Forord

Før oppgaven begynner vil jeg gjerne benytte anledningen til å takke alle som har bidratt i gjennomføringen av dette prosjektet. Jeg har hatt mange viktige støttespillere gjennom de siste månedene, og jeg setter umåtelig pris på det.

Først og fremst, tusen takk til alle informanter for at dere satt av tid til å stille opp på intervju. Uten dere hadde ikke denne avhandlingen kunne blitt til.

Jeg vil også rette en stor takk til alle i House of Knowledge for et flott samarbeid, og for å gi meg muligheten til å skrive denne oppgaven. Jeg har lært mye av dere det siste året.

Min veileder, Fay Giæver, fortjener også takk for god og målrettet hjelp når jeg har trengt det som mest.

Videre vil jeg takke min kjære samboer for hjelp, oppmuntring, og tålmodighet de siste månedene, samt venner, medstudenter, og kollegaer både for faglig støtte og sårt trengte avbrekk.

Experiences and Reflections of Participants Using the Business Strategy Tool Leap Canvas

Håvard B. Almås

NTNU Trondheim

Author Note

Håvard B. Almås, Department of Psychology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.

A special thanks to Fay Giæver at the Department of Psychology, NTNU, for assistance throughout the research process.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Håvard B. Almås. E-mail: haavarba@stud.ntnu.no

Abstract

The present study examines the experiences and reflections of participants using the business strategy tool Leap Canvas, which aims to increase competitiveness through change based on increased IP and IPR knowledge. Experiences and reflections regarding the goals of the tool is of special interest, and as such increasing knowledge and subsequent change intentions are emphasized. Therefore, knowledge, behavioral change, and organizational change is used as a theoretical framework. The study is conducted using semi-structured research interviews, analyzed using thematic analysis. The analysis reveals a total of seven themes within two categories, knowledge and social themes. The themes are discussed, revealing that participants experience gaining knowledge and reflect upon how they can take advantage of this knowledge. It is concluded that participants in this study evaluate the tool positively, based on these experiences and reflections.

Sammendrag

Denne studien undersøker erfaringer og refleksjoner blant brukere av det strategiske organisasjonsverktøyet Leap Canvas. Leap Canvas har som mål å bedre konkurransedyktighet gjennom IP og IPR basert endring. Erfaringer og refleksjoner vedrørende målene til dette verktøyet er av spesiell interesse, og kunnskap og endringsintensjoner blir derfor vektlagt. Det teoretiske rammeverket for oppgaven vil derfor bestå av kunnskap, atferdsendring, og organisasjonsendring. Studien utføres ved bruk av semi-strukturerte intervjuer som analyseres med tematisk analyse. Analysen finner totalt sju tema som kan klassifiseres innen to kategorier; kunnskap og sosiale temaer. Videre diskuteres temaene, og det vises at deltagerne erfarer økt kunnskapsnivå, og reflekterer rundt hvordan dette kan brukes i organisasjonen. Basert på disse erfaringer og refleksjoner konkluderes det med at deltagerne i denne studien har en positiv evaluering av verktøyet.

Keywords: experience, reflection, Knowledge Management, Organizational Change, strategy tools, competitiveness, change intention.

Contents

Business planning through utilization of specialized tools and methods for change initiation has seemingly become common practice in knowledge-intensive work. These planning tools are all different in their methods, however they all tend to aim at the same basic, underlying goal: value creation through changing the mode of operation within the organization. Change something in the organization, and value will be created in the form of increased competitiveness, increased efficiency, more efficient work relationships, more engaged employees, or some other factor. It is assumed that creating knowledge in and of the organization, its business strategy, and its contextual factors, will realize some form of change potential, and value can thus be created. The potential could, for instance, be for innovation, increased competitiveness, increased efficiency, or any other outcome deemed valuable. This is not to say that all business strategy tools are the same, but they are comparable in what they aim to achieve. If a consultancy agency offers a strategic planning tool which does not add value to the target organization in the long run, it is unlikely that tool will be particularly sought-after. However, even though it is known from anecdotal evidence that business planning and strategy tools are commonplace, there seems to be a lack of empirical evidence supporting their efficiency. Even some of the most commonly used business assessment tools, like SWOT analysis and Business Model Canvas, are wanting when it comes to actual, empirical evidence (Helms & Nixon, 2010; Ching & Fauvel, 2013). This lack of research, paired with the knowledge that strategic change initiatives in general commonly fail to reach their predetermined goals (Kotter, 1995; Elving, 2005; Meaney & Pung, 2008), creates a need for research.

When looking up consultancy agencies online, in many cases, testimonials from previous users will be the only accreditation of utilized methods. Testimonials, while having some perceived value for potential clients, is too subjective to be the only measurement of usefulness in tools used to create organizational change. There could be different reasons why consultancy agencies choose not to test their tools. For instance, the consultants could feel it is not worth it, due to potentially high costs of research. Another reason could be keeping a certain level of secrecy, as not to let competitors in on the methods used. This is probably a concern especially when using external researchers, as should be done to not create any conflicts of interest. A third reason why could even be a fear of realizing the tool is not as effective as believed or does not work as intended. These are just speculations, as the answer to why there is a lack of studies is not known. However, whatever the reason is, there are many positive sides of researching strategy tools as well. That is, there can be a potential for value creation for the consultant agency by researching the methods they use. Having thoroughly researched methods might (a) improve the tool itself, by discovering flaws, strengths, and unattained potential, and (b) actively enhancing the agency's renown amongst potential clients, assuming the outcome of the research is favorable to the tool.

This study will be the first research done on one such business planning and assessment tool called Leap Canvas, a tool created by consultancy agency House of Knowledge in Trondheim. Leap Canvas is a strategic planning and change initiation tool based on facilitated group discussion and stress testing, in which the explicit goal is to increase competitiveness, by providing participants with relevant knowledge and strategies to better account for intellectual property (IP) and intellectual property rights (IPR) in their work. As such, IP and IPR knowledge is at the core of the tool. IP refers to "*creations of the mind, such as inventions; literary and artistic works; designs; symbols; names and images used in commerce*" (WIPO, 2004), and IPR are the rights related to this, i.e. patenting, copyright, trademarking, etc. It is believed by House of Knowledge, and ultimately its clients, that creating, and altering, IP and IPR knowledge has a potential for strengthening competitiveness through risk reduction, by assuming a precautionary role in relation to potential IP theft, as well as a realization of opportunities for the organization when it comes to utilization of IPR knowledge. Furthermore, this knowledge is concretized during the Leap Canvas, with participants creating an action plan for the organization. This action plan has the potential to make clear how the organization should prioritize when aiming to stay in line with the boundaries and opportunities created by IP/IPR. Therefore, the way Leap Canvas aims to create value is through making employees change the way that they act at work (being more conscious of IP/IPR pitfalls and opportunities, and making decisions based on this) by making them more knowledgeable, thus increasing competitiveness. For the sake of this study, the specific change in question is less important, as the focus will be on the ability these kinds of tools have for creating intentions regarding personal change and organizational change through the created knowledge. That is not to say that how Leap Canvas works will not be important, but the underlying concept of knowledge and the ways knowledge is managed by the participants using the tool is the focus of the study, and the IP/IPR-aspect is secondary in this regard. The logical structure of a Leap Canvas workshop and details of how it is used will be presented the Methods-chapter.

With this in mind, Knowledge Management (Evans & Ali, 2013) was adopted as a staple of the theoretical framework in this study, due to the central role of knowledge in the workshop. The organizational environment of today demands highly knowledgeable organizations, and employees. Without having the necessary knowledge within the organization, competitiveness is bound to suffer (Wang & Noe, 2010), and with an increasing part of the population engaging in higher education (Berg, 2016), this statement is true for more people and organizations than ever. It is crucial to create relevant knowledge (Nonaka, 1994), as well as being able to efficiently share already existing knowledge between organization members (Wang & Noe, 2010). The importance of knowledge has given rise to the field of Knowledge Management, outlining strategies for finding, creating, sharing, and improving organizational knowledge (Evans, Dalkir, & Bidian, 2014). Therefore, when aiming to understand participants' experiences of Leap Canvas, Knowledge Management will be crucial, as it can be directly related to the change potential of the tool. If the tool fails in creating and altering knowledge amongst participants, lasting change, and the benefits that come with it, is unlikely. In addition to Knowledge Management, a definition of knowledge and the distinction between tacit and explicit knowledge will be presented along with theory regarding knowledge creation (Nonaka, 1994). Knowledge Management can be considered the culmination of these theories, incorporating several related fields into one. It will, however, be beneficial to consider some parts of the knowledge field more in-depth than what Knowledge Management alone can achieve. This is done to provide a deeper theoretical understanding on topics of special interest when aiming to understand participant experiences, for instance knowledge creation and knowledge conversion (Nonaka, 1991). The reasoning behind putting this much emphasis on knowledge in the study can be related both to Leap Canvas itself and the experiences of participants. Leap Canvas because the main objectives of the tool are to create, alter, share, and explicate knowledge within the organization, and as such this is likely to shape the experiences and reflections participants have.

As mentioned above, Leap Canvas aims to change organizations by changing the way people think and behave in presence of new knowledge. The line of reasoning for this statement is: Leap Canvas aims to change the status quo, the mode of operation, in the organization to a state of being more competitive. This happens through making employees more knowledgeable, specifically on IP and IPR. Between acquiring knowledge and committing to organizational change, lies a necessary change in beliefs, attitude, and intention, which has the power to make the individual change his behavior in a way that facilitates organizational change. Since behavior plays an important role in this chain of events, the study will also be related to behavioral change intention. This is done by integrating the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) as part of the theoretical framework. Using this theory, it can be assumed that intention is a prerequisite for behavioral change (Ajzen, 1991), which again is necessary for the successful implementation of organizational change (Armenakis & Harris, 2002). If the individual is unable, or unwilling, to change, the organization cannot reach its predetermined goals, if these goals are related to individual knowledge, which knowledge creation and organizational change related to IP and IPR necessarily are. By exploring how participants experience being encouraged to act and change based on increased knowledge, this study can aid in the understanding of the underlying properties which are necessary for business planning tool efficiency in instituting change. This can contribute as a step towards reducing the lack of empirical evidence for the use of strategic planning tools in general, as well as being a first step towards the empirical foundation of Leap Canvas.

Lastly, the goal of Leap Canvas is to make organizational change happen. Therefore, theory on organizational change, specifically change management (Kotter, 1995) and change readiness (Armenakis & Harris, 2002), is adopted as part of the empirical framework to create a link between Knowledge Management, behavior, and organizational change. In other words, organizational change theories are included to explain the necessary prerequisites for making change happen. This happens by moving the theory of change beyond behavioral change from the Theory of Planned Behavior, onto organizational change, whilst retaining the Knowledge Management perspective.

Aim

The aim of this study is to understand how participants experience, and reflect upon knowledge from, the Leap Canvas workshop. Seeing as the goal of Leap Canvas is to make participants more knowledgeable regarding IP and IPR, and inspire change according to this knowledge, experiences related to these goals will be central. Therefore, the general experiences and evaluations of the workshop, alongside future-oriented reflections regarding learning outcome and intention to implement change, will be the basis for answering the research question, which will be "*What are the experiences and reflections of Leap Canvas participants?"*. This way, the research question is open-ended enough to account for variation in experiences, while retaining a focus on the stated goals of the workshop. Answering this research question was accomplished by conducting qualitative, semi-structured interviews regarding the general experience of participating in a Leap Canvas workshop.

By utilizing such an approach, the specificity of this particular workshop is retained, whilst having a potential for generalizing to other, comparable tools. This is accomplished by aiming to understand the general experiences and reflections of participating in a business planning and strategy workshop. The knowledge this will generate can potentially be used as a starting point for further research. As such, it is an aim of this study to inform further research, mainly on Leap Canvas, but also taking in account possible transferability to other business planning and strategy tools, when applicable.

Structure of the Dissertation

This paper is divided into chapters based on a standard IMRaD (Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion)-structure. In the introduction, the theoretical and empirical framework will be explained. In the methods-chapter the utilized method is explained, ethical considerations are listed, and relationships disclosed. The results-section contains interview excerpts accompanied by explanatory commentary, subdivided into reoccurring themes. Lastly, the discussion-section combines the results-chapter with the theoretical & empirical framework-subsection to answer the research question and draw conclusions where applicable. Lastly, there is a chapter for references, followed by relevant appendices.

SWOT Analysis & Business Model Canvas

Before moving on, a review of the state of SWOT analysis and Business Model Canvas should be included. This is added to provide some insight into the field of strategic business planning tools, and the lack of research that exists within it. What is more, as no previous research has been conducted regarding the tool used in this study, the specificity of earlier research will be limited. This is why SWOT analysis and Business Model Canvas is included, as they are the closest thing to comparable tools, where at least some effort has gone into research. The SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats analysis) is one of the most frequently utilized situation analysis tools during the last fifty years (Stavroulakis & Riza, 2015). It has become impossible to reference an original author of SWOT, as no one seems to know who invented the tool (Helms & Nixon, 2010). SWOT is a planning tool for consolidation of strategic factors within the four elements, pertaining to the internal and external environment of the organization. SWOT is commonly carried out by first listing internal strengths and weaknesses (resources, capacity, efficiency, economy, etc.), and then listing external opportunities and threats (customers, competitors, partners, suppliers, etc.). Going through strengths/weaknesses and opportunities/threats is done in a similar way in Leap Canvas as it is in a SWOT analysis, which gives it a partial comparability, making it appropriate to include it in this dissertation. Despite being frequently used, and frequently featured in research literature, the available research lacks quantifiable evidence for the successfulness of SWOT (Helms & Nixon, 2010).

The Business Model Canvas (BMC) is a tool for describing, analyzing, and designing business models (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010). The basic BMC, as defined by Osterwalder and Pigneur (2010) lets participants list their businesses' partners, activities, resources, customers, etc. These bits of information about the business is then in turn used as a starting point for creating an explicit, agreed-upon business plan. The tool is frequently used by practitioners, but arguments for its effectiveness seems to be anecdotal, as a Google Scholar query for "Business Model Canvas" reveals lacking empirical evidence. What is more, the field is immature, with scholars arguing whether the Business Model-field in general is a valuable endeavor, and lack of consensus between researchers is hindering development (Zott, Amit, Massa, 2010; Coes, 2014). BMC have many aspects in common with Leap Canvas. Listing of partners, resources, and so on is done in both tools, and creating a plan is done in both. The differences are that Leap Canvas is more specifically engaged with IP and IPR, whereas BMC is general; Leap Canvas aims to create an action plan for IP and IPR related goals, the BMC a complete business plan; and the Leap Canvas includes stress testing participants with specific scenarios, BMC does not. What is more, where both of these comparable tools have a more direct focus on strategy and organizational meta-knowledge, Leap Canvas will focus on strategy and meta-knowledge as well as generating new and specialized knowledge on IP and IPR. Regardless of the differences, the prevailing similarities makes the two tools comparable, and research on one can as such be beneficial to the other.

At this point is should be noted that it is not the aim of this study to explore anything specifically about SWOT or BMC, but they are still mentioned in part due to the possibility of this study having implications for further research on these tools as well, seeing as they work in similar ways as Leap Canvas.

Theoretical & Empirical Framework

In this chapter the theoretical and empirical framework of the study is presented. The framework is divided into three separate, but connected, categories:

Knowledge: The theory related to knowledge includes; knowledge as a term and how to define it, an explanation of the difference between tacit and explicit knowledge, a theory of organizational knowledge creation (Nonaka, 1994), as well as Knowledge Management (von Krogh, 1998), and the Knowledge Management Cycle (Evans & Ali, 2013). By including these four different but related fields within knowledge theory, the field should be explained to the extent required by its importance in this study.

Behavioral change: The Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) will be used as the behavior theory in this study. This theory can be linked to the knowledge field and is important to the study because it explains how behavioral intentions are formed, and how that may lead to subsequent behavioral change. Knowledge and Theory of Planned Behavior are linked by the three factors that influence intention in the theory, namely attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control, as well as the beliefs underlying these factors. Information and knowledge can influence all three, and that interaction will be of importance in answering the research question.

Organizational change: The field of organizational change includes both change management models such as Kotter's (1995) model, as well as the change readiness principals of Rafferty, Jimmieson, and Armenakis (2013), amongst others. Furthermore, change readiness is defined as specific beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding necessity and feasibility of change (Rafferty et al., 2013). Therefore, relating this to the Theory of Planned Behavior should be no problem, seeing as beliefs, attitudes, and intentions are at the core of this theory as well (Ajzen, 1991). The change readiness principals can also be understood in relation to Kotter's stages to further contextualize change intention with the principles of efficiently guiding change processes.

Knowledge. This chapter outlines the theoretical framework used to explain the field of knowledge. There are four sub-chapters, *defining knowledge, Knowledge Management, tacit and explicit knowledge,* and *organizational knowledge creation.* In the field of knowledge, the amount of literature is vast, and accounting for it all would be beyond the reach of this study. Therefore, when choosing what literature to rely on, the focus has been on including the most influential scholars (such as Nonaka [1994]), as well as using meta-analytic works where available (such as Evans, Dalkir, and Bidian [2014]). This ensures the study is as congruent with the prevailing paradigm as possible.

Defining knowledge. Defining knowledge has historically proved to be a difficult endeavor (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). However, it is necessary in this study to be precise about what, exactly, the term 'knowledge' constitutes. One way of defining knowledge is through a hierarchal view of data (raw numbers/ facts), information (processed data), and knowledge (authenticated information) (Vance, 1997). A definition based on this perspective would be that knowledge is personalized information, the information an individual possesses in their mind (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Tuomi (1999) argues that the hierarchical relationship should be inversed, as no data can be produced without knowledge. This perspective posits that knowledge can't exist outside of a knower, as it is formed based on current knowledge. A definition based on this perspective is knowledge as new stimuli that is cognitively processed (Alavi & Leidner, 2001).

Knowledge could also be defined without the data, information, knowledge-distinction, for instance as a justified true belief (e.g. Nonaka, 1994). This has been a common way of defining knowledge (Ichikawa & Steup, 2017), but it might still be lacking (Gettier, 1963). Another way of defining knowledge would be as a state of mind, where the state of knowing is a condition for understanding gained by experiences and studying (Schubert, Lincke, & Schmid, 1998; Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Knowledge could also be defined as an object that can be stored and manipulated (McQueen, 1998). Regardless of definition, Alavi & Leidner (2001) points out three major points that are important in the discussion of knowledge. The distinction between data, information, and knowledge, and using this distinction to draw implications. Secondly, since knowledge is personal, it must be expressed in a way that makes it interpretable by receivers, and lastly, having great quantities of information is useless by itself without active processing by the individual. These three points are drawn mainly from the knowledge as a state of mind definition and the data, information, knowledge-distinction (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Based on this, a definition of knowledge could be: "*Knowledge is the personal state of knowing, achieved through understanding gained by experience and study, which can be expressed to others in the form of information"* (Alavi & Leidner, 2001; Schubert et al., 1998).

Knowledge Management. With the importance of knowledge in organizations still on the rise, it has become a necessity to manage it efficiently (Girard & Girard, 2015). Using a strategic business planning tool such as Leap Canvas can be one way to make sure knowledge is managed properly. This necessity is why the field of Knowledge Management (KM) has risen, aiming to identify and leverage the collective knowledge in the organization, to create or increase competitiveness (von Krogh, 1998). By collecting more than a hundred definitions of Knowledge Management Girard and Girard (2015) created a composite definition of the term; "*Knowledge Management is the process of creating, sharing, using, and managing the knowledge and information of an organization".* What is more, Knowledge Management projects can commonly be categorized as aiming to: (a) explicate knowledge, and underscore the importance of knowledge, (b) create a culture for knowledge sharing, or (c) create an internal knowledge infrastructure (Davenport & Prusak, 1998). As the research question is related to attaining knowledge, the first of these project-types might be the most congruent with this study, as well as the aim of doing a Leap Canvas workshops. Categorizing is, however, of limited value, as how the workshop is related to Knowledge Management is not altered by which category it falls under.

Furthermore, it is believed that for information to be transformed into a valuable strategic asset for the organization, becoming organizational knowledge, there is a set route of processes that must be followed (Dalkir, 2005). For instance, knowledge and knowledge sources is first identified as valuable, and is then explicated, or codified, which in turn facilitates dissemination. For a Leap Canvas process, and therefore of interest in this study, is especially the two first parts, identify and explicate, as these are the two things that can happen during the workshop. Dissemination is of interest as well, but in the form of intention to disseminate, and not actual dissemination, and as such can potentially be related to the reflections of participants. When knowledge is eventually disseminated, it will be integrated in the organization, becoming the best possible knowledge foundation, and thereafter used for problem solving and decision making. These best practices will then become part of the organizational knowledge repository, the corporate memory (Dalkir, 2005). These routes are referred to as Knowledge Management cycles. As with the definition of Knowledge Management, there is no one agreed upon KM cycle. However, Evans, Dalkir, and Bidian (2014) has created a model based on previous research, and Heisig's (2009) review of 160 KM frameworks. The model is a continuation of Evan and Ali's (2013) model.

The model, simply called the Knowledge Management Cycle (KMC) model, contains seven distinct, but inter-related phases: (a) *identify,* (b) *store,* (c) *share,* (d) *use,* (e) *learn,* (f) *improve*, and (g) *create.* When a need, or request, for knowledge appears, the person requesting the knowledge will either (a) *identify* the sought-after knowledge in-house or acknowledge that it must be (g) *created.* During the identify stage, explicit knowledge is elicited, and tacit knowledge is identified through processes such as brainstorming. If the necessary knowledge is not discovered through identification, a need to create new knowledge assets arises. After the knowledge in question is identified or created, and deemed valuable to the organization, it is (b) *stored* in the corporate memory. Once knowledge is in the corporate memory, it can be (c) *shared* through dissemination or communication, internally or externally. When knowledge is disseminated to relevant receivers, its value can be extracted and (d) *used* in the organization. For a knowledge asset to see usage in the organization it must be comprehensible to the receivers, which might require an expert intervention to better specificity and efficiency (Evans et al., 2014). This kind of expert intervention is especially useful when receivers use the knowledge to acquire experience, through interpretation of the impact knowledge has on their work (Evans & Ali, 2013). This, along with internalizing, connecting, and integrating pieces of knowledge happens in the (e) *learning* phase. If the knowledge is deemed valuable, it can be further (f) *improved.* Improvements are refinements through reviewing, reflection, or adaption. Improved knowledge goes back to the store phase. If the learned knowledge is deemed insufficient, it is cycled back to the identify or create phase to increase knowledge based on the gaps that made it insufficient (Evans et al., 2014). This makes the learning process reflexive or double-looped (Argyris, 1991). The most valuable parts of the KMC in relation to Leap Canvas is when it is in the creation, learning, improving, and sharing stages. All of these can happen during a workshop, whereas identification, storing, and using is more likely to happen in-house before and after the workshop. It will, however, also be interesting to look at intention to use, and intention to share, as this can be related to the Theory of Planned Behavior approach used in this study and as such the reflections of participants.

Tacit and explicit knowledge. Nonaka (1994) draws heavily on the philosophical work of Polanyi (1962; 1966) when he explains the distinction between two types of knowledge, tacit and explicit. Explicit knowledge is the form of knowledge that is transmittable through language, or symbolically. Tacit knowledge on the other hand is personal, and therefore harder to communicate (Polanyi, 1966). Nonaka (1994) uses this as the basis for creating a more nuanced, practical approach to the distinction. This is accomplished by creating a further distinction between the technical and the cognitive elements of tacit knowledge. The technical elements of tacit knowledge refer to know-how and skills that are applicable in specific contexts. The cognitive elements of tacit knowledge, on the other hand, are the individuals' mental models; their beliefs, viewpoints, thought process and so on (Nonaka 1994; Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Furthermore, tacit and explicit knowledge have different ways of being communicated. Whereas explicit knowledge can be written down and kept as records, tacit knowledge is communicated between individuals', with the goal of creating mutual understanding (Nonaka, 1994). Therefore, tacit and explicit knowledge are mutually dependent, as tacit knowledge is necessary for developing explicit knowledge (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). The distinction between the two types of knowledge is the starting point for the knowledge conversion inherent in Nonaka's (1994) knowledge creation and conversion theory, explained below.

Organizational knowledge creation. In addition to making clear the distinction of tacit and explicit knowledge in practical use, Nonaka (1991; 1994) introduced a theory of organizational knowledge creation. In relation to Knowledge Management, the step most closely resembled is, of course, creation. However, it can be argued that organizational knowledge creation can also be linked to the learning and improving phases in a Knowledge Management Cycle, as it is a wider take on the term creation. Organizational knowledge creation is the process in which the knowledge of an individual is amplified and made more available to the organization, as well as connecting the knowledge to the organizations knowledge system (Nonaka & von Krogh, 2009). The organization can make this happen through supporting creative individuals and providing the context in which these employees can create knowledge (Nonaka, 1994). There are three basic factors found in these employees, or knowledge subjects, which induce commitment to create knowledge:

Intention: Intention in relation to commitment is the way in which the individual forms his approach to the world and makes sense of his environment. It is through intention that the individual can then judge the value of information, and knowledge can be created.

Autonomy: Since personal intention varies across organization members, the freedom to act autonomously allows for introducing opportunities to the organization. An organization that allows autonomy amongst its members is likely to achieve flexibility in getting and using information and makes possible an individual self-motivation to create knowledge.

Fluctuation: Even though intention and subsequent knowledge creation happens at an individual level, it cannot exist without an external interaction. This connection has the potential to create new patterns of interactions between individual and environment. What is more, ambiguity, noise and redundancy can arise in organizations and its environment, and people will then recreate their own knowledge system to deal with it. The pattern this is executed in is termed fluctuation, and is not completely disorderly, but rather follows a pattern that is hard to predict (Nonaka, 1994). It can then be beneficial for the individual to interrupt this pattern, what has been termed breakdowns (Winograd & Flores, 1986), and question habits and routines, potentially creating a realignment of commitment (Nonaka, 1994)

Nonaka (1994) uses this as an underlying framework for explaining the patterns of interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge, and creating a spiral model of knowledge creation. These patterns are the basis of knowledge conversion, the ways in which existing knowledge can be converted to new knowledge. There are four modes of knowledge conversion, which all can create new knowledge independently:

- *Socialization* (a): converting tacit knowledge to tacit knowledge through shared experience, i.e. learning a craft.
- *Externalization* (b): converting tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. Can happen by using metaphors.
- *Combination* (c): converting explicit knowledge to explicit knowledge by combining the explicit knowledge held by different people.
- *Internalization* (d): converting explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge, comparable to 'normal' learning.

Despite the ability of these modes to create new knowledge on their own, the interaction between them is more powerful, and that is what is central to the organizational knowledge creation model. Failure to properly implement all modes, and create a dialogue between tacit and explicit knowledge, can be problematic (Nonaka, 1994).

The spiral of organizational knowledge creation model stems from the thought of shifting between the different modes of knowledge conversion, expanding knowledge in an outward-bound spiral, ever moving towards increased inter-organizational knowledge. The idea is that an organization can manage the knowledge creation of employees, in a way that forms a continual cycle. Socialization (a) starts the cycle, usually by creating a team (or other field of action), facilitating sharing of experiences and perspectives. Thereafter follows externalization (b), in which members discuss, and use metaphors to better articulate perspectives and experiences when knowledge is tacit, and therefore hard to otherwise communicate properly. The externalized knowledge can then be combined (c) with existing data to make the explicit knowledge more concrete and sharable. This process is facilitated by coordinating members and documenting knowledge. Lastly, the development and articulation of concepts will trigger internalization (d) through learning (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka & von Krogh, 2009).

Behavioral change. This chapter introduces behavioral change theory. The Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) is used as the only theory for explaining behavior in this study, as it covers all necessary aspects of behavior, intention, attitude, and belief, whilst remaining one of the most influential theories of behavior to date.

Theory of Planned Behavior. Since its conception, the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1985), has been used extensively by scholars in several different fields (Ajzen, 2011; McEachan, Conner, Taylor, & Lawton, 2011; Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis, 2003). The Theory of Planned Behavior is an extension to the Theory of Reasoned Action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Ajzen, 1991), introducing the factor of *perceived behavioral control* in addition to the existing factors. Ajzen (1985) states that to understand behavior, these factors will be determinants of intentions, and intention is the determining factor of behavior. According to the Theory of Reasoned action there is one personal determinant, and one social influence determinant. The personal factor is termed *attitude* *toward the behavior* and captures the individuals' positive or negative beliefs regarding the behavior, as well as evaluations of behavioral outcomes (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Montaño & Kasprzyk, 2008). The social influence determinant is called *subjective norm,* referring to the individuals' perception of the behavior as something relevant others wants or does not want him to do (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), and is thus driven by normative beliefs and motivation to comply (Montaño &Kasprzyk, 2008).

In Theory of Planned Behavior perceived behavioral control is added as a third factor (Ajzen, 1991). Perceived behavioral control is similar, but not identical, to Banduras' (1977) concept of self-efficacy. Perceived behavioral control is defined as the individuals' own judgement of his ability to exert action to deal with a situation. In other words, perceived behavioral control is the individuals' confidence in his ability to perform the specified behavior (Ajzen, 1991). This differs from volitional control or ability to perform the behavior, but perceived control seems to be as much of a determining factor (Ajzen, 1991). Perceived behavioral control differs from attitude toward the behavior and subjective norm in that in addition to influencing intention, like the other factors, it can also influence behavior directly (Ajzen, 1991).

To explain human behavior, Ajzen (1991) states that the antecedents of attitude toward the behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control must also be explained. This is done through what is termed salient beliefs, the most central, noticeable beliefs an individual hold, which determines his intentions and actions. For attitude toward the behavior the salient beliefs are termed *behavioral beliefs.* Behavioral beliefs is the cognitive link between the behavior in question and outcomes of engaging in the behavior. Through the positive or negative value ascribed to outcomes of performing behavior, an attitude toward the behavior is formed. This is how the individual learn to favor behavior yielding desirable outcomes, and stay away from behavior resulting in negative outcomes or consequences (Montaño & Kasprzyk, 2008). When it comes to the subjective norm factor, the related salient belief is termed *normative beliefs.* This is used to describe beliefs related to how likely referent individuals or groups are to approve or disprove of the behavior in question. These beliefs are strengthened or weakened by the person's motivation to comply. Lastly *control beliefs* are the salient belief counterpart of perceived behavioral control. Control beliefs are the beliefs related to resources and opportunities, whether the individual believe they exist and are in his control. These beliefs are influenced by previous experiences, as well as second-hand information about experiences from influential others. The perceived resources and opportunities, as well as perceived lack of obstacles, is what creates perceived control (Ajzen, 1991; Montaño & Kasprzyk, 2008).

The Theory of Planned Behavior is most commonly used in quantitative research with participants scoring how they believe behavior will influence related outcomes (Montaño &Kasprzyk, 2008), using qualitative data only preliminary (Ajzen, n.d.). The use of qualitative data initially is crucial, especially when determining what salient beliefs of a behavior is, because "*An arbitrarily or intuitively selected set of belief statements will tend to include many associations to the behavior that are not salient in the population*" (Ajzen, 1991, p. 192). There are, however, examples of studies using the Theory of Planned Behavior framework with qualitative data. These studies will typically use constructs from the theory as predetermined themes when coding the interview data, in addition to standard theme creation (e.g. Renzi & Klobas, 2008; Zoellner et al., 2012; Duncanson, Dip, Burrows, Holman, & Collins, 2013). This is not necessarily in line with the quasi-mathematical theory application suggested by Ajzen (e.g. 1991). However, as Duncanson and colleagues (2013) state, qualitative application of Theory of Planned Behavior can provide a beginning understanding of a problem, as well as determining the potential of the theory for further research of a specific situation or behavior.

In relation to knowledge and Knowledge Management, the Theory of Planned Behavior can be instrumental in explaining and understanding how knowledge can create intention to commit to organizational change. The reason for this is that beliefs and attitude in Theory of Planned Behavior can be shaped from knowledge. For instance, behavioral beliefs, which is the cognitive link between the behavior and outcomes of performing the behavior, can be shaped by new knowledge. Becoming more knowledgeable on why it is important for the organization to make a specific change, will thus make it more likely that the employee ascribes positive value to that behavior, increasing intention to make the change. That same line of reasoning can be applied to moving control beliefs to perceived behavioral control. Normative beliefs is less directly applicable to Knowledge Management, but it will still be important in creating intention to change. This happens through the collaborative nature of Leap Canvas, where participants can corroborate their beliefs and attitudes, solidifying intention to commit to change.

Organizational change. This chapter introduces two perspectives on organizational change; change readiness principles (Armenakis & Harris, 2002) and organizational change management (Kotter, 1995). In selecting literature for this chapter, the aim has been to rely on the most influential scholars in each respective field of study.

Change management. The most influential model for efficiently leading change during the last two decades is probably Kotter's (1995; 1996) 8-step model (sometimes referred to as eight common errors that causes change efforts to fail). Being aware of these steps can provide a framework for understanding participant experiences in relation to the research question in this study. More specifically, by using the theory to interpret the participants' intention to change and the role of new knowledge in evaluation of the workshop. The eight steps are:

- *Establishing a Sense of Urgency*: When examining the organization in relation to the market it operates in it is important to identify potential crises and opportunities. The identified problem/opportunity must then be understood as important for value creation. This is effectively done through discussions about new competition, reduced margins, lack of growth, or other ways in which change is necessary
- *Forming a Powerful Guiding Coalition*: To get a change initiative of the ground, the initiators must have some power. Usually, this means a leader of the organization or department, alongside a group of other powerful people, in terms of influence, relationships, expertise, or reputation. Creation of this coalition is facilitated by establishing a sense of urgency, but it is also important to come together, often on offsite retreats, to develop a shared assessment of the problems and opportunities the organization faces.
- *Creating a Vision*: the guiding coalition must aim to create a vision of the future, which they can easily communicate to employees and customers. This means that, in addition to outline how to change, there must be an easily understood and compelling statement of what the aim of the change is.
- *Communicating the Vision*: There must be an effort to communicate the vision of the change through meetings, speeches, newsletters, etc. If this is not done, employees quickly forget about the vision. What is more, even when the vision is communicated, employees must see it as possible. If they do not believe the change is feasible, they

are unwilling to make the short-term sacrifices that are often necessary to meet organizational goals. Therefore, higher ranking organization members should incorporate the vision into their daily functioning, always working in terms of strategic goals, rather than status quo.

- *Empowering Others to Act on the Vision*: Even though efficient communication is important, that alone is not enough to ensure goals are achieved. It is also important to empower other employees by removing barriers and obstacles to change. These barriers can be both internal and external. When they are internal to the individual, communication is key, but often the barriers are external, such as narrow job categories or performance-appraisal mismatches. These barriers must at this point be located and removed for the process to continue, changing systems and structures detrimental to the vision.
- *Planning for and Creating Short-Term Wins*: It is hard for people to keep up interest in a change effort over longer periods of time, and therefore it is important to create sub-goals along the way. These short-term wins should be based on performance, indices that the change effort is heading in the right direction. Employees instrumental in making it happen, by taking an active role in the change process, should be rewarded for their prolonged effort.
- *Consolidating Improvements and Producing Still More Change*: Even when performance goals are reached, it is important not to stop the hard work. It can take time before a change is truly a part of the organizational culture. If effort stops before the change is truly implemented, it can quickly revert.
- *Institutionalizing New Approaches*: For change to stick, it must be rooted in the social norms and shared values of the organization, becoming a part of 'the way things are done around here'. There are two main ways to do this. First, employees should be shown how their new attitudes and behavior have helped with reaching predetermined goals. Secondly, it is important that the new way of operation is so rooted in all employees that even when there is a change of command in the organization, the change is not reverted.

As is the case with the Knowledge Management Cycle, some of these steps will be more relevant than others, simply because Leap Canvas is just part of a larger process where participants go back to work and put what they have learned to use. Seeing these steps in relation to the experiences of participants will, however, provide a frame which can be instrumental in understanding participant intention. It should also be noted that Kotters' (1995) principles are commonly applied as what leaders can do to create successful change, but in this study the leader is not necessarily participating. The principles, e.g. establishing urgency, creating visions, and planning for wins, can, however, still be useful in understanding how change-related experiences and reflections happen among the participants

Change readiness. Changing an organization is no easy task, with many factors that can potentially cause failure to achieve predetermined goals. As, for instance, Meaney and Pung (2008) discovered, most change efforts fail. The attitudes of employees have been found to be crucial to the rate of success during change (Miller, Johnson, & Grau, 1994), which is why assessing employee change readiness is necessary. Change readiness is defined as "*beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the extent to which changes are needed and the organization's capacity to successfully undertake those changes* (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993: 681).

Rafferty, Jimmieson, and Armenakis (2013) have created a multilevel framework for change readiness based on previous research. In this framework antecedents of change readiness are divided firstly into individual level and group/ organization level, and then further subdivided for each into cognitive and affective change readiness, for a total of four groups of antecedents influencing change readiness level (Rafferty et al., 2013). The overall change readiness resulting from the four groups of antecedents are then used to explain outcomes (e.g. change capabilities, group attitudes, job performance).

At the individual level, five beliefs have been identified as key cognitive components of change readiness (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Rafferty, Jimmieson, and Armenakis, 2013). They argue that the individual must (a) sense a discrepancy between the status quo and how things should be done, and (b) believe that the proposed change is appropriate to fix this discrepancy. Furthermore, it is argued that a (c) sense of efficacy must be created by the change message. Oreg, Vakola, and Armenakis, (2011) describe sense of efficacy as a temporary or malleable form of self-efficacy, related to the change. It is also necessary for the individual to believe that the organization will sufficiently support the change, termed (d) principal support. Lastly the individual must believe the benefits outweigh the costs in relation to his job and role, creating a (e) positive valence. In addition to these cognitive components, Rafferty and colleagues (2013) argue that the overall judgement of being ready for change is also influenced by "*the individual's current and future-oriented positive affective emotional responses to a specific change event*." (p. 116). Change readiness at the group level is also argued to be important for the implementation and adoption of proposed change (Rafferty et al., 2013). The group level change readiness will be determined by individual cognitive and affective change readiness, when it becomes shared within the organization or group due to social interaction.

Furthermore, organizational change can be connected to Theory of Planned Behavior in several ways. First of all, for organizational change to be effective, a change in attitude is necessary. A part of this can be what Kotter (1995) refers to as 'establishing a sense of urgency', and Armenakis and Harris (2002) would call 'sensing a discrepancy between the status quo and how things should be done' (both terms are explained in greater detail below). This can be directly linked to behavioral beliefs forming attitude towards the behavior in the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Secondly, all three theories have a social element: an influential guiding coalition communicating and empowering others to act on a vision in Kotter (1995), a belief that the organization will sufficiently support the change (Armenakis & Harris, 2002), and the normative belief/ social norm in Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Lastly, both organizational change approaches can be linked to the perceived behavioral control element of Theory of Planned Behavior. Specifically, the change readiness principle of creating a sense of efficiency (Armenakis & Harris, 2002), and planning for and creating short-term wins in Kotter (1995).

Method

This chapter includes all methodological considerations relevant to answering the research question "*What are the experiences and reflections of Leap Canvas participants?"*. Firstly, a rationale for choosing qualitative research in general, and interviewing specifically, is presented alongside epistemological and ontological considerations. This is followed by a presentation of the contextual factors of this study, House of Knowledge and Leap Canvas. Thirdly, all steps in the data collection process is accounted for. Finally, the analytic approach chosen for this study, which is thematic analysis, is introduced and related to the research question.

Methodological Decisions

This chapter will describe the decisions that had to be made concerning how the study was conducted. That includes the rationale for using a qualitative approach, the rationale for using interviews, and the reason why a contextualist approach was appropriate as an epistemological point of view. Furthermore, how the interviews were conducted, and why it happened as it did, based on the research question, is also included in this section. These properties are included to make clear not only how the study was carried out, but also why it was carried out in this specific way.

Qualitative research. To answer the research question, several method-related decisions had to be made. The first decision, which all further methodological properties is based on, is whether to apply a qualitative or a quantitative approach. In this study, a choice was made to apply a qualitative research approach. There are several reasons for this, but the determining factor is that no research had been conducted on Leap Canvas, making the study exploratory in terms of what participants experience and reflect upon, as well as what knowledge is created and how intentions are formed among participants. The exploratory nature of the study contributes to the appropriateness of qualitative approaches, as qualitative research is a good approach to explorative research in areas with minimal preexisting knowledge (Braun & Clarke, 2006). According to Ajzen (n.d.), this is also true specifically when using the Theory of Planned Behavior as a theoretical framework, when there is no preexisting knowledge of what causes intention and change in behavior. What is more, the research on other relevant tools is not directly relevant for making any implications regarding intentionality and behavior. Because of this, a qualitative approach seems appropriate. Considering this is a study of experience and reflections, with participant experiences of the tool in relation to knowledge and intention to change is central, it is an aim of the study to explore, describe, and interpret these experiences, which makes qualitative approaches further appropriate, as studies of experience are commonly conducted qualitatively (Smith, 2015). Furthermore, experiences are complex, and influenced by many factors, in this case, for instance, the individual, the organization, the job, and so on (Geertz, 1973; Smith, 2015). Being able to locate the elements that make up an experience is crucial to understanding knowledge creation and intentions in this study. This is something that qualitative analysis is especially concerned with and leads to the rationale of using interviews as the mode of inquiry.

Epistemology and ontology. A defining aspect of qualitative research is the understanding of linguistic meaning situated in textual material (Madill, Jordan, & Shirley, 2000). There are different schools of thought regarding how this understanding can develop and how to judge knowledge attained through qualitative research. (Madill et al., 2000). These evaluations of knowledge, or epistemologies, are often classified as realist/essentialist, critical realist/contextualist, and relativist/constructionist (Clarke, Braun, & Hayfield, 2015; Madill et al., 2000; Willig, 2013). Furthermore, these epistemologies can be understood within an ontological context. Ontology is the answer to the question of ‘what is there to know?’, what is meant by ‘being’, ‘reality’ and ‘existence’, and is commonly divided into realist and relativistic views (Willig, 2013).

Which epistemology and ontology is appropriate depends on the aim of the research and the method used, which is shaped by the researcher and his epistemological values. For this study, the aim is to understand experiences of knowledge and the reflections of informants, which informs the evaluation of epistemological and ontological frameworks in this chapter. A realist/essentialist values objectivity and accuracy, and aims to "capture" a discoverable reality that exists "out there" (Willig, 2013; Clarke et al., 2015). The focus on experiences and reflections in the study does not constitute a discoverable reality existing out there by itself, but rather existing within a wider context, and as such this approach would be inappropriate. A contextualist approach on the other hand, would agree that reality is out there, but research can only provide us with *interpretations* of people's *version* of reality (Willig, 2013; Clarke et al, 2015), and a constructionist will focus on the way in which language is used to create versions of reality within the research; rejecting that an external reality can be discovered (Willig, 2013). Seeing as the aim of this study is to understand experiences in an interpretative context with existing theories, some version of external reality must exist. Therefore, a contextualist approach is the appropriate epistemological framework for this study, with a form of a realist ontological position. Ontologically, this is a critical realist approach, because contextualism refuses the idea of direct access to *the* reality but posits a mediated access to *versions* of reality.

What is more, considering the contextualist framework is a middle ground approach, it can be utilized with both an inductive and a deductive perspective on coding and theme development. What this means is that both an analysis grounded in data, rather than existing theories and concepts (inductive), and an analysis grounded in theory, which lets existing theories and concepts inform coding and guide theme creation (deductive), can be deployed (Clarke et al., 2015). In this study, the aim was initially to conduct an inductive thematic analysis. However, seeing as the possibility of true induction is contested, as research is always shaped by the researcher and his theories, presumptions, and knowledge (Clarke et al., 2015), a decision was made to acknowledge the necessity of deduction, and instead be aware of the impact this has on coding and theme generation specifically, and the study in general. This means I did not intend to repress my preexisting knowledge, but rather acknowledge that it exists, and try to be aware of how that can influence the research. Therefore, I have disclosed my previous experience with Leap Canvas, and I aim to be as transparent as possible regarding my views throughout the dissertation.

Interviewing. It is not easy to cover experiences sufficiently in research, but it is necessary to be able to answer the research question of this study. One way this can be achieved is by using interviews. By using interviews, the researcher can be provided with 'thick', naturalistic, and descriptive accounts of participant experiences (Geertz, 1973). Achieving this is pivotal to answering the research question. Seeing as this is an exploratory study, using interviews is an appropriate approach to broadly capture individual experiences and perspectives in a way that other forms of data collection cannot match. Also, other modes of inquiry would likely yield insufficient results, due to the lack of preexisting knowledge in the field. The use of qualitative interviews as a research method builds upon a simple notion; that talking to people is the best route to understanding how they understand and make sense of their world, and their lives (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Furthermore, conversation between interviewer and interviewee produces knowledge about the life world of the interviewee (Brinkmann, 2014). As a researcher, getting access to the experiences and feelings of informants are highly valuable, and to answer the research question in this study, it is necessary. An interview conversation is, however, not like any normal conversation. The interview is more one-sided, with the interviewee doing most of the talking (Brinkmann, 2014).

The structure of interviews can vary from a rigid, experiment-like question-set to an unfiltered conversation. Both extremes have their place in research, but in studies of experiences, a middle-ground approach is most common, as it allows the researcher some control, whilst accounting well for all experiences. This is called a semi-structured interview. This type of interview typically has some general themes (and sample questions) the interview must 'stop by’ but giving the researcher freedom to do it in the manner most natural to the conversation. In a semi-structured interview, the interviewer will also aim to establish rapport, letting the interviewee speak openly and freely (Smith & Osborn, 2015). Semi-structured interviews have several advantages when compared to un-/structured interviews in experiential research. For instance, the researcher is freer to pursue interesting themes that come up during the interview, while maintaining an interview guide to not stray too far from the interview topic. Since this study is exploratory, retaining the ability to follow up when something of interest comes up is important. Furthermore, considering there are many constituent properties of both knowledge and intention, this importance is even greater. This also makes another aspect of semi-structured interviews important; open questions. Since experiences vary greatly between participants in this study, having open-ended questions, allowing the informant to talk about his experiences, and not the experiences the researcher believed he would have, was important. This is also reflected in the central aspects of the study, and the questions used, described below.

Contextual Factors

In this chapter, contextual factors will be introduced and described. These are the factors surrounding the project and the tool being used as a basis for interviewing, namely House of Knowledge and Leap Canvas. The contextual factors are included in this study to facilitate transparency both in my relationships and my previous experiences with using this tool.

House of Knowledge. This master's thesis is written in collaboration with House of Knowledge. House of Knowledge is a small (<10 employees) consultancy firm operating out of Trondheim. The role of the employees at House of Knowledge in this project is tied to facilitation of the Leap Canvas, which is explained in more detail below. It is important to any researcher to ensure the integrity of his research, and as such avoid any possibility of conflicts of interest, which is why House of Knowledge employees have not been further involved in the research process. Despite this, I have kept in touch with House of Knowledge employees throughout the process of this study. This has provided insight into their beliefs and assumptions regarding the tool in question. Furthermore, House of Knowledge employees have been invited to read and comment on drafts throughout the writing process of this dissertation, allowing for a mutual understanding of what is appropriate to be included in the final text.

The main area of expertise within House of Knowledge is creating competitiveness (comparative advantages to competing organizations) within intellectual property and intellectual property rights. My involvement with the firm started in the spring of 2017, as an internship through the university I attend. During the following months, an intent to collaborate was established, and a general idea for the thesis was chosen. The initial idea was to study Leap Canvas participants to determine whether the tool could facilitate engagement and/or increase efficiency. It would be valuable to the development of Leap Canvas to determine its efficiency, its ability to reach the goal of creating knowledge and inspire necessary change based on knowledge. This idea was, however, discarded, on grounds of it being premature to start such a project without first doing an exploratory study regarding experiences and intentions. From this starting point, the research idea graduated into the current research question, "*What are the experiences and reflections of Leap Canvas participants?*"

Leap Canvas. The Leap Canvas is a strategic analysis tool designed for mapping of challenges, advantages, and goals within organizations. Leap Canvas is based on the idea of explicating and systematizing information and knowledge, with a direct focus on intellectual property (IP) and intellectual property rights (IPR), and the competitive advantage they can create. Leap Canvas can be used both with the organization as a whole, and its general operation, as the basis of discussion, or with a specific case or project, real or fictitious. If many (more than about eight) participants are present, smaller groups will be created based on competencies and experiences of participants.

The Leap Canvas works in similar ways to the BMC. Leap Canvas is based on categories of strategic interest. For instance, advantages and disadvantages that creates competitiveness in the organization. In addition to advantages and disadvantages, Leap Canvas analyzes the competition and the environment in which the organization operates. This, in combination with stated goals is used to create an action plan, making explicit what to do, in what order, and to what extent. During the first phase, organizational members will fill the canvas itself with the information they deem most important. The resulting steps are then scrutinized during the second phase, in the form of a stress test, in which intellectual property and intellectual property rights is central.

Leap Canvas is administered in small groups, as a discussion between members of the organization. Participants can be organizational members at any level, but it is beneficial to have some higher ranking organizational members represented, to ensure the resulting plan is implemented. Furthermore, the use of Leap Canvas is always facilitated by consultants. Expert facilitation is believed to increase the potential for a rewarding outcome (Evans & Ali, 2013).

What is specifically done during a Leap Canvas workshop most closely resembles a discussion, where topics and proposed solutions are written down and systematized (on a canvas, hence the name). The facilitator will start the discussion by asking the informants to discuss among themselves, for instance, what the organization's advantages are. When a few advantages that all members agree on has been written up, the discussion moves on to a new part, for instance disadvantages. This continues until all the categories have been discussed, while continuously using previously agreed upon information in shaping what to write in each category, as well as linking categories together. When this discussion concludes, the facilitator will move the discussion on to creation of an action plan. The action plan can be as concrete as the context of the organization allows, depending on the specificity of their case, but will always use the information gathered in all categories as a starting point. This concludes part one of the workshop. Part two is the stress test, in which the facilitator will choose scenarios that would be straining for the organization, based on what he has experienced in the first part of the workshop. This part creates further discussion and aims to act as an eye-opener in terms of new information and knowledge to the participant. Ultimately, it is the goal of the workshop that participants become more knowledgeable on IP and IPR and finds ways to incorporate this in changes to their business strategy.

Data Collection

The data collection in this study happened in three stages. First, I observed the workshop, informing my choices for thematic content of the study. Secondly, I conducted a pilot interview, further refining content and phrasing of questions. Third, I conducted the research interviews. In this sub-chapter, these stages are explained in detail, alongside information relevant to the data collection in other ways, such as guidelines of ethical participant treatment, recruiting, interviewing, and informant descriptions.

Ethical Treatment of Participants. Before going on to describe the specifics of the data collection in this study, there are some ethical guidelines that should be explained, which has informed how participants have been treated during the study. There are five basic ethical considerations that should be taken to ensure fair treatment of participants (Elmes, Kantowitz, & Roediger, 2011; Willig, 2013). These are:

- *Informed consent*: Informants should be informed about the nature of the study and give their explicit consent to participate before interviewing. Informants in this study were given written information prior to the interview (see Appendix A for the written information given to participants), as well as verbal information on tape at the start of the interview. All informants have given written consent to participate, as well as verbal consent on tape.
- *No deception*: Any deception should be avoided, unless there is no other way of answering the research question, and it comes at no or very little risk to the

participants. No deception of participants was necessary or in any way beneficial in this study.

- *Right to withdraw*: Informants should be aware of their right to withdraw at any time, for any reason. Participants in this study were given written information on the right to withdraw at any time, prior to interviewing.
- *Debriefing*: Participants should be informed of the full aims of the study after data collection. In this study participants were aware of the full aims of the study before data collection, as this was deemed not detrimental to the data collection. All informants should also be given access to the full research publication when available. This study will be released publicly, and steps will be taken to ensure informants are informed of their ability to retrieve the publication. Furthermore, time was left at the end of all interviews to address any question the informant might have.
- *Confidentiality*: The researcher should ensure confidentiality regarding information about participants attained during the research process. For the confidentiality of this study, see subheading *internal and external confidentiality* below.

  Due to the relationship between the researcher and House of Knowledge some extra care has been taken to make sure interviewees understand who will have access to unedited research materials. Specifically, it has been made clear prior to the interview process, both verbally and in writing, that interview recordings and any un-anonymized material is only available to the researcher, taking extra care to mention that this also applies to House of Knowledge. This is done to make sure participants feel able to talk freely about every aspect of the process.

Internal and external confidentiality. As mentioned above, steps should be taken to guarantee the complete confidentiality of informants. However, there are two sides to confidentiality, internal and external. External confidentiality is the ‘normal’ confidentiality, where the researcher makes certain the informants are not recognizable to readers of the study. Internal confidentiality on the other hand, refers to the confidentiality between involved parties (Tolich, 2004); in this study across participants, and between participants and House of Knowledge-employees. To ensure the internal confidentiality is as high as possible, some information that would normally be included, is excluded. For instance, it is common to include the work sector and region of residence of informants, but this is removed from this study due to possible breach of internal confidentiality. The same is true for interview excerpts where informants talk about the specifics of their place of work, or the nature of the work they do. It is difficult to guarantee internal confidentiality, but as much information as possible has been redacted to accomplish it.

Observation. I have on three separate occasions observed the Leap Canvas in action, having the role of secondary facilitator/ observer. Two of these occasions were before data collecting for the study commenced. One of those times, one of the participants ended up being the pilot-interviewee for the study. I have, however, not participated in the administration of Leap Canvas when any other informant in the study participated. The third time I attended a Leap Canvas workshop was after data collection and most analysis had concluded. Observing the workshop in progress may have influenced the value I ascribe to it. Seeing as this study is conducted within a contextualist, top down, framework, having knowledge of the workshop prior to interviewing, and being aware of the ways in which my preexisting knowledge shapes interpretation, I am better equipped to understand participant experiences and reflections. This knowledge, in addition to the theoretical framework of the study, has helped in creating the interview guide, and has been useful in shaping the study itself. For instance, it was through observation of the workshop I learned that participants are likely to have eye-opening, aha!-moments in relation to how knowledge of IP and IPR can shape a strategy and strengthen competitiveness. Thus, I made sure to include questions in the interview which would cover these types of experiences, should they occur.

Recruiting. Informants were recruited from clients of House of Knowledge that did a Leap Canvas workshop in Q4 2017. The House of Knowledge employee who conducted the workshops acted as a gatekeeper, relaying contact information of potential informants in the study. From this pool, some, but not all, were contacted directly by me. This way, the anonymity of all participants was guarded as well as possible, including towards employees at House of Knowledge. This also serves as a mean of distancing the research from the organization, as this study is conducted by an independent researcher, and not an employee at House of Knowledge. All participants were contacted via e-mail, and communication prior to and after the interview was conducted mainly over e-mail, but also some phone calls and text messages. When recruiting informants, I wrote a brief e-mail asking if they would like to participate in a research project, based on having completed the Leap Canvas. If the potential participant responded positively, I would follow up with some more information, such as mode of inquiry, my academic field and interest, and practical information. At this point informants were told that this would be a study of their experiences of participating on Leap Canvas but were not told specifically what kind of experiences this would include. This mail was accompanied by a participation agreement and information document (which can be found in Appendix A). In total six participants (in addition to the informant participating in the pilot interview) were contacted, five of which participated in interviews.

Informants. This study is based on a total of six interviews, one of which is a preliminary pilot interview. All informants have been through a Leap Canvas workshop, with interviews being conducted shortly after, mostly less than a week later. Conducting interviews close in time to the date of workshop participation was important because of the research question. By doing this, it would be fresh in the mind of informants what they experienced, and how that shaped their reflections regarding knowledge and change intention. If it had been a long time between workshop and interviewing, the risk of informants forgetting what, specifically, they talked about during the workshop would increase.

Every interview is anonymized, but informants have been assigned a number so that they can be recognized within the study and paired with some basic information. This information provides some context as to the type of organization, education level, and age of informants. This is included to provide an understanding of the personal circumstances under which the experiences appear. Descriptions of participants and their contextual factors is included to let the reader assess applicability and relevance of the work, as participant backgrounds and perspectives are known to shape data (Yardley, 2015). All informants are Norwegian.

- Informant 1 (I1): Man, 20-30 yo, is the CEO (chief executive officer) of a technology company, small size, newly established.
- Informant 2 (I2): Man, 20-30 yo, oversees development in a multinational SME (small and medium-sized enterprises, less than 250 employees), well established company.
- Informant 3 (I3): Man, 20-30 yo, is the COO (chief operating officer) of a multinational SME in development industry, well-established company.

- Informant 4 (I4): Man, 40-50 yo, is a middle management employee at a multi-national organization working with technology development and production in several industries, well-established company.
- Informant 5 (I5): Man, 30-40 yo, is an employee working at a large multi-national organization in technology production.
- Informant 6 (I6): Man, 20-30 yo, is one of the founders of, and an engineer at, a start-up working in product development. I6 is the informant with which the pilot interview was conducted.

As mentioned previously, the information on informants is limited, as to ensure every possible action is taken not to breach internal confidentiality. Going more in detail regarding informants could provide a more nuanced contextual frame, but it was judged as necessary to keep detailed information restricted.

Furthermore, as can be seen from the information above, there are some aspects in which the informants are homogenous, such as being relatively young, Norwegian men in knowledge-intensive work. On the other hand, there is high variation as to the position informants have within their organization, ranging from floor-level employee via middle management, up to higher management.

Pilot Interview. Prior to the start of the project, in May 2017, one pilot interview was conducted. This interview was conducted with an informant who had participated on a Leap Canvas workshop previously. As this study is exploratory, with no previous research existing on Leap Canvas, it was important to get a feel for how the generated questions worked. Based on this interview some changes were made to the interview guide. The most noteworthy change was a shift away from engagement and motivation during the workshop, towards knowledge, behavioral intention, and experiences. The reason why motivation and engagement were supposed to be at the core of the research is that I assumed informants would experience this during the workshop, which my experience with the workshop suggested it may. This might still be the case, but looking at knowledge in general is more in line with the aim of the workshop, and is as such more directly related to the tool itself. Furthermore, questions regarding engagement were substituted with more open questions, that would capture the entire experience of participating, not only engagement. Another thing that was made clear in the interview was that becoming aware, or generally explication of knowledge, would have a more pivotal role than previously believed. Therefore, the interview guide was altered to include not only knowledge creation, but also knowledge explication. This change more accurately represents the aim of Leap Canvas, and shifted the research question from knowledge creation, and towards attaining knowledge in general. Furthermore, in the discovering dis-/advantages part of the interview guide, the pilot interview created a realization that the questions should be more open-ended. This did not lead to changes in the questions, but it was noted and kept in mind during subsequent interviews.

Interviewing. Interviews that were conducted in person happened either at NTNU in a closed room, or at the participant's place of work, in an office or conference room. This way the probability of interruptions was kept low, and the confidentiality of participants was not breached. Where the interview was conducted was left up to the informant, as I asked if they would prefer for me to come to their place of work, or if they preferred for me to find a place where we could meet. It should, however, be mentioned that not all interviews in this study were conducted face-to-face. Due to House of Knowledge having clients all over the country, meeting up for interviews was not always possible (without resorting to air travel). In these situations, the choice of alternative communication form has been guided by Daft and Lengels (1986) Media Richness Theory. The theory states that media reproducing more of the social cues (verbally and non-verbally), facilitates more efficient communication, reducing equivocality (Dennis & Kinney, 1998). This means that information-sharing ranges from written to face-to-face, in terms of its efficiency at conveying what it is meant to convey. Therefore, video conferencing has been utilized when face-to-face interviewing was not possible, as this keeps as much of the verbal and non-verbal cues as possible. Both informants who were interviewed via video conferencing were told to find a quiet place where they would not be interrupted during the duration of the interview. One interviewee was unable to attend a video conference, and was unable to meet up in person, resulting in one of the interviews being conducted over the phone. All interviews were recorded with a digital voice recorder. Informants were given the opportunity to opt out of being recorded, but no one used that opportunity.

Interviews varied in length, but most were approximately 45 minutes long, with some as lengthy as 60 minutes, and some as short as 30 minutes. All interviews, whether they happened face-to-face or not, had somewhat the same structure. Starting with a few minutes of meet-and-greet and unstructured chat to build rapport, before heading into the interview guide. At the start of the interview, the participants were also given the formal information from the information document verbally, to make sure they were familiar with it. The order of the central aspects of the interview were similar across all informants, starting with discovered dis-/advantages, followed by action plan creation, and ending with collaboration and knowledge sharing intent. After the questioning, I made sure to explain to participants how the interviews would be used, as well as explaining to them that they could read the finished study, and when that would happen. Participants were also asked if they would be willing to participate in a second, shorter, interview, if it was deemed necessary. All participants agreed to this, but no participants were contacted again regarding the study, as no information was missing from the initial interview.

Transcription. Following the interviews, all data was transcribed. This was done by listening to voice recordings of the interviews and writing down everything said both by interviewee and interviewer. This was done immediately following interviews, to better structure the data material, and to start the process of analysis, in compliance with Kvale & Brinkmann's (2009) suggestion. The transcriptions were written out in standardized Norwegian Bokmål, aiming to retain as much as possible of the nuance of the spoken word. This means including sounds and onomatopoeia where applicable. Some information can be lost regardless, for instance visual cues or irony. To deal with this, I wrote down explanations when informants said or did something of importance that was not translatable to plaintext.

Interview guide. In this study, the interviews are semi-structured. There is a total of five central aspects that every interview included; discovered advantages, discovered disadvantages, collaboration, action plan creation, and knowledge sharing. Each of these aspects are included in the interview guide (which can be found in Appendix B), but the actual wording used in the interviews differ. Including these aspects was judged to be sufficient to answer the research question, "*What are the experiences and reflections of Leap Canvas participants?"*

The first two of these aspects, discovered advantages and discovered disadvantages, can be grouped, as they both aim to map how the participants view the organizational resources in relation to IP, IPR, and competitiveness, as well as making room for more general statements regarding the state of the organization. Questions in this category are overarching, allowing the informant to choose where to go into detail, based on the kind of new information and knowledge he got. An important part of this category is the knowledge and awareness created by explicating dis-/advantages, and the intentions that could be formed in this process. An example of a question in this group of questions is "*In regards to dis-/advantages, did anything arise during the workshop, that you had not previously considered*?" This question was asked to all informant both about advantages and disadvantages, as a way of getting them talking about knowledge they got from the workshop.

The third aspect, collaboration, was included to gain insight into the social aspect of Leap Canvas, and more specifically the experience of team work. It is common for organization members at different hierarchical levels to be present during the workshop, and team work across these levels should be captured in this aspect. This is included to understand how the social aspect of being in a workshop with coworkers can shape experience and intention. Questions asked regarding this aspect would be along the lines of "*Were you* [the participants] *pretty much on the same page?"* and/or "*Did any disagreements arise during the workshops? How was that handled?"*. This was meant to capture the perceived coherence and collaboration in the group.

The fourth central aspect, action plan creation, is included to get a sense of how participants believe they will implement new knowledge in their day-to-day. This can enable an understanding of experienced value of information and knowledge attained during the workshop, as well as generally intention to change. Questions in this aspect is overarching, allowing the participant to talk about how he experienced the action creation, as this will vary from person to person. There were pretty much only two questions needed on this aspect, "*What do you think about the action plan you created?"* and "*How are you going to use it going forward?"*.

Lastly there is the central aspect of knowledge sharing, which pertains to how the participant aims to use what he has learned to increase awareness and knowledge in the organization, amongst those not attending the workshop. There is no way of knowing, within this study, how these intentions pan out, but the intentions in themselves are interesting. "*What will you do to make sure those of your colleagues who need it get the same knowledge that you have gotten here today?"* is the only question used in this aspect, except for prompts to elaborate if the participants answered positively.

Thematic Analysis

Analysis of data in this research project was done using thematic analysis (TA), as this is a good fit with the research question, "*What are the experiences and reflections of Leap Canvas participants?"*. It is a good fit for several reasons. Firstly, TA allows for searching for reoccurring patterns across participants, and not only within participants. To answer the research question, this is necessary. Secondly, TA can identify both explicit and latent (underlying) themes, which is useful, as both experiences and reflections can be stated on an explicit and a latent level. Thirdly, while this is a study of experiences and reflections, these are guided by the goals of the workshop; knowledge creation and change potential. Seeing as these are established, theoretical fields of study, it is appropriate to let these fields inform the study. As such, a deductive, top down approach where ideas, theories, and concepts can be brought into the analysis is more appropriate. Thematic Analysis is open to the use of such an approach (Braun & Clarke, 2012), which allowed for principles from Knowledge Management and Theory of Planned Behavior to inform the analysis process throughout. This encouraged a more theoretically driven coding and theme creation process, in which theory guided the codes that were used, and what was judged as important enough to be promoted to a theme.

Building on this, thematic analysis is compatible with essentialist, contextualist and constructionist paradigms, giving the researcher epistemological freedom. This theoretical freedom makes thematic analysis a flexible approach to qualitative research. Since the contextualist epistemology is deemed most appropriate for this study, as mentioned introductorily in this chapter, this will also be reflected in a focus on interpretation of data, and its importance, rather than purely summarizing and describing the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Braun et al., 2015). Through the analysis process, an interpretation of the participant's realities was created, informed by the theoretical framework of the study, as well as my preexisting knowledge. Therefore, when the participants talk about their experiences and perspectives it is understood both as entities on their own, and in a wider, interpretative context of Knowledge Management and behavioral intention. This allowed the research question to be answered in a manner that took the goals of Leap Canvas into account, while still taking care to include the unique experiences of every informant.

The thematic analysis, as described by Braun and Clarke (2006) consists of six phases:

1. *Familiarization*: The researcher should be properly acquainted with his data before starting analysis. This can be accomplished by listening and re-listening to interview recordings, as well as reading and re-reading the transcripts in a curious and questioning way. The familiarization phase should be accompanied by note-taking, to keep track of observations and insights.

   To familiarize myself with the data in this study I read through the transcribed data several times while aiming to understand the assumptions, and implications, of the informant and his answer. When coming across uncertainties in meaning, I would move back to listening to the transcription, aiming to find non-verbal cues that had been missed during transcription. After this process, I would take notes describing meaning in the transcription.
2. *Coding*: Rigorous coding of data is the foundation that makes subsequent theme development possible. By coding the researcher engages with the data in a new way, allowing him to go beyond the immediate and obvious. The codes can be semantic or latent. As stated above, I will focus on the semantic level, but almost all analyses contain both semantic and latent codes. Coding happens by reading through a transcription closely and taking notes when something of interest presents itself. Codes should make sense by themselves, without being reliant on the data it represents. By using the same code for several items in the transcript, the first grouping of data begins.

   During this phase, I would use the notes from the previous phase, in combination with the rest of the transcription, to map together interesting information, one interview at a time. More specifically, I put the transcription into a document with two columns, one for the text, and one for codes. I did not have a strict rule that every sentence must be coded, but most text did, however, warrant a code. Some examples of early codes are "*sees new ways to use IP", "lack of knowledge",* and "*facilitator experience".* Through the coding process, the need for an overarching categorization into knowledge-related and social-related experiences and reflections became apparent.
3. *'Searching' for themes*: The aim of this phase is to start building a thematic map of the data. The most common way to accomplish this is by clustering similar codes, and 'promoting' the cluster to a theme. To determine if a cluster of codes should be a theme, the researcher should determine if it identifies a coherent aspect of the data and provides information relevant to the research question. Furthermore, a central organizing concept, a

key analytic point, should be present for the theme to be of analytic value. Thematic analysis is lenient regarding hierarchical levels of themes, although Clarke, Braun, and Hayfield (2015) suggests no more than three levels.

In this phase, I used the codes as a starting point for developing themes that appeared across several informants. This was done by printing a physical copy of the transcripts, and cutting questions and answers with similar coding out, followed by grouping them according to theme. Overarching thematic reoccurrences were found in this fashion, whereas themes were found by marking text within these groups with different colored markers.

4. *Reviewing themes*: There are two levels at which themes should be reviewed. At the first level, themes are reviewed in relation to the collated and coded data for each theme. This involves reading all data relevant to codes in a theme and tweaking them as necessary. Secondly, the researcher will review themes in relation to the entire data set. At this stage, the researcher will make sure that the themes do in fact fit with the research question, and that it is a good reflection of the content of the data.

   Reviewing themes was made harder by having the coded data electronically, and the grouped themes physically. Therefore, I opted to make a list of all themes, and added all relevant excerpts to this list, ensuring all data is available electronically. When reviewing themes, I found that some coded excerpts could adhere to more than one theme. This could either mean that codes are to general, or that themes are too wide. When going back in the process and taking a second look at codes, I found that some excerpts had more than one bit of meaning/ information attached to it. This realization made me go even further back in the process, to identify codes that were not good enough, and thereafter making the appropriate changes to themes as well. It was through this process that themes such as 'Realization of usefulness' and 'Implementation intention' were separated, themes that were similar, but not similar enough to be integrated into one.

5. *Defining and naming themes*: Creating short definitions of themes explaining the central organizing concept, as well as what it includes and what it does not include, will help the researcher developing his interpretative commentary on the data. Definitions will provide a useful guide towards the write up of the analysis. Naming should be done in a way that catches the essence of the theme.

Naming themes in this study was hard because some themes seem very close in meaning, if not given an explanatory name, even with a central organizing concept. Therefore, I tweaked theme names during this phase, returning to it several times after starting the write up. Having written up all names of themes and all excerpts used in each theme in a separate document allowed for easily grasping the entirety of the themes, making the process of creating a description easier, and as such made naming easier as well. Furthermore, naming of themes were done in a way that could be easily related to the research question. This was done by creating theme names that could finish the sentence "*participants experienced…*" or "*participants reflected upon…*", for instance "*participants experienced an intent to disseminate*" or "*participants reflected upon their realization of usefulness*".

6. *Writing up*: When using thematic analysis, the researcher will do some writing at all stages of analysis, so the last phase is not separate from the previous phases. Instead, it will involve both compiling and editing existing writing, and adding new writing. When writing up the number of themes should not exceed six, and every theme should be backed up by descriptive data excerpts. This does not mean the researcher should use excerpts for every analytic take, but rather make sure to use them when presenting key observations. Furthermore, it is necessary to use quotations from a wide sample of participants, not relying too heavily on the more articulate participants.

   Especially the part of not relying too heavily on more articulate participants was an issue in this study. Some of the interviewees were extremely articulate, whilst some were not very talkative. Therefore, I initially used some informants much more than others in the text. When realizing this, I took some time to count how many times each informant had been quoted within and across themes. This process revealed that some informants had been somewhat neglected, and I went back into the themes, as well as the source material, to find useful information from these informants. For the remainder of the writing up phase, I kept this in mind as well as continuing to count occurrences for each informant.

In addition to the steps of the analysis, Braun and colleagues (2015) lists five practices that should be implemented to achieve a good analysis. First there is the balance between analytic narrative and data extracts. It is recommended that there is at least as much analytic commentary supporting the extracts, as actual extracts. Often, it is beneficial to have more than that, upwards of an 80:20 ratio in favor of the supplementary commentary. Furthermore, the text provided should let the reader assess the author's interpretation, so all analytic claims must be backed up by appropriate data excerpts. Secondly, it is important to be nuanced when choosing data excerpts, aiming to use compelling, vivid quotes from all informants, and making sure to use several excerpts when claiming patterning in the data. Third is the fit between data and analytic claims. Data excerpts must clearly demonstrate the reasoning behind analytic claims. All possible interpretations must be considered. Fourth is the character of individual themes. There should be a central organizing concept behind each theme, which facilitates making sure that the theme is a theme, and not just an area of the text. Lastly, every theme should be different enough that there is no confusion to its distinctness.

Results

In this part of the paper, interview excerpts will be presented accompanied by explanatory commentary, as described in the guidelines for thematic analysis. These are the results of the thematic analysis and will be instrumental in answering the research question "*What are the experiences and reflections of Leap Canvas participants?*" within the context of knowledge and change intention as aims of the workshop. Analysis of the transcribed interviews reveal two main areas of interest which can answer this research question. There is the knowledge category, with themes consisting of experiences and reflections relating themselves either to creation of new knowledge, modifying knowledge, or a combination of the two. Furthermore, how participants reflect on this knowledge, and how it seems to have sparked an intention to change in the participants, is explained, as this is a stated goal of the Leap Canvas workshop, and as such an aim of this study. Secondly, there is a social category, which consists of themes related to collaboration, social support, social norms, and so on. In relation to the research question, these are experiences and reflections regarding the social elements of the workshop. These themes are not necessarily directly related to knowledge and future-oriented change potential but are still relevant for answering the research question and understanding the role of knowledge. Placing the themes into categories is done to provide an overarching structure for the experiences and reflections that are relevant to answering the research question. The results are derived using a thematic analysis method of coding and creating themes.

For the sake of clarity, informants will be referred to as "I1", "I2" and so on, based on the numbers assigned to informants in the methods-section, as to distinguish them and make it clear when the same informant is being quoted. All interviews were conducted in Norwegian, but in the text excerpts will be translated to English. All unedited excerpts can be found in Appendix C. Throughout the interview excerpts used in the text, "[…]" is used instead of text, when something irrelevant is left out of an excerpt, whereas "…" is used when the informant stops briefly during a statement. Hard brackets will also be used when explanatory commentary is added in lieu of extended quotations. It should also be noted, to avoid confusion, that informants use different names when referencing Leap Canvas, including 'the game', 'the workshop', and 'the tool'. The use of the term ‘game’ in reference to Leap Canvas is due to the workshop sometimes being branded as a ‘serious game’, a game with another purpose besides entertainment.

Themes

A total of seven themes answering the research question was found during analysis of the interview transcripts. These are presented in table 1.

Table 1

Theme names and sample quotes

Theme	Category	Sample Quote
Establishing a knowledge foundation	Knowledge	I1: *I feel it was effective learning, and effective to come in and view and discuss those things that you…that are relevant to us*
Becoming aware	Knowledge	I3: " *If you do a canvas process on IP, then you create through that process a conscious… a more conscious relationship to IP."*
Realization of usefulness	Knowledge	I3: ”*Because then you get to stop and think 'yes, what if that had happened to us?' so that I found very positive*
Implementation intention	Knowledge	I1: "*It made me very aware that we should rent out equipment and not sell it, that gives us an extra protection, since it allows us to control the market on the product"*
Need for facilitation	Social	I4: "*And he is always watching what is going on and providing feedback, and I think that is necessary in this kind of workshop, that those facilitating the course is there and visible"*
Intent to disseminate	Social	I5: "*So that's how I have continued working with it, processed it, concretized it, and gotten feedback that it is important"*
Collaborative effort	Social	I2: "*That was maybe a bit … those times when we did not agree, we found out that well, here is something that is not known, or that is not well enough communicated since we both don't know it"*

The research question in this study has two defining parts, *experience* and *reflection*. The term experience is used to describe the general, in-the-moment experiences, such as realizations and altered perceptions due to the workshop. Reflection is used to cover the future-oriented talk about intentions as well as wanting to act on new knowledge. The experiences and reflections of participants are highly interlinked and are thus subsequently presented as such.

The Role of Knowledge in Leap Canvas

Knowledge plays a pivotal role in Leap Canvas, it is both a stated aim of the workshop and it became apparent through interviewing that a lot of the experiences of using the tool is related to getting, altering, and using knowledge. By using thematic analysis as an approach to understand participant experiences, the following four themes have been created within this category: *Establishing a knowledge foundation, becoming aware, realization of usefulness,* and *implementation intention.*

E*stablishing a knowledge foundation* contains experiences of learning about what IP and IPR is, and the knowledge stemming from this. The experience of establishing a knowledge foundation is the basis of the subsequent experiences and reflections gained within the knowledge category, and the theme is thus hierarchically above the remaining themes.

Becoming aware contains experiences of becoming more conscious, or aware, of the role IP and IPR can or should have, and why it should be treated as important. Becoming aware can happen through getting information, but that does not necessarily mean that the participant has become more knowledgeable. Rather, information is explicated, or knowledge reinterpreted in a more meaningful way.

Realization of usefulness contains the experiences participants have in which they realize that knowledge related to IP and IPR can be valuable, or necessary, to them, and how it impacts the participant and the organization.

Implementation intention contains experiences where participants understand how they can use knowledge, new or reinterpreted, in specific business situations, and the new perspectives created due to the understanding of possible actions made available during the workshop.

There are a few different ways in which the themes will relate to knowledge, as they are dealing with knowledge alteration, creation, or explication. Knowledge alteration refers to changing or modifying preexisting knowledge in ways that will benefit the organization or the individual. Knowledge creation is the generation of new knowledge, and the ways it can be utilized. Knowledge explication is an elaboration of how preexisting knowledge can be applied to business in a meaningful way, seeing existing knowledge in a new light. No theme will feature only one of these three types of knowledge relation, but some will be more important than others within specific themes.

Establishing a knowledge foundation. This theme captures the reoccurring tendency amongst participants to experience the workshop as a learning process, and the feeling of getting, or not getting, any new, valuable knowledge. If the participant can say explicitly that he has learned something that he finds useful, this is the theme where that fits. Hierarchically, it is located above the remaining three themes pertaining to knowledge, due to its overarching role as a prerequisite for the other themes. It can be characterized as the foundation of the other themes because it includes situations where participants expand their knowledge, and the opportunities that creates for working in new ways.

Establishing a knowledge foundation does not automatically mean that the knowledge will be used actively, but it makes the participants start thinking, and captures the emerging realizations that the workshop can be useful. What is more, it aids in shaping the emergent intention to change behavior, and in initiating organizational change. The way this happens is described by Informant 2:

> I2: "*We got to work on … our concrete case, and we got to [think]both about potential problems and thoughts and such, and a bit on the solutions. So yeah … I feel it was effective learning, and effective to come in and view and discuss those things that you…that are relevant to us.*"

This informant explains, without going into detail on how, that he experienced Leap Canvas as creating a foundation for knowledge, and that he received relevant new information. Without a positive evaluation like this, it is unlikely the informant would have other positive experiences relating to the workshop, and an intention to act on the knowledge is not likely to occur. Furthermore, when the informant talks about how he finds the workshop effective in conveying knowledge relevant to him, new perspectives regarding IP and IPR can become apparent. The creation of a knowledge foundation was further explained by Informant 4, responding to a question pertaining to competitive disadvantages that were explicated during the workshop:

> I4:"*So it is absolutely clear that I discovered a lot of things which [was discussed], that I had not thought about previously […] So absolutely, the answer is yes, there was new information for me, and whether that was new things that no one had thought about earlier, I don't know"*

This informant explains briefly that he discovered new things, and that there was information new to him in the workshop. This experience of gaining new information can be understood as part of creating the new knowledge foundation, as it is likely information gotten in this scenario will aid in quickly establishing new, relevant knowledge.

The knowledge foundation can be further understood by looking at how informants replied when questioned about how they felt the workshop worked, for instance these excerpts from Informant 5: *"The perception we have is that we are very happy with it. Erm, a lot of issues became apparent, which arise when you work with it."* and Informant 3 "*It was fun, interesting. We got some new ideas and perspectives".* Thus, the experiences of these informants can be condensed into a general, reoccurring perception of Leap Canvas as informative and eye-opening in terms of new challenges and opportunities arising based on the knowledge participants gain. Therefore, it can be argued that participants experienced creation, and alteration of, knowledge that is relevant to the organization, which can aid in creating new perspectives on, and reflections about, IP and IPR, and thus an emerging intention to change. This is of interest by itself, but it becomes even more so when diving deeper into how information and knowledge was used to become aware, realize usefulness, and create an intent to implement new knowledge, which the subsequent themes will describe further.

Becoming aware. One recurring experience mentioned by several participants was the utilizing of information through increased awareness of the role intellectual property and intellectual property rights should have in the organization. Becoming aware of how important it is to keep IP and IPR in mind can make participants reflect on changing in accordance with knowledge. This can be exemplified by one participants statement when asked about the disadvantages the organization have in the market:

> I2: *" […] so in relation to the goals we established in our timeframe, there were some things we listed that are going to be important, of which we have not been aware earlier. Whether this was brand new things or yeah, several of these things does at least surface, which might be more pivotal then … then what we have previously discussed."*

This excerpt captures the essence of the theme, and a recurring pattern amongst the participants. Participants do not necessarily come up with new knowledge that they have never previously thought about, but rather the way in which this knowledge can be utilized is altered. This part of a knowledge-based workshop could easily be overlooked, due to the importance of newly established knowledge, but it is important to avoid that. Most participants are likely to have some knowledge about IP and IPR, but how this knowledge can be modified and expanded upon is also an important part of the workshop. Through this process, a change in perspective occurs in which what had previously been deemed unimportant or low priority, can be important to the company. Within this realization also lies a potential for new or modified intentions to change. Furthermore, the theme captures experiences of moving peripheral knowledge into the consciousness of the participants, and therefore acting as a reminder.

Furthermore, when asked how the awareness gained during the workshop would benefit his future work, one informant replied:

> I1:*"Yes, I believe the continuous classification of what we are building regarding IP and protecting it accordingly, and being aware of that, is something that we are going to remember. Being conscious that well, really, that we are focused on what is most important to us, that concretizes our thoughts in what we are working towards, and what we protect. That is something that… we won't forget that now."*

This speaks to the value the informant perceives in getting the information provided in the workshop, even though it is a matter of becoming more conscious, and not creating new knowledge directly. Even though knowledge is not created directly by becoming aware, it is linked to knowledge. Experiences of finding new ways to think about the importance of IP and IPR, can be interpreted as a way of becoming more knowledgeable about the organization and the context in which it operates, and further inspire an intention to change behavior accordingly. Furthermore, this quote also gives some insight into how valuable it seems informants believe their newfound awareness to be. This ascribed value is also an important part of this theme, because if the informants were to judge the new information as unimportant, it would not make them more aware, and therefore would not start a knowledge creation or alteration process, and it would also not create an intention to accept or initiate organizational change. This can be backed up further by another informant, saying:

> I3: "[…] *The process in itself is valuable, not necessarily the result that follows, but it creates more awareness regarding what you are currently doing. If you do a canvas process on IP, then you create through that process a conscious… a more conscious relationship to IP."*

This informant explains that regardless of the value previously ascribed to IP, the increased consciousness is beneficial. Just being reminded that it is in fact important to think about, is enough for the workshop to be valuable, as it primes knowledge that may have been forgotten, and reflections regarding the necessity of changing behavior occurs, if deemed necessary based on this reminder. The statements of these three informants are further backed up through excerpts such as: I5: "*a general increase in consciousness regarding the terms IPR, patenting, and freedom to operate is positive in the organization"* and: I4: "[people said] *it was an eye-opener, especially the software people got several Aha! moments".* Thus, there seems to be a general trend across the informants to experience the increased awareness as something that they themselves will benefit from, and/or that the organization will benefit from, even though they are not necessarily able to pinpoint exactly how that knowledge is going to be used in the organization. What is more, the general awareness created can be instrumental in making participants reflect upon the need for change, and as such making an intention to change seem necessary, because participant perception of value is altered.

Realization of usefulness. The third theme, which is somewhat related to becoming aware, is realization of usefulness. Where becoming aware is concerned with Leap Canvas as an eye-opener, or more generally creating awareness, realization of usefulness is describing the experiences of Leap Canvas as a solution to a problem previously judged less important, or the feeling of finding new meaning in old issues. The two themes are, however, both related to the explication of knowledge, to a larger extent than to creation of knowledge. Establishing necessity is for instance understood by this excerpt from informant 5: "*What I think is often challenging, is that you do not feel the need for this knowledge until you need it, and then when a problem rises, you think 'we should have known this'.".* As he states, he misjudged the importance of the knowledge now provided during the Leap Canvas. Not because he did not know it existed, but because it is difficult to pinpoint ways in which this sort of knowledge is going to be beneficial before it suddenly becomes apparent that it is crucial. Reflection on this issue has as such given the informant a new perspective on IP and IPR. A more specific example of realization of usefulness came from Informant 3, stating

> I3: " *[…] these concrete scenarios which arise. Because then you get to stop and think 'yes, what if that had happened to us?' so that I found very positive. And even if we couldn't answer everything, there was a lot we could answer. And the answers we did have were not 100% [correct], so that is definitely valuable."*

when asked whether the importance of IP was made clear to him. This excerpt shows how the participant, during the workshop, could relate new information to his organization, and the contextual factors surrounding it. These are the types of experiences captured by this theme, in which the informant not only becomes aware of the role of IP and IPR, but also perceives this as immediately useful and necessary for the organization. Informant two further explains the explication-process of establishing necessity when asked to elaborate on the experience of discussing further steps:

> I2: " […] *Yes, it was good to think about things that can happen, so that was an advantage of it, that we got to discuss 'yes, this could happen, what if it does happen, what do we do then?' so it's just about having talked about it, now we are better prepared on several things, just by thinking about scenarios, and discussing what could be done"*

Both these informants have positive experiences from the discussion in Leap Canvas, where they got to stop and think about how some negative scenarios related to IP and IPR can happen to their organization. This makes the participants reflect upon new knowledge and creates an increased feeling of urgency and necessity of having knowledge about IP and IPR, as well as an intention to do something about it. This does not, by itself, mean that the participants are now more knowledgeable, but rather that they perceive their business and its relation to IP/IPR in a new light, and are therefore experiencing a new frame of reference for the information they are getting, and can create useful knowledge from it.

Furthermore, the realization of usefulness could be extended from the 'what-if's to more concrete scenarios where participants were unaware of the necessity of doing certain tasks related to IP and IPR. For instance, Informant 1 responding to a question on new tasks arising during the workshop: "*There are a lot of tasks here that we were not aware of having to do, that arose through [facilitator] and the game",* as well as informant 5 when asked whether he saw the potential risks of not being knowledgeable regarding IP and IPR after the workshop "*Yes, and risk reduction, by being precautionary, and the issues related to that, which we discussed during the workshop, and the importance thereof".* Even though these excerpts exemplify more concrete scenarios than simply thinking 'what-if', they are all related in that the informants experience the newly established knowledge as something useful to themselves or to the organization.

The risk aspect, and risk reduction, even though only explicitly brought up by one informant, is something that seems to be reoccurring. When the other informants talk about 'what if this happened to us', it is likely that they too are concerned with the risks of not being well versed in the field of IP and IPR. Some even go as far talking about problems they have had in the past with having their intellectual property stolen. All this tie together to create the theme realization of usefulness, which therefore incorporates not only usefulness, but also realization of necessity and realization of risk. These elements were judged too closely related to be separate themes, but it is worth noting that they are all incorporated into this theme.

Implementation intention. Several informants stated that the workshop made them able to relate the fields of IP and IPR to their day-to-day work, in a way which they had not before. As such, the participants experience that the newfound knowledge from Leap Canvas contributes to altering their knowledge base, and as such makes them reflect upon the need for a change in standard mode of operation. Therefore, this theme captures both knowledge creation and what you could call knowledge conversion; combining new knowledge with existing knowledge. The essence of the theme is exemplified in this excerpt, where the informant is asked about the importance of IP and IPR: "*Well, the importance of IP didn't necessarily become any clearer, but how we can use it to our advantage became clearer, since we got some new perspectives on this."*(I3). The informant points out the extent to which the workshop provided him with new perspectives, in that he already knew how important IP is for the organization, but he experienced that new ways to benefit from it was made available. It seems this informant sees the workshop as a way of breaking from the status quo, and think anew, and thus has some new perspectives regarding how he can implement IP and IPR in his day-to-day. This realization is backed up by Informant 1, stating:

"*Very fun, very nice way to pull some strings, and get some frames of reference. Yes, really it was a bit like… it was a quick way to get through different opportunities* " (I1).

The sense of generally being better prepared to handle IP and IPR is also explained by this participant's answer to what insights from the workshop he is going to take advantage of in the time to come:

> I2: "*[…]to be clearer regarding what we have good control over and what we do not control properly, and, well, which areas we have to work with, and tips as to how we can do it, […] what measures we can utilize on different areas*"

Even though he does not mention IP or IPR specifically, it is probable that is what he means when talking about control, as insights from the workshop leading to an increased feeling of control would necessarily be related to IP/IPR. Neither of these informants mention how, specifically, they intend to change, but they reflect upon it in a manner suggesting they now have more of the prerequisite knowledge necessary to create beneficial change.

There are also more concrete examples of how, specifically, informants relate their new knowledge to business operation. See for instance these excerpts: "*Yes it helped in any case with thinking differently than just protecting technology. For instance, getting ownership of a standardization process, to make use of the technology for our self*" (I3) and

> "*And that was something that I got out of the game, […] it made me very aware that we should rent out equipment and not sell it, that gives us an extra protection, since it allows us to control the market on the product*" (I1).

These informants have gotten concrete knowledge from the workshop, which they have been able to directly relate to their business operation, in establishing new ways of using IP or IPR knowledge. As can be seen from the excerpts, these informants reflect upon perceiving new and altered ways to protect their assets. This is not saying that they were unable to protect their assets previously, but through the workshop they experience a realization that there are better ways to do it, and thus intend to change their behavior accordingly.

All experiences describing this theme have in common a realization of new ways to work towards implementing IP and IPR knowledge in day-to-day business and is set apart from the realization of usefulness-theme by being directly relatable to action, intent, and specific strategies. Furthermore, all excerpts exemplify general or specific ways in which the newly established knowledge can be used to the advantage of the informant, and the organization he works in.

The Social Aspect

The other main overarching category is the social aspect of experiences during Leap Canvas, consisting of situations where social interaction is relevant to the research question, "*What are the experiences and reflections of Leap Canvas participants?"* This includes experiences regarding both the relationship between facilitator and participant, the relationship between participants, and the relationship between participants and the organization. In this group of themes there is no internal hierarchical relation, all themes are at the same level. The themes are called *need for facilitation, intent to disseminate,* and *collaborative effort.*

Need for facilitation is the collection of experiences where participants perceive added value or increased learning outcome due to interaction with a facilitator and is thus meant to capture the social dynamic of participant – facilitator.

Intent to disseminate captures participants talk about how they aim to use new knowledge and understanding in their organization in ways that will benefit the organization in its entirety. This theme captures part of a social interaction between the participant and the organization in which he works.

Collaborative effort, is used to describe experiences of adding value through collaboration during the workshop. This theme then describes the social element of communication between participants during the workshop.

Seeing as Leap Canvas is in its entirety done in groups, with discussion as a vital part, the social category of experiences could be expanded greatly. However, for the sake of this study, only those social interactions relevant to the aims of the Leap Canvas, Knowledge Management, and reflections regarding subsequent change intentions, as well as what contributes to positive evaluation of the workshop experience, are of interest.

The need for facilitation. This theme describes the value participants ascribe to the workshop, and thus the benefit they experience from participating. In relation to the research question, this theme is included because it is believed that perceiving an added learning outcome due to facilitation can change participant's perspective on the workshop positively, creating an overall more positive experience. In terms of the social dynamic captured by themes, as mentioned above, this theme is thus located within the participant – facilitator aspect. Several informants mention that their experience was enhanced by the fact that expert facilitators were present during the workshop. One informant describes:

> I4: "[…] *[facilitator] is very 'on', very engaged, and he is always watching what is going on and providing feedback, and I think that is necessary in this kind of workshop, that those facilitating the course is there and visible, [to make sure that] people do not sit in a vacuum, and doesn't progress"*

The informant is worried that it would be impossible for the participants to progress, had there not been a facilitator present. It seems this informant thinks the workshop would have been worthless, or at least of lower value, had it not been facilitated. The way in which feedback from the facilitator is experienced as instrumental to creating knowledge is explained further by informant 2:

> I2: "*[…]and that's feedback to [the facilitator] too, that he participated in the discussion on actions that can be taken on various areas. So that was useful, that it was both creating awareness about us, and learning and surveying of us, in addition to input from, and tips and learning from [the facilitator]"*

This informant agrees that it is useful to have a participating facilitator and adds that he experienced learning directly from the facilitator. From these two informants' statements, it seems that the experienced need for facilitation is part of an overall perceived knowledge creation process.

Another informant describes how it is sometimes hard to tell whether new knowledge came from the facilitator or from the workshop itself:

> I1: *"[…] whether [newfound knowledge of IP and IPR] came from [facilitator] or if it came from the game…it comes from both of those, really. […] We were sitting there with [facilitator] too, and we got a lot of good advice from [facilitator]"*

This claim can be backed up by another excerpt from informant three, when answering a question about the extent to which the importance of IP became clearer to him during the workshop:

> I3: "*We got some new perspectives [on IP], but I don't know if it has that much to do with the way the process was done, or if it had to do with the input from he who led the process, it could be both"*

It is clear from these excerpts that what is the result of the workshop, and what is the result of the facilitation is experienced as somewhat intertwined, and probably mutually dependent.

This can impact the experience of participants in two major ways. First, through facilitation, and seemingly only through facilitation, the workshop has the potential to create an experience of knowledge creation for the participants, as the facilitators' input provides a lot of the specific information on IP and IPR. Informants in this study experience this as highly valuable, and the relationship that the participants experience as a part of their learning outcome, can be interpreted as a necessity for the effective use of the Leap Canvas workshop, adding value to the tool in the eyes of participants. Secondly, progress is ensured by facilitation, as it reduces stagnation. This is also positively perceived by participants, who believe they would not have been able to complete the workshop on their own. Therefore, the facilitation, and the participants experienced need for it, can be interpreted as necessary for successfully creating knowledge, and thus creating opportunities for future-oriented reflections regarding change of behavior.

The intent to disseminate. There is a reoccurring tendency among participants to talk about how they intend to share their newfound knowledge with peers at the organization, as well as having already done this in some way. Even though it is impossible to know if informants follow up on their plans to disseminate, if it has not happened at the time of the interview, their intent to do so can be interpreted as a testament to the perceived value of new knowledge gained during the workshop. For the sake of the theme it matters less where the informant is in this process, as it is the intention reflections that are of interest, regardless of whether it has been executed or not. Furthermore, it is likely that there would be no experienced intention to disseminate, if the participant does not experience the knowledge gained in the workshop as important. The reflection on necessity of created knowledge is as such central to this theme. Informant number four explains how he sees the learning outcomes of the workshop being shared in the organization:

> I4: "[…] *the implementation is concrete as I said, in that we are actually getting it digitalized, and therefore actually get it disseminated, and get it anchored in management, that is what is important here. […] I think that is how we have to work, try to anchor things high up, as high up as possible, as well as down on our baseline of workers, to make everyone more aware"*

It seems that this informant is very concerned with spreading IP and IPR knowledge within the organization, as he sees a lot of value in implementing the strategies and knowledge from the workshop. Informant five also explains what he has done to further the knowledge from the workshop, specifically how the steps of the action plan will be used within the organization in the time to come:

> I5: "*So what I have done is that I have summed up input from the participants, that was six people, and then sent it upwards in the organization, so that they can evaluate what value it will have for us. So that's how I have continued working with it, processed it, concretized it, and gotten feedback that it is important"*

Both participants have moved past intention, and onto actual dissemination of knowledge, at the time of the interview. This can, however, be interpreted as stronger support of the essence of the theme; experiencing the value of the workshop as high enough to (intend to) spread the knowledge within the organization. Informant one has also rapidly gone on to use new knowledge:

> I1: "*And this [graphical representation of IP in the organization]is also a bit of a consequence of the game, that we've sat down and structured it like this, gotten to what IP we actually have. And it was the game that made us 'dig it up', [and think] what do we actually have?*

Considering these informants were all interviewed within approximately one week of Leap Canvas participation, the fact that they have already started spreading knowledge in the organization can be interpreted as experiencing a strong intention towards organizational dissemination of knowledge.

This theme has elements of both learning and knowledge, in addition to being related to the social aspect of the workshop. It is related to learning and knowledge because an intent to disseminate would not arise without it. However, the social element of intending to share knowledge central, and that is why the choice was made to keep this theme separate from the knowledge-based themes.

Collaborative effort. The theme collaborative describes experiences where participants feel engaged with their peers in worthwhile discussion or other social activity. This is used to capture a reoccurring sense that learning from each other during the workshop is useful. Collaborative effort is added to account for the presence of experiences related to social norms, specifically the importance of influential others' opinions, as well as reflections made upon these experiences. Seeing other participants having positive experiences is likely to be a part of creating positive experiences for the individual. One informant broadly says;

> I4: *"Experiences from the workshop last week with us, was at least that people were very engaged, and [they] discussed, and everyone participated* […] *You don't think about everything every day, so like, it's good to get some input, it's a diversity [of people], you know, a diversity which you pour from when you do group work*".

when asked about how he felt Leap Canvas fitted in the organization he works for. It seems like this informant experiences the workshop as a good way to create opportunities for sharing knowledge in a new setting, while opening for discussion on previously undiscussed topics. By seeing that his peers are positively engaged, it is likely that the informant will also have more positive experiences with the workshop. A second informant explains how the workshop can be used as a way in which incongruence is discovered and dealt with:

> I2: "*[…] well, I have a belief, and the other [person] has a belief, and then we see that we are not sure. That was maybe a bit … those times when we did not agree, we found out that well, here is something that is not known, or that is not well enough communicated since we both don't know it"*

This informant explains how the workshop helped them not only discuss, but also made him realize that he was not always on the same page as other participants. The learning effect the participants get from each other is thus further emphasized. I1 also describes this as: "*a strength of the game, to corroborate what is viewed as disadvantages, advantages, goals, that that gets corroborated between everyone".* These excerpts together provide a sense that the learning potential of Leap Canvas is experienced as enhanced by internal discussion, and internal communication. When asked about the collaboration, and the experience of getting on the same page, all informants replied either that they found it positive to get there, or that they already were on the same page. When participants mention that they were already on the same page, it is likely that Leap Canvas participation has helped in explicating this, as participants are required to communicate their views and knowledge, which can also be a beneficial experience. Either way, being sure that peers are on the same page as you can aid in creating the knowledge necessary to reflect upon the necessity of change. Thus, the recurring experiences within this theme is talking about how different people within the organization can hold different beliefs, and the perceived benefit of getting on the same page, as well as the perceived benefit of corroborating knowledge.

Discussion

In this chapter, the research question, "*What are the experiences and reflections of Leap Canvas participants?",* will be discussed in light of the findings from the previous chapter, the goals of the Leap Canvas, and the theoretical framework of behavioral change, organizational change, and knowledge. Furthermore, the experiences and reflections from the themes in the results-chapter will be combined, and the chapter will thus be divided firstly into the overarching knowledge and social categories, and then further into experiences and reflections.

Knowledge

The experiences and reflections in this chapter are discussed with the Leap Canvas' aim of making participants knowledgeable on IP and IPR in mind, as well as discussing the potential link between experiences/ reflections and intention to change behavior based on this knowledge. Therefore, I made a choice to focus the discussion mainly around the learning and improving stages of the Knowledge Management Cycle. These stages are most directly relevant to the aims of Leap Canvas and its potential for change intentions.

Experiences. As was mentioned in the introduction of this dissertation, Leap Canvas can be understood as a Knowledge Management project. Specifically, a Knowledge Management project with the aim to explicate knowledge and show the role of knowledge in the organization (Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Alavi & Leidner, 2001). In this study it was found that participants experienced increased knowledge about, and awareness regarding, IP and IPR. This is not only in line with the aim of the workshop, but it also happens under the proposed ideal conditions for generating knowledge; talking about contextual factors, experiences, and values under the guidance of an expert facilitator (Davenport & Prusak, 1998). Therefore, when Leap Canvas is understood as this type of Knowledge Management project, the participant experiences regarding knowledge seem to support the way the workshop is intended to work.

Building on this, if the knowledge experiences are understood within a Knowledge Management Cycle framework, increased knowledge and awareness experiences can be understood within the learning and improving stages in the Evans and colleagues (2014) framework. Learning constitutes understanding the value of knowledge, internalizing, connecting, and integrating pieces of knowledge. When informants talk about how they, during the workshop, experience seeing more clearly potential problems and solutions, as well as getting new ideas and perspectives, this can be understood as both connection and integration of knowledge in the learning phase. Simultaneously, participants improve already existing knowledge. As the learning and improving stages are amongst the later phases in the model, it is assumed that some knowledge was already present in the individual, and that this is a refinement of that knowledge. From what the participants have experienced, it seems to be the case that no one was starting without any knowledge on the matter at all, but rather with a limited understanding that could be improved upon by an expert facilitator providing contextual understanding (Evans et al., 2014), in line with the previous stages of the cycle being completed to some degree. This could be problematic, as the previous stages of the model are prerequisites for learning and improving on knowledge. However, identifying the need for more knowledge is what makes organizations feel a need for the workshop in the first place, and as such must occur prior to Leap Canvas participation. Therefore, the participant experiences are interpreted to be consistent with the aim of the Leap Canvas workshop in regard to its position within the Knowledge Management Cycle.

Considering that the experiences of participants are found to be related to expanding on existing knowledge, one way of interpreting it is by looking at it through the lens of knowledge conversion, which is the ways existing knowledge can be converted to new and improved knowledge (Nonaka, 1994). If the aforementioned experiences are to be understood within this framework, it most closely resembles the internalization mode of knowledge conversion, in which explicit knowledge is made tacit. However, participants talk about both getting new knowledge and improving upon knowledge, in several different ways. Improving upon knowledge is more like combination in Nonaka's (1994) model, in which explicit knowledge is converted to improved explicit knowledge. The aim of Leap Canvas is for participants to learn and be able to use this knowledge to create change. Having more than one mode of knowledge conversion present in the workshop is more likely to create lasting knowledge, than any one mode alone (Nonaka, 1994). This is valuable by itself, but the most effective knowledge conversion happens when all stages are present (Nonaka, 1994). Leap Canvas' ability to do this is discussed further later in this chapter, as it has elements of both experience and reflection, and a social element in addition to the role of knowledge.

Reflections. The knowledge creation experienced by participants in this study can be further discussed within the framework of behavioral beliefs and control beliefs in the Theory of Planned Behavior. This happens through realizations that the created knowledge is useful in the organization, and the subsequent intention to change.

Consider for instance when participants reflect upon how the knowledge they have gained from the workshop can be used in the organization, and the usefulness of this. That can be interpreted as seeing a new link between a behavior (actively using IP/IPR knowledge) and the outcomes of this behavior (increased competitiveness), and would as such constitute a change in behavioral beliefs (Ajzen, 1991). Following this line of reasoning, an intention to change will be forming. However, it should be noted that using Theory of Planned Behavior in an organizational setting is less common than using it on changes in personal behavior (McEachan et al., 2011). Yet, I would argue that it is applicable, as long as the behavior is something that the individual can do, in this case using IP/IPR knowledge.

Furthermore, when participants talk about their intentions to use newfound knowledge in specific ways in the organization it is likely that the behavioral beliefs are accompanied by control beliefs. These are the beliefs regarding the opportunities and resources for implementing change, influenced by previous experience and previous experience of influential others (Ajzen, 1991). My interpretation is that it is unlikely that participants would reflect upon concrete changes without believing it could be done, and as such this could be a part of a change intention stemming from Leap Canvas. However, control beliefs do not necessarily arise from Leap Canvas. It is possible that participants already felt in control but failed to realize the importance of the change, or failed to even think about the issue of IP and IPR in the first place. Nonetheless, knowledge from the workshop would be the reason why these beliefs come to light.

Furthermore, the knowledge related reflections of participants can be discussed in light of organizational change. For instance, when participants experience the knowledge they have gained as useful, they are more likely to sense a discrepancy between the status quo and optimal functioning, making them ready for accepting change (Rafferty et al., 2013). What is more, reflections regarding the intention to do something about the current situation can also be interpreted as establishing a sense of urgency, a principle for efficient change management (Kotter, 1995). These reflections can be interpreted as beliefs, building towards the intention to change, just like the beliefs mentioned above.

The knowledge participants acquire also opens for reflections regarding *how* to change, not only *to* change. From the experiences described in the theme called implementation intention it seems like participants are eager to implement what they have learned during the workshop. This can be interpreted as perceiving the proposed changes as appropriate for the organization, which is a principle of change readiness (Rafferty et al., 2013). This could either mean that the participants have ideas of their own based on new knowledge, or that they received ideas/solutions during the workshop. Either way, it likely stems from participating in the workshop.

Social

In this chapter, knowledge and experiences regarding the social interactions that occur during the Leap Canvas workshop are discussed. The discussion is based on Knowledge Management, behavioral change (specifically, the role of social norms), and what this means for organizational change. Within Knowledge Management, the learning and improving stages are still most relevant, but the knowledge sharing stage will be discussed as well.

Experiences. In this study, participants experienced collaborating with colleagues and facilitators as a valuable endeavor. This means, broadly, that the social element of the workshop was interpreted in a positive way by the participants. When these experiences are understood in a Knowledge Management perspective, they fill a role that the knowledge related experiences cannot, namely knowledge sharing. When learning from each other and making sure peers are on the same page as you, knowledge is shared in the organization. As informants stated, this can pertain both to others' beliefs and views, and to being better acquainted with the explicit knowledge peers have. Through this sharing process, the knowledge present in the organization can be more easily accessible and is thus likely to see increased usage (Evans et al., 2014). However, this is reliant upon the knowledge being positively evaluated by the individual. If that is not the case, the knowledge sharing attempts are likely futile. On the other hand, the knowledge reflections mentioned above regarding intentions to change suggests a positive evaluation of gained knowledge.

Furthermore, participants in this study experience the facilitation of the workshop as necessary for successfully completing it. These experiences are interesting because of the role facilitation is believed to have in becoming knowledgeable within the learning stage of the

Knowledge Management Cycle (Evans et al., 2014). This happens specifically through interpretations of the impact knowledge has on the organization (Evans & Ali, 2013). Participants in this study talk about the feedback they get, and what actions they can take, and this can be interpreted as the facilitator filling the role proposed by Evans and Ali (2013). Another possible explanation for the experienced importance of the facilitator can be simply in providing the necessary information for the knowledge to arise in the first place. Regardless, it seems likely that the experienced facilitation importance is a valuable step in the process of becoming knowledgeable.

Reflections. Participants in this study reflect on how other people react to created knowledge, and the perceived benefit of the organization changing based on this knowledge. This can be understood in relation to the subjective norm, and normative beliefs, in the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991). For instance, when the facilitator provides his perspectives on what should be done, this is likely to shape the normative beliefs of the participant. The same can be said about the reflections participants make regarding collaboration, and corroboration of knowledge. This can be interpreted as normative beliefs moving towards a perception of referent individuals accepting the change, and if so the participant would be more likely to form an intention to change (Ajzen, 1991). It should be mentioned that for a normative belief to eventually inspire an intention, a motivation to comply must exist (Ajzen, 1991). Amongst the participants in this study, based on their experiences and reflections, I would argue there is a strong tendency towards being motivated to comply.

Normative beliefs can be further understood as shaping participant reflections regarding dissemination within the organization. Considering that the participants experience an intention to disseminate the knowledge they have gained, it is likely that they believe their colleagues at the organization will approve of it. On the one hand, this could also be due to the perceived necessity of changing, and not because colleagues would necessarily approve. However, on the other hand, if the intention to disseminate is understood in connection to the reflections regarding the collaboration during the workshop, it seems likely that the perceived acceptance amongst present colleagues, and facilitators, would shape reflections regarding other organizational members.

Furthermore, the participant reflections in the present study can be interpreted within the framework of organizational change management (Kotter, 1995), and especially the steps related to creating a vision. Through the knowledge from the workshop, colleagues, and the facilitator, an outline of what needs to change, and how to do this, can arise. This is how Kotter (1995) sees a vision being formed. Now, this is related both to knowledge and social factors, but I believe that the reflections participants make together regarding how change should be implemented, is instrumental in creating the vision. A vision of change could, of course, also be created without the Leap Canvas, but it is likely that participants experience a vision as more easily understandable and compelling if they have participated in creating it. This can be understood as a form of communicating the vision and empowering others to act on it, in Kotter's (1995) terms.

In the chapter above, regarding knowledge, the ways in which participant experiences and reflections can be interpreted as making them ready for change were explained, based on the principles of Rafferty and colleagues (2013). Another principle suggested by the same authors comes into play at this time; the group change readiness. This is determined by individual change readiness, when being shared through social interaction in the organization/group (Rafferty et al., 2013). Participants reflections regarding the collaboration and corroboration of knowledge can be interpreted as creating a platform in which the group change readiness can be formed. As such, participants talking about their beliefs regarding using knowledge to implement change can be understood as an important reflection on its own.

Before moving on to a methodological discussion, I would like to revisit the topic of knowledge conversion, due to its relevance to all parts of the discussion. According to Nonaka (1994) there are four distinct ways in which knowledge is converted, which should all work together in a spiral of knowledge conversion. The first step in this is socialization, in which tacit knowledge becomes extended tacit knowledge through forming a team and sharing experiences. In this study, participants are put into teams, and they experience the collaboration with colleagues as informative and useful. This can be interpreted as fulfilling the goals of the socialization mode of knowledge conversion. The second step in Nonaka's (1994) model is called externalization and constitutes the use of metaphors to articulate experiences when knowledge is tacit. Whether metaphors are actually used by participants is unknown, but participants do experience explication of knowledge, which is the point of this mode of conversion. Therefore, it seems this mode is also accomplished, at least to some extent. The third step in the model is called combination and deals with combining explicit knowledge held by different people into more concrete and shareable explicit knowledge. In this study, participants experience corroboration of knowledge and as such getting on the same page in relation to the importance of knowledge. This can be interpreted as filling the role of combination. Lastly, Nonaka (1994) describes a stage called internalization, in which the agreed upon explicit knowledge is again made tacit, through a 'normal' learning effect. It is likely because of this internalization that participants experience being more knowledgeable and reflect upon their possibilities for using this knowledge to change. I would argue that the experiences and reflections of participants in this study largely arises due to this process of getting together, talking about business, and finding ways to improve. However, on one hand, it could be argued that going through these stages over the course of one workshop is insufficient to really make a change. On the other hand, participants do seem to experience and reflect upon all stages of the spiral. As such, the word spiral might be very meaningful, because even though it can be argued that all stages of the model are completed, it has only happened once. Therefore, for change to actually happen, it might be necessary to go through Nonaka's (1994) stages again under different circumstances, to put the improved knowledge foundation to use.

Methodological Discussion

The evaluation of trustworthiness and usefulness of research, as well as judgements of how the research has been carried out, are crucial determinants of quality. In quantitative research, criteria such as objectivity, reliability, and generalizability, as well as validity, can be used to evaluate a study, but these criteria are not necessarily directly applicable or appropriate for qualitative research (Yardley, 2015). Several attempts have been made to incorporate validity, reliability, and generalizability in qualitative research, but there is no consensus as to the appropriate way to do this (Ali & Yusof, 2011). It is, however, still necessary for the qualitative researcher to be able to show that his study is rigorous and sound. Therefore, this study will rely on methodological criteria developed for psychological qualitative studies. Several sets of criteria for quality in psychological qualitative research has been developed (e.g. Yardley, 2000; Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992; Elliot, Fischer, & Rennie, 1999; Kitto, Chesters, & Grbich, 2008; Willig, 2013), but they all have a degree of overlap. In this study, some of the more common ones will be included and discussed. These are:

- *Epistemology and ontology*: The epistemological and ontological framework the researcher aims to work within shapes how validity can and should be treated. For instance, a researcher aiming to conduct his work within a strict realist framework might be more likely to strive for the quantitative quality of objectivity, than he will reflexivity, as a realist would argue that his role is to capture a reality existing in the data (Willig, 2013). As this study is conducted within a contextualist/ critical realist framework, which is a middle-ground approach, using strict quality measures is appropriate, whilst acknowledging that the quantitative quality measures are inappropriate. Hence, the epistemology has informed the further quality measures used in the study. Epistemology and ontology in this study is further discussed in the sub-chapter called 'Epistemology and ontology' in the method-chapter.
- *Reflexivity:* A disclosure or explicit consideration of the ways in which the researcher has influenced the study. By disclosing values, interests and assumptions, the researcher can allow the reader to make informed decