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Abstract:
Intrapreneurship is defined as behavior of organizational members in established organizations that is focused on the creation and implementation of innovation, new business, and renewal (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003; Camelo-Ordaz et al., 2011; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013). A company that helps organizations with implementing the concept of intrapreneurship is Innovation Booster. Innovation Booster does not know how to best identify and select intrapreneurs for their projects. Therefore, the following research questions were central to this research: 1) How can organizations identify and select intrapreneurs? and 2) How should the identification and selection of intrapreneurs for the projects of Innovation Booster be set up? 

In order to answer the research questions a methodology based on the design science and the explanatory research paradigm is used. Interviews were used to collect the data. Subsequently, the data was analyzed and results were generated. The generated results were used during the design process. Five different interviewee groups were involved: academic experts, innovation experts, innovation boosters (employees of Innovation Booster), intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs.

Based on literature and explanatory research the following results were found. Three aspects seem to influence the identification and selection of intrapreneurs, the characterization of intrapreneurs, the identification process and organizational factors. Based on these results a new theoretical model is proposed that attempts to distinguish different types of intrapreneurs, namely: classic, latent, potential, and enabled intrapreneurs. The results are also used as basis for the design. The design measures intrapreneurial behavior and uses a cut off score to identify people as an intrapreneur. The design is translated into an excel tool, to be used by Innovation Booster.
Management summary

Introduction
Change has become the essence of organizations today and as technological and market changes occur much faster than expected, organizations are looking for ways to cope with this speed of change (Davis, 1999; Mokaya, 2012). The problem is that established organizations are in general not suited to cope with this increasing rate of change and often lack the necessary focus on innovation (Thompson, Heinonen & Scott, 2014). Corporate entrepreneurship forms a possible solution for these organizations (Brizek, 2013; Herron, 1992; Mokaya, 2012; Rathna & Vijaya, 2009; Thornberry, 2001). One dimension of corporate entrepreneurship is intrapreneurship, which can be regarded a bottom-up process wherein organizational members initiate and implement activities to explore and exploit business opportunities (de Jong et al., 2011). Individuals showing entrepreneurial behavior in established organizations are identified as intrapreneurs (Pinchot & Pellman, 1999; Rathna & Vijaya, 2009; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013; Weber et al., 2014). The challenge for organizations is to implement this concept and create an environment that is supportive and helps attract, motivate and retain these intrapreneurs.

Innovation Booster
A company that helps organizations with implementing the concept of corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship is Innovation Booster. Innovation Booster is a consulting and design company and specializes in two areas: product & market innovation, and innovation culture & organizational transformation. Central to their projects are the employees of the organizations for which they perform projects (from here on out called ‘client organizations’). They need employees that take responsibility, are proactive and are not afraid to take risks. In other words, they need to involve the intrapreneurs of the client organizations. However, Innovation Booster does not know how to do this, which results in the following problem statement: **Innovation Booster does not know how to best identify and select intrapreneurs for their new business and innovation transformation projects.**

Research questions
The goal of this research was to design a solution for Innovation Booster, which helps to identify and select intrapreneurs of client organizations. This taken together with the challenge of organizations in general to implement the concept of intrapreneurship leads to the following research questions that will be central to this research: 1) **How can organizations identify and select intrapreneurs?**, 2) **How should the identification and selection of intrapreneurs for the projects of Innovation Booster be set up?**

Theoretical framework
Intrapreneurship is defined as behavior of organizational members in established organizations that is focused on the creation and implementation of innovation, new business, and renewal (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003; Camelo-Ordaz, Fernandez-Alles, & Ruiz-Navarro, 2011; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013). Intrapreneurship contains three key behavioral dimensions: innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior. Innovative behavior is behavior that is focused on opportunity and problem recognition, idea generation and idea implementation. Proactive behavior is behavior that is persistent and comes from personal initiative. Risk-taking behavior is behavior that goes beyond the standard job description and the available resources (De Jong et al., 2011; Preenen et al., 2015; Preenen et al., 2014; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013; Teltumbde, 2006). Currently, two methods that can identify intrapreneurs exist, the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) and the Intrapreneurial Behavior Measure (IBM). The GEM describes an intrapreneur as someone who was involved in the development of a new activity for his or her most important employer in the past three years. The other identification method, the IBM, makes it possible to measure intrapreneurial work behavior by measuring innovation, proactive and risk-taking behavior of employees (Preenen et al., 2014).

Methodology
In order to answer the research questions a combined methodology is used, which is based on the design science and the explanatory research paradigm. This means that I solve a field problem by coming up with a fitting solution which is informed by and based on scientifically obtained knowledge. Interviews
were used to collect the data and five different interviewee groups, including over thirty-five people, were involved; academic experts, corporate innovation experts, innovation boosters (employees of Innovation Booster), intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs. Subsequently, the data was analyzed and results were generated. The generated results were used during the design process. The design process consisted of determining the design directions and design parameters, designing a solution and testing the designed solution. The design was tested by conducting several design and user tests.

This research resulted in two deliverables. First, an academic contribution to the field of intrapreneurship is produced as it became evident, based on literature and explanatory research, how established organizations can identify and select intrapreneurs. Secondly, a solution for Innovation Booster for the identification and selection of intrapreneurs and an accompanying change plan are provided.

Results
The experts describe many different types of intrapreneurs by using terms like ‘real intrapreneur’ and ‘latent intrapreneur’. Also, a distinction is make between a nature and nurture approach concerning intrapreneurs, which seem to closely relate to the two approaches concerning the intrapreneur described in literature (GEM and IBM). Taking all this together it seems that intrapreneurs are suggested to differ on two axes: predisposition to being an intrapreneur (nature approach) and intrapreneural behavior (nurture approach).

The experts and intrapreneurs also mention some possible identification options. For example, most intrapreneurs were introduced to the program by their manager or supervisor. More specifically, it seems that a persons’ previous actions and behavior plus their network are important. Next to the informal network, innovation initiatives are believed to form a possible identification method, with many different factors influencing this like budget, communication and the set-up of the program.

Zooming in on the results of the intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs that are specifically focused on their intrapreneural behavior shows that none of the intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs had any experience with being a business owner or founder. Furthermore, every intrapreneur was involved in the development of a new activity, while this applied only to four of the non-intrapreneurs. Also, some of the activities that non-intrapreneurs were involved in seem to generate less impact. Finally, nine of the twelve intrapreneurs score a 3.5 or higher on every intrapreneural behavior dimension, while only two of the fourteen non-intrapreneurs do. Thus, a cut-off score of 3.5 or higher on every behavioral dimension seem to best distinguish intrapreneurs from non-intrapreneurs.

Respondents also mention the organizational structure, culture, reward system, and top and middle management as important factors that influence the identification of intrapreneurs and the expression of intrapreneural behavior.

From the results it becomes evident that in order to be able to identify and eventually even select intrapreneurs, it is important to make a distinction in the different types of intrapreneurs. Therefore, a new theoretical model is proposed that attempts to distinguish different types of intrapreneurs. The model introduces four new terms that describe different intrapreneurs, namely: classic, latent, potential, and enabled intrapreneur. This categorization forms the basis for developing identification strategies, as different approaches seem to be needed to identify each category of intrapreneur.

Design
The design focuses on measuring intrapreneural behavior (innovative, proactive, and risk-taking behavior) of people within organizations. By measuring intrapreneural behavior and using a cut-off score it becomes possible to identify people as an intrapreneur. The definite selection is made after short interviews with the employees. The GEM and IBM are central to the design as questions from these two validated measures were used to compose a questionnaire. This questionnaire was integrated in an excel tool, which generates an intrapreneural profile. This profile can be used as basis for the interviews. Next to the excel tool, a manual is composed, which describes how and when the tool should be used.

The questionnaire that was integrated in an excel tool consists of three parts. First, it contains some general questions. This includes name, function within the organization and number of years employed. The questionnaire also ends with a general, open-ended question where it is asking for suggestions on how the organization can stimulate intrapreneural behavior. The second part of the
The questionnaire contains sixteen statements about innovative, proactive, and risk-taking behavior. These statements are based on the IBM. The statements can be graded on a one to five scale. This part of the questionnaire can also be used at the end of a project to measure the difference in intrapreneurial behavior. The third part consists of four questions that are based on the GEM. These questions ask if someone was involved in the development of a new activity for his or her most important employer in the past three years and what type of role this person had in this development process, which is split up into two phases: the ‘development of an idea’ phase and the ‘preparation and implementation of the idea’ phase. Furthermore, it is asked to describe the activity.

The intrapreneurial profile consists of two pages and forms the basis for identifying and eventually also selecting intrapreneurs. The first page of the profile consists of four parts: general information, intrapreneurial behavior scores graph and specification, involvement in activities results, and intrapreneur/non-intrapreneur result. The second page consists of three parts: suggestions of employees, comparison intrapreneurial behavior scores and a specification of the compared intrapreneurial behavior scores. Especially important is the intrapreneur/non-intrapreneur result, which is based on a cut off score of 3.5, meaning that when an employee scores an average of 3.5 on every intrapreneurial behavior dimension this person is considered an intrapreneur. This score was based on explanatory research and design tests.

Change plan
The main difference between the old and new situation is that after implementing the proposed design every start of a project is guided by a more evident procedure. Important stakeholders influencing the successful implementation are Innovation Booster and their client organizations. It is especially important to inform and involve the innovation boosters during the implementation process of the tool. The latter consists of three main phases: the informing, pilot testing and scaling up phase.

Discussion & conclusion
A number of theoretical contributions can be distinguished. First of all, this research clearly shows the difference between personal characteristics of an intrapreneur and intrapreneurial behavior. By making this distinction it became possible to compose a theoretical model for classifying intrapreneurs. This research also provides insights into some other identification options, which were not specifically mentioned before in literature. Next to providing some new potential identification option, this research also adds to the currently existing IBM method by providing a possible cut-off score. Furthermore, this research substantiates the relationships between organizational factors and intrapreneurship made in literature.

Besides theoretical implications, also some practical implications are distinguished. The design makes it possible for organizations to identify and select intrapreneurs for specific reasons, like innovation initiatives or projects. The design can also be used to determine the number of intrapreneurs within an organization and can therefore determine how intrapreneurial an organization is. Moreover, the design measures intrapreneurial behavior of employees, which makes organizations possible to monitor the influence and effect of intrapreneurship interventions.

In conclusion, three aspects seem to influence the identification and selection of intrapreneurs in organizations (research question one), namely the characterization of intrapreneurs, the identification process and organizational factors. From these conclusions, it became evident that in order to be able to identify and select intrapreneurs, it is important to make a distinction in the different types of intrapreneurs. Therefore, a new theoretical model is proposed. Furthermore, these conclusions formed the basis for answering the second research question. The identification and selection of intrapreneurs for the projects of Innovation Booster should be setup by using an identification and selection process that is focused on measuring intrapreneurial behavior of people.
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1. Introduction

The world is changing fast and the speed of change is only increasing. Some even say that we have entered a world of constant change and that the only certainty is change (Davis, 1999; Mokaya, 2012; Pinchot, 1985). Globalization and technological progress are just two of the driving factors behind these changes (Rathna & Vijaya, 2009). Change is become the essence of organizations today and as technological and market changes occur much faster than expected organizations are looking for ways to cope with this speed of change (Davis, 1999; Mokaya, 2012).

Innovation is a term often used to describe a way in which organizations can anticipate the changes that are happening. Productivity in innovation is therefore becoming as vital as productivity in production (Pinchot, 1985). Innovation, which involves the creation, optimization and implementation of new products, services, production processes, organizational processes and business models, can help organizations establish a competitive advantage is this world (Herron, 1992; Mokaya, 2012). The problem is that established organizations are in general not suited to cope with this increasing rate of change and often lack the necessary focus on innovation (Thompson et al., 2014). Innovation requires adaptability, speed, flexibility and risk taking, qualities many established organization probably once had, but which they have lost by the increase in size, complexity, bureaucracy and hierarchy (Mokaya, 2012; Thornberry, 2001).

1.1 Corporate entrepreneurship & intrapreneurship

Corporate entrepreneurship can form a possible solution for these organizations (Brizek, 2013; Herron, 1992; Mokaya, 2012; Rathna & Vijaya, 2009; Thornberry, 2001). Corporate entrepreneurship includes a set of actions and attitudes that can help established organizations regain some of these lost qualities (Thornberry, 2001). In this research corporate entrepreneurship is defined as the process of organizational renewal in established organizations, as initiated by actions which originate from organizational strategy or organizational members’ individual behavior (Amo & Vereid, 2005; Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003; Kuratko et al., 2014; Phan et al., 2009). One dimension of corporate entrepreneurship is intrapreneurship, which focuses more on the behavioral and individual level. It can be regarded a bottom-up process wherein organizational members initiate and implement activities to explore and exploit business opportunities (De Jong et al., 2011). Individuals showing entrepreneurial behavior in established organizations are identified as intrapreneurs (Pinchot & Pellman, 1999; Rathna & Vijaya, 2009; Rigttering & Weitzel, 2013; Weber et al., 2014). The challenge for organizations is to implement this concept and create an environment that is supportive and helps attract, motivate and retain these intrapreneurs (Davis, 1999; Mokaya, 2012; Rathna & Vijaya, 2009). It is therefore essential to understand, identify, develop and nurture intrapreneurs (Herron, 1992; Rathna & Vijaya, 2009).

1.2 Innovation Booster

Innovation Booster is a company that helps organizations with implementing the concept of corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship. Innovation Booster is a consulting and design company that tries to reshape large corporates to become more economically sustainable and to become better at conducting business in new and increasingly dynamic marketplaces. Innovation Booster thereby focuses on stimulating innovation and entrepreneurship and attempts to embed these characteristics in organizations. Innovation Booster specializes in two areas: product & market innovation, and innovation culture & organizational transformation. This means that they perform new business projects and/or innovation transformation projects together with their clients (large and established organizations).

Central to these projects are the employees of the organizations for which Innovation Booster performs their projects (client organizations). As both type of projects face many obstacles, Innovation Booster needs employees that make sure that innovation initiatives are initiated and implemented, concrete actions are taken and other people are stimulated to think outside their own job description. They need employees that take responsibility, are proactive and are not afraid to take risks. In other words, they need to involve the intrapreneurs of the client organizations. However, currently it is not clear if Innovation Booster identifies and selects the right people for their projects as there is no evident procedure to identify and select the intrapreneurs for these projects.
1.3 Research questions
The goal of this research was to design a solution for Innovation Booster, which helps to identify and select intrapreneurs of client organizations. This taken together with the challenge of organizations in general to implement the concept of intrapreneurship leads to the following research questions that will be central to this research:

1. How can organizations identify and select intrapreneurs?
2. How should the identification and selection of intrapreneurs for the projects of Innovation Booster be set up?

1.4 Methodology & deliverables
In order to answer these research questions a combined methodology is used, which is based on the design science paradigm and the explanatory research paradigm. The main focus is on the former and thus on the design of a solution for a business problem. Moreover, it focuses on the change and implementation processes that accompany the solution (Van Aken et al., 2012). Although the focus is on the design science paradigm the research project also contains aspects of the explanatory research paradigm to develop scientific knowledge that can be used to design the solution. In summary, this means that I solve a field problem by coming up with a fitting solution which is informed by and based on scientific research and scientifically obtained knowledge.

This research resulted in two deliverables. First, an academic contribution to the field of intrapreneurship is produced. More specifically, this means that by answering the first research question, it becomes evident how established organizations can identify and select intrapreneurs. Based on this knowledge a new theoretical model is proposed that attempts to distinguish different types of intrapreneurs. Secondly, a solution for the identification and selection of intrapreneurs and an accompanying change plan are provided. This solution helps Innovation Booster in setting up the front-end of their projects.

1.5 Structure
This research report is structured as follows. First, a theoretical background concerning the topic of intrapreneurship is provided. Secondly, a more extensive description of Innovation Booster and the context of the problem is given. Thirdly, the methodology used in this research is explained, including the data collection and analysis processes. Thereafter, the results chapter will provide an answer to the first research question and proposes a new theoretical model. Consequently, the knowledge of the result chapter is used for the design chapter of this research, which concludes with a design for Innovation Booster and therefore an answer to the second research question. The design chapter is followed by a chapter that describes the change plan that accompanies the design. Finally, a discussion and conclusion chapter is provided.
2. Theoretical background

The purpose of this chapter is to give insight into past research concerning corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship. Intrapreneurship has been a subject of research for more than two decades. Research in the areas of organizational renewal, innovation, risk taking and entrepreneurship fall under the umbrella of corporate entrepreneurship (Antonic & Hisrich, 2001; Hornsby et al., 2002). This chapter includes mostly articles specifically concerning corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship and less articles concerning the other mentioned research areas. The reason for this is that most of the other research areas are only applicable up to a certain point. For example, the entrepreneurship literature is sometimes cited when talking about corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship. Characteristics and behaviors describing an entrepreneur come close to describing an intrapreneur. However, there is one major difference, namely the setting. Where entrepreneurs act in an environment without direct boundaries, the intrapreneur has to act within the confines of an established organization. This makes that the necessary behaviors may seem similar but cannot be compared properly.

This chapter is structured as follows. The first paragraph focuses on defining the corporate entrepreneurship concept. Thereafter, the effects of corporate entrepreneurship are shortly described to show the importance and benefits of corporate entrepreneurship for organizations. This paragraph is followed by a description of the different dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship. From here on out I will focus on the intrapreneuring dimension. The concepts of intrapreneurship, intrapreneurial behavior and the intrapreneur are explained. These concepts form the basis for this research, because in order to figure out how to identify and select intrapreneurs it is important to fully understand what an intrapreneur is and how an intrapreneur behaves. Next, two ways of approaching and identifying intrapreneurs, that currently exist in literature, are described, which offer important input for the data collection and design process. Finally, factors that influence intrapreneurship are described, because factors that influence intrapreneurship and intrapreneurial behavior could influence the identification of intrapreneurs.

2.1 Corporate entrepreneurship

In very general terms corporate entrepreneurship can be described as entrepreneurship in existing and/or established organizations (Heinonen & Korvela, 2004). Besides this very general description corporate entrepreneurship is described as a strategy that can be used for the development and implementation of new ideas (Amo & Vereid, 2005). Scholars (e.g. Felicio et al. 2012, Seshadri & Tripathy, 2006, and Thompson et al., 2014) all define corporate entrepreneurship as the creation of a new organization or the creation of renewal within the organization. Finally, corporate entrepreneurship is described as individual or employee behavior that is focused on the introduction and implementation of innovation (Camelo-Ordaz et al., 2011).

In this research, corporate entrepreneurship is described in broad terms including many aspects mentioned by different authors. Corporate entrepreneurship is described as follows:

*Corporate entrepreneurship describes the process of organizational renewal in established organizations, initiated by actions originating from organizational strategy or organizational members’ individual behavior, which includes activities that explore new business domains and new ways of conducting business within the existing domains (Amo & Vereid, 2005; Antonic & Hisrich, 2003; Kuratko et al., 2014; Phan et al., 2009).*

2.2 The effects of corporate entrepreneurship

From the literature it becomes clear that there is a positive relationship between the corporate entrepreneurship concept and organizational performance (Bierwerth et al., 2015; Felicio et al., 2012; Heinonen & Korvela, 2004; Mokaya, 2012; Zahra & Covin, 1995).

First of all, research suggests that corporate entrepreneurship positively effects financial performance (Felicio et al., 2012; Heinonen & Korvela, 2004; Mokaya, 2012; Zahra & Covin, 1995). Corporate entrepreneurship is also suggested to effect other aspects of organizational performance. For example, organizations that engage in corporate entrepreneurship are expected to achieve higher levels of growth (Felicio et al., 2012; Mokaya, 2012). Moreover, corporate entrepreneurship is suggested to
effect the innovative output of organizations (Preenen et al., 2014; Preenen et al., 2015). Corporate entrepreneurship is suggested to influence job and work satisfaction, performance of employees and customer satisfaction (Heinonen & Korvela, 2004; Preenen et al., 2014; Thompson et al., 2014).

The underlying processes that explain the positive relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and organizational performance are strategic renewal processes, increased innovation ability, the exploitation of new products and/or services and new ways of learning and working. These aspects make the organization more competent to react to change and therefore the organization is able to maintain and increase their competitive advantage (Bierwerth et al., 2015; Felicio et al., 2012; Heinonen & Korvela, 2004; Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Mokaya; 2012; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013; Zahra & Covin, 1995).

2.3 Intrapreneurship and intrapreneurial behavior – three dimensions

Due to the difference in definitions of corporate entrepreneurship there are also a number of dimensions further defining this concept. Two main dimensions are distinguished: (1) organizational transformation, and (2) intrapreneuring. The first dimension can be seen as a top-down approach, while intrapreneuring has a bottom-up approach. Important to note is that both dimensions are closely related and influence each other. For example, it can be argued that intrapreneuring, initiated bottom-up, is necessary for organizational transformation, a top-down initiative, to take effect. On the other hand, it is suggested that the desired result of a corporate entrepreneurship strategy is intrapreneurial behavior of organizational members (Amo & Vereid, 2005). In this research I will focus mainly on intrapreneurship. Intrapreneurship is defined as behavior of organizational members in established organizations that is focused on the creation and implementation of innovation, new business, and renewal (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003; Camelo-Ordaz et al., 2011; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013). A number of key behavioral elements of intrapreneurship can be distinguished; innovative behavior, proactive behavior and risk-taking behavior (see Figure 1) (De Jong et al., 2011; Preenen et al., 2015; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013).

Figure 1: Intrapreneurial behavior dimensions (Preenen et al., 2014)

Innovative behavior is defined as behavior that is focused on opportunity and problem recognition, idea generation and idea implementation (De Jong et al., 2011; Mehta & Gupta, 2014; Preenen et al., 2015; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013; Thompson et al., 2014). More specifically, innovative behavior includes identifying opportunities and problems, generating ideas that can form a solution and championing the idea or solution to peers, managers and other important stakeholder in an attempt to create support for the idea. Moreover, innovative behavior encompasses developing the idea into a prototype or find the right people to do this. It includes lobbying for the necessary resources to further develop the idea or solution and translating innovative ideas into useful applications (De Jong et al., 2011; Liebregts et al., 2015; Preenen et al., 2015; Preenen et al., 2014).
The second behavioral element can be described as behavior that is proactive, persistent and which comes from personal initiative (Mehta & Gupta, 2014; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013). Proactive behavior can be regarded pioneering behavior which includes initiative taking to pursue new opportunities and improve oneself and/or the situation (De Jong et al., 2011). For example, individuals that show proactive behavior try to improve the internal organizational environment by improving work methods and influencing colleagues. Proactive behavior includes taking charge and voicing opinions and ideas. It includes actively seeking feedback, negotiating job roles, dealing with setbacks, issue selling to colleagues and important stakeholders, and scanning the strategic environment of the organization to identify threats and opportunities (De Jong et al., 2011; Liebregts et al., 2015; Preenen et al., 2015; Preenen et al., 2014).

Finally, intrapreneurship includes risk-taking behavior, which is behavior that goes beyond the standard job description and the available resources (De Jong et al., 2011; Preenen et al., 2015; Preenen et al., 2014; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013; Teltumbde, 2006). It involves bold actions from which the results are uncertain and often unknown and for which time, effort, money, and other resources are required. It is behavior which could affect an individual’s reputation and status and maybe even job retention. For example, individuals could implement initiatives without help or approval from management. It may also involve committing significant resources to an idea or venture in unknown environments. Finally, it includes behavior that involves breaking through routines and the current status quo of an organization (De Jong et al., 2011; Liebregts et al., 2015; Preenen et al., 2015; Preenen et al., 2014).

2.4 The intrapreneur

Part of the intrapreneurship concept are the organizational members within an established organization that perform the abovementioned type of behaviors (Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007). When these organizational members are individuals, they can be named intrapreneurs. An intrapreneur is an employee within an established organization who turns ideas into reality and who takes responsibility for this process (Pinchot & Pellman, 1999; Rathna & Vijaya, 2009; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013; Weber et al., 2014). An intrapreneur may or may not be the person who came up with the initial idea. An intrapreneur is however the person that takes action and gets things done (Pinchot & Pellman, 1999).

