learning and creative & innovative behaviour.

I hope to identify and interview creative and innovative employees so I can discover more about the role learning has played in this process. I will also be interested to hear about any other examples of creative and innovative behaviour, particularly if they help me to understand more about the part that learning plays.

Why have I been invited to take part?

You have been invited to participate in this study, as you have been identified as a creative and innovative employee. You may be part of a team that has developed a new technology, or you may be an individual who has found a better way of doing some part of your job.

What will happen to me if I take part?

If you take part in this research I will invite you to attend an interview. This interview will be held at a time and place convenient to you, and will last for up to one hour.

The purpose of the interview will be for me to learn more about all of the things that have led to you being successfully creative and innovative.

- The first half of the interview will involve you telling me 'your story' of how your idea came about and what inspired you.
  - I will be interested to listen to your account of how the idea became a reality.
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I will also be interested in what may have helped you and hindered you along the way.

- The second half of the interview will give me an opportunity to 'home in' on areas that I have found particularly interesting and relevant to my research.
- I will also use the second half an hour to find out a bit more about your vocational background, training and other skills and attributes that feel have helped you along the way.

The interviews will be recorded using a Dictaphone, and will be transcribed and stored onto a PC until project expiry.

In some cases I may also ask if I could view the new/ different way of working in action. Again this will be entirely up to you.

Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?
All information that is collected about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential. Any information about you will have your name and address removed so that you cannot be recognised from it, and all interview recordings will be given a false name.

What will happen to the results of the research study?
The results of this study will be used as part of a doctoral thesis for the Business School at the University of Wales, Bangor. Also a report will be compiled for the Trust, which participants and the public will have access to.

Who is organising and funding the research?
The research is funded by the University of Wales, Bangor and is a joint collaboration between two academic departments; The School for Business and Regional Development and the School of Nursing Midwifery and Health Studies.

Who has reviewed the study?
- North West Wales Research Ethics Committee
- North Wales Central Research Ethics Committee
- North East Wales Research Ethics Committee
- North West Wales Trust Research Governance Committee Internal Review Panel
- North Central Wales Research and Development Internal Review Panel
- North East Wales NHS Trust Internal Review Panel

Contact for Further Information
For further information, please do not hesitate to contact myself, Clair Roberts on 01248 354930, or 07838 136429 or e-mail abpc56@bangor.ac.uk

Thank you for your time

Clair Roberts
Dear Sian,

My name is Clair Roberts and I'm from the School of Business at the University of Wales, Bangor. I am writing to you as I have been recommended to contact you by Geraldine Black regarding some research that I am conducting within the Trust in relation to creative and innovative practice within the Trust.

The working title of my project is
An investigation of workplace changes: How have Trust employees found new and better ways of working (through being creative and innovative) and what is the role of learning within this creative and innovative process?

I have attached an Invitation to Participate in Research and an Information Sheet. I would be extremely grateful if you could spare the time to have a quick read and get back to me if you would like to participate in an interview (normally 1/2 hour to an hour maximum) at a time and location convenient to you.

If you have any questions in relation to this, please do not hesitate to contact me on 07838 136429

Many thanks for your time

Kind Regards

Clair
Clair Roberts (BA Hons)
PhD Researcher
University of Wales, Bangor
Hen Coleg, College Road
LL57 2DG

E-mail abpc56@bangor.ac.uk

 supported by a joint collaboration between the School for Business and Regional Development and the School of Nursing Midwifery and Health Studies
16 Strategic level Interview Template
Interview Palette for Step 1

1. Introduce myself
   Introduce purpose of interview:
   a. Thank you
   b. Recap why I have invited you
   c. Areas that I hope to address.

2. Who has been affected by the WTD and how has it affected their working practices?

3. Can you tell me about any creative/innovative activities that have emerged or that is
   emerging from these groups?

4. Can you tell me about any other unrelated creative and innovative behaviour?

5. Do you know of anybody else that I could contact within the Trust that would be useful
   for my research?

6. I have asked all the questions that I thought were important. Is there anything else you
   would like to tell me about this topic that I have missed?

7. It seems that we have reached the end of the session! Thank you very much for giving up
   your time to participate. I will be providing the Trust with a detailed report of my
   research and will let you know once I have submitted it.
Corporate Entrepreneur Interview Template

Alias Name(s): 
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Section 1
1.1 Introduce myself
1.2 Introduce purpose of interview:
1.3 Why I have invited you
1.4 Areas that I hope to address.
   1.4.1 To learn more about creative and innovative behaviour, and in particular the role that learning plays within this.
1.5 Layout of interview
   1.5.1 1ST½ ‘your story’
   1.5.2 2ND½ ‘home in’ & skills and attributes’

Section 2
2.1 Tell me about your creative/innovative behaviour – ‘your story’ –;
2.2 People or things that have supported you

Examples
Think about:
- People in your life—how, why
- Trust—what things, techn, comms, time, access, freedom
- Learning—easy

2.3 People/things hampered or hindered your progress?

Examples
Have a think about:
- People in your life negative influence, how/why?
- Your Trust. Techn, comms, access, time, resources, freedom to experiment.
- Learning

Section 3
3. Career history, work experiences that have helped and supported personal (creative innovative) development

4. Personal strengths, weaknesses, personal qualities and business skills that have helped.

5. Did you have to find out new things or learn new things during this experience? Can you talk me through what you had to learn and how you went about doing this?

6. If you met someone in work who wanted to be more creative and innovative, what advice would you give him/her/them?
7. If you could turn back-time how would you have prepared yourself for this process better? Would you have learned certain skills or developed certain aspects of yourself?

8. Concluding Question and Statement
   - Any further questions/ comments?
   - Anything you would like to add?
   - Reached the end
   - Thank you sharing experiences
   - Thank you, for giving up time
18 Interview Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE PERSON</th>
<th>THE TEAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Past</td>
<td>The Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Transferable skills &amp; Goals. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Group formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The present</td>
<td>(formal/informal) Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Transferable skills &amp; Goals. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>group purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future</td>
<td>The Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Transferable skills &amp; Goals. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Emergent activities, norms, satisfactions, dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future</td>
<td>The Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The idea – Insight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal/informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpinning motivations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacit/Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface/Deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal/Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/On-the-Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reflective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PESTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team Learning
- Contained learning: learning contained within individual members.
- Collected learning: Individuals share information and meaning. Group knowledge is an aggregate of individual knowledge.
- Constructed learning: Individual’s knowledge and meaning perspectives are integrated, not aggregated.
- Continuous learning: the group habituates processes of transforming its experience into knowledge.

Instrumental Knowledge -> Co-operative Team Learning is structured.
Communicative Knowledge -> Collaborative Team Learning
Emancipatory Knowledge -> Transformative Team Learning

Organisational Learning
- Congenital, Experiential, Vicarious, Grafting, Searching & Noticing
- Intuiting, Interpreting, Integrating, Institutionalising

Single-loop
Double-loop
Deutero-Learning
Example of Interview Summary Sheet for all Interviews (1st version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIALS</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>TRUST</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended by</th>
<th>1st Contact</th>
<th>2nd Contact</th>
<th>Interview 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description and observations of meeting

THEMES (CONTINUE OVERLEAF IF REQUIRED)
20 Example of Interview Summary Sheet for all Interviews (2nd version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name</th>
<th>2. Code</th>
<th>3. Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. No of meetings arranged</th>
<th>5. Trust</th>
<th>6. Recommended by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Gender</th>
<th>11. Age</th>
<th>12. Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A

Site B
Example of Interview Summary Sheet for Corporate Entrepreneurs (3\textsuperscript{rd} version)

1. Name 2. Code 3. Date of Interview
4. No of meetings arranged 5. Trust 6. Recommended by
10. Gender 11. Age 12. Location

Champs Site A  Design Site B  Personality

CE  Culture

Change Plan

Learning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Document</th>
<th>Notes/ observations from document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aberash: Statement of Internal Control (downloaded from HOWIS)</td>
<td>4.4.5 Managers are encouraged and supported in attending conferences 4.4.6 All non-medical staff supported in CPD 4.5.1 mistakes learned from through adverse incident reporting, complaints and litigations systems &amp; proactive approach to learning adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aberash: Emergency Planning and Performance Targets (downloaded from Trust website)</td>
<td>£2mn allocated to Trust to tackle waiting times and lists Aberash have won funding from Innovations in Care team for an administrative innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aberash: Clinical Governance (downloaded from Trust website)</td>
<td>Reports on the areas that have received positive feedback, the number of new research studies and the number of compliments (but not complaints)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Aberash: Aberash NHS Trust (downloaded from HOWIS)</td>
<td>Describes Trust, includes breakdown of each directorate using terms such as ‘improve its services’, ‘reduce waiting times’, innovative new developments, recently built, innovative new services, continuous improvements, new projects. Document emphasizes Trusts commitment to learning and CPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Aberash Annual accounts (downloaded from HOWIS)</td>
<td>Expenditure on Education, training and research over £5000,000 Losses from Clinical Negligence over £9000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aberash CHI (downloaded from HOWIS)</td>
<td>No overaching strategies in Aberash for clinical effectiveness, but a structure is in place to manage it. Staff generally feel supported and valued Staff feel that their development is very well supported by the Trust* Information needs to be made more accessible to staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aberash: Annual Audit Letter (downloaded from HOWIS)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Aberash X Ward admission details (internal from CE)</td>
<td>Count of admissions by month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Aberash: Hospital Force Field analysis for A&amp;E ward (internal from SP)</td>
<td>Significant forces for change: 4 hour target, Patient Charter Standards, Patient experience (Risk management &amp; complaints), PDP Staff development/ Role enhancement &amp; Practice evidence based practice. Forces resisting change: Funding for ENP, No guidelines, Limited training, Infrastructure &amp; access to service out of hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Aberash: Interview template for manager post (Internal from SP)</td>
<td>Highlights the values that Trust desire from new manager; includes references to leadership, EI, OL and CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Aberash: HR Strategy Communications structure (Internal from SP)</td>
<td>Flowchart of HR Communications strategy. Many meetings. 8 tiers high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Aberash HR Newsletters (Internal from SP)</td>
<td>Bullet points about activities, government policies etc. A couple of references to courses and one to innovative thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Aberash: Clinical Audit document (Internal from SP)</td>
<td>Risk averse audit form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Aberash EWTD document (internal from SP)</td>
<td>Well written document on some innovations emerging out of EWTD, policy implications etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Brynbeth: Trust General Information (from Intranet)</td>
<td>General info – one of the largest employers within the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Brynbeth Annual Audit letter (downloaded from HOWIS)</td>
<td>Trust has been named in good hospital guide Trust is collaborating with Aberash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Brynbeth CHI report (downloaded from HOWIS)</td>
<td>Highlights innovative flat communications structure within trust, and gives evidence of knowledge &amp; innovation has been used to improve the Trusts services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Brynbeth Annual Accounts (downloaded from HOWIS)</td>
<td>£7272, 000Clinical negligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Brynbeth OD Strategy (from Intranet)</td>
<td>Very useful document, lots of information to facilitate construction of cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Brynbeth HRM Programme (from Intranet)</td>
<td>Very useful document, lots of information to facilitate construction of cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Brynbeth Leadership Development Strategy (from Intranet)</td>
<td>Very useful document, lots of information to facilitate construction of cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Brynbeth Postgraduate Education Centre Events Diary (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Very useful document, lots of information to facilitate construction of cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Brynbeth: Mandatory Training (from Intranet)</td>
<td>My training on entering on an Honorary contract – not useful or relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Brynbeth CPD Lectures</td>
<td>R&amp;D lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Brynbeth Therapy services (from Intranet)</td>
<td>Very insightful re: culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Brynbeth Therapy services, recruitment and retention (from Intranet)</td>
<td>Very insightful re: culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Brynbeth Therapy services Annual Report (from Intranet)</td>
<td>Provides detail on culture, structures etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Brynbeth Trust Committee reporting structure (from Intranet)</td>
<td>Insightful re: culture &amp; structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Brynbeth: Briefing paper on Chronic nurse staffing (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Brynbeth: Briefing paper on staffing pilot (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Very insightful re: OL, culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Brynbeth: Draft paper on an innovation (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Very insightful re: CE, OL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Brynbeth: Paper on the modernisation of a service (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Brynbeth: Briefing paper on the Modernisation of Nursing in a Directorate (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Very important - themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Brynbeth: Briefing paper on innovative administration of patients (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Brynbeth: Briefing paper on staffing requirement on a ward (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Brynbeth: Powerpoint handout of R&amp;D (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Very insightful into culture and CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Brynbeth: Perceptions towards R&amp;D in Brynbeth trust (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>Culture, CE and OL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Brynbeth: List of nurse led research projects in Trust (from Senior Participant)</td>
<td>CE (nurse led) culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>