The abovementioned behavioral elements result in a list of characteristics that describe or summarize a typical intrapreneur. Some examples of these characteristics are self-determined goal setter, self-motivated, action focused, ambitious, creative, optimistic, persuasive and questioning the status quo (Amo & Vereid, 2005; Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kolveried & Amo, 2002; Mehta & Gupta, 2014; Pinchot, 1985; Sayeed & Gazdar, 2003; Shatzer & Schwartz, 1991; Teltumbde, 2006; Thompson et al., 2014; Weber et al., 2014). Many different authors point out different aspects and it is not explained which aspects are absolutely necessary and to what extent they need to be present. The description is only an indication of what characteristics are given to an intrapreneur in the literature and as can be seen these characteristics are very closely related to the three behavioral dimensions.

2.5 Identifying intrapreneurs – two methods

Two ways of approaching the concept of the intrapreneur are described in the literature. The first approach argues that there are intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs in an organization. So either an individual has the right characteristics or not. The other approach describes that everyone contains a certain level of the three behavioral dimensions making up intrapreneurship (innovative, proactive, risk-taking). Some people contain higher levels of this behavior than others, which makes that some individuals show more intraprenurial behavior than others (Preenen et al., 2014; Preenen, Liebregts & Dhondt, 2015). Where the first approach tries to localize the ‘real/naturally talented’ intrapreneurs, the second approach explains that everyone can become an intrapreneur. The two approaches do not exclude each other, for example you can go looking for the ‘real’ intrapreneurs and you can find them, however this does not automatically mean that this person actually expresses intrapreneurial behavior. Some people may have more potential but this does not mean that others cannot become an intrapreneur.
Currently there exist two methods that can identify intrapreneurs, which are based on these two approaches and are named the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) and the Intrapreneurial Behavior Measure (IBM).

2.5.1 The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)
The GEM is a validated questionnaire, which has been executed often on a large scale. The GEM method is based on the first approach explained in the previous paragraph that describes that there are intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs. However, they do use a broad and narrow definition of an intrapreneur. They consider intrapreneurship an entrepreneurial employee activity and describe an intrapreneur as someone who was involved in the development of a new activity for his or her most important employer in the past three years. The latter is considered the broad definition of an intrapreneur. The narrow definition of an intrapreneur applies to someone that is currently involved in the development of a new activity. This new activity can include introducing or developing new products or services or setting up a new department or (internal) venture. Next to being involved in the development of such a new activity, the person has to have had a leading role in at least one of the two phases of the intrapreneurial process. According to the GEM, the intrapreneurial process consists of a ‘development of an idea’ phase and of a ‘preparation and implementation of the idea’ phase. The first phase consists of brainstorming about new activities, searching for information, introducing the idea to management or supervisors. The second phase consists of promoting the idea or activity, preparing the business case, selling the idea or looking for funding, or looking for employees/colleagues that could implement the idea (Preenen et al., 2014).

2.5.2 The Intrapreneurial Behavior Measure (IBM)
The other identification method, the IBM, makes it possible to measure intrapreneurial work behavior by measuring innovation, proactive and risk-taking behavior of employees. The IBM measures intrapreneurial work behavior of employees, can detect individual intrapreneurs, measures the intrapreneurial climate of an organization and maps the antecedents of intrapreneurial work behavior within an organization, which forms the basis for coming up with stimulating measures for intrapreneurial behavior (Preenen et al., 2014).

Specifically focusing on the intrapreneur identification part of the IBM, IBM detects intrapreneurs on the basis of innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior. It includes nine statements that measure innovative behavior, six statements that measure proactive behavior and four statements that measure risk-taking behavior. The IBM does not suggest any standard cut off scores for innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior as this partially depends of the background, situation and goals of the organization. However, it provides some guidelines for determining the cut off score. For example, it is suggested to identify people as intrapreneurs when they score on average a 4.0 or higher (three behavioral dimensions combined) as those people score themselves ‘high’ to ‘very high’. It is also possible to look at the distribution of the data and accordingly identify the 10% highest scoring people as intrapreneurs. Another option would be to search for clear cut off points in the distribution. It is also suggested to use standard deviations. For example, when a person scores higher than one standard deviation above the average score, he or she can be seen as an intrapreneur. Finally, the cut-off point could be determined on the basis of performance of employees. In this case, you would look at the scores of well performing employees and see if there is a clear relationship with their score on intrapreneurial behavior compared to less performing employees (Preenen et al., 2014).

2.6 Factors influencing intrapreneurship
According to literature there are many factors, both organizational and individual, that influence intrapreneurship, including innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior. These factors are shortly described, because they influence to what extent someone can show intrapreneurial behavior which consequently can influence identifying intrapreneurs. Figure 2 shows all the factors.

2.6.1 Organizational factors
Intrapreneurship is influenced by a number of organizational factors. The organizational factors are the reward and reinforcement system, management support, job design, organizational structure and organizational culture.
Many researchers name the reward and reinforcement systems as a factor that affects intrapreneurship (Hayton, 2005; Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kuratko et al., 2014; Mokaya, 2012; Rule & Irwin, 1988). These systems are often based on the current structure, hierarchy and bureaucracy, while they should encourage innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior to stimulate intrapreneurship.

Secondly, many authors point out that management support, the extent to which an employee perceives the support of managers, is also an important factor influencing intrapreneurship (Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Mehta & Gupta, 2014; Mokaya, 2012; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013; Rule & Irwin, 1988; Seshadri & Tripathy, 2006). Management support does not have to imply only the support of someone’s direct manager. Research shows that each level of management is important in facilitating corporate entrepreneurship (Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kuratko et al., 2014).

Job design is suggested to be another antecedent. People’s jobs need to be broadly defined and provide room for autonomy so employees have room to experiment and decide for themselves how to perform their work. Employees need to get the opportunity to voice their opinion and have influence in decision-making processes. Also, jobs should provide some level of variety and challenge (Kuratko et al., 2014; Preenen et al., 2015; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013).

A fourth important factor stimulating intrapreneurship is the organizational culture. This culture should provide the freedom to fail. It needs to condone mistakes and see mistakes as an opportunity to learn (Kuratko et al., 2014; Seshadri & Tripathy, 2006). Furthermore, it should be a culture that stimulates transparency, openness and communality (Heinonen & Korvela, 2004; Mehta & Gupta, 2014).

Finally, the organizational structure is of importance in stimulating intrapreneurship (Heinonen & Korvela, 2004; Mehta & Gupta, 2014; Mokaya, 2012). Research points out that a flat organizational structure and a limited number of organizational procedures are important structural aspects that stimulate intrapreneurial activities (Kuratko et al., 2014; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013). These structural aspects should include decentralization of authority, participation in decision making, and avoidance of bureaucracy (Hayton, 2005; Kuratko et al., 2014; Veenker et al., 2008).

2.6.2 Individual factors

Besides these organizational factors there are individual factors affect intrapreneurship. Many individual aspects are named in the literature (see description characteristics intrapreneur), which are said to influence intrapreneurial behavior. However, it is also pointed out that not all characteristics have to be present. Furthermore, for many of those characteristics it is not researched to what extent they need to be present or if they can actually be used to recognize intrapreneurs. For example, it is suggested that intrapreneurs are often male (Liebregts et al., 2015). However, this does not mean that it would be useful to only focus on male employees when trying to stimulate intrapreneurship. Another example is intrinsic motivation, it is suggested that intrapreneurs are often intrinsically motivated (Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007), but it is not sure to what extent it affects entrepreneurial behavior and to what extent it needs to be present. Therefore, only four individual antecedents are explained which are suggested to influence intrapreneurship and could possibly be useful for this research: proactive personality, core self-evaluation trait, educational attainment, and experience with entrepreneurship.

Proactive personality is a factor which is believed to effect intrapreneurship (De Jong et al., 2011; Kolveried & Amo, 2002). Someone with this type of personality is relatively unconstrained by situational factors and affects change (De Jong et al., 2011). An individual with a proactive personality believes that he or she can intentionally and directly change their environment and circumstances.

Core self-evaluation trait is another factor possibly influencing intrapreneurship. The core self-evaluation trait is an aggregation of the following four traits: neuroticism (concerns emotional stability), self-esteem, locus of control and self-efficacy. Positive core self-evaluation includes low neuroticism (emotional stability), high self-esteem, internal locus of control and high self-efficacy. These four traits are all named in one way or another in the description of the intrapreneur and it could therefore be suggested that this concept influences intrapreneurial behavior.

Educational attainment is found to strongly correlate with intrapreneurial behavior (De Jong et al., 2011). Employees with a master degree, but also with only a bachelor degree were found to be significantly more intrapreneurial (De Jong et al., 2011).
The fourth antecedent is prior experience with entrepreneurship. Literature suggests that prior experience with entrepreneurship can positively affect intrapreneurship (Preenen et al., 2014). Through prior experience with entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial activities people develop relevant knowledge, skills and a useful network that are necessary for solving problems and coming up with innovative solutions and consequently show this behavior in established organizations.
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Figure 2: Factors influencing intrapreneurship (De Jong et al., 2011; Hayton, 2005; Heinonen & Korvela, 2004; Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kuratko et al., 2014; Mehta & Gupta, 2014; Mokaya, 2012; Preenen et al., 2014; Preenen et al., 2015; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013; Rule & Irwin, 1988; Seshadri & Tripathy, 2006; Veenker et al., 2008)
3. Innovation Booster

Innovation Booster was founded in 2012 by three young graduates. Although at that moment the exact business offering was not completely certain, it was sure that they wanted to challenge the status quo of corporates. In almost five years Innovation Booster has evolved into a company with over twenty employees and a proven track record with almost a hundred successfully finished projects for clients such as ING, Achmea International, Ahold, N&S, and Noordhoff. This chapter gives a more extensive description of Innovation Booster and describes the problem it faces.

3.1 Description Innovation Booster

Innovation Booster is a consulting and design company that tries to reshape large corporates to become more economically sustainable and to become better at conducting business in new and increasingly dynamic marketplaces. Innovation Booster thereby focuses on stimulating innovation and entrepreneurship and attempts to embed these characteristics in organizations. Innovation Booster uses a methodology called ‘Entrepreneurial Innovation for Enterprises’, which combines organizational transformation and business innovation in one methodology.

Innovation Booster specializes in two areas: (1) product and market innovation (new business) and (2) innovation culture and organizational transformation (innovation transformation). The goal of a product and market innovation project is to generate new business for an organization. The goal of an innovation culture and organizational transformation project is to initiate change in an organization, which eventually leads to a transformation of that organization into a more dynamic, innovative and flexible organization.

During a new business project, innovation boosters (this is how the employees of Innovation Booster are called) work together with employees of the organization. These projects often start within the scope of one department and are performed using only a small group of people. Methods and tools from the fields of business, technology and design are used to generate the new business. During this process of developing new propositions, the engaged employees and their department become familiar with a more ‘entrepreneurial and innovative’ way of working and thinking. This is also how the second area of specialization of Innovation Booster (innovation culture and organizational transformation) was initiated. They realized that the new way of working and thinking, which can be seen as a first step in the transformation process, was just as important, maybe even more, for their clients. Recently, these transformation projects therefore have gotten more attention. Transformation projects are larger and more invasive compared to the new business projects. During these projects Innovation Booster acts more as a partner to develop internal accelerators or innovation hubs within large and established organizations.

3.2 Problem description

As mentioned in the introduction, central to the projects that Innovation Booster performs for its clients, are the employees of these client organizations. For both new business and innovation transformation projects, Innovation Booster needs employees that make sure that innovation initiatives are initiated and implemented, concrete actions are taken and other people are stimulated to think outside their own job description. New business projects are challenging, require a lot of effort and time, and the outcome is uncertain. Moreover, these projects are performed in a short time period so the pressure is high. The innovation transformation projects can be regarded new business projects, but with more employees and teams involved and a focus on transforming employees. In both cases, Innovation Booster needs employees that take responsibility, are proactive and are not afraid to take risks. In other words, they need to involve the intrapreneurs of the client organizations. However, the problem is that Innovation Booster does not know how to do this.
Therefore, the following problem statement is composed:

*Innovation Booster does not know how to best identify and select intrapreneurs for their new business and innovation transformation projects.*

An important side note, which is taken into consideration during the design process, is that every project Innovation Booster performs is different. For example, sometimes Innovation Booster gets a department of the organization assigned with which they have to start of the project, while in other situations they have no specific starting point. This means that sometimes they have to work with a specific group of people and sometimes they get to choose with whom to work, which makes that an identification and selection process is not always possible. However, in this case measuring intrapreneurial behavior could still be useful to adapt the project to that specific organization.

In summary, whether it concerns a new business or innovation transformation project, success of these projects depends strongly on the client organizations’ employees, which are preferably intrapreneurs who can initiate actions, motivate others and realize results. Currently, Innovation Booster identifies and selects the employees of the client organization for their projects without any evident procedure. Sometimes they do not even get to chance to identify and select employees as they get a specific department of the client organization assigned. If Innovation Booster would be able to identify and select the intrapreneurs of client organizations based on an evident procedure, the right people can be selected, teams can be better composed, and intrapreneurial behavior can be stimulated more precisely, which results in more efficient and effective projects.
4. Methodology

This chapter describes the methodology used in this research. It consists of five main components. First, it describes the type of methodology used and explains the nature of this research. The second part of this chapter describes the data collection process that is used in this research, which is qualitative in nature. Furthermore, it describes the process of data analysis, which is followed by a description of the design process of this research. The fifth and final component of this chapter is concerned with the quality of this research and describes the steps the author took to guarantee this.

4.1 Methodology and nature of this research

The methodology used in this research is based on the design science paradigm and focuses on the analysis and design of a solution for a business problem. Moreover, it focuses on the change and implementation processes that accompany the solution (Van Aken et al., 2012). This research forms a combination of a field problem solving project and a science-based design project (Van Aken et al., 2012). The purpose of a field problem solving project is to solve a business performance problem in the actual business world. The aim of a science-based design project is to apply scientific design knowledge to design a solution (Van Aken et al., 2012). In other words, the approach used is problem and design oriented and theory informed. Although the focus is on the design science paradigm this research project also contained aspects of the explanatory research paradigm to develop scientific knowledge that can be used to design the solution. Explanatory research aims at developing knowledge. This type of research tries to solve a pure knowledge problem in the immaterial world of knowledge. This can take place in an academic context, where the knowledge problem is more generic, or in a business context, where the knowledge problem is more specific (Van Aken et al., 2012).

4.1.1 Design science research and explanatory research

The organization for which this research is performed (Innovation Booster) is searching for a solution to a specific problem they face. The organization wants to achieve actual improvement in this area and is therefore looking for a solution. It seems therefore only fitting to use a design science research approach, as this aims at actively solving business performance problems. A second reason for choosing this approach concerns the work methods of Innovation Booster. Innovation Booster applies fast, iterative learning cycles in their own projects to effect change, achieve visible results quickly, and most of all to make sure their solutions fit exactly with what their client wants. It seems therefore more appropriate the use a design science research approach as this approach also aims at using multiple iterative learning cycles to optimize the designed solution.

Using a design science approach as main focus does not mean that only a solution will be designed and that no new knowledge is generated. The aim of this research was also to contribute to the scientific literature by generating new knowledge and is therefore also based on the explanatory research paradigm. Qualitative research methods are used to provide an in-depth understanding of the research issues at hand. Qualitative methods are useful for exploring new topics, understanding complex issues and explaining people’s beliefs and behaviors. Qualitative research is most suitable for answering ‘why’ questions, which try to explain and understand issues, and ‘how’ questions, which describe behavior and processes (Hennink et al., 2011). The research questions of this research are ‘how’ questions and establish knowledge about identifying and selecting intrapreneurs. Therefore, a qualitative research method in the form of interviews was used (more information on the interviews is provided in paragraph 4.2 ‘Data collection’).

4.1.2 The problem solving cycle and the empirical cycle

Central to a field problem solving projects is the problem solving cycle. The problem solving cycle is driven by the needs that arise when a company has a business problem. The cycle consists of the following components: problem definition, analysis and diagnosis, solution design, intervention, and learning and evaluation (Van Aken et al., 2012). The final two steps, intervention and learning and evaluation, fall out of the scope of this research as the complete, fully developed solution was not actually implemented and therefore it was not possible to evaluate the solution. However, iterative
learning cycles were used during the development of the solution, which made sure that the intervention and learning and evaluation steps of the problem solving cycle are less prone to surprises. Using iterative learning cycles is based on the methods of ‘Lean startup’ and ‘Agile’, which are described more extensively in Appendix A.

The empirical cycle consists of five steps: observation, induction, deduction, testing, and evaluation (Van Aken et al., 2012). The observation and induction step roughly compose the theory development aspect of the empirical cycle. The other three steps (deduction, testing, and evaluation) are part of the theory testing process of the empirical cycle. The empirical cycle has been completed during this research. During the literature review, which preceded this research report, and during the beginning of this research a topic was chosen, literature gaps were distinguished and research questions were composed. The research questions were answered by the data that was gathered from the interviews. Subsequently, the results of these interviews were translated into design knowledge and a new theoretical model.

Figure 3 shows how the problem solving and empirical cycle were integrated in this research to comprise one overall methodology. As can be seen, during the analysis & diagnosis step of the problem solving cycle the empirical cycle can be started to develop new knowledge that can be used during the ‘solution design’ step of the problem solving cycle.

4.1.3 The design process
The third step of the problem solving cycle includes the design of the solution. In this research report specific attention is placed on the design, therefore this paragraph zooms in on this step and explains what a design process looks like. Paragraph 4.4 explains the specific design process that is used for this research.

A design process is structured as follows: determining design directions, identifying design requirements, identifying design parameters, creating solutions, selecting a solution, detailing. Although this sounds like a linear process, it is actually not. The basic actions which are central in the design process are iterations, which are constant loops of designing to evaluation (this is based on the principles of ‘lean startup’ and ‘agile’, as these loops resemble the ‘build – measure – learn loop’ that is central to the lean startup methodology). The steps therefore represent the main process steps, which can be performed in parallel, influence each other and include iterations.

Another component that is important in a design process is the change plan, which describes how the designed solution can be implemented and which accompanying changes in the organization need to be established. A change plan consists of the following components: delta analysis, stakeholder analysis, resistance analysis, an intervention strategy, and an action plan. The delta analysis describes the major changes that need to be realized. The stakeholder analysis identifies the people or groups of people that are effected by the solution. The resistance analysis identifies the type and level of resistance.
expected from every stakeholder. Based on the resistance analysis an intervention strategy is created (Van Aken et al., 2012). Based on the all the previous analyses an action plan is composed. This action plan describes which actions the organization needs to take in order to implement the proposed solution (Van Aken et al., 2012).

4.2 Data collection
This paragraph describes the method of data collection that is used in this research. A variety of data collection methods can be used in qualitative research, for example observations, textual analysis and interviews. In this research the chosen method of data collection, besides academic literature, was interviews. More specifically, this research used different types of interviews for different interviewee groups. In total, five different interviewee groups were interviewed; academic experts, corporate innovation experts, innovation boosters (employees of Innovation Booster), intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs. A detailed description of this data collection process per interviewee groups is provided below. This description explains why people were interviewed, provides some demographic information about the interviewees, and describes the set-up of the interviews.

The saturation principle was used to determine how many people to interview, which means that a topic was considered covered enough when the new information gathered did not provide real new insights into this topic, instead it only confirmed what had already been found/known. When this so called diminishing returns effect kicked in, I assumed that the most important information was gathered.

4.2.1 Academic experts
Academic experts in the field of intrapreneurship were interviewed to substantiate the composed research questions. These experts provided valuable insights into several aspects of the literature review, which formed the basis for composing the research questions. Furthermore, these experts provided useful information on how to answer the research questions (data collection framework and process) and on what solution directions to think of.

In total three academic experts were interviewed. Two of the three academic experts were identified by a research report that they wrote. These two experts were part of a group of people that developed the Intrapreneurial Behavior Measure (IBM), which is important to this research. The other expert was identified during the interview with the other two academic experts. They pointed out that I should interview the third academic expert.

The first two academic experts were interviewed together, during a face to face meeting. This interview took about an hour. The third academic expert was interviewed over the phone. This interview took about a half hour. Both interviews were in Dutch. Furthermore, the interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Both interviews were open in nature. This means that only a few questions were written down as guideline for the interviews as the goal was to have an open discussion about the research questions and set-up of the research. The first interview also contained some questions specifically focused on the IBM, as those experts were involved in its development. The experts received a short explanation of the research beforehand via email. The interview questions used can be found in Appendix B.

4.2.2 Corporate innovation experts
A corporate innovation expert was also interviewed during this research. The corporate innovation expert was interviewed to provide information on innovation processes in organizations and how to organize and stimulate these processes. This corporate innovation expert was identified through a former internship of the author. The corporate innovation expert works for a multinational financial organization, where he set-up the innovation department.

The interview was face to face, took about a half hour and was in Dutch. The interview was not recorded, because the surrounding was too chaotic. The author made notes during the interview and transcribed those notes right after the interviews, when the interview was still fresh in the memory of the author. The interview was also open in nature and only a few questions were written down as guideline for the interview. The main goal was to discuss the research questions and his experience at his organization. The interview questions that were used can be found in Appendix C.
4.2.3 Innovation boosters

Innovation boosters (employees of Innovation Booster) are central to this research as they are performing the projects and eventually have to use the proposed solution. Therefore, innovation boosters were interviewed and included during every phase of this project.

First, innovation boosters were interviewed during the problem diagnosis and analysis phase, as they are the ones that experience and encounter the problem. At least seven innovation boosters were interviewed officially and other innovation boosters were spoken to in a less official manner. All interviewees were face-to-face and in Dutch. The interviews were not recorded, took between ten to thirty minutes and notes about essential information were made. The information was used to specify the scope and problem statement of this research. Furthermore, the interviews increased my understanding of Innovation Booster as organization, its work methods and projects. The interviews were all very open in nature and were only guided by the initially composed research questions.

Half way into the project a presentation was given. This presentation functioned as basis for an open discussion on the scope and design direction. During this presentation around the fifteen innovation boosters were present. The presentation and discussion were in Dutch and only the discussion was recorded.

Finally, innovation boosters were interviewed during the design phase of this research. In total, five innovation boosters were officially interviewed. The design, which was translated into an excel tool and accompanying manual, formed the basis for these interview sessions. During these interviews the innovation boosters were asked to read the manual and click around in the excel tool, any issues and feedback that came up were integrated immediately afterwards. The sessions were in Dutch and were not recorded. These interview sessions are considered user design tests, which are also shortly mentioned in paragraph 4.4 ‘The design process of this research’ and Chapter 6: ‘The design’.

4.2.4 Intrapreneurs

Intrapreneurs are important to interview, because they can give valuable insights into what convinced them to participate in an innovation project and how they were identified. Furthermore, they can provide information on what the organization does right and what it can improve to stimulate intrapreneurship. Intrapreneurs are also considered potential users of the tool and are therefore important to include.

In total thirteen intrapreneurs were interviewed, from four different client organizations of Innovation Booster. Innovation boosters were asked if they knew people within their client organization that could be considered an intrapreneur. In this way, the thirteen interviewed intrapreneurs were identified. The intrapreneurs possessed very diverse functions and worked at very different departments. For example, there were intrapreneurs from a new business development department, sales department, operational department, IT department and marketing department. They had functions like, strategic advisor, senior software developer, operational specialist, and digital business intelligence manager. From the thirteen intrapreneurs interviewed, ten were female and three were male. Also, their nationalities were very diverse, for example, intrapreneurs had Indian, Scottish, Greek and Dutch nationalities.

The intrapreneurs were interviewed individually. Four of the thirteen interviews were face to face, while the other nine interviews were conducted over Skype. Two of the interviews were in Dutch, while the other interviews were conducted in English. The interviews took approximately thirty minutes, were recorded and transcribed.

The interviews were semi-structured, because enough information was available on which the interview questions could be based. Furthermore, the interviews had to be structured to some extent to make sure that the information could actually be used to answer the research questions. However, some room was left to ensure the discovery and elaboration of knowledge that may not have been previously thought of.

Background information on the interview questions

The interview questions used for the intrapreneurs were based on the GEM and IBM, already validated questionnaires, as described in the research report of Preenen et al. (2014). Also, input from literature, experts and innovation boosters was used to compose the questions. The questions consisted of three main parts. The first part consisted of general questions about the intrapreneur. For example, there were questions about someone’s function. Furthermore, intrapreneurs were asked how long they had been
working for the organization. The second part was focused on intrapreneurial behavior and contained elements of the GEM and IBM. Furthermore, it consisted of questions about how intrapreneurs joined or were identified for the project of Innovation Booster and what strengths and weaknesses of the project were.

More specifically, during the interviews with intrapreneurs ten intrapreneurial behavior statements from the IBM, which has originally nineteen statements, were used; four on innovative behavior, three on proactive behavior and three on risk-taking behavior. The IBM has a number of statement that are focused on the same aspects, which are asked in a slightly different way. For example, two statements on innovative behavior that are very closely related are: ‘I create new ideas for difficult issues’ and ‘I generate original solutions for problems’. In these cases, only one of these statements was used during the interviews with intrapreneurs. In this way, the most important components of every behavioral dimension were still included. One other slight adjustment was made to the statements of the IBM, which concerns only the innovative behavior statements. These statements are not formulated as ‘I-statements’ in the IBM, were the statements concerning proactive and risk-taking behavior are. In order to make the design easy to use, all statements are ‘I-statements’ and therefore can have the same one to five answer scale. This meant that the innovative behavior statements had to be rewritten. To give an example, an original IBM statement was ‘evaluating the usefulness of innovative ideas’, the rewritten statement used in the design is ‘I evaluate the usefulness of innovative ideas’. Also important to note is that the original IBM statements on intrapreneurial behavior in Dutch and were translated for this research.

The IBM also includes the GEM questions. Therefore, the questions used in the interviews originated officially from the IBM. The GEM questions concern someone’s involvement in the development of a new activity for their most recent employer. Only the questions that elaborated on the new activity that someone described were left out due to limited relevance and time limitations. Furthermore, the questions were open-ended during the interviews but were originally multiple-choice questions. These questions were also originally in Dutch and therefore translated for this research.

The final part of the interview questions focused on the organization the intrapreneurs worked for. I asked the respondents their opinion on the climate for intrapreneurship that did or did not exist in the organization, including the structure of the organization and other factors that stimulated or blocked intrapreneurial behavior of employees. These questions were based on research of Preenen et al. (2014) and on the theoretical framework which suggests factors that could influence intrapreneurship.

The interview questions used for the intrapreneurs can be found in Appendix D.

4.2.5 Non-intrapreneurs

Besides intrapreneurs, also non-intrapreneurs were interviewed to see if there is a clear difference between the answers, specifically focused on intrapreneurial behavior, that intrapreneurs gave compared to non-intrapreneurs. Furthermore, non-intrapreneurs are also considered potential users of the tool and are therefore important to include.

Nineteen non-intrapreneurs were approached from which fourteen non-intrapreneurs responded. Thus, in total fourteen non-intrapreneurs were included in this research. The non-intrapreneurs were from two different organizations and had very different functions, like researcher, trainee, project engineer, project manager and technical specialist. Ten non-intrapreneurs were male and four were female.

The non-intrapreneurs were asked to fill out a questionnaire that contained parts of the interview questions that were asked to the intrapreneurs. One non-intrapreneur filled out the questionnaire over email, while the other non-intrapreneurs filled out the questionnaire after a project session with an innovation booster. The author was not present during the latter. The questionnaire was made in Dutch and English, however only the Dutch addressed non-intrapreneurs responded. Filling out the questionnaire took around ten minutes, according to the innovation booster.
**Background information on the questionnaires**

The questionnaire specifically focused on intrapreneurial behavior (part two of the interview questions of intrapreneurs). The questionnaire contained sixteen statements of the IBM. All original IBM statements on proactive and risk-taking behavior were used and six of the nine statements on innovative behavior were used. There were two reasons for extending the number of statements. The non-intrapreneurs were asked to rank the statements without the researcher being present, as was not the case with intrapreneurs, where the statements were part of the interviews. So, it was not possible to explain anything and therefore it seemed more appropriate to use more of the original statements of the IBM. Furthermore, if one statement would have been unclear there would still be enough other statements that measured the same dimension of behavior. Secondly, more statements were expected to give a more nuanced result. Comparing the results of intrapreneur and non-intrapreneurs was still based on the ten original statements used during the interviews with intrapreneurs.

Thus, three statements of the innovative behavior dimension of the IBM were not used. Two statements were very similar and therefore integrated (as mentioned before). The statement ‘I find out new working methods, work techniques and work instruments’ was regarded to be too unclear and expected to generate confusion. Finally, the statement ‘I introduce innovative ideas in the work environment in a systematic way’ was not used because there already was another statement concerning implementation of ideas and the term ‘systematic way’ and ‘work environment’ were expected to generate confusion. The term ‘systematic way’ is unclear and the term ‘work environment’ could suggest the internal organization, while many ideas people generate are also for (potential) clients, which are considered less the direct and internal work environment.

The questionnaire also contained the GEM questions, however in this case they were multiple choice questions instead of open questions.

The questionnaire used for the non-intrapreneurs can be found in Appendix E, both the Dutch and English questionnaire are included.

**4.3 Data analysis**

In order to analyze all the data collected during the interviews, the interviews were transcribed. The transcribed interviews are documented and available from the author. For the intrapreneurs a table (see Table 6, Appendix F) was composed that included the categories/questions that were most important for answering the research question. For example, the table includes a column ‘function’, ‘intrapreneurial behavior scores’, ‘included in Innovation Booster program by’, and positive and negative aspects about the Innovation Booster program. Furthermore, it includes a column named ‘other interesting insights’, which was used for information that did not fit into one of the other columns but was still interesting and useful to mention. This table summarizes all the relevant information that was collected during the interviews with the intrapreneurs and was filled out immediately after an interview was transcribed in order to make sure no relevant information was overlooked. This table also makes sure that information about the same aspects is structured in the same way, at the same place and made easily comparable. The data of the non-intrapreneurs was also structured by using a table (see Table 7, Appendix G). The table includes many of the same columns of the intrapreneur data table, however contains less columns as less questions were asked.

A table (see Table 8, Appendix H) was also used for the data of academic and corporate innovation experts. However, this table was less structured and included less categories, because data from these interviewee groups was more diverse and less comparable due to the openness of the interviews. This table therefore only includes the column interesting insights. These interesting insights were gathered by transcribing the interviews, reading the transcripts and highlighting the interesting and useful parts. This highlighting was done with the research question in mind.

**4.4 The design process of this research**

This paragraph shortly explains the design process that is used in this research. First, the design directions were determined. The design directions were based on the results of the explanatory research part of this research. Besides the design directions, the design requirements were identified. The design requirements of this research consist of functional requirements, user requirements and design restrictions. The design requirements were determined during the interviews with innovation boosters and were based on aspects innovation boosters mentioned during the interviews. Also, during the
interviews my understanding of Innovation Booster as organization, its work methods and projects increased, making it possible to determine what would and would not work as solution for Innovation Booster. After determining the design direction and requirements, the design parameters were identified. This was done by the author herself when an initial idea of the design was distinguished, but the specifications still needed to be added. Thus, the design parameters made it possible to specify and elaborate on the initial design. Also, a number of test were performed in order to specify and elaborate on the initial design. First of all, numerous design tests were performed. These design tests tested the initial design in order to get a validated start of the complete design creation. Besides these design tests, a number of user tests were performed as well. This included user tests with the employees of client organizations and innovation boosters. These test ensured that the design would become more user friendly. More information on the performed design and user tests can be found in paragraph 6.4.1.3 ‘Conducted tests’.

In summary, the design process of this research largely corresponds with a general design process (as described in paragraph 4.1.3 ‘The design process’), however where a general design process consists of creating solutions and selecting a solution, the design process of this research performed those phases more implicitly by using the parameters and design tests to continuously improve and adapt the design into the final tool.

4.5 Quality of this research
This section shortly describes the quality criteria that are important to academic research. Furthermore, it describes how the quality of this research is guaranteed. The most important research oriented quality criteria are: controllability, reliability, validity (Van Aken et al., 2012).

4.5.1 Controllability
Controllability refers to the extent to which research results are controllable. In order to ensure this, researchers have to show how they executed their research. A detailed description of how research is performed enables others to replicate it and check whether they get the same results (Van Aken et al., 2012).

In order to ensure the controllability of this study everything was very clearly reported. Although, it was not possible to use a complete standardized process for data collection, analysis and interpretations, by providing a description of this process it still gives insight in how these processes were conducted and which ‘thinking’ steps the author made.

4.5.2 Reliability
The second quality criterion is reliability. Reliability refers to the independence of the results. Research results are more reliable when they are independent of the researchers who conducted the research (Van Aken et al., 2012). In other words, research is perfectly reliable when every time the research is replicated it provides the same results. The reliability of research can be increased by, for example, including multiple researchers, standardization and triangulation (Van Aken et al., 2012).

In order to ensure the reliability of this research the method of triangulation was used, which means that multiple data sources were used in order to make decisions and conclusions. Furthermore, the saturation principle was used.

4.5.3 Validity
The third quality criterion is validity. Research can be considered valid when the way the research results are generated provides good reason to believe that the research results are true or adequate (Van Aken et al., 2012). Three different types of validity can be identified: construct validity, internal validity and external validity. Construct validity refers to the extent to which the measuring/data collection tool used actually measures what it is intended to measure. Internal validity refers to the results of the research and is met when the conclusions are justified and complete. External validity focuses on the generalizability and transferability of research results (Van Aken et al., 2012).
In order to ensure the validity of this research a number of steps were taken. For example, the interview questions (measuring tool of this research) for every interviewee group were carefully composed. The internal validity of this research was increased by using multiple data sources and different perspectives on this topic. In this way the topic is viewed from several angles and therefore can facilitate the discovery of all causes and important insights. External validity can be argued to be less important for field problem solving projects as it focuses on one specific problem. However, as this research also has a strong explanatory research component, the generalizability is more important. The goal was to, besides an appropriate solution, generate new (design) knowledge. In order to ensure the external validity of this knowledge a number of different cases (organizations where Innovation Booster is working for) were used in this research.
5. Results

This chapter describes the results of the interviews that were conducted with experts, intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs. For the sake of clarity, the results are presented and structured according to the following three questions: 1) How can intrapreneurs be characterized?, 2) What identification processes are currently available and/or used?, 3) What other factors influence the identification of intrapreneurs?. Taken together, the results of experts, intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs answer the first research question ‘How can organizations identify and select intrapreneurs?’.

This chapter is structured as follows. First, the results of the experts are presented. Thereafter, the results of the intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs are provided. Thirdly, a discussion and conclusion section is included, which discusses and summarizes the results. Finally, the results are integrated into a theoretical model that proposes a new way of characterizing intrapreneurs and explains how to identify these different types of intrapreneurs.

5.1 Results academic & other experts

Both academic and corporate innovation experts were interviewed. The results of these interviews are presented below.

5.1.1 Experts: characterization of intrapreneurs

The experts describe many different types of intrapreneurs. They used terms like ‘real intrapreneur’ and ‘latent intrapreneur’. A real intrapreneur is described as someone ‘who does it anyway’, where the latent intrapreneur is described as someone ‘who wants it, but does not dare, someone who needs the right environment’. Also, intrapreneurial types are described as ‘intrapreneurs that are very much developed’ and as ‘intrapreneurs with a predisposition’. Furthermore, it is suggested that there are people that are maybe not aware of the fact that they are an intrapreneur or possess intrapreneurial potential.

Next to all these different terms, experts mention that a distinction needs to be made between a nature and nurture approach concerning intrapreneurs. Where, according to the experts, the nature approach describes intrapreneurs as people having the natural talent to be an intrapreneur, the nurture approach focuses more on intrapreneurial behavior and how to stimulate this. The nurture approach is pointed out specifically as interesting. For example, an academic expert points out the following: ‘I think the nurture approach is more interesting for organizations, as organizations want to develop something in people. However, this does not take away that in some people you can develop something more easily than in others’.

Furthermore, respondents note the distinction between ‘being an intrapreneur’ and ‘showing intrapreneurial behavior’, which corresponds with the nature and nurture approaches mentioned. One expert states that there are people in which their intrapreneurial attitude (predisposition) does not come to expression as these people are stuck in organizations, because, for example, they do not get the time or get counteracted by the organization.

One expert zooms in on the nurture approach and highlights that another distinction needs to be made. On one side it may be possible to stimulate intrapreneurial behavior in people that normally would not express this type of behavior. On the other side it may be possible to nurture the people that have an intrapreneurial predisposition, but do not make enough use of it. In these cases, they claim that setting up the organization in such a way that people get challenging tasks and time is important. Furthermore, they suggest that there may be people that score higher over time on ‘being an intrapreneur’ and people that score the same on ‘being an intrapreneur’ but do more with the skills they possess.

5.1.2 Experts: the identification process

Experts also highlighted some possible ways to identify intrapreneurs. First of all, an innovation program, like the one from Innovation Booster, is suggested to be a self-selecting mechanism. An expert mentions that intrapreneurs are supposed to come running when hearing about a program like that. Furthermore, they claim that during the program it becomes evident which persons are intrapreneurs. As an expert explained: ‘Just give people during the program enough uncomfortable tasks and things to do, like things that are unknown, things that require risks, and things that are out of someone’s comfort zone, and you will be able to see which people are intrapreneurs.’ A respondent notes that it depends on
budget whether it is possible to actually use an innovation program as identification and selection mechanism, because the budget influences how many people can join a program like that, to consequently identify and select them.

Another approach mentioned arises from an example an expert explained, called ‘opt in’ vs. ‘opt out’. He explained research that was conducted, which compared two different situations. In the ‘opt in’ situation there is an innovation program or initiative and people have to decide for themselves if they want to join. In the ‘opt out’ situation everyone participates in an innovation program or initiative unless a person actively declines and decides not to participate. It is argued that with the first option you find the intrapreneurs that are already fully developed, while with the second option you give the chance to people with or without the predisposition to be intrapreneur to develop and actually show intrapreneurial behavior. As an expert explained: ‘The real intrapreneur will do it anyway, but for the latent intrapreneur, who wants but doesn’t dare as much, you need to build the right surrounding.’ The ‘opt out’ situation is offered as a possible solution.

5.1.3 Experts: other factors
Besides the different types of intrapreneurs that are mentioned and the distinction between intrapreneurial behavior and intrapreneurial predisposition, experts also mention a lot of other factors influencing the identification of intrapreneurs and the expression of intrapreneurial behavior. First of all, it is mentioned that when focusing on intrapreneurial behavior it is important to focus on all of three types and that many people and/or organizations often focus only on one type or even a sub-component of this type. For example, an expert mentioned that some people focus only on creativity (considered a sub-component of innovative behavior). He explains that some people are very creative, however this does not necessarily mean that they are also able to take concrete steps (e.g. developing, generating support, implementing, selling) with all the creative ideas they generate.

Next to this, experts mention the organizational context as very important when identifying intrapreneurs as it is said to influence the expression of intrapreneurial behavior. For example, an expert states: ‘I think a lot of people could be intrapreneurs but this does not show because they are stuck, they do not get the time and are counteracted by the organization. You need to build the right surrounding.’ It is pointed out that the identification of intrapreneurs is a multilevel question, because a person could really want to do something and have the right predisposition, but if their supervisor completely blocks it, this person gets stuck. It is mentioned that the organizational structure can make it so hard for intrapreneurs that these persons need to be so highly proactive to accomplish something, that this could not always be expected. Top and middle management are suggested to be important in nurturing intrapreneurs and intrapreneurial behavior. An expert explains that top management can do this by creating the right context, freeing up a budget and setting appropriate key performance indicators. Middle management needs to be responsible for really supporting the intrapreneurs on the work floor.

Finally, communication is considered an important factor that influences the identification of intrapreneurs. One expert suggests that instead of it being an identification challenge, it is more of a distribution challenge. He states the following: ‘You could expect from intrapreneurs that they will come running when they hear about some kind of innovation initiative. Therefore, an organization should make sure that everyone in the organization is familiar with the innovation initiatives that exist.’ Other experts, to which this suggestion was presented, also thought that how you communicate is very important and that innovation initiatives could form a self-selecting mechanism.

Next to communication considering innovation initiatives, how you communicate the attitude of the organization towards intrapreneurship to all employees is also claimed to be important. It is suggested to potentially influence the expression of intrapreneurial behavior in employees. For example, an expert explained that he introduced the innovation manifest, which describes the attitude towards innovation and change that the organization would like employees to have. He states: ‘I always say, ask yourself the following questions: 1) Does this action add value?, 2) Do I get fired for it? IF the answers are yes and no, then just go for it.’

5.2 Results intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs
Intrapreneurs were interviewed and non-intrapreneurs were presented a selection of the questions that were asked to intrapreneurs. The results of the answers of intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs are described below.
5.2.1 (Non-)Intrapreneurs: characterization of intrapreneurs

By analyzing the data of intrapreneurs, some interesting results were found. First of all, none of the intrapreneurs have any experience with being a business owner, founder or being self-employed. One intrapreneur pointed out that he tried setting up a startup but it did not work out. A few other intrapreneurs highlighted the circumstances in their country (Greece) as ‘difficult’ and ‘too risky’ for setting up something for their own. Looking at the data from the non-intrapreneurs, it becomes evident that also none of the non-intrapreneurs have experience with being a business owner, founder or being self-employed.

Next to having experience with being a business owner, founder or being self-employed, intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs were asked if they were involved in the development of new activities. It appears that all intrapreneurs were involved in the development of new activities in the past couple of years, either at their current or former employer. For one intrapreneur this new activity included changing the online shop, which meant setting up a business case, getting support for this business case and eventually implementing the business case. Two other intrapreneurs explained the new activity as setting up a whole new department within the company. Another explained that she was involved in the development of the social media presence of the organization, as it did not exist before.

Focusing on the non-intrapreneurs, four of the fourteen non-intrapreneurs were involved in the development of a new activity in the past couple of years and had at least in one phase of this development (development or implementation) a leading role. One non-intrapreneur described this activity as ‘determining working methods’, while another described it as ‘being involved in the development of various new services for different vertical markets’. Another non-intrapreneur described this new activity as being part of a team in the innovation program and being part of the board of her student organization.

Besides to the two abovementioned results, some interesting results were found by analyzing the scores that were given to the statements concerning intrapreneurial behavior by intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs. Looking at the scores the intrapreneurs gave to the three different behavioral dimensions of intrapreneurship, which is only the case for twelve of the thirteen interviewed intrapreneurs, the average score for innovative behavior is 4.0, for proactive behavior it is 4.3 and for risk-taking behavior the score is 4.0. All intrapreneurs score a 3.0 or higher on every behavioral aspect. Nine of the twelve intrapreneurs score a 3.5 or higher on all behavioral aspects.

Looking at the scores the non-intrapreneurs gave to the three behavioral dimensions of intrapreneurship, the average score on innovative behavior is 3.4, for proactive behavior it is 3.7, and for risk-taking behavior the score is 3.0. Seven of the fourteen non-intrapreneurs score a 3.0 or higher on every behavioral aspect. However, only two non-intrapreneurs score a 3.5 or higher on all behavioral aspects. The latter two results do not change when calculating the scores with all the sixteen statements used in the questionnaires of the non-intrapreneurs. Table 1 provides an overview of the abovementioned scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Innovative behavior</th>
<th>Proactive behavior</th>
<th>Risk-taking behavior</th>
<th>Number of people that score 3.0 or higher on all three dimensions</th>
<th>Number of people that do not score a 3.0 or higher on all three dimensions</th>
<th>Number of people that score 3.5 or higher on all three dimensions</th>
<th>Number of people that do not score a 3.5 or higher on all three dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrapreneurs</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intrapreneurs</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2 (Non-)Intrapreneurs: the identification process

The intrapreneurs were asked how they became aware of and involved with the innovation program of Innovation Booster and three ways were identified. First, two intrapreneurs became part of the program, because they were the ones that initiated the program. One intrapreneur explains: ‘I came up with the idea, the program, and set it up.’ Another way by which intrapreneurs became involved was by actively acting or searching. This means that they either knew about the program or found out about it and reached out. For example, one intrapreneur reached out to one of the program leaders and told him that she wanted to be part of the team. Another intrapreneur, uploaded ideas on a newly introduced platform and was contacted to take part. Finally, most intrapreneurs were introduced to the program by their manager or supervisor. An intrapreneur states the following: ‘My manager proposed that I attend this open day where they introduced us to the Innovation Booster way and I liked the idea and then I volunteered for it.’ Other intrapreneurs explain that people knew about them, their attitude and past behaviors, and therefore asked them to join.

Some other interesting things were mentioned concerning the identification of intrapreneurs. One intrapreneur states that if she had worked or had been in contact with a person, she could identify them as an intrapreneur. Another intrapreneur states that he thinks that a manager or supervisor can definitely identify people as an intrapreneur, as he or she knows who has certain skills and capabilities. On the other hand, it is mentioned that people who volunteer for an innovation initiative should also be able to participate, despite their skills, capabilities and past behavior, as these people can prove to be very useful and maybe even be an intrapreneur.

5.2.3 (Non-)Intrapreneurs: other factors

Next to aspects that seem to characterize intrapreneurs, also some important factors that influence the identification and expression of intrapreneurial behavior are distinguished by the interviews with intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs.

One overarching factor often mentioned is the organizational structure. For example, an intrapreneur highlights the structure as important factor and said the following: ‘A lot of people get stuck in a certain role within the organization, so a lot of people do not get the opportunity to broaden their horizons and look at the bigger picture.’ Moreover, it suggested that people need responsibility, freedom and space to express intrapreneurial behavior. Another respondent claims that intrapreneurial behavior can be stimulated by less hierarchy, which ensures less bureaucracy and consequently creates less obstacles for developing ideas. Furthermore, culture is also mentioned as a factor. As an intrapreneur explains: ‘… and with intrapreneurship, I think that a lot of people have that in them, but the culture and structure just suppresses it.’ Culture is not only mentioned as suppressing factor, but also as a factor that can stimulate intrapreneurial behavior. One organization introduced a behavioral code, which includes core values and statements like ‘take it on and make it happen’, ‘you help others be successful’, and ‘you are courageous’. These values form the basis for evaluating employees in that specific organization. It is suggested that these core values largely correspond with the three types of intrapreneurial behavior and could therefore influence how an organization can identify intrapreneurial behavior and stimulate it as well. Also, the reward system is mentioned as a factor, with an intrapreneur saying the following: ‘They (the organization) have to show that entrepreneurial behavior will get rewarded if you want to stimulate it.’

Zooming in more specifically on the structure of an organization, an intrapreneur points out that resistance towards intrapreneurship does not typically come from the top or bottom of the organization, but from the middle layers. Middle management is said to form a large obstacle. On the other hand, top management is in some cases seen as a large facilitating factor, as many intrapreneurs explain that their CEO is very much in favor of intrapreneurship and this creates a level of transparency and comfort, which helps people share ideas and act more intrapreneurial. One intrapreneur quotes: ‘Our CEO says, if you fail a hundred times, you did not fail, you just found a hundred ways that do not work.’. Another intrapreneur states that she has the feeling that she has the opportunity to knock on the CEO’s door and tell him her ideas, even though she never actually talked to him. She states: ‘I am not afraid to talk to the top-level management so I am not afraid to share my ideas.’
5.3 Discussion and conclusion
Empirical research, in the form of interviews and questionnaires, was performed to answer the research question: ‘How can organizations identify and select intrapreneurs?’ This section discusses the results that were found and provides the main conclusions.

5.3.1 Characterization of intrapreneurs
First of all, there seem to be different types of intrapreneurs as experts mention terms like ‘real’ and ‘latent’ intrapreneur. Also, intrapreneurial types are described as ‘intrapreneurs that are very much developed’ or as ‘intrapreneurs with a predisposition’. Furthermore, an intrapreneur states: ‘…these people can prove to be very useful and maybe even be an intrapreneur.’ The latter suggest that someone could at first not seem to be an intrapreneur, but maybe eventually become one.

This all seems to relate with the distinction that experts make between a nature and nurture approach concerning intrapreneurs. The two approaches mentioned by experts seem to closely relate to the two approaches concerning the intrapreneur described in literature (see paragraph 2.5 ‘Identifying intrapreneurs – two methods’). The nature approach is linked to the method that states that there are intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs in an organization, which forms the basis for the GEM. The nurture approach corresponds to the other approach that describes that everyone contains a certain level of the three behavioral dimensions making up intrapreneurship (innovative, proactive, risk-taking) and which corresponds with the IBM (Preenen et al., 2014; Preenen et al., 2015).

Taking all the information together it seems that intrapreneurs are suggested to differ on two axes: predisposition to being an intrapreneur (nature approach) and intrapreneurial behavior (nurture approach).

5.3.2 The identification process
Focusing specifically on how to identify intrapreneur a number of aspects can be concluded. Literature describes two methods for identifying intrapreneurs, the GEM and IBM (see paragraph 2.5 ‘Identifying intrapreneurs – two methods’). The experts and intrapreneurs offer some other possible identification options. For example, most intrapreneurs were introduced to the program by their manager or supervisor. Other intrapreneurs explain that people knew about them, their attitude and past behaviors, and therefore asked them to join. So, it seems that the informal network of an organization could be an interesting factor when looking for ways to identify intrapreneurs. More specifically, it seems that a persons’ previous actions and behavior plus their network are important. This was substantiated by an intrapreneur quoting the following: ‘If I had worked, or if I had some contact, with the person I could identify them as an intrapreneur.’ Another intrapreneur stated that he thinks that a manager or supervisor can definitely identify people as an intrapreneur, as he or she knows who has certain skills and capabilities.

Next to the informal network, the innovation initiative itself also forms a possible identification method, with many different factors influencing this like budget, communication and the set-up of the program. The latter is explained by the ‘opt in’ vs. ‘opt out’ example, which describes an innovation initiative wherein people have to sign up versus an innovation initiative wherein everyone participates unless he or she actively declines. It is suggested that the situations can be used to identify different type of intrapreneurs. This substantiates the previously drawn conclusion about there being different intrapreneurs.

Zooming in on the results of the intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs that are specifically focused on identifying intrapreneurs based on intrapreneurial behavior (aspects of the GEM and IBM were used during the interviews), three main conclusions can be drawn. First, experience with being a business owner, founder or being self-employed seems not to characterize an intrapreneur as both the intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs included in this research have no experience with this. This result is different from the results often found in the literature. Literature suggests that prior experience with entrepreneurship can positively affect intrapreneurship (Preenen et al., 2014). Through prior experience with entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial activities people develop relevant knowledge, skills and a useful network that are necessary for solving problems and coming up with innovative solutions and consequently show this behavior in established organizations (Preenen et al., 2014). A possible explanation for this contradictory result could be that many of the interviewed intrapreneurs were from Greece, and some pointed out that the economic climate in Greece is currently very unstable, which...
makes setting up your own business very hard. Furthermore, an intrapreneur pointed out that being an entrepreneur is not something that is stimulated very much in the Greek culture, which could explain why they do not have any experience with being an entrepreneur.

Secondly, the involvement in the development of a new activity could potentially be a factor that distinguishes an intrapreneur from a non-intrapreneur, because every intrapreneur was involved in the development of a new activity, while this applied only to four of the non-intrapreneurs. Furthermore, the new activities that were described seem to be from another level. More specifically, some of the activities that non-intrapreneurs were involved in seem to generate less impact. Were intrapreneurs describe this new activity as, for example, setting up a whole new department, a non-intrapreneur described it as ‘determining working methods’.

The third conclusion concerns the intrapreneurial behavior scores of intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs. On average, the intrapreneurs score higher on the three intrapreneurial behavioral dimensions (4.0, 4.3, 4.0 compared to 3.4, 3.7, 3.0), however it cannot be confirmed if this is also a significant difference. More interesting are the scores of three behavioral dimensions for every single intrapreneur and non-intrapreneur. It was pointed out by an expert that looking at all three behavioral dimensions combined is important compared to focusing only on one dimension, as an intrapreneur is suggested to possess all three types of behavior instead of only one. A one to five scale was used for measuring intrapreneurial behavior, so 3.0 could be considered the average score. If scoring a 3.0 or higher on every dimension is used as a cut off score to assume that someone is an intrapreneur, all intrapreneurs interviewed can also be assumed to really be intrapreneurs. However, in this case also seven of the fourteen non-intrapreneurs are supposed to be intrapreneurs. When taking 3.5 or higher as cut-off score these results change substantially. Nine of the twelve intrapreneurs are in this case really intrapreneurs and twelve of the fourteen non-intrapreneurs are classified as non-intrapreneurs and score lower than a 3.5 on at least one dimension (see Table 1). Thus, a cut off score of 3.5 or higher on every behavioral dimension seems to best distinguish intrapreneurs from non-intrapreneurs1.

5.3.3. Other factors
Besides possible different types of intrapreneurs and different identification options, respondents also mention a lot of other factors that influence the identification of intrapreneurs and the expression of intrapreneurial behavior. For example, the organizational structure is mentioned as important factor. It is mentioned that the organizational structure can make it so hard for intrapreneurs that these persons need to be so highly proactive to accomplish something, that this could not always be expected. Another respondent claims that intrapreneurial behavior can be stimulated by less hierarchy, which ensures less bureaucracy and consequently creates less obstacles for developing ideas. This is in line with the results from literature. Research points out that a flat organizational structure and a limited number of organizational procedures are important structural aspects that stimulate intrapreneurial activities (Kuratko et al., 2014; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013).

---

1 Determining this cut-off score was done by using the research report of Preenen et al. (2014). Preenen et al. (2014) provide a number of suggestions for determining a cut off score that determines if someone can be identified as intrapreneur (see paragraph 2.5 ‘Identifying intrapreneurs – two methods’). One of the suggestions is to determine this cut off score based on performance and achievements of people. So, for example, if it appears that people that perform very well (in this research innovation boosters pointed out which people can be considered intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs in their projects based on the performance of these people), clearly show a specific score on every dimension, this score can become the possible cut off score. Another suggestion is to search for clear cut off scores within the data distribution. Using these two methods makes that a score of 3.5 or higher on every dimension forms a possible cut off score that characterizes an intrapreneur from a non-intrapreneur. Another suggestion for determining a cut off score that Preenen et al. (2014) explains is taking the average score of the three behavioral dimensions and using a 4.0 or higher as the cut off score, because then you select the people that give themselves a ‘high’ to ‘very high’ on intrapreneurial behavior. Applying this method does not change the results from the other methods just explained. However, this method does not take into account that all three types of intrapreneurial behavior are important, as someone could score very high on innovative behavior and low on risk-taking behavior and still score a 4.0 or higher.
Furthermore, culture is mentioned as a factor, which is also in line with what literature describes. The organizational culture should provide the freedom to fail and needs to condone mistakes and see mistakes as an opportunity to learn (Kuratko et al., 2014; Seshadri & Tripathy, 2006). It seems that this can be partially created by management of an organization as an intrapreneur states the following: ‘Our CEO says, if you fail a hundred times, you did not fail, you just found a hundred ways that do not work.’ This suggests that top management can make sure people feel safe and are not afraid to act intrapreneurial.

Also, the reward system is mentioned as a factor, with an intrapreneurs saying the following: ‘They (the organization) have to show that entrepreneurial behavior will get rewarded if you want to stimulate it.’ Many researchers name the reward and reinforcement systems also as a factor that effects intrapreneurship (Hayton, 2005; Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kuratko et al., 2014; Mokaya, 2012; Rule & Irwin, 1988).

Finally, top and middle management are suggested to be important in nurturing intrapreneurs and intrapreneurial behavior. An expert explains that top management can do this by creating the right context, freeing up a budget and setting appropriate key performance indicators. Middle management needs to be responsible for really supporting the intrapreneurs on the work floor. Also, many authors point out that management support is an important factor influencing intrapreneurship (Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kuratko et al., 2014; Mehta & Gupta, 2014; Mokaya, 2012; Rigttering & Weitzel, 2013; Rule & Irwin, 1988; Seshadri & Tripathy, 2006).

5.3.4 Conclusion
In summary, there seem to be different types of intrapreneurs, which can influence how intrapreneurs are identified and selected. Furthermore, there are different ways in which intrapreneurs can be identified, however it is not yet clear what identification option is best suited to what situation and how these options are linked to different types of intrapreneurs. Finally, identifying and selecting intrapreneurs is influenced by many other factors, like the organizational structure, culture, reward system, and top and middle management. These factors can possibly influence the different identification options and types of intrapreneurs.

In conclusion, identifying and selecting intrapreneurs seems to be a multi factor question as the different types of intrapreneurs seem to be linked to the different identification options, which in turn are both influenced by other factors.

5.4 Theoretical model
It becomes evident from the conclusions of the interviews, that in order to be able to identify and eventually even select intrapreneurs, it is important to make a distinction in the different types of intrapreneurs. This part of the results chapter explains a new theoretical model that attempts to distinguish different types of intrapreneurs. Furthermore, it discusses different identification methods, which are explained in the previous paragraphs, and links those to the classification of intrapreneurs.

5.4.1 Classification of intrapreneurs
An intrapreneur can be described as an employee within an established organization who turns ideas into reality and who takes responsibility for this process (Pinchot & Pellman, 1999; Rathna & Vijaya, 2009; Rigttering & Weitzel, 2013; Weber et al., 2014). An intrapreneur may or may not be the person who came up with the initial idea. An intrapreneur is however the person that takes action and gets things done (Pinchot & Pellman, 1999). Intrapreneurs are said to be self-determined goal setters, self-motivated, action focused, ambitious, creative, optimistic, persuasive and questioning the status quo (Amo & Vereid, 2005; Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kolveried & Amo, 2002; Mehta & Gupta, 2014; Pinchot, 1985; Sayeed & Gazdar, 2003; Shatzer & Schwartz, 1991; Teltumbde, 2006; Thompson et al., 2014; Weber et al., 2014). Also, intrapreneurs are believed to show innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior (Preenen et al., 2014).

5.4.1.1 Classic intrapreneur
The intrapreneur that fits the abovementioned description can be labeled a ‘classic’ intrapreneur. The classic intrapreneur is someone who has the natural talent or predisposition to become one and is able to actually show this behavior as well. It is someone who shows intrapreneurial behavior no matter what.
Experts described this type of intrapreneur as ‘real’ intrapreneur, and as ‘someone with the predisposition to be an intrapreneur, who is able to also show intrapreneurial behavior’.

5.4.1.2 Latent intrapreneur
The second type of intrapreneur that can be distinguished is the ‘latent’ intrapreneur. In order to explain what a latent intrapreneur is, it is important to make a difference between personal characteristics of an intrapreneur and intrapreneurial behavior. This is an important distinction, which is often not clearly emphasized in the literature. Personal characteristics may describe the person who has the best predisposition to become an intrapreneur, however this does not mean that this person will actually show or engage in intrapreneurial behavior. This may sound counterintuitive, because intrapreneurs are described as persons that turn ideas into reality, take responsibility, and will push through boundaries to accomplish this. However, the organizational environment is believed to being able to block the predispositions of an intrapreneur to such a significant level that it becomes almost impossible for intrapreneurs to also really show intrapreneurial behavior.

The theory of planned behavior forms a possible explanation for this ambivalence. This theory helps to predict and explain behavior of people in specific situations. The idea behind this principle is that specific behavior is not only influenced by general dispositions, like personality traits, but also by other factors that are unique to the specific situation (Ajzen, 1991). Central to this theory is someone’s intention to perform a given behavior. In general, the stronger someone’s intention to perform certain behavior, the more likely that this behavior is performed. However, this is only the case if the person can decide at will to perform or not perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). This means that, so called, non-motivational factors like time, money, skills and cooperation of others could influence if someone’s intentions get translated into actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991). This could be the case for latent intrapreneurs. They may have the intention to perform intrapreneurial behavior, however showing the actual behavior gets blocked by other factors.

Furthermore, the theory of planned behavior considers intentions a function of information or beliefs about the likelihood that performing a particular behavior will lead to a specific outcome. This information and/or belief can be based on someone attitude or on subjective norms (Madden et al., 1992). Furthermore, intentions are influenced by someone’s perceived behavioral control, which refers to someone’s perception of the ease or difficulty of performing the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). It could be that a latent intrapreneur has different attitudes or subjective norms, or that he or she perceives a different level of behavioral control than classic intrapreneurs.

Also, the personality trait-based model of job performance offers a possible explanation. This model explains when and how a personality trait is expressed and proposes that task, social and organizational aspects in the work setting can influence the relationship between personality traits and the expression of trait related work behavior. An example of the organizational aspects are an organizations’ climate and culture (Tett & Burnett, 2003). So, it could be that there are aspects and conditions present in the work setting that put restraints on the expression of a latent intrapreneurs’ predisposition.

In conclusion, a latent intrapreneur is someone who has the natural talent or predisposition to become active as intrapreneur, but does not show intrapreneurial behavior as clearly as a classic intrapreneur does. Experts describes this type of intrapreneur as ‘someone who wants it, but does not dare, someone who needs the right environment’.

5.4.1.3 Potential intrapreneur
Thirdly, there is the ‘potential’ intrapreneur. As described in the literature, some people may have more potential to be an intrapreneur, but this does not mean that others cannot become an intrapreneur. Most scholars believe that is it possible to develop an intrapreneurial attitude in employees and thus argue that the intrapreneur is buried in almost every person (Davis, 1999, Herron, 1992; Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kolveried & Amo, 2002; Pinchot, 1985). The potential intrapreneur is a person who has a somewhat lower natural predisposition to be active as intrapreneur compared to the classic and latent intrapreneur and does not show intrapreneurial behavior as clearly. However, it is possible to unlock this behavior within this person. Experts explain this by suggesting that it may be possible to stimulate intrapreneurial behavior in people that normally would not express this type of behavior.
5.4.1.4 Enabled intrapreneur

Finally, I would like to introduce the term ‘enabled’ intrapreneur. An enabled intrapreneur, is someone who clearly shows intrapreneurial behavior. An ‘enabled’ intrapreneur could be a former potential intrapreneur that became able to unlock its potential and now shows intrapreneurial behavior. Also, it could be a former latent intrapreneur, which is now enabled to show intrapreneurial behavior. An enabled intrapreneur is not a classic intrapreneur as a classic intrapreneur does not have to be enabled to show intrapreneurial behavior.

5.4.1.5 Intrapreneur characterization model

Figure 4 shows the relationship between the four types of intrapreneurs. The x-axis describes the level of intrapreneurial behavior that a person shows. The y-axis describes the predisposition that a person has to become an intrapreneur. These two axes correspond with the nurture and nature approach respectively, as mentioned by the experts. As the figure shows, a classic intrapreneur is someone with a high predisposition and also shows high levels of intrapreneurial behavior. A latent intrapreneur is someone with also a high predisposition but is not able to clearly show intrapreneurial behavior. The potential intrapreneur scores lower on having a natural predisposition to being intrapreneur than a latent and classic intrapreneur and is not yet able to show intrapreneurial behavior. An enabled intrapreneur is someone that is enabled to clearly show intrapreneurial behavior. It can be someone with a high or somewhat lower predisposition to being an intrapreneur. The arrows show that both a latent and potential intrapreneur can become an enabled intrapreneur. A non-intrapreneur is someone with almost no predisposition to being an intrapreneur and therefore also shows no intrapreneurial behavior. It is believed by many scholars that the intrapreneur is buried in almost every person (Davis, 1999, Herron, 1992; Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kolveried & Amo, 2002; Pinchot, 1985), however as the word ‘almost’ explains, there will always be people in which this is not possible, hence the non-intrapreneur.

In summary, there are four new terms that are introduced when discussing an intrapreneur, namely: classic intrapreneur, latent intrapreneur, potential intrapreneur and enabled intrapreneur. The categorization forms the basis for developing identification strategies, as different approaches may be needed to identify each category of intrapreneur.

![Figure 4 – Intrapreneur characterization model](image_url)
5.4.2 Identification methods
In the previous paragraph a new classification of intrapreneurs was proposed. This paragraph describes how the classification of intrapreneurs links to different identification methods that were mentioned by interviewees and that already exist in literature. Per method it is described which types of intrapreneurs it could possibly identify.

First, the GEM considers someone to be an intrapreneur when this person was involved in the development of a new activity for his or her most important employer in the past three years. The latter is considered the broad definition of an intrapreneur. The GEM method also distinguishes a narrow definition of an intrapreneur, this definition applies to someone that is currently involved in the development of a new activity. The GEM focuses on someone’s past and current activity and accordingly behavior. The narrow definition suggests that the GEM method is able to identify a classic or enabled intrapreneur, as they are believed to show intrapreneurial behavior. Using the broad definition, the GEM method also seems to be able to identify a latent intrapreneur as it looks to the past three years. A latent intrapreneur does not currently show intrapreneurial behavior, but it could be possible that this person was enabled to show this behavior in the past, for example, in a different department or organization and is currently blocked by other factors that did not exist before.

The IBM makes it possible to measure intrapreneurial work behavior, by measuring innovation, proactive and risk-taking behavior, and provides suggestions for determining which scores can be used to identify someone as an intrapreneur. The IBM makes it possible to measure the x-axis of the classification; intrapreneurial behavior (development level of the intrapreneur). Although no specific cut off point is provided by the IBM itself, this research suggests a cut off score of 3.5 on every intrapreneurial behavior dimension. With this score it would be possible to identify a classic and enabled intrapreneur. Furthermore, the IBM makes it possible to measure intrapreneurial behavior over time and could be used to see the progress of people on intrapreneurial behavior. This can be used to see what the effects are of interventions and measures to stimulate this behavior. Moreover, with proven interventions it becomes possible to see who increases most on intrapreneurial behavior, which insinuates the presence of a latent and/or potential intrapreneur.

Another way to identify intrapreneurs is suggested to be by using the informal network of the organization and the managers and supervisors. As an intrapreneur states: ‘If I had worked, or if I had some contact, with the person I could identify them as an intrapreneur.’ Furthermore, many intrapreneurs were identified by their own manager or supervisor. This method seems to be able to identify classic and enabled intrapreneurs as it focuses on proven behavior of people. It could possibly also help to identify a latent intrapreneur as a manager in general knows the skills and capabilities of his employees and could therefore be able to judge who has the predisposition of being an intrapreneur, but does not yet make use of it or is not yet enabled.

Also, an innovation program like that of Innovation Booster is suggested to be a good identification method for intrapreneurs. In this case two possible options exists, called the ‘opt in’ option and the ‘opt out’ option. As previously explained in the ‘opt in’ situation there is an innovation program or initiative and people have to decide for themselves if they want to join, assuming that everyone in the organization is aware of this initiative, this method identifies classic and enabled intrapreneurs, as it suggests that with this method you find the intrapreneurs that are already fully developed. Furthermore, it could potentially also identify a latent intrapreneur as the presence of an innovation initiative in which you can participate could be enough stimulation for the latent intrapreneur to become enabled and show intrapreneurial behavior. However, this depends highly to what extent the organization really promotes this innovation initiative and offers the time and resources to people.

In the other situation, the ‘opt out’ option, everyone participates in an innovation program or initiative unless a person actively declines and decides not to participate. This option gives the chance to people with or without the predisposition to be an intrapreneur to develop and actually show intrapreneurial behavior and therefore is suggested to be able to identify latent and potential intrapreneurs.
5.4.3 Conclusion and discussion theoretical model
The suggested theoretical model for classifying intrapreneurs provides a better insight into what type of intrapreneurs there are. Furthermore, it includes a distinction, that literature and experts suggest, between the predisposition to being an intrapreneur and intrapreneurial behavior. Making a distinction between different types of intrapreneurs makes it possible to use more appropriate identification methods. Being able to identify different intrapreneurs can consequently assure that organizational measures and initiatives that stimulate intrapreneurship are targeted more precisely, making the development of intrapreneurship in an organization more efficient.

Many aspects still need to be figured out in order to optimize this model. First of all, the y-axis, predisposition to being an intrapreneur, is still very vague. Although literature suggests many aspects that characterize an intrapreneur, it is unclear if these characteristics form someone’s predisposition to being an intrapreneur. Also experts do not elaborate on what this predisposition could include. Furthermore, there does not seem to be a clear method for measuring this predisposition, making it hard to clearly substantiate the difference between a latent and potential intrapreneur.

Questions also arise when focusing on the x-axis, intrapreneurial behavior. A classic intrapreneur is assumed to have a predisposition and show intrapreneurial behavior, where a latent intrapreneur only has the predisposition. However, a latent intrapreneur can become an enabled intrapreneur, who clearly shows intrapreneurial behavior. Thus, a latent intrapreneur that became an enabled intrapreneur, looks a lot like a classic intrapreneur. Although situational factors are mentioned as potentially being the main differentiating factor, information or beliefs about the likelihood that performing a particular behavior will lead to a specific outcome and someone’s perceived behavioral control are also potential differentiating aspects. More research will have to turn out what really makes the difference between a latent intrapreneur which is enabled and a classic intrapreneur.
6. Design

This chapter consists of four main parts. First, the design directions are described, followed by a description of the design requirements and parameters. Subsequently, the design is discussed, which contains a general description of the design after which every aspect of the design is explained in detail.

6.1 Design directions

The first step in the design process was determining the design directions. The design directions were derived from the problem description of Innovation Booster and the results and conclusions of the interviews with experts, intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs.

The problem statement identified in Chapter 3 was: ‘Innovation Booster does not know how to best identify and select intrapreneurs for their new business and innovation transformation projects.’ The design should offer a solution to this problem and offer a possible way by which Innovation Booster can identify and select intrapreneurs for their projects.

The conclusions of the results chapter specify this initial direction. First of all, the best way to identify intrapreneurs seems to be by focusing on intrapreneurial behavior. Secondly, the experts and intrapreneurs offer some other possible identification options that could be useful for the design. These two design directions are explained more extensively below.

Focusing on intrapreneurial behavior when identifying intrapreneurs (the first design direction) can be done by using components of the GEM and IBM method. Focusing on the GEM components, the involvement in the development of a new activity can be considered a factor that distinguishes an intrapreneur from a non-intrapreneur, because every intrapreneur was involved in the development of a new activity, while this applied only to four of the non-intrapreneurs. Also, some of the activities that non-intrapreneurs were involved in seemed to be of less impact. For example, an intrapreneur described this activity as ‘setting up a whole new department’, where a non-intrapreneur described it as ‘determining working methods’.

Focusing on the IBM components, the three dimensions of intrapreneurial behavior (innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior) and the corresponding statements, most intrapreneurs seem to score substantially higher on all three intrapreneurial behavior dimensions than non-intrapreneurs. The cut off score of 3.5 or higher on every behavioral dimension seem to best distinguish intrapreneurs from non-intrapreneurs, as with this score nine of the twelve intrapreneurs are actually classified as intrapreneurs and twelve of the fourteen non-intrapreneurs are classified as non-intrapreneurs and score lower than a 3.5 on at least one dimension.

As above-mentioned, the experts and intrapreneurs offer some other possible identification options. For example, most intrapreneurs were introduced to the program by their manager or supervisor. Other intrapreneurs explain that people knew about them, their attitude and past behaviors, and therefore asked them to join. So, it seems that the informal network of an organization could be an interesting factor when looking for ways to identify intrapreneurs and is taken into account when designing the solution.

6.2 Design requirements

The second step in the design process was determining the design requirements, which are the demands that the design has to meet. Three type of requirements are distinguished and applicable to this project: functional requirements, user requirements, and design restrictions. Functional requirements are performance demands of the design. User requirements are user demands (van Aken et al., 2012). In this case two types of users can be identified, the innovation booster, who will use and apply the design to their projects, and the employees of the client organizations of Innovation Booster, to which the design will be applied. Finally, design restrictions comprise the solution space as preferred by Innovation Booster (van Aken et al., 2012). The design requirements applicable to this design process are presented in the table below (see Table 2).
6.3 Design parameters

The third step in the design process included identifying the design parameters. Design parameters are qualitative and quantitative aspects of the object or process to be designed. Making an overview of these parameters means that you are actually identifying the key design decisions that have to be made (Van Aken et al., 2012). The design parameters are explained below and Table 3 summarizes them. By using the design parameters, the design was created and specified, which will be presented in the following paragraph.

Parameter 1: Way of measuring intrapreneurial behavior

This parameter describes in what way intrapreneurial behavior is measured. Intrapreneurial behavior can be measured by a more quantitative method, like questionnaires or by a more qualitative method, like interviews. Something to take into consideration is that questionnaires often take less time than interviews. It is also possible to use a combined way of measuring intrapreneurial behavior by using both questionnaires and interviews.

Parameter 2: Used source for measuring intrapreneurial behavior

This parameter describes what source is used to measure intrapreneurial behavior. As becomes evident from the GEM and IBM, intrapreneurial behavior can be measured by letting a person fill out a questionnaire or answer interview questions about their own behavior (Preenen et al., 2014). On the other hand, as discussed with experts, it is also possible to let someone else, for example a manager or colleague, report on the level of intrapreneurial behavior of a person. The final option would be a combination of the former two options, which means that both the person itself and someone else report on the level of intrapreneurial behavior of that person.

---

2 The color test that Innovation Booster used is called Insights Discovery. The test is built to help people understand themselves and others, and make the most of the relationships that influence them in the workplace. Insights Discovery uses a four color model: red, yellow, green and blue. The test is used by Innovation Booster to compose balanced teams and help employees understand themselves and others.

The team canvas is a framework that Innovation Booster uses with the teams to kick off projects and align on a common vision. It helps people learn about each other. The canvas consists of five components: purpose, goals, values, roles & skills, and rules & activities.
Parameter 3: Way of selecting based on intrapreneurial behavior

This parameter describes how the design is used to select intrapreneurs based on intrapreneurial behavior. Two opposite possibilities of this parameter are a quantitative versus a qualitative way of selecting. When using a quantitative way of selecting, there is a clear cut off score or answer that defines if a person is selected or not. Using a qualitative way of selecting offers the possibility to leave this selecting process more open to the interpretation of the organization and/or Innovation Booster. This parameter is related to parameter one. Using, for example, a qualitative method for measuring intrapreneurial behavior would making using a quantitative method for selecting very difficult. Also, a combination of the two methods can be used. For example, if the quantitative score of a person is very close to the required quantitative score, but just not enough, a qualitative assessment can be used to make the final decision.

Parameter 4: Openness of the results

The parameter ‘openness of the results’ describes how the information gathered from measuring intrapreneurial behavior is shared with the employees that took the test or were interviewed. The results can be kept closed, so only Innovation Booster sees it and uses it to select people, compose a team, and keep track of someone’s progress. On the other hand, you can give the employees full access to their results. In this way, people are made aware of their intrapreneurial behavior and can actively keep track of the progress they make on behaving intrapreneurial. The results can even be more open, which means that everyone is able to see each other’s results. Another option would be to provide people with ‘moderate openness’, meaning that some results are open while others remain closed.

Table 3 – Design parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Parameter values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Way of measuring intrapreneurial behavior</td>
<td>quantitative method - combined method - qualitative method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Used source for measuring intrapreneurial behavior</td>
<td>individual reporting - combined reporting - other party reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Way of selecting based on intrapreneurial behavior</td>
<td>quantitative method - combined method - qualitative method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Openness of the results</td>
<td>complete openness - moderate openness - no openness (closed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 The design

First, a general description of the design is provided, including how the design scores on the parameters, which deliverables accompany the design, what test are conducted to optimize the design, and an assessment of the design based on the design directions. Secondly, a detailed description of the design is given, which includes the identification and selection process, the excel tool, the application options and the manual.

6.4.1 General description design

The design focuses on measuring intrapreneurial behavior of people within organizations. By measuring intrapreneurial behavior and using a cut off score it becomes possible to also identify people as an intrapreneur. The GEM and IBM are central to the design as questions form these two validated methods were used to compose a questionnaire. This composed questionnaire forms the basis of the design and needs to be filled out by the employees that want or have to participate in the projects of Innovation Booster. A preferred score for the IBM part of the questionnaire is proposed and also preferred answers for the GEM part of the questionnaire are provided. These scores and answers form the baseline for selecting people for the projects, however do not form a definite decision. The selection is made after short interviews with the employees. These interviews are conducted by Innovation Booster. A more extensive description of the design is provided a few paragraphs below.
6.4.1.1 Parameter values
Looking at the parameters described previously, the design uses a combined method for measuring intrapreneurial behavior (parameter 1) with a focus on a quantitative method. The questionnaire forms the basis of the design and the interviews are an addition. The design is based on individual reporting (parameter 2), however can be easily adapted to also include the opinion of a manager or supervisor by, for example, letting managers decide who gets to fill in the design (preselection) or by including managers during the interview part. The way of selecting people for the projects based on intrapreneurial behavior remains mainly qualitative (parameter 3). Although cut off scores and preferred answers are provided, from the results of this research it becomes evident that these scores and answers are not always leading to the right conclusion (being an intrapreneur or not). Therefore, these scores and answers are suggestions on which, after a short interview with an employee, the real decision is made. Depending on the project that Innovation Booster is running, the results are open or closed to the employees (parameter 4). For example, if the goal for using the design is to select, it is suggested to keep the results closed. If personal development of employees is more important, it could be an option to open up the results for employees.

6.4.1.2 Deliverables
The design resulted into two deliverables. First, an excel tool was composed, which includes the questionnaire and the results of the questionnaire. These results are presented in the form of a profile of the employee. This profile can be used as basis for the interviews. Next to the excel tool, a manual is composed, which describes how and when the tool should be used.

6.4.1.3 Conducted tests
In order to optimize the design a few tests were performed during the development of the design. First of all, numerous design tests were performed. This means that the conceptual design, the questionnaire, which functions as basis for the tool, is tested in order to get a validated start of the excel tool creation. During this research, the questionnaire was tested on validity by comparing the results of the questionnaire with the judgement of Innovation Booster about people being an intrapreneur or not. This design test validates whether the questionnaire gives the right outcomes. Furthermore, the design was tested on two different groups, from which the results were compared. Also, the composition of the questionnaire, more specifically the number of used statements of the IBM, was tested. These design tests resulted in the final questionnaire, with accompanying cut off scores (see Appendix I).

At the same time user (employees of the client organizations) tests were performed. This means that unclear aspects of the questionnaire, which came up during the interviews, were reported and changed if it appeared that more people faced these issues. These unclear aspects concerned, for example, wording of questions and statements. Also, user (innovation boosters) tests were performed in a later stadium when the design was translated into the excel tool with accompanying manual. Numerous innovation boosters reviewed the manual and excel model and slight changes were made when things came up like wording. For example, from both user tests it appeared that the statement ‘I translate innovative ideas into useful applications’ confused people. The word ‘application’ was interpreted as an app, however it should be interpreted in a more general sense. Therefore, this statement was changed into ‘I translate innovative ideas into something that can actually be applied and implemented.’

Tests that still need to be performed, and which are part of the change plan, are pilot tests. A more extensive explanation on these pilot tests is provided in the chapter 7 ‘Change plan’. These pilot tests actually consist of more design and user tests, as on the basis of these pilots, the design and excel tool can be adapted and optimized. For example, a more precise cut off score could possibly be generated or wording of the manual could be adapted.

6.4.1.4 Assessment of the design and tool
This paragraph shortly assesses the design and tool based on the requirements described in paragraph ‘6.2 Design requirements’.

The functional requirements of the design were that the design should make Innovation Booster able to identify, and accordingly select, people that can be considered an intrapreneur, while also measuring intrapreneurial behavior. As explained the tool consists of a profile that identifies someone
as an intrapreneur, this assessment is based on his or her intrapreneurial behavior. Furthermore, an accompanying identification and selection process is provided (see paragraph 6.4.2.1 for an explanation of this identification and selection process).

The user requirements included that the design should be easily understandable for both the innovation boosters and employees of the client organizations of Innovation Booster. The tests that were performed during the development of the tool make sure that this is indeed the case.

Finally, there were a number of the design restrictions. The first design restriction states that it should not take too much time to apply the tool. The tests performed show that the questionnaire takes around ten minutes to fill out. Using the tool from the perspective of Innovation Booster, which includes reading the manual, conducting the tests, the interviews and eventually selection (see a more extensive explanation of this process below), takes slightly more time and effort but is considered necessary for a correct identification. Furthermore, the tool is easily adaptable to different situations due to the intrapreneurial behavior measuring aspect, which makes it possible to adapt it to the amount of time available. Also, the tool can be easily changed by Innovation Booster making it possible to integrate feedback that is generated during pilot tests. Furthermore, the excel tool could possibly be integrated with the color test and the results of the color test could also be transferred to the profile. Also, the results of the profile can be discussed when filling out a team canvas.

6.4.2 Detailed description design

This part gives a detailed description of the design and excel tool. First, a description of the proposed identification and selection process is given. Thereafter, the excel tool is explained, consisting of the questionnaire and profile. This is followed by a description of the application options. Finally, the manual that accompanies the tool is shortly mentioned.

6.4.2.1 Identification and selection process

The main purpose of the design and tool is to identify and select intrapreneurs. Based on the profile that the tool creates a first assessment about someone being an intrapreneur is made. This first assessment is based on someone’s own judgement of his or her innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior. In this research a cut off score was determined, which, in most cases, identified the appointed intrapreneurs as really intrapreneurs and the appointed non-intrapreneurs as really non-intrapreneurs. However, the words ‘in most cases’ already point out the problem, this was not the case 100% of the time. Therefore, the questionnaire forms the basis of the identification and selection process but some other aspects are also part of it and can be used if the time and resources are available. The optimal identification and selection process is explained below and consist of four steps: 1) filling in the questionnaire, 2) profile review, 3) short interviews, 4) selection (see Figure 5).

The first step is to let employees fill in the questionnaire. It could be possible to let the organization pre-select people that need to fill in the questionnaire. During the second step the profiles that are composed by the answers employees provided during the first step are reviewed. Based on these profiles people are invited for an interview. It would also be possible to make a pre-selection at this moment, for example, by filtering out the low scoring profiles. During the third step, short interviews with the (pre-selected) employees are conducted. The profile forms the basis for these interviews. Based on the answers people provided questions are asked. The goal of the interview is to verify the answers people gave. For example, the intrapreneurial behavior statements could be verified by asking for examples. Finally, based on the information of the interviews and profiles a selection is made.

![Figure 5: Identification and selection process](image)
6.4.2.2 The excel tool

The excel model contains four sheets. The first two sheets (‘questions beginning project’ & ‘questions end project’) form the input part of the model. The final two sheets (‘intrapreneurial profile’ & ‘answer categories & calculation’) form the output part of the model. Figure 6 gives an overview of the excel tool sheets.

The ‘questions beginning project’ needs be filled in by the employees of the organization before or at the start of a project. The ‘questions end project’ could be filled in by the employees of the organization at the end of the project. If filling in this end project questionnaire is necessary depends on the reason for using the tool for the project. If one of the goals was to measure intrapreneurial behavior before and after the project, this questionnaire needs to be filled in. Thus, it is also an option to only use the ‘questions beginning project’ sheet.

The ‘intrapreneurial profile’ sheet is composed by the input of the model. The profile is used to identify intrapreneurs, get a general picture of someone’s intrapreneurial behavior and it serves as guideline for the interviews. It is recommended to initially hide this profile, so no employee can review his or her profile after filling in the questionnaire. Depending on the type of project that Innovation Booster is running, the profile remains closed or is shared with the employees. The final sheet, ‘answer categories & calculation’ contains the answer categories that are used to automatically fill in the profile when someone answers the questions. This sheet should not be changed and is locked.

![Figure 6: Overview excel tool](image)

6.4.2.2.1 Input part of the model

The questionnaire (the design) of the sheet ‘questions beginning project’ constitutes the basis of the tool and consists of three different parts; general questions, questions about intrapreneurial behavior and questions about past or current involvement in the development of new activities. In total, the questionnaire contains nine questions (see Appendix I).

The questionnaire first contains some general questions about the person that is filling it out. This includes name, function within the organization and number of years employed. This information can be used to compose a profile and eventually compare profiles and compose teams. The questionnaire also ends with a general, open-ended question where it is asking for suggestions on how the organization can stimulate intrapreneurial behavior. This information could possibly be used to optimize the project or program.

The second part of the questionnaire contains sixteen statements. Six statements about innovative behavior, six about proactive behavior and four about risk-taking behavior. These statements are based on the Intrapreneurial Behavior Measure (IBM). The statements can be graded on a one to five scale. This part of the questionnaire can also be used at the end of a project to measure the difference in intrapreneurial behavior. The tool contains a separate questionnaire for this, which is found in the sheet ‘questions end project’.

The third part consists of four questions that are based on another validated measure, the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM). These questions ask if someone was involved in the development of a new activity for his or her most important employer in the past three years and what type of role this person had in this development process, which is split up into two phases: the ‘development of an idea’ phase and the ‘preparation and implementation of the idea’ phase. Furthermore, it is asked to describe the activity.

The questions contain open-ended answers options, ranking options and multiple-choice options. If a question has an open-ended answer option, the employee can fill in anything he or she
wants. However, the questions suggest what type of answer is required. The ranking answer options apply to the intrapreneurial behavior statements. A score of one to five can be given to the statement. One is in this case 'totally disagree' and five means 'totally agree'. The multiple-choice options apply to question five, seven and eight. Where question five has different answer categories than question seven and eight. Question five can be answered by ‘yes, currently/yes, in the past three years/no/I don’t know’ and questions seven and eight can be answered by ‘yes, I had a leading role/yes, I had a supporting role/no/I don’t know’.

Appendix I contains the final questionnaire. This questionnaire is based on the questionnaire that was used for the non-intrapreneurs. Concerning the intrapreneurial behavior statements, it was decided to use the sixteen statements used for non-intrapreneurs, instead of the ten statements that were used for the intrapreneur. When comparing the results of intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs this was based on the ten statements that were used during the interviews with intrapreneurs. Although the main conclusions did not change when the intrapreneurs were compared with non-intrapreneurs based on both the ten or sixteen statements, I felt that the results of the non-intrapreneurs were more nuanced (when using sixteen statements). With more nuanced I mean that one answer to a statement determines less the eventual average score on that behavioral dimension and more focus can be placed on all the components of a behavioral dimension. Also, using more of the original statements of an already validated measure seemed more appropriate.

One difference of the questionnaire used for non-intrapreneurs and the questionnaire used for the design is that the question about experience with entrepreneurship is removed, because from this research it appeared that this did not influence intrapreneurial behavior. Furthermore, some changes were made to the wording of questions and statements as was described in paragraph 6.4.1.3 ‘Conducted tests’.

6.4.2.2.2 Output part of the model
As mentioned before, the tool also consists of an intrapreneurial profile. The profile is generated based on a respondent’s answers. The profile consists of two pages, the profile and the extended profile, and forms the basis for identifying and eventually also selecting intrapreneurs. The profile contains the most important information and can be used to identify intrapreneurs. The extended profile mainly provides information on the difference in intrapreneurial behavior scores and is useful when the questionnaire is filled out at the beginning and end of the project. The first page of the profile consists of four parts: general information, intrapreneurial behavior scores graph and specification, involvement in activities results, and intrapreneur/non-intrapreneur result. The extended profile consists of three parts: suggestions of employees, comparison intrapreneurial behavior scores and a specification of the compared intrapreneurial behavior scores. Every aspect of the profile is discussed shortly below.

Intrapreneurial profile (see Figure 7)
The first part consists of some general information about the employee, including name, function and years in employment. This information could be used when composing teams, making sure that they are diverse in function and experience with the organization.

The second part, the intrapreneurial behavior scores graph, shows the average scores on the three intrapreneurial behavior dimensions. A dotted red line shows the cut-off score (3.5) that distinguishes an intrapreneur from a non-intrapreneur. Further on, more information on this cut-off score is provided.

Figure 7: Dummy profile
Also, a more specific analysis of the intrapreneurial behavior scores is provided. The reason for this specification is that it gives a more insightful judgement to the scores. A qualitative judgement is labeled to a score range, as shown in Table 4. The ranges are not divided equally because special attention should be put on people that score between 3 and 3.4. From this research it appeared that three intrapreneurs could not be labeled an intrapreneur according to the test, because they scored on one or two dimension lower than a 3.5 but higher than a 3.0. They never scored lower than a 3.0. Therefore, this range gets its own qualitative judgement and special attention is needed for people with this ‘medium’ score, especially when he or she scores medium on only one dimension while the other two dimensions are ‘high’ or ‘very high’. This means that this person was just not identified as intrapreneur, however could very well be one. It is recommended to look at part three of the profile closely in these cases. Also, the interview in these cases can be very important. Furthermore, the qualitative judgements could be used to communicate to the person that filled out the questionnaire. A qualitative judgement in these cases is considered more helpful than a score, which without explanation means nothing to an employee.

Table 4: Qualitative judgements intrapreneurial behavior scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative judgement</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>1.0-1.9</td>
<td>‘Very low’ means that someone is almost not showing the type of behavior to which the score applies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.0-2.9</td>
<td>‘Low’ means still no sufficient innovative, proactive or risk-taking behavior is shown, however there is some level of potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>A ‘medium’ score means that it is just not enough to be on the level of an intrapreneur, however there is definitely potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.6-4.5</td>
<td>‘High’ means that enough of this behavior is present and this type of behavior is on the level of an intrapreneur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>4.6-5.0</td>
<td>‘Very high’ on a dimension is considered exceptional and this could point to a very experienced intrapreneur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third part summarizes the answer on someone’s involvement in the development of new activities. This part serves as ‘back-up’ test for the intrapreneurial behavior score. This means that the intrapreneurial behavior scores are used to judge if someone is an intrapreneur or non-intrapreneur, however, as this method is not always correct it is recommended to always compare it with the answers of this part as it appeared from this research that this is also a possible distinguishing factor. In this research every appointed intrapreneur was involved in the development of a new activity, while this applied only to four of the non-intrapreneurs. Furthermore, the new activities that were described seem to be from another level. Where intrapreneurs describe this new activity as, for example, setting up a whole new department, a non-intrapreneur described it as ‘determining working methods’. In order to classify someone an intrapreneur, he or she should be involved in developing a new activity or should have been involved in such an activity in the past three years. Furthermore, this person should have (had) a leading role in at least one of the two phases of the development of this activity.

Finally, the profile shows if someone can be regarded an intrapreneur or non-intrapreneur according to the scores on innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior. When an employee scores an average of 3.5 on every intrapreneurial behavior dimension this person is considered an intrapreneur. The cut off score is based on my research. With a cut off score of 3.5, nine of the twelve intrapreneurs were really intrapreneurs and twelve of the fourteen non-intrapreneurs are classified as non-intrapreneurs and score lower than a 3.5 on at least one dimension. It is important to focus on all of three intrapreneurial behavior dimensions instead of on one or on a sub-component of this type, as was explained by an expert.
The extended profile (see Figure 8)
The second part of the profile, 'the extended profile', mainly provides information on the difference in intrapreneurial behavior scores and is useful when the questionnaire is filled out at the beginning and end of the project.

The first part of the extended profile contains the suggestions that the employee made regarding how the organization could improve or stimulate intrapreneurial behavior of employees. The suggestions could be used to optimize the project or program.

The second part of the extended profile shows (if the beginning and end questionnaire are filled in) a graph that presents the scores of the first and second test. From this graph the difference in scores can be seen, which could be considered the impact score of a project or program. Next to the graph the percentages increase or decrease on innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior are shown. These percentages can be used to communicate to the client organization.

The final part of the extended profile presents a specification of the scores on intrapreneurial behavior of the first and second test. It shows the difference in scores per intrapreneurial behavior statement. This graph makes it possible to see what specific statement(s) influenced an increase or decrease on an intrapreneurial behavior dimension. This could help to figure out the specific impact of a project. The abbreviation IB stands for innovative behavior, PB for proactive behavior and RB for risk-taking behavior. Statement one to six of the questionnaire concern innovative behavior, statement seven to twelve concern proactive behavior and statement thirteen to sixteen concern risk-taking behavior.

6.4.2.3 Application options of the design and tool
The tool has two main application options, which can be used for different situation. First of all, the tool can be used to identify intrapreneurs. By being able to identify intrapreneurs, it becomes possible to start off a project (new business or innovation transformation) with a higher quality and/or better composed team(s). For a new business project, a team that is composed of people that are innovative, proactive and take risks makes sure that new business can be generated more easily and effective. For a transformation project the tool can be used for the selection process. For example, it becomes possible to only allow intrapreneurs of the organization to participate during the first few innovation projects in order to kick-start the innovation transformation. Also, it could be used to compose balanced teams. A balanced team in this case is suggested to contain intrapreneurs and less intrapreneurial people, and ensures a more efficient transformation.

Secondly, the tool can measure intrapreneurial behavior. The tool measures intrapreneurial behavior in order to identify intrapreneurs. This also makes it possible to measure the impact of a project on intrapreneurial behavior of employees by measuring intrapreneurial behavior at t=0 and t=x. It also becomes possible to measure and quantify the transformation. Furthermore, the project/program can be personalized to the intrapreneurial behavior levels of employees. It becomes possible to follow someone’s personal development and to evaluate employees on intrapreneurial behavior. As Innovation Booster faces many different situations at client organizations (sometimes they have to work with assigned departments and assigned people, while other times they have the freedom to select people) and is often under strict time limitations, this aspect of the tool makes it possible to easily adapt it to every situation.
6.4.2.4 The manual
Next to the excel tool a manual is composed, see Figure 9. This manual contains twenty-three pages and describes in detail how to use the design and excel model. It consists of an explanation of the design, including theoretical background, application options and a description of the identification and selection process. Furthermore, it describes in detail the input and output aspect of the model. Screenshots of the manual can be found in Appendix J.

![Image of manual cover](image-url)

Figure 9: First page manual
7. Change plan

A change plan is necessary to ensure the successful implementation of the tool. This chapter describes this change plan, which consists of a delta analysis, stakeholder analysis, resistance to change analysis, intervention strategy and action plan.

7.1 Delta analysis

A Delta-analysis is an analysis of the major differences between the current organizational system and the redesigned organizational system (van Aken et al., 2012). In this research, this is the difference between the current identification and selection procedure that Innovation Booster uses and the newly designed identification and selection process. Currently, Innovation Booster does not have one unambiguous identification and selection method for their new business and innovation transformation projects. This means that selecting the people and composing the teams for these projects (a team consists of employees of the client organization) happens in many different ways, sometimes more structured than other times. For example, in some cases Innovation Booster gets a department of the organization assigned with which they have to start the project, while in other situations they have no specific starting point. Sometimes specific people are already selected by management of the client organization and sometimes only people that sign themselves up are participating. Furthermore, a color test is often used to measure the personality of persons and if the situation allows it this test is used to compose teams of different personality colors.

After implementing the proposed design all these different possible situations are guided by a more evident procedure. The design offers more structure to the first few weeks of a project and identifies the right people for these projects, which accordingly helps to compose teams. The design forms a starting point. In other words, it forms the first step in every project for interacting with the employees, whether they are assigned to the project or not determined yet.

7.2 Stakeholder analysis

Different stakeholders are involved in the implementation of the design and it is important to manage the stakeholders in an appropriate way. All the stakeholders are categorized by the power and interest they have in the design so the appropriate method of coping with the stakeholders can be distinguished. Figure 10 shows an overview of the stakeholders and their power and interest levels.

7.2.1 Innovation Booster

Innovation Booster is owner of the problem and therefore an important stakeholder. Two different stakeholder groups of Innovation Booster can be distinguished; partner boosters and innovation boosters. The partner boosters are the managers of Innovation Booster and are also responsible for sales. The innovation boosters actually perform the projects at the clients of Innovation Booster.

The partner boosters have high power and high interest. They have the power to make sure that the innovation boosters actually implement the design. Furthermore, they have the power to convince their (potential) clients to agree with the identification procedure, instead of letting the client organization identify people themselves or assign a specific department. The partner boosters also have a high interest in the design as it could make projects more efficient, effective and of higher quality, which makes clients more satisfied and increases the chances of a follow-up project.

Innovation boosters are classified as having high power and high interest. Many decisions about the methodology of Innovation Booster are not only made by the management level of Innovation Booster. The innovation boosters themselves also have a very high level of influence over new procedures and adoptions to the methodology. This makes that innovation boosters form a very important stakeholder as they have a lot of power in implementing the design and actually using it during their projects. They also have a high interest in the design as it gives the beginning of their projects more structure and provides a way to substantiate the identification, selection and team composing process. It therefore offers a higher probability of success, which is what every innovation booster eventually wants; finishing the project with the highest possible quality.
7.2.2. Client organizations of Innovation Booster

Besides Innovation Booster as important stakeholder, the client organizations of Innovation Booster also form a stakeholder. Three different stakeholder groups are important in this case: management of the organization, the program/innovation lead of the organization and the employees of the organization that will potentially be part of the project.

The management of the organization is seen as the person or persons with whom the partner boosters has had contact and who actually gave permission to Innovation Booster to perform the project. This stakeholder has medium power and low interest. This stakeholder group has the power to decide what part of the organization is involved in the project of Innovation Booster, therefore they can influence the way in which the design can be applied. Their interest in this specific design is considered low, as this stakeholder wants good results, but is less focused on how these results are actually achieved. Another possible stakeholder group is the program or innovation lead of the client organization. This person is responsible for the project from the side of the client organization. This stakeholder is often responsible for more innovation initiatives in the organization. The program or innovation lead of the organization is considered to have a medium level of power and a medium level of interest. It depends a bit on how much this person is involved, but as this person helps Innovation Booster and possibly has experience with other initiatives and ways of identifying/selecting people, he or she could influence if this tool is actually used. The interest level is considered medium as this tool could have influence on the project and could potentially be useful for other projects of the organization as well.

Finally, the employees of the client organization are important. These are the person who have to fill out the questionnaire of the tool. Their power level is considered low to medium and their interest level is medium. Although they have to make use of the tool, if it is part of the identification process it is a requirement, which means that if they want to participate they have low power in whether to use it or not. However, if the tool is used for personal development, their power increases somewhat. The employees could be interested in the tool as it possibly influences if they can participate in the project.

Figure 10: Stakeholder analysis
7.3 Resistance to change
There are several sources of resistance that can arise during the implementation of the tool. This paragraph shortly explains to which stakeholders every source of resistance applies, Table 5 summarizes this.

According to Van Aken et al. (2012) five sources of resistance could arise: lack of understanding, difference in opinion, lack of trust, low willingness to change and conflict of interest.

Lack of understanding arises due to the fact that people do not understand the problem or the new tool. For example, Innovation Booster or the client organization could not understand the tool or could not understand what effect the tool will have on the projects. This source of resistance applies to every stakeholder group.

Difference in opinion may arise when stakeholders understand the problem but disagree with the solution for technical, economic or personal reasons. Innovation Booster or client organizations could have some other thoughts on the tool. For example, it is possible that a client organization already has a way of identifying and selecting the right people. Also, employees of client organizations may not agree with the result of the tool. This source of resistance is most likely to arise at innovation boosters and program/innovation leads as they have to work very closely with the tool.

When stakeholders do not believe in the intentions or competencies of the design, there is possibly lack of trust. In the case of this research, this means that it could be possible that the innovation boosters and client organizations do not trust the design and this way of identifying and selecting intrapreneurs. Innovation booster, program/innovation leads and employees of the client organization could possibly show a lack of trust.

Low willingness to change may arise for a number of reasons such as fear to the unknown and not wanting to lose a familiar organizational environment. For the proposed tool, this source of resistance could come from partner and innovation boosters as they might not want to change the current way of working and rather follow the old way of identifying people and composing teams as projects are currently also finished successfully in most cases.

Finally, it is important that different considerations concerning the interests of the various stakeholders are taken into account. In this case, conflict of interest could arise when the client organization only wants to work with people they themselves selected or when employees that are selected may not be possible to actually participate. Therefore, this source of resistance applies to the program/innovation lead.

Table 5: Resistance to change analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance to change</th>
<th>Partner booster</th>
<th>Innovation booster</th>
<th>Management client organization</th>
<th>Program/innovation lead client organization</th>
<th>Employees client organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low willingness to change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4 Intervention strategy
This paragraph describes the different intervention strategies that exist according to Van Aken et al. (2012). Furthermore, it explains the type of intervention strategy that is needed for a stakeholder group.

7.4.1 Type of intervention strategies
As discussed in the previous paragraph, different sources for resistance to change can occur. Not all sources of resistance can be resolved in the same way. Van Aken et al. (2012) defines three types of interventions that can be used to deal with the different kinds of resistance; technical, political, and cultural interventions.

Technical interventions include interventions that further explain the solution and the reason(s) for changing. This can be in the form of a report or another way of communication the business problem, why it is important to do something about the problem, the proposed solution, and why and how the solution will solve the problem (Van Aken et al., 2012). Political interventions, include formal orders like appointments and dismissals. Finally, cultural interventions include participation of stakeholders in different phases of the design or change process. Participation can contribute to the quality of the design, can increase understanding of the design and it can foster a sense of ownership (Van Aken et al., 2012). The interventions can either be executed on their own or as a combination. This depends on the expected type of resistance to change. If the main source of resistance includes lack of understanding a technical intervention will suffice. If the main source of resistance is difference in opinion a combination of technical and political interventions can be used. If lack of trust is the main issue a cultural intervention is most appropriate, depending on the fact that this mistrust is unfounded. Cultural interventions in combination with technical ones will form a possible solution to low willingness to change. Finally, when conflicts of interest arise a political intervention may be needed (Van Aken et al., 2012).

7.4.2. Intervention strategy per stakeholder group
The partner boosters’ main sources of resistance are lack of understanding and low willingness to change. In order to counter this resistance a technical intervention combined with a cultural one is found to be most appropriate. This means that the partner boosters need to be informed on the implementation of tool on a regular basis. Partner boosters should be asked to provide feedback on the different phases of the implementation process. Furthermore, it is important to make sure that the reason for changing, the so-called ‘why’, is communicated and argued very clearly. This already partially happened during the presentation that was given halfway into the project.

For the innovation boosters, with as main sources lack of understanding and low willingness to change, technical and cultural interventions are needed. These interventions help to get people more familiar with the problem and the solution. The interventions are already partially performed during the design process. A number of innovation boosters were interviewed during the process, were asked for their opinion and were kept informed. Also, many innovation boosters were present during the presentation that was given halfway into the project. Besides the technical and cultural interventions that are already put in place or performed, it remains very important to keep informing and involving the innovation boosters during the implementation process as well.

Management of client organization could possibly show a lack of understanding concerning the tool. In this case a technical intervention is best suited, meaning that partner booster should make sure, that during the sales process, it is clearly explained why and how the tool optimizes a project.

Program and innovation leads of the client organizations could potentially show many sources of resistance. Therefore, a combination of technical and cultural interventions need to be implemented. This means that this/these person(s) are well informed about the tool and even involved during the first pilot projects to show what the tool can do and accordingly create a sense of ownership. Conflict of interest and difference in opinion are more difficult to resolve. A political intervention is suggested as best suited in these cases, however, in the case of Innovation Booster this does not work so easily. If the organization really wants to work with people they self-selected or if the people selected by the design are not able to actually participate (due to for example lack of time and resources) a formal order may not be up to Innovation Booster. Innovation Booster is not yet in a position to demand that they select the people. Instead, Innovation Booster has to deal with the circumstances that the client organization offers. If conflict of interest and difference of opinion appear it is therefore suggested to first introduce
just a part of the tool. For example, only the measuring intrapreneurial behavior part of the tool could be used. After a few follow-up projects Innovation Booster could try to implement the complete tool.

Finally, the employees of the client organizations could potentially show a lack of understanding and trust, and difference in opinion. A combination of technical and cultural interventions seems most appropriate. It is important to clearly explain how the selection process is structured and organized. This could also help mitigate difference in opinion. Furthermore, employees can be asked for feedback on the tool, especially during the first pilot projects when the tool still needs to be optimized.

7.5 Action plan
It is important to have a solid action plan for implementing the tool. The action plan contains the actions that need to be performed in order to guarantee a successful implementation. The action plan contains three main phases: informing, pilot testing and scaling up. The action plan is represented into a timeline, see Figure 11.

7.5.1 Informing phase
The informing phase consists of information/feedback sessions with partner and innovation boosters, a workshop and officially presenting the tool. First, a number of partner and innovation boosters are asked for an information/feedback session. During these sessions the tool and manual are presented and feedback is collected. The tool is optimized for pilot testing and a first level of ownership is created. Furthermore, possible pilot projects are identified. Also, possible ambassadors, innovation boosters who are extra excited and motivated to see the tool get implemented, are identified. The latter is very important as I will not be present to completely implement the tool myself, therefore it is key to find people within Innovation Booster that will carry this responsibility.

Besides these individual information/feedback sessions a workshop should be scheduled. The goal of this workshop is to educate as many innovation boosters as possible about the tool. After this workshop, innovation boosters should be able to use the tool during their projects. It is especially important that the ambassadors are present during this workshop.

Finally, the information phase ends with a presentation for the whole organization. The main goal of this presentation is to further enthuse Innovation Booster and convince them of the importance of the tool.

7.5.2 Pilot testing phase
The second phase of the action plan, pilot testing, is already partially initiated during the information phase as during the information/feedback sessions possible pilot projects are discussed and identified. The pilot testing phase consists of two rounds of pilots. The first round of pilots should be used to further optimize the tool. Therefore, I suggest to first run a few pilot projects where the design is not yet used to actually select intrapreneurs, but instead to measure intrapreneurial behavior before and after the start of the project. The innovation boosters should at the end of the project, based on their intuition, point out who they see as intrapreneurs. Subsequently, this information should be compared with the data. This first round of pilots can be considered another true positive design test to get a higher probability that the tool measures the right aspects. Furthermore, cut off scores and answers can become more nuanced. The first round of pilots can also be considered a user test, as feedback from the innovation boosters and employees can be used to adapt the tool where necessary.

After the first round of pilots there could be a possibility to create a more professional and fun interface for the tool. For example, a chat bot could be used to administer the questionnaire in a fun and more engaging way. Also, it could be possible to integrate the tool with other tools innovation boosters uses, like the color test.

Whether or not the interface is professionalized, a second round of pilot projects should be initiated during which the identification and selection aspect of the tool gets implemented and tested. During this round the main focus is on testing the identification function and preforming another user evaluation test to adapt the tool were necessary. At the same time, the gathered data can be used to obtain relevant insights specify the cut off score even more. If the interface was changed, this second pilot round could also function as a user interface test.
7.5.3 Scaling up phase
The third and final phase of the action plan is scaling up. After the two pilot testing rounds it becomes time to scale-up the tool and make sure that it is used for every project. The ambassadors identified in the first phase are responsible for this process. Scaling up the tool means that is should become part of the methodology and capabilities framework of Innovation Booster. New innovation boosters need to get educated on the tool as well, which can be done by including the tool during the training week or scheduling another workshop.

Figure 11: Action plan timeline
8. Discussion & conclusion

The final chapter of this research report consists of five components. First, the theoretical contribution is discussed, followed by the practical contribution. Secondly, the limitations of this research are explained, followed by the possibilities for future research. Finally, an overall conclusion is provided.

8.1 Theoretical contribution

A number of theoretical contributions can be distinguished. First of all, this research clearly shows the difference between personal characteristics of an intrapreneur and intrapreneurial behavior. This is an important distinction, as it leads to different possible identification options, which is often not clearly emphasized in literature. Personal characteristics may describe the person who has the best predisposition to become an intrapreneur, however this does not mean that this person will actually show or engage in intrapreneurial behavior. By making this distinction it became possible to compose a theoretical model for classifying intrapreneurs. Literature does not currently define different types of intrapreneurs. Making a distinction between different types of intrapreneurs makes it possible to use more appropriate and specified identification methods.

This research also provides insights into some other identification options, which were not specifically mentioned before in literature. Literature currently identifies two methods for identifying intrapreneurs, which are the GEM and IBM (Preenen et al., 2014). This research adds someone’s manager and informal network, and innovation initiatives as two other possible identification options. Most intrapreneurs in this research were introduced to the program by their manager or supervisor. Other intrapreneurs explain that people knew about them, their attitude and past behaviors, and therefore asked them to join. Next to the informal network, the innovation initiative itself also forms a possible identification method, with many different factors influencing this like budget, communication and the set-up of the program. According to experts, during an innovation initiative it becomes evident which persons are intrapreneurs. Furthermore, intrapreneurs are supposed to come running when hearing about such an initiative.

Next to providing some new potential identification options, this research also adds to the currently existing IBM method by providing a possible cut off score. In their research on the IBM, Preenen et al. (2014) state that the question of a cut off score remains open. Subsequently, they only provide a number of suggestions for composing a cut off score that determines if someone can be identified as an intrapreneur. This research adds to the research of Preenen et al. (2014) by providing a possible cut off score that can be used to distinguish intrapreneurs from non-intrapreneurs.

Finally, many suggestions about possible relationships are made between organizational factors and intrapreneurship in literature, some more empirically researched than others. This research substantiates these relationships as both intrapreneurs and experts mention the organizational structure, culture, reward system, and top and middle management as important factors that influence the expression of intrapreneurial behavior and subsequently the identification of intrapreneurs.

8.2 Practical implications

Besides theoretical implications, also some practical implications can be distinguished. First of all, the design can be used to determine the number of intrapreneurs within an organization and can therefore determine how intrapreneurial an organization is. Also, it can identify and select intrapreneurs for specific reasons, like innovation initiatives or projects. Innovation initiatives and projects can in these cases be started off with the most appropriate people, which ensures a more efficient and effective project.

Besides identifying intrapreneurs, the design makes it possible for organizations to measure intrapreneurial behavior of its employees. Consequently, organizations can monitor the influence and effect of intrapreneurship interventions by measuring the general level of intrapreneurial behavior in the organization before and after the intervention. This can show the impact of the intervention and accordingly determine if the intervention needs to be stopped or adapted. For example, it can be measured if an innovation program set up for employees actually stimulates intrapreneurial behavior of these employees. Furthermore, interventions can be personalized to the intrapreneurial behavior levels of employees. For example, if a group of employees scores low on one of the intrapreneurial behavior
dimensions (innovative, proactive, risk-taking behavior), the intervention could be specifically focused on increasing that specific type of behavior. Also, it becomes possible to follow someone’s personal development and to evaluate employees on intrapreneurial behavior, which are aspects that can stimulate intrapreneurship in organizations.

The proposed theoretical model could also have some practical implications for organizations. The theoretical model could actually optimize the previously mentioned practical implications. For example, being able to identify different intrapreneurs can assure that organizational interventions and initiatives that stimulate intrapreneurship are targeted more precisely, making the development of intrapreneurship in an organization more efficient. Moreover, distinguishing and accordingly identifying different types of intrapreneurs could ensure more successful projects, as exactly the right kind of intrapreneur can be selected for the most fitting project.

8.3 Limitations
A number of limitations concerning this research are identified. First, the process of data collection happened in different languages, namely Dutch and English. Specifically, this meant that questions and statements of the IBM had to be translated. This translation could affect the validity of the measure, therefore also influencing its results. Furthermore, most of the non-intrapreneurs were given a Dutch questionnaire. The results of intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs were compared on the same amount of statements, however some respondents scored the translated statements while others scored the original Dutch statements. As the translation could have affected the validity of the measure, it could also have affected the extent to which scores could be compared, including the results that followed from the comparison of intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs. Furthermore, the questionnaires of non-intrapreneurs contained sixteen statements, while the interviews of intrapreneurs contained ten statements. Although the comparison between intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs was made on the same ten statements, giving non-intrapreneurs sixteen statements to rank could have affected the score of the ten eventually used statements. For example, people could have answered differently when there were more statements due to loss of concentration.

Another limitation of this research concerns the cut off score of 3.5 that was determined and the quantitative scores of intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs. This research did not contain a quantitative analysis and therefore could not confirm if the differences in scores of intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs could be considered significant. The same goes for the determined cut off score. This score is based on suggestions of Preenen et al. (2014) and face validity of the author, however no quantitative analysis underlies this conclusion.

The third limitation of this research concerns the expert interviewee groups. The intention was to interview more corporate innovation experts and to also interview different types of experts. For example, experts in the field of human resources encounter people selection and identification problems on a daily basis and could have therefore provided more valuable insights on how to identify intrapreneurs. Due to unsuspected circumstances these experts were not included. However, as the saturation principle was used to determine if more people should have been interviewed, I am confident that most important insights were gathered.

Finally, the validation of the design is considered limited. Although multiple design and user test were performed during this research, it is still unclear what specific and concrete value the design delivers for the innovation boosters during their projects as no pilot tests has been completed. Currently, the value of the design is only suggested and not proven yet. Therefore, it is unclear if the design really helps innovation boosters and if using the design results in higher quality projects. It was not possible to complete a pilot test due to time limitations. Pilot tests are being setup as we speak, but could not be included in this research.

8.4 Future research
A number of areas for future research can be distinguished. First of all, more research is needed to substantiate the proposed theoretical model. As described earlier still many aspects of this model need to be figured out in order to optimize it. First of all, the y-axis, predisposition to being an intrapreneur, is still very vague. Although literature suggests many aspects that characterize an intrapreneur, it is unclear if these characteristics are absolutely necessary, to what extent they need to be present and if they form someone’s predisposition to being an intrapreneur. Furthermore, there does not seem to be a
clear method for measuring this predisposition, making it hard to clearly substantiate the difference between the types of intrapreneurs. Questions also arise when focusing on the x-axis, intrapreneurial behavior, a latent intrapreneur that became an enabled intrapreneur, looks a lot like a classic intrapreneur. Although situational factors are mentioned as potentially being the main differentiating factor, information or beliefs about the likelihood that performing a particular behavior will lead to a specific outcome and someone’s perceived behavioral control are also potential differentiating aspects. More research will have to turn out what really makes the difference between the different types of intrapreneurs. This in turn would enable research into the different identification options and their effects on different type of intrapreneurs. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see if and how the influencing organizational factors are linked to different intrapreneurs and identification options. This could make sure that different organizational factors can be put in place to stimulate different types of intrapreneurs specifically.

Secondly, a cut off score for the design is proposed that distinguishes an intrapreneur from a non-intrapreneur. This cut off score is based on the results of this research. Future research and testing of this score should prove if a more nuanced cut off score would be more appropriate. It is important to more precisely determine this cut off score as this score currently determines if someone can be named and intrapreneur or not and this decision can have a big impact on the actual selection. Not only should this cut off score be researched more, also the design itself needs more testing in order to optimize it. For example, future testing should determine if short interviews really benefit the identification of intrapreneurs in combination with the questionnaire/excel tool.

The third suggested area for future research concerns intrapreneurial teams. As an expert mentioned: ‘It is all about balance, you should not forget that a company or team with only intrapreneurs does not work either, you need a couple of persons that take the lead and a couple that are more execution focused.’ Almost all research into intrapreneurship is focused on individuals and their behavior even though this individual will eventually need a team to unlock the full potential of the opportunity. As Pinchot & Pellman (1999) points out, there is no significant innovation without an intrapreneurial team. Furthermore, there has been an increasing focus on teamwork in organizations over the past decades and there is almost no job in the world were teamwork is not a central aspect. Also, the employees of client organizations of Innovation Booster always work in teams. Therefore, it could be argued that research into intrapreneurial teams deserves more attention. Currently, not much is known about these types of teams, while it could be possible that intrapreneurial teams are more important for intrapreneurship than only the intrapreneurs themselves. For example, questions that arise are: How does the composition of an intrapreneurial team look like? How many intrapreneurs should an intrapreneurial team include? Is a team with only intrapreneurs ineffective?

8.5 Conclusion
Intrapreneurship is a bottom-up process wherein organizational members initiate and implement activities to explore and exploit business opportunities (de Jong et al., 2011). A company that helps organizations with implementing the concept of intrapreneurship is Innovation Booster. However, Innovation Booster did not know how to best identify and select intrapreneurs for their projects. Therefore, the following research questions were central to this research: 1) How can organizations identify and select intrapreneurs? and 2) How should the identification and selection of intrapreneurs for the projects of Innovation Booster be set up? Empirical research, in the form of interviews and questionnaires, and design science research in the form of a design process, were performed to answer these questions.

Three aspects seem to influence the identification and selection of intrapreneurs in organizations (research question one), namely the characterization of intrapreneurs, the identification process and organizational factors.

Concerning the characterization of intrapreneurs, the experts describe many different types of intrapreneurs by using terms like ‘real intrapreneur’ and ‘latent intrapreneur’. Also, a distinction is made between a nature and nurture approach concerning intrapreneurs, which seem to closely relate to the two approaches concerning the intrapreneur described in literature (GEM and IBM). Taking all this together it seems that intrapreneurs are suggested to differ on two axes: predisposition to being an intrapreneur (nature approach) and intrapreneurial behavior (nurture approach).
Literature describes two methods for identifying intrapreneurs, the GEM and IBM. The results of this research offer some other possible identification options. Most intrapreneurs were introduced to the program by their manager or supervisor. More specifically, it seems that a persons’ previous actions and behavior plus their network are important. Next to the informal network, innovation initiatives are believed to form a possible identification method, with many different factors influencing this like budget, communication and the set-up of the program.

Zooming in on the results of the intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs that are specifically focused on their intrapreneurial behavior shows that experience with being a business owner, founder or being self-employed seems not to characterize an intrapreneur as both the intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs included in this research have no experience with this. Furthermore, the involvement in the development of a new activity could potentially be a factor that distinguishes an intrapreneur from a non-intrapreneur, because every intrapreneur was involved in the development of a new activity, while this applied only to four of the non-intrapreneurs. Finally, nine of the twelve intrapreneurs score a 3.5 or higher on every intrapreneurial behavior dimension, while only two of the fourteen non-intrapreneurs do. Thus, a cut-off score of 3.5 or higher on every behavioral dimension seem to best distinguish intrapreneurs from non-intrapreneurs.

Finally, experts, intrapreneurs and non-intrapreneurs mention the organizational structure, culture, reward system, and top and middle management as important factors that influence the identification of intrapreneurs and the expression of intrapreneurial behavior. This result is in line with the results from literature as many authors point out that a flat organizational structure, a culture that condones mistakes, a fitting reward and reinforcement system, and support from management can stimulate intrapreneurial activities (Hayton, 2005; Kenney & Mujtaba, 2007; Kuratko et al., 2014; Mehta & Gupta, 2014; Mokaya, 2012; Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013; 2006 Rule & Irwin, 1988; Seshadri & Tripathy, 2006). So, this research substantiates that it remains important to keep in mind these factors when trying to stimulate intrapreneurial behavior.

From these results and conclusions, it became evident that in order to be able to identify and eventually even select intrapreneurs, it is important to make a distinction in the different types of intrapreneurs. Therefore, a new theoretical model is proposed that attempts to distinguish different types of intrapreneurs. The model introduces four new terms that describe different intrapreneurs, namely: classic, latent, potential, and enabled intrapreneur. This categorization forms the basis for developing identification strategies, as different approaches seem to be needed to identify each category of intrapreneur.

This knowledge on how organizations can identify and select intrapreneurs formed the basis for answering the second research question. The identification and selection of intrapreneurs for the projects of Innovation Booster should be set up by using an identification and selection process that is focused on measuring intrapreneurial behavior of people. By measuring intrapreneurial behavior and using a cut-off score it becomes possible to identify people as an intrapreneur. The definite selection is made after short interviews with the employees.

Thus, intrapreneurial behavior is measured using a combined method of quantitative and qualitative aspects. The design is based on individual reporting, which means that the source for measuring individual behavior is the individual, in this case an employee of a client organization, itself. Furthermore, the actual selection is mainly qualitative, which means that the cut-off score is a suggestion on which, after a short interview with an employee, the real decision is made. Depending on the project that Innovation Booster is running, the results can be open or closed for the employees.

The design was translated into an excel tool. This tool contains a questionnaire and intrapreneurial profile. The questionnaire contains elements of the GEM and IBM, two validated measures. The profile should be used as basis for the interviews and contains, among other things, general information of the employee, a ‘intrapreneurial behavior scores’ graph, involvement in activities results, and an intrapreneur/non-intrapreneur result. The latter is especially important and is based on a cut-off score of 3.5, meaning that when an employee scores an average of 3.5 on every intrapreneurial behavior dimension this person is considered an intrapreneur.

The excel tool comes with a manual and change plan. The manual and change plan are provided to ensure a successful implementation of the design.
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Appendix A
Description ‘lean startup’ and ‘agile’ methodology

The lean startup is a new approach for developing and managing (young) organizations and focusses on detecting the desires of customers (Ries, 2011). It can be difficult for organizations to find out what their customers exactly want and how to approach them. To discover whether a product or service is built upon a sustainable business model, organizations that apply the lean startup methodology formulate and test hypothesis by using a minimal viable product (Ries, 2011). The hypothesis can be tested in the field with real customers and answers whether there is any demand for the product or service. Central to the lean startup methodology is the ‘build, measure, learn’ iterative cycle. This is a short learning cycle, which provides valuable knowledge for the next learning cycle (Ries, 2011).

In the current dynamic environment, it is critical that organizations are flexible. Agile is an approach, which tries to stimulate this flexibility. The scrum method is part of the agile approach and is a relatively new way of working that transforms project management. Where traditional management demands control and predictability, scrum embraces uncertainty and creativity. In this new approach teams are self-manageable, which allows them to quickly react to changes. It ensures that people and teams regularly analyze and check if they take the right path. Additionally, they also try to continuously improve and adjust their actions in order to respond more accurately to new situations.
Appendix B
Interview questions academic experts

B.1 Information send to academic experts before interview

Research questions
Central to the concept of intrapreneurship are three types of behavior: innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior. These behavior types characterize an intrapreneur. It is vital that we focus on these individuals and their behavior types, if organizations want to experience the beneficial results of intrapreneurship. Therefore, it becomes important that these individuals are identified, developed and nurtured. By identifying intrapreneurs organizations are able to find those individuals with already the right attitude, characteristics and natural high levels of intrapreneurial behavior. By developing intrapreneurs organizations train employees in intrapreneurial attitudes, skills and behaviors which increases the level of intrapreneurial behavior. Finally, by nurturing intrapreneurs organizations encourage, by creating the right environment, employees (both identified and developed intrapreneurs) to actually express intrapreneurial behavior.

Intrapreneurship forms the main focus of this research and in the previous written literature review four main research questions were identified:
- How can organizations identify intrapreneurs?
- How can organizations develop intrapreneurs?
- How can organizations nurture intrapreneurs?
- How can the answers to the previous three question be implemented in the innovation transformation programs of Innovation Booster?

Innovation Booster
Innovation Booster is a consulting and design company that tries to reshape large enterprises to become more economically sustainable and to become better at conducting business in new and dynamic marketplaces. Innovation Booster thereby focuses on stimulating innovation and entrepreneurship and attempts to embed these characteristics in organizations. Innovation Booster uses a concept called ‘Entrepreneurial Innovation for Enterprises’, which combines organizational transformation and business innovation in one methodology.

Methodology
This research (thesis) project forms a combination of a field problem solving project and a science-based design project. This means that I aim at solving a field problem by coming up with a fitting solution which is informed by and based on scientific research.
B.2 Interview questions academic experts

1. How can organizations identify intrapreneurs?
   In what way could the tool you developed be useful in this case?
   When does someone show actually intrapreneurial behavior?
   How do the two approaches, GEM and IBM, interlink?

2. How can organizations develop intrapreneurs?
   In what way could the tool you developed be useful in this case?
   Could the tool be used to measure the effect of projects of Innovation Booster on intrapreneurial behavior?
   What are practical solutions or ways to develop intrapreneurs/stimulate intrapreneurial behavior?
   Could projects of Innovation Booster also serve as a solution?

3. How can organization nurture intrapreneurs?
   What are practical solutions or ways to nurture intrapreneurs?

4. For the data collection framework I am thinking of the four different interviewee groups (academics, experts, intrapreneurs, and innovation boosters). What is your initial thought on this? Any other suggestions?
Appendix C
Interview questions corporate innovation expert

1. How does your organization identify intrapreneurs?
   How do you currently select employees for the innovation initiatives?
   What are important aspects?
   Is there a standard procedure?
   Do you use experts?
   How can this be improved/what could be done differently?

2. How does your organization develop intrapreneurs?
   Is the goal of the innovation initiatives to develop people into intrapreneurs so they can spread this attitude through the organization?

3. How does your organization nurture intrapreneurs?
   What factors are important to take into account?
Appendix D
Interview questions intrapreneurs

First, can I record the conversation? It will stay completely confidential, so no one at … or Innovation Booster will listen to the recording.

INTRODUCTION

My name is Dieke ter Weel, I am a master student Innovation Management and I am currently writing my master thesis for Innovation Booster. My research is about corporate entrepreneurship, so how can large, established corporations become more entrepreneurial. More specifically, I focus on intrapreneurship, this can be regarded as a bottom-up process wherein organizational members initiate and implement activities to explore and exploit business opportunities. It focuses on organizational members’ individual behavior, which is self-determined instead of answering to a top-down request. The people that show this behavior are called intrapreneurs. An intrapreneur is an employee within an established organization who turns ideas into reality and who takes responsibility for this process. An intrapreneur is the person that takes action and gets things done and can be recognized by three types of behavior, innovative behavior, pro-active behavior and risk-taking behavior.

Innovative behavior: defined as behavior that is focused on opportunity and problem recognition, idea generation and idea implementation
Proactive behavior: behavior that is proactive, persistent and which comes from personal initiative. It can be regarded pioneering behavior which includes initiative taking to pursue new opportunities and improve yourself and/or the situation.
Risk-taking behavior, which is behavior that goes beyond the standard job description and the available resources. It involves bold actions from which the results are uncertain and often unknown and for which time, effort, money, and other resources are required.

During my research I am trying to answer the following questions:
How can organizations identify these intrapreneurs?
How can they stimulate innovative, proactive and risk-taking behavior in employees?
How can organizations nurture intrapreneurs? So, what can an organization do/facilitate to stimulate intrapreneurs?

QUESTIONS
I first have some general questions, thereafter they become more specific and focus on your behavior and on … as organization.

General
1. How long have you been working for …?
2. What is your current function at …? What does this entail?
3. Did you have other functions/positions within …?
4. Before joining …, did you have any experience being a business owner or founder or were you self-employed?
5. Are you currently a business owner next to your job at …?

Intrapreneurial behavior
1. Do you recognize yourself in the description of an intrapreneur (this will be provided in the introduction)? In what way do you recognize yourself?
2. Do you and in what way do you recognize yourself in the following statements? Can you rank the following statements on a scale from 1 to 5.
3. I generate new ideas for problems
4. I mobilize support for innovative ideas
5. I make other people in the organization enthusiastic/excited about innovative ideas
I translate ideas into useful applications

If there is something at work that I do not like, I will try to change it
If I believe in something at work, I'll make sure it happens, regardless of my chances
I am always looking for ways to do things better at work

I regularly take risks at work
I see risks at work as a challenge
I am prepared to take significant risks at work if the possible reward is high enough

3. You are currently part of a IB program, can you tell be a little bit about this and your role?
4. How did you come part of this team and the innovation program that Innovation Booster is guiding?
5. How did you hear/came to know about this program?
6. What do you think of program? What is good/stimulating about this program? What could be improved?
7. What type of behavior does the program stimulate?
8. Does the IB program stimulate innovative, risk-taking and proactive behavior?

9. Next to being part of the IB program, were your or are you, in the past couple of years, involved in the development of new activities, like introducing or developing new products or services or setting up a new department or (internal) venture?
10. Can you describe this activity?
11. What was or is your role?
12. Were or are you involved in the development of the idea for this new activity? For example, brainstorming about new activities, searching for information, introducing the idea at management or supervisors.
13. Were or are you involved in the preparation and implementation of this new activity? For example, promoting the idea or activity, preparing the business case, selling the idea or looking for funding, or looking for employees/colleagues that could implement the idea/activity.

The organization
1. What do you think of … and corporate entrepreneurship, do you recognize some aspects of the concept at …? In what way does … stimulating intrapreneurship according to you?
2. Do you have the possibility to choose or change the way you work (approaches), for example your work rhythm and speed?
3. Do you feel you have autonomy in you work (tasks)? In what way or to what extent do you have autonomy in your work?
4. Do you feel trusted/supported by your supervisor? Does your supervisor provide you with time and/or resources to work out ideas you have?
5. Do you feel challenged in your work? In what way do you feel challenged?
6. Do you think … makes use of the ideas employees have? To what extent/how?
7. If you have an idea and you want to see where it goes, do you get the opportunity to do so?
8. How are decisions being made in the organization?
9. Does … welcome change? Do you have to feeling they do? In what way, to what extent?
10. Do you feel like the organization welcomes/is open to making mistakes? In what way?
11. What could … improve?
12. Do you have any ideas on how … could stimulate entrepreneurial behavior of their employees?
Appendix E

Questionnaires non-intrapreneurs

E.1 English questionnaire

1. What is your current function at …?

2. Before joining …, did you have any experience being a business owner or founder or were you ever self-employed?

3. In what way do you agree with the statements provided in the table below?
   l= totally disagree, 5=totally agree

   | I generate new and original ideas for difficult issues or problems. |             |
   | I mobilize support for innovative ideas.                         |             |
   | I make other (important) people in the organization excited about innovative ideas. |             |
   | I translate innovative ideas into useful applications.          |             |
   | I acquire approval for innovative ideas.                        |             |
   | I evaluate the usefulness of innovative ideas.                  |             |
   | If there is something at work that I do not like, I will try to change it. |             |
   | If I believe in something at work, I'II make sure it happens, regardless of my chances. |             |
   | I like supporting my own ideas, even when others oppose me.     |             |
   | I am always looking for ways to do things better at work.       |             |
   | If, at work, I believe in an idea, nothing will stop me to make it happen. |             |
   | I excel at recognizing opportunities at my work.                |             |
   | I regularly take risks at work.                                |             |
   | I see risks at work as a challenge.                            |             |
   | I enjoy the excitement of uncertainty and risks at work.       |             |
   | I am prepared to take significant risks at work if the possible reward is high enough. |             |

4. Next to being part of the Innovation Booster accelerator, were you, in the past three years, involved in the development of new activities for your employer, like introducing or developing new products or services or setting up a new department or (internal) venture? If so, can you describe this activity shortly?

5. Were you involved in the development of the idea for this new activity? For example, brainstorming about new activities, searching for information, introducing the idea to management or supervisors.
   1. Yes, I had a leading role.
   2. Yes, I had a supporting role.
   3. No
   4. I don’t know

6. Were or are you involved in the preparation and implementation of this new activity? For example, promoting the idea or activity, preparing the business case, selling the idea or looking for funding, or looking for employees/colleagues that could implement the idea/activity.
   1. Yes, I had a leading role.
   2. Yes, I had a supporting role.
   3. No
   4. I don’t know

7. If you have ideas on or suggestions for how … can stimulate intrapreneurial behavior of its employees, you can write them down below.
E.2 Dutch questionnaire

1. Wat is je huidige functie?

2. Had u, voordat u in dienst trad bij uw huidige werkgever, enige ervaring als eigenaar van een bedrijf of als zelfstandig ondernemer?

3. In hoeverre bent u het eens met onderstaande stellingen? 1= volledig oneens, 5=volledig eens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stelling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ik creëer nieuwe en originele ideeën voor moeilijke kwesties of problemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik mobiliseer steun voor innovatieve ideeën</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik maak belangrijke mensen binnen de organisatie enthousiast voor innovatieve ideeën.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik vertaal innovatieve ideeën naar nuttige toepassingen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik verwerf goedkeuring voor innovatieve ideeën.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik evalueer het nut van innovatieve ideeën.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Als ik iets zie op mijn werk wat me niet aanstaat, dan verander ik het.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Als ik ergens in gelooof op mijn werk, dan zorg ik dat het gebeurt, ongeacht mijn kansen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik houd ervan om op mijn werk op te komen voor mijn ideeën, zelfs wanneer anderen mij tegenwerken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik ben altijd op zoek naar manieren om dingen op mijn werk beter te doen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Als ik op mijn werk in een idee geloof, dan zal niets me ervan weerhouden om het mogelijk te maken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik blink uit in het herkennen van kansen op mijn werk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik neem regelmatig risico’s op mijn werk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik zie risico’s op mijn werk doorgaans als een uitdaging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik geniet van de opwinding van onzekerheid en risico op mijn werk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik ben bereid om significante risico’s te nemen op mijn werk als de mogelijke beloningen hoog genoeg zijn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Bent u betrokken (geweest in de afgelopen 3 jaar) bij de ontwikkeling van nieuwe activiteiten voor uw werkgever, zoals het ontwikkelen of introduceren van nieuwe producten of diensten, of het opzetten van een nieuw bedrijfsonderdeel, een nieuwe vestiging of dochteronderneming? Zo ja, kunt u deze activiteit(en) kort omschrijven?

5. Bent u betrokken (geweest) bij de ontwikkeling van een idee voor een nieuwe activiteit?
   Denk hierbij aan het actief zoeken naar informatie, brainstormen over nieuwe activiteiten en het indienen van uw eigen ideeën bij het management.
   1. Ja, in een leidende rol
   2. Ja, in een ondersteunende rol
   3. Nee
   4. Weet ik niet

6. Bent u betrokken (geweest) bij het voorbereiden en implementeren van een nieuwe activiteit?
   Denk hierbij aan het promoten van uw idee, het voorbereiden van een ondernemingsplan, het verkopen van de nieuwe activiteit of het vinden van financiën en het werven van werknemers.
   1. Ja, in een leidende rol
   2. Ja, in een ondersteunende rol
   3. Nee
   4. Weet ik niet

7. Heeft u ideeën of opmerkingen over hoe … ondernemend gedrag door werknemers kan stimuleren of wat ondernemend gedrag door werknemers nu tegengaat, dan kunt u deze hieronder in het kort omschrijven.
### Appendix F

**Data analysis table intrapreneurs - Table 6: Data intrapreneurs**

The data analysis table contains the most important information of the interviews with intrapreneurs and consists of three parts.

#### F.1 Data analysis table intrapreneurs – Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Business owner experience</th>
<th>Innovative behavior score</th>
<th>Proactive behavior score</th>
<th>Risk-taking behavior score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Digital business intelligence manager, business development department</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Director digital product development</td>
<td>No, but I have been running businesses</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business development department, bringing in commercial value by partnerships</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Software engineer, software team leader</td>
<td>No, tried setting up a startup but it did not work out</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Operational specialist</td>
<td>No, but I had some experience during my studies at the university</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sales department</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Customer client service department</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Digital marketing and communication</td>
<td>No, the circumstance in Greece are a little bit difficult, it is too risky. In some cases, I know I could, why not, because I have the expertise and of course I could start up something, so I am not excluding it for the future, but now it is too difficult.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Product and business developer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>3,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Senior software developer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sales division</td>
<td>Never before, I wish I could, but it is very difficult in Greece to start your own business and to be honest here in Greece we do not so much have the mentality to be entrepreneurship or innovation in general. But, I am constantly considering it.</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strategic advisory</td>
<td>No, but I am entrepreneurial as a person and have done a lot of things to develop myself. For example, when I was 5 years old I designed my own shop. I also painted a lot and immediately visited galleries to see if I could sell it. I am thinking about setting up myself, but the stress that it brings, I find it a big downside.</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Initiative lead of an accelerator</td>
<td>No, I have a hobby of baking and decorating cakes and selling them to third parties, friends, family, so it is a little bit of a side business, but not really.</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Interviewee</td>
<td>Involved in the development of new activities in the past couple of years</td>
<td>Became involved in the innovation program by</td>
<td>Positive aspect innovation program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, at … I was responsible for selling the maps online, at a moment we changed the whole shop in five months, I set up a business case, managed to get enough support and after five months I had 45 people working the project.</td>
<td>I knew about the program yes, but I did not know the details. Rob mentioned the different moonshots and we saw that I could cooperate with one of them.</td>
<td>Basically, it had a solid start, it is properly structured, involving the right people at the right time with the right support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, this department for example did not exist three year ago. The way of working we introduced did not exist three years ago. We are the only business function that has her own IT development capability. We have introduced new disciplines that we never had in the organization before, like user experience design, user research. And we have launched, introduced five to six new web and mobile products.</td>
<td>Between myself, Rob and I, we initiated the program.</td>
<td>The best thing about the program is, is that it is motivating quite a lot of people to think differently. It brings different dynamics it brings a different, it kind of inspires the rest of the organizations as well which I think that's really strong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In terms of coming up with new solutions yes. And I focused on both the development and implementation side.</td>
<td>I reached out to Rob and said that I wanted to be part of the team. I knew Rob was joining so I looked him up at LinkedIn and saw that whatever he is doing is quite interesting so I contacted him before the whole team was formed.</td>
<td>The program allows different stakeholders to come into the same room and talk about an idea together. That is digital, but also the head office, but also reaching out to customers. That combination is so strong, it includes everybody, also the parts that maybe at first do not want to change. So it includes operations, it includes sponsors, business owners, everybody on one table.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My team is developing this core system and that we want to expand it to launch it as a product, instead of it only being an information system for …, we want to make it as an insurance core system that can also work for other insurance companies or markets. Right now, we are about to launch a part of it within ….</td>
<td>I became part because I saw that there was a move on it, first … launched a platform called Imagine on which employees can upload ideas, I uploaded the ideas that I had and then I met the marketing department and we discussed on this and they told me that there would be an innovation boosting program, an accelerator, I found it interesting to do something beyond the daily job.</td>
<td>It is interesting and demanding at the same time and not so controlling, you have some guidelines and tools on how to work as a team, but the field is free. The program gives space to people to take initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I was actually, as I mentioned before, responsible for the creation of the ‘bring a friend’ program, from scratch, since then it is working and now from an</td>
<td>I first found out about the imagine platform and then about the accelerator program, it was during a presentation for</td>
<td>I think it gives a new vision to us as an employee, to for example understand the other parts of the company. I work with four different people, form four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Regarding products, no, regarding application for example selling business that have to do with agents, yes, I am still part of these teams. It has to do with a platform that we introduced. I am involved regarding the development, I am involved from the beginning of the project, until the end, so the whole process. I think my manager proposed it to me first. I believe in this program, I believe the company needs this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No, I wouldn’t say I was developing something, but when I was still working at the customer intelligence department the department had just launched, we were just two people and we were figuring out everything from the beginning. And when we started thinking about the transformation I was part of the team that came up with some ideas. So I was more part of the ideation phase. Our manager, there was an open day, and my manager proposed that I attend this open day where they introduced us to the Innovation Booster way and I liked the idea and I thought yes I want to join and then I volunteered for that. My manager knows that I am interested in doing new things, because I have already taken part into some transformation processes and I enjoy doing different things and she knows that so she proposed. I believe that the best thing about the program is that you test everything you think of, because that is the biggest mistake we have been doing, they put money, people and time in it and after they find out that customers do not really want that. So for me it is very valuable to have tested everything and to say that you have at least a minimal interest from your customers before you go on and scale it up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Actually yes, I developed the social media presence as I said, as it did not exist. We are now working on things that we did not use before, so yes I was involved. I was involved in both the ideation and implementation. I was the one who started, who build the social media presence of the … brand three/four years ago, that meant that I had to take the initiative to bring the whole procedure within the company and also try to transmit the social mentality into the organization. I had to be kind of, it was a kind of risk-taking and also a kind of, because it could evolve into something good or could sink. You My manager told me to, I was selected in the first phase, for the second phase I was asked to continue with it. I did not know about the program before my manager came to me, the only thing that I knew was that there was a platform in the company where we could submit our innovative ideas, so I knew they were trying to establish a process for generating new ideas and culture innovation within … , but not about the program specifically, not at all. I really like the way how you make the things done, and the way you that you can get some many learnings in a small period and discover new opportunities, the way things are done, the enthusiasm that your colleagues (Innovation Booster) have brought to us is great, I hope that this is a new era for … , a new mentality of working in general and we can be the transformers of this and the people that establish this in … in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes, I joined the product development department, which was created when I joined it, so it was a new department, with new members and I joined it. So we created this department, we set it up and since then we have launched more than five products. I was involved in both the ideation and implementation, we are a small department, three members and our manager so everyone is involved in the whole procedure. So, when we have to launch a product we have to write a paper, you have to do all the research, market analysis, the specifications of the product, we talk to a committee and a lot of people to see how they see the new product and we talk to many different departments.</td>
<td>They just announced to me that I would become part of it and that I would be a team captain, so of course my supervisor asked me, and I said yes but I had no idea what it was exactly about. When I hear about something new I always say yes. Why did your supervisor choose you specifically? I think there are a number of reasons, first is because I am in the development team, so we are developing things, so that is why I would be a candidate. I am much younger than many of my colleagues. And third, my manager knows that I like new things.</td>
<td>I think the second round is almost perfect, I think the first round is very, again we were searching what we were trying to do. The Boosters had never worked with a Greek company before, so they had to make a lot of adjustments in the model and the way they worked with us, but they were very adaptive and flexible, which was very good. At the end of the first phase they asked us for feedback, I said a lot of things that could have been improved and I see that there is a huge step forward in the second round. Now I see that they are very well organized, the program is tailor-made on this company, all the procedures are far more organized, I think they are great.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Actually my supervisor proposed that.</td>
<td>The really amazing thing is that we are colleagues from different departments, so we share knowledge. There are things that I never thought about, I had only the perspective of IT and know I feel I have a more global opinion about things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>We wanted to deploy a CRM platform and I was part of this team to test the new platform, write down all the difficulties around things that should be changed. I was more involved in the implementation aspect.</td>
<td>I was chosen by my supervisor, he explained to me what was about the happen and I realized that something great is building, and I positively accepted. I didn’t know about the program before my manager approached me, I knew that … launched the Imagine platform, I considered it as a very positive aspect and we realized that innovation becomes part of our everyday thing. I am always searching for new stuff and safe time and resources to get things better and my manager knows that.</td>
<td>The program is actually very good, it is very well designed and prepared. The methodology is very efficient, it gives you the feeling that everything has a reason. I cannot find things that need improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes, I started off with setting up a new business line. I also did a project in order to reorganize the distribution department. I setup a program for CO2 reduction and now I also setup the innovation program. And I have been involved in both the ideation and implementation, in some only for one of them and for other, the final two, also really the implementation.</td>
<td>I came up with the idea, the program, and set it up.</td>
<td>The program is going well, it transforms people, it helps people to think more customer focused and to use the lean startup methodology. It helps to, in a short timeframe, go from idea to project plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes, I am initiative lead of an accelerator. The accelerator is within … a way to quickly guide an idea into an innovative concept and my team is now focusing on a concept in the wholesale banking.</td>
<td>PACE program …: People knew about me, so they asked me, the head of innovation in wholesale banking.</td>
<td>PACE program …: You get the time and focus to find out if there is a market for an idea you have. There is also a direct link with senior management, for which you have to do a few presentations, so if you get held back by the big organization, you immediately have a sponsor that is high up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### F.3 Data analysis table intrapreneurs – Part 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continued Interviewee</th>
<th>Improvement that can be made to the innovation program</th>
<th>Other interesting insights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>At business development we have something called TWAG (team with a goal): team system, each team has a specific focus area, teams consist of designers, analysts, programmers, all these kind of different people. - If I had worked, or if I had some contact with the person I could identify them as an intrapreneur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Biggest thing that we could have improved on looking back was when we came up with our first moonshots, first things we wanted to experiment with, they were completely relevant to our industry but not linked in closely enough to strategic priorities.</td>
<td>So, how did you manage to make such a change within such a big corporate? We were successful because we were able to work from the bottom up, we put smart people who now this business together and who were really motivated to make that change happen and we had the CEO as a sponsor. The resistance does not typically come from the top of the organization or the bottom, it is the middle layers that, that middle management, that form the problem. Do you have any ideas on how … could stimulate entrepreneurial behavior of their employees? A lot of people get stuck in a certain role within in the organization, so a lot of people do not get the opportunity to broaden their horizons, look at the bigger picture. So that could be improved. Do you think it is good to have a more structured way, or that you know with what kind of people you go into these moonshots? If you want to get really buy-in from people it has to go through a network, it is really getting people on board, getting people excited. You get more done through informal and formal networks than through formal decision bodies. Distribution problem vs. selection problem? Do you think it is a distribution problem? That is absolutely the case I think. You need people to really, really invest, you need to people more than just 4 hours a week. This is a management thing, but also employees need to show commitment. But that is why it is important to connect it to the long term value, not just short time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>If everyone could dedicate some more time to run the experiments and make it to the next step faster, that would really help.</td>
<td>Do you think looking at the innovation program, looking at how to select people, how does that go right now? I think it is more word-of-mouth. It builds a good network when you are doing the innovation program. The program is open to everyone, I think that right now, we defined six moonshots, and it is really important that we get some outcomes. So, at this point it should stay this way and later when we have some successes it would be easier to open it up again, then we have defined a way of working, the process, we validated it. So this is right now also validating how the program works, so opening it up to everybody will make the processes change, will also making the way of working change and then you can end up losing focus on what you are really trying to achieve. We need to get a full run through at least once with a full team, till we get a product out and how to scale, then you can identify your pain and positives, to see where you need to work on until you roll it out into the whole organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>There is little guidance from other parts of the company, this program is targeted mostly and consists of people that are somehow considered talented, but they have not as much</td>
<td>Do you have any ideas on how … could stimulate entrepreneurial behavior of their employees? If there is an idea or a product that … wants to invest in, they should make a spin out company, put a team on it with people with a more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experience and for me there is a gap here, few people with great experience and key positions within ... has embraced this initiative. It is not something complete, it doesn’t involve the whole organization yet.

entrepreneurial mindset, otherwise people always will feel the safety of the big company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>One suggestion I would give for improvement is, I think that there should be more guidance for digital things. For example, how to set up a Facebook campaign or how to make a landing page.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any ideas on how … could stimulate entrepreneurial behavior of their employees? I think that if you give the employees the choice to decide and take initiative in their daily life, they will feel more productive and more engaged to you. If they are feeling that they are doing what they are said to do, this will never change anything, so give them more responsibility and freedom, and give them the possibility to express themselves and to not be afraid to do this. The program stimulates that, I can see it from the people I have in my group, when we first met they were really scared to express their ideas, but now they are willing to talk and discuss and they are out of their daily routine, they see different things and this is a great improvement. And I also see this in my daily job, not so much the methodology we use, but I learned to be faster, make decisions more easily, be confident about thing I have in my mind, become to discuss this with other people, also from other departments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>The program should be more organized, sometimes we face problems that involve another department and we need support, but we do not have it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The company focuses on the new way of working now. This happened since we changed CEO, since we recognized that we have internal problems. If the company would create more opportunities for employees to be more interactive, the problem I think is the communication, we must improve the communication inside the company. I think there are many good ideas, but never does upper management learn about them or are informed about them, that is the problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>As for the improvement, first of all I believe that compared to the first phase the second phase has much more improved because Innovation Booster took into account our previous feedback and now we have more focus on the tools and now they are also more experienced in the insurance world, we exchanged information and that is important. I don’t have something specifically that should be improved now but it is really satisfying that everything we said as feedback is taking into account.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What could … improve? There should be more participation from people from more departments, it is like I told you before, some departments are already part of the team, of the transformation, but other departments are still doing what they were doing without understanding what we do and what changes. Concerning identifying intrapreneurs, how to select the right people for the IB programs, do you think it is important to select the right people in the beginning or do it should be open for everyone? I believe it should be somewhere in the middle, because managers know who has certain skills and capabilities and who is more willing to participate and to change and they can propose some people who can initiate things, but if people volunteer and want to do it, it should be for everyone, especially for those that have declared their willingness to do it despite their skills and capabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>We need to be a little bit more organized, what I mean, for example, at this moment there are here three colleagues of yours, three Innovation Boosters, and all the coaches, we are receiving a lot of emails during the week from various people, there is not one clear point for us and sometimes we are getting confused.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What type of behavior does the program stimulate? Certainly, taking initiatives, thinking out of the box. For me as a coach, to create empathy, cultural empathy. Also, making things done. Does the IB program stimulate innovative, risk-taking and proactive behavior? Yes, every initiative of ours has some risks and we have to confront them or take them, you never know, in every case you can phase from resistance to limitations of resources for example, so nothing is without risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because of this high volume of emails and all these different senders. Also, because the needs, in terms of this program are getting higher and higher we can create more synergies and be more organized. For example, my team has made the request for something, at the same time another team makes the same request, we are not aligned right now, we do not know that also another team also has made this request. Another example, we are making email campaigns to our customers, however there are no specifications regarding these campaigns, it is very high risk and it is possible for one customer to receive more than one email communication for different things at the same time, So, we need to be more aligned. and more organized regarding all the initiatives that are taking place.

What do you think of … and corporate entrepreneurship, do you recognize some aspects of the concept at ….? In what way does … stimulating intrapreneurship according to you? Yes, it has started to do it, there is many room for improvement but a good start has been done but I think there is now a good pool of people that can be trained in that way that can transmit it in a higher volume and a higher extension. But of course we are always requested and invited to think outside of the box, but know the procedure is more structured, because we communicated in a better way and I think they gives us the room to do it.

Does … welcome change? Do you have to feeling they do? In what way, to what extent? Yes, definitely, and there is evidence for it, we have built internal companies for it, we are running this program, it is not only theory, we see it in practice. Also our new CEO is very much in favor of it, we have more open space to work at and more transparency.

What could … improve?
Do you have any ideas on how … could stimulate entrepreneurial behavior of their employees? Yes, they can improve, they need to build, they need to improve the process of processing the ideas that are submitted to the Imagine platform and communicate, I mean those that submitted these ideas need to be involved in this procedure, because if I see that one of my ideas has impact or is taking into account by the company, I will think again if I will submit an idea, if not, I will not do it again. So, we need to close the funnel, in order to stimulate more entrepreneurial behavior.

See answer to positive aspects of IB program.

What do you think of … and corporate entrepreneurship, do you recognize some aspects of the concept at …? In what way does … stimulating intrapreneurship according to you? Right now there are a lot of changes happening in the company, and all these changes will lead us to an agile way of working, the organization is being transformed right now, so yes we are changing and we are trying to promote this intrapreneurship in the company and our CEO keeps telling it to the whole company, to all employees that … is trying to change, that … will change and that everybody needs to change and that there is no alternative here, so everyone is being pushed into this direction.

How are decisions being made in the organization? Until now it has been top down, but it is starting to change, now it becomes more bottom-up. Small decisions do not have to be made top-down, we are getting more autonomy. It is not that slow. I think most of the time it is about good relationships between people that are key in the company, so I am talking about my department, the people I know, there may be also departments that are not that fast.

Do you feel like the organization welcomes/is open to making mistakes? In what way? Our CEO is his speech, if you fail 100 times, you did not fail, you just found 100 ways that do not work. So, yes.

What could … improve? Right now I am very happy with the company, if you would have asked me a few months ago I would have said a million things, the company is it employees. So I would say
that the employees should be different, not different people, but
different trained, different motivated, differently managed, the
company understands that this has to change and are putting all I
effort in it.

Explanation about the research questions…
In my opinion, at the beginning you do not know if you select the
right people, so at the first phase we had quite a big problem with
people who were selected, not only for captains or coaches or
anything but team members who were not ready for change, so you
cannot involve people who are very resistant to change in this kind of
program, because they keep you back and discourage other people
who are willing to be part of it. During the second round I think the
selection was much more successful. And also, there are a lot of things
that should be considered, not only the behavioral colors, but the
performance of a person should be taking into consideration by the
recruiters, they should run personal interviews and ask a lot of things
that would challenge the person that you interview, like you did. You
need to let them sign a contract, not an actual contract but say I want
to be part of it and I am very excited about it and I promise that I will
do my best. And if you get someone through this procedure and you
have him 100% with him, it will be better. Maybe you can use cases,
so you describe a situation and then you ask them what would you do
in this situation and you can see a lot of interesting over there. There
are a lot of people that when you ask them something, they are like, I
don’t know, I am not sure, ok think, they don’t think, they say nothing,
I think there should be a threshold over there.

The thing I believe we should
improve is how can we apply this on
this on a Greek culture. We are a
little bit, we don’t trust easily new
ideas, so we have to adopt this idea
as Greek, as colleagues, as society,
because we are going with the
questionnaires and when they saw
we had something in our hands, they
run, as society we should be more
open to this way of working.

Does … welcome change? Do you have to feeling they do? In what
way, to what extent? Yes, it is changing, we talked about the top and
bottom level, they want all of us to participate that makes us feel
unique. The head of our company, I feel that I have the opportunity
to knock on his door and tell him my ideas, I have never talked to him,
but I have that feeling, it is a person that you can approach. You are
not afraid to talk to the top-level management so you are not afraid to
share your ideas.

What could … improve? We should make use of programs like the
accelerator, not only for small teams, we are fifty people here, but I
believe that in this program all of us should participate from the
supervisors to the last colleague. I doesn’t work if I know the new
way of working, but my supervisor does not.

What do you think of … and corporate entrepreneurship, do you
recognize some aspects of the concept at …? In what way does …
stimulating intrapreneurship according to you? The last couple of
years yes, I have seen a change, in terms of innovation, in letting
people and colleagues be more active. For example, I remember our
CEO tell us, try everything you do, do not be afraid of failures, try,
fail again, fail, fail, you have our support, you can feel autonomous to
act and I think this is the biggest change in our company the last
couple of years.

How are decisions being made in the organization? Unfortunately,
things go quite slow, I think we should sit down department and see
which procedures go slow and how we could improve them and try to
be more efficient. I think we have a lot of ground to cover to be in a position to say that we are fast and efficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>The challenge is now to make sure that the project plans are put to practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I noticed that people who had a very low basic level, were very happy about their experience and that they say, I never have to innovate anymore, but I have learned so much about how you can quickly go from idea to project plan. And what you see with people that are already more innovative, they can also be a little stubborn and want to do their own thing and are less open to a new methodology and a group input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you think … makes use of the ideas employees have? To what extent/how? No, totally not. But people with only an idea, they don’t care to me at all, because of the time those people are not motivated enough to actually something with it. But also, there is often not enough space to work out your idea. It is because you have managers that lead up ten people, you would rather have those managers more in a coaching role, but not everyone can handle this. Not everyone can handle a coaching supervisor. And that is the problem with a company like … (80% of the people that work there are MBO educated), we want coaching supervisors, but if we are not clear what actually we want delivered, then we have our own dilemma. So it is not always good for all the ideas, but a lot of people really do not like it to come up by themselves what they have to do. So, it is a completely different reality here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have any ideas on how … could stimulate entrepreneurial behavior of their employees? They have to show that entrepreneurial behavior will get rewarded. They need to provide more trainings into this kind of behavior and give space to employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PACE program …: We are noticing that the rest of the organization is not really innovation minded yet and that is an enormous energy drain and I still have to experience what happens afterwards.

And with intrapreneurship, I think that a lot of people have that in them, but that the culture and structure just suppresses that.

Then I went looking for my own team mates, this was via my network in the organization and my own outside network.

Distribution problem discussion … what do you think? There are many information sharing things and innovation initiatives, but than do I think, ok but if you yourself just take a half hour on a day to screen through it than you will see yourself that there is PACE for example. But you have to do it yourself, you are the master of your own destiny. So, you can also actively go looking for it. But on the other hand, the PACE methodology, putting the client central, I am of the opinion that everyone should be familiar with it.

Does the PACE program stimulate innovative, risk-taking and proactive behavior? So not PACE the methodology specifically, but I think the orange coat does, that is the behavioral code we have. For example, one of them is ‘take it on and make it happen’, and ‘you help others be succesful’, ‘you are courageous’. And I think that is pretty much in line with the three types of behavior, and some managers have said, ok I don’t evaluate anymore on individual KPI’s, I evaluate people on their orange code behavior.
Appendix G
Data analysis table non-intrapreneurs - Table 7: Data non-intrapreneurs

G.1 Data analysis table non-intrapreneurs – Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Business owner experience</th>
<th>Innovative behavior score</th>
<th>Proactive behavior score</th>
<th>Risk-taking behavior score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manager technologie &amp; bronnen</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3 (4.2)</td>
<td>4 (3.8)</td>
<td>3.3 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Onderzoeker water-technologie</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.5 (2.7)</td>
<td>4 (3.5)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trainee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.8 (3.7)</td>
<td>3 (3.2)</td>
<td>3.3 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Management trainee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.7)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project engineer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.8 (2.7)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.7)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>4.7 (4.7)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Project engineer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.8 (3.8)</td>
<td>4.7 (4.5)</td>
<td>4.8 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Management trainee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3 (4.3)</td>
<td>3.7 (3.8)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.8 (2.8)</td>
<td>4.7 (3.7)</td>
<td>2 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5 (3.8)</td>
<td>3 (3.2)</td>
<td>3 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Management trainee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.8 (2)</td>
<td>3.3 (3)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Technische specialist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (3.8)</td>
<td>3.3 (3.2)</td>
<td>2 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.8 (3.8)</td>
<td>4.7 (4.8)</td>
<td>4 (4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Manager Industry Services</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3 (4.3)</td>
<td>3.3 (3.3)</td>
<td>3 (3,3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The scores between brackets represent the average score when using sixteen IBM statements. The scores without brackets represent the average score when using ten IBM statements.
## G.2 Data analysis table non-intrapreneurs – Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Involved in the development of new activities in the past couple of years</th>
<th>Involved in development</th>
<th>Involved in implementation</th>
<th>Ideas on how to stimulate or what blocks intrapreneurial behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The current trajectory of innovation stimulation is a good start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>By less hierarchy, which ensures less bureaucracy and thus less obstacles for new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rinew, afvalwaterzuivering met fous op terugwinnen grondstof, onderzoeker</td>
<td>Yes, supporting role</td>
<td>Yes, supporting role</td>
<td>Bonus for best innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The organizational culture blocks this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ja, vastleggen van werkmethoden</td>
<td>Yes, leading role</td>
<td>Yes, supporting role</td>
<td>Stimulating entrepreneurial attempts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Innovatietraject Lood, activiteitencommissie + bestuur</td>
<td>Yes, leading and supporting role</td>
<td>Yes, leading and supporting role</td>
<td>More stimulation, taking away barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>More time and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes, (unreadable)</td>
<td>Yes, supporting role</td>
<td>Yes, leading role</td>
<td>More space, time, and daring more. Thinking more in opportunities than in risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ontwikkelen van diverse nieuwe services voor de verschillende verticale markten (bijvoorbeeld voor HealthCare - innovatief lease concept voor temperature controlled transport)</td>
<td>Yes, leading and supporting role</td>
<td>Yes, leading and supporting role</td>
<td>Stimuleren: door werknemers actief mee te laten denken over verbeteringen in de … processen, producten, services etc. en ze daar ook recognition voor geven. Koffie corner sessies - brainstormen met gelijkgestemden over bepaalde problemen, uitdagingen, veranderingen etc. Ideenbus. Standup sessies met crossfunctionele deelnemers - presenteren van services/producten in begin van life cycle om input te krijgen voor eindproduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H
### Data analysis table experts - Table 8: Data experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Other interesting insights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 & 2 (academic experts) | - Bij deze tool moeten mensen vragen beantwoorden over zichzelf en niet over iemand anders, maar dat zou wel een goed punt kunnen zijn.  
- Wat hier interessant is, is dat je naar drie gedragingen kijkt, heel veel mensen kijken vaak alleen maar naar creativiteit, sommige mensen zijn heel creatief, maar daar moet je er niet drie van je omheen hebben want die maken nooit wat af en durven niet hun idee te verkopen.  
En dat is wel mijn ervaring, vaak focussen maar op een soort type gedrag.  
- Je wilt natuurlijk niet een bedrijf dat alleen maar bestaat uit intrapreneurs. Ik denk dat je eerder een aantal moet hebben, die meer de leiding nemen en ook wat meer uitvoerender. De vraag is, wie zijn nu de echte voortrekkers. Die mensen verzamelen ook vanzelf mensen om zich heen om een team samen te stellen.  
- Ik denk wel dat het heel belangrijk is hoe je het communiceert, ik geloof heel erg dat dat wel een zelf-selecterend mechanisme is en ik weet ook zeker dat die mensen ook zeker erg hoog, hoger dan gemiddeld scoren op beide maten van intrapreneurship.  
- Ik denk dat je twee dingen moet onderscheiden, je hebt nature vs nurture en/of is het te stimuleren. En binnen die laatste moet je weer onderscheid maken tussen, is het gedrag te stimuleren of is de organisatie zo in te richten dat je personen die dat toch al bezitten daar meer gebruik van gaan maken. Dus heb je mensen die over de tijd hoger gaan scoren, of heb je mensen die hetzelfde scoren over de tijd maar gewoon meer met dat gedrag gaan doen.  
- Onderzoek bij grote consultant: opt in vs opt out ideensystemen. Organisaties doen over het algemeen wel aan intrapreneurship en/of innovatie en proberen wel iets te doen met de ideeën van lower level employees, maar daar moet de persoon wel echt proactief naar het management stappen. Daar hebben ze gekeken wat nu als we zeggen iedere werknemer maakt onderdeel van dit programma, tenzij hij of zij actief zegt niet mee te willen doen. En dan zitten we dus in die laatste categorie, dan zit je dus in een structuur van een bedrijf dat toch al innovatieve en proactieve werknemers, dat te starten zeg maar. Dus bij opt in kom je de echte intrapreneurs tegen die al heel erg ver ontwikkeld is en met die opt out geef je iedereen de kans om erin te stappen, mensen met wel de aanleg, en dat te laten zien. Die twee persoenen kunnen best even hoog scoren op die mate van gedrag, maar de een zou het aan de hand van nature zelf al hebben ingebracht en mensen om zich heen hebben verzameld, waar de ander kennelijk wat meer systeem nodig heeft of meer zekerheden. Dus dan modereert die relatie de organisatie die iets in place heeft om dat effect te stimuleren  
- Ik denk ook dat het redelijk in de nurture zit, en dat met name zit in het faciliteren, waardoor het niet tot uiting komt in, die hebben vaak heel veel goede ideeën, maar die mensen zitten dan gewoon vast, omdat ze niet de tijd krijgen of worden tegengewerkt. Dus belangrijk om te kijken hoe kan je die cultuur, die middelen stimuleren. En ik denk dat er wel mensen zijn die misschien niet door hebben dat ze zelf een intrapreneurs zijn, of dat zouden kunnen zijn en die zou je dan ook moeten faciliteren en dat zit hem grofweg wel in dezelfde dingen die dat faciliteren  
- Ik heb zelf ook laatst een onderzoek gedaan, waarin we aantoonden dat als je mensen een uitdagende taak gaf, dit was in dit geval een workshop geven aan collega’s, dan ze dan zelf achteraf aangaven dat ze meer intrapreneurial gedrag vertonen. |

| 3 (academic expert) | - Denk ook dat die tweede benadering interessanter is voor bedrijven, je wilt natuurlijk in mensen iets ontwikkelen. Dat houdt niet in dat je bij sommige mensen iets sneller kan ontwikkelen dan bij andere mensen.  
- Als je kijkt naar gedrag en de onderzoeken die ik heb gedaan, de grootste voorspeller van gedrag ben jezelf, maar de context is ook heel belangrijk, dan kom je snel in de management literatuur uit, en iemand moet tijd krijgen.  
- De echte intrapreneur, die doet het toch wel, dus inderdaad, daar komt management bij kijken, die latente intrapreneur, die maar wil maar niet durft, die kan je alleen door dat soort dingen stimuleren, door het opbouwen van de omgeving.  
- Het is wel echt een lastige, het is echt multi-level, bij intrapreneurship, als ik iets wil doen en mijn leidinggevende blokkeert dat helemaal, en ik geef daaraan in, en dan is het heel snel over. En dan verlies je dus iemand die heel goed voor de organisatie zou zijn. Dan is weer het ontdekken van de personen weer |
heel mooi, en dan kan je kijken naar de mensen die wel die kenmerken hebben, die kan je dan wel stimuleren, die moet je dan stimuleren om te ondernemen en bij de rest hoeft dat niet helemaal, maar dan zit je wel heel erg in snel in hokjes te denken. Het identificeren is wel heel erg handig, dan weet je wie je kan gaan inzetten voor die intrapreneurial projects.

4 (corporate innovation expert)

- De mensen als ze ervan horen, dan komen ze wel. Ze moeten het lezen, zien of voelen. Dus het is misschien meer een distributie uitdaging.
- Makkelijk om ze eruit te filteren, constante de juiste en oncomfortabele dingen laten doen. Dingen die niet bekend zijn, risico vergen, en buiten de comfortzone zijn.
- Voeden: top en middel management
- Bestuur: context, budget, kpi's
- Middel: altijd beschikbaar voor raad en daad, echt steunen
- Geen filterprocedure nu, programma zelf is de filter, maar kan me voorstellen dat dit afhangt van het budget, wij kunnen zoveel mensen als we willen door het programma laten gaan.
- Innovation manifest: Daarin staat eigenlijk beschreven dat je je continu moet afvragen, draagt het bij en word ik ontslagen, is het antwoord ja en op de volgende nee, dan dus gewoon doen.
Appendix I
Final design questionnaire

1. What is your name?
2. What is your current function?
3. How long have you been working for your current employer?
4. To what extent do you agree with the statements provided in the table below?
Use the option menu: 1=totally disagree, 5=totally agree

I generate new and original ideas for difficult issues or problems.
I mobilize support for innovative ideas.
I make other (important) people in the organization excited about innovative ideas.
I translate innovative ideas into something that can actually be applied and implemented.
I acquire approval for innovative ideas.
I evaluate the usefulness of innovative ideas.
If there is something at work that I do not like, I will try to change it.
If I believe in something at work, I'll make sure it happens, regardless of my chances.
I enjoy supporting my own ideas, even when others oppose me.
I am always looking for ways to do things better at work.
If, at work, I believe in an idea, nothing will stop me to make it happen.
I excel at recognizing opportunities at my work.
I regularly take risks at work.
I perceive risks at work as a challenge.
I enjoy the excitement of uncertainty and risks at work.
I am prepared to take significant risks at work if the possible reward is high enough.

Use the option menu were possible

5. Are you currently and/or were you in the past three years involved in the development of new activities for your employer, like introducing or developing new products or services or setting up a new department or (internal) venture?

Yes, currently
Yes, in the past three years
No
I don’t know

6. Can you describe the activity or activities shortly?

In the development of a new activity two phases are distinguished, please indicate for each of the two phases if you contributed. Use the option menu were possible

7. Are you or have you been involved in the development of the idea for this new activity? For example, brainstorming about new activities, searching for information, introducing the idea to management or supervisors.

Yes, I had a leading role
Yes, I had a supporting role
No
I don’t know
8. Are you or have you been involved in the preparation and implementation of this new activity? For example, promoting the idea or activity, preparing the business case, selling the idea or looking for funding, or looking for employees/colleagues that could implement the idea/activity.

Yes, I had a leading role
Yes, I had a supporting role
No
I don’t know

9. If you have ideas on or suggestions for how your organization can stimulate and/or improve intrapreneurial behavior of its employees, you can write them down in the box.
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1. Intrapreneur Identification Tool
1.1 Theoretical background – the intrapreneur

- Creative
- Persuasive
- Ambitious
- Self-determined goal setter
- Not afraid to take risks

1. Intrapreneur Identification Tool
1.3 Theoretical background – intrapreneurial behavior

- Innovative behavior
  - Innovation focused on opportunities and problems
  - Recognition of future growth and data implementation
- Risk-taking behavior
  - Tackling risks and chances from entrepreneurial initiatives
  - Tackling risks in an organized and controlled environment
- Positive risk behavior
  - Tackling risks and chances in an organized and controlled environment

PREFAE
This manual is made as a guide for using the Intrapreneur Identification Tool. The intrapreneur Identification Tool is built to identify intrapreneurs to play a role in the projects of Innovation Booster. Apart from identifying intrapreneurs the tool can be used to assess intrapreneurial behavior. By filling in the questionnaire a profile of the possible intrapreneurs is generated.

The manual provides a detailed description of the tool including theoretical background, user instructions and interpretation guidelines.

The tool is developed for Innovation Booster by Dick Ver Weel during his graduation research (2-8-15-17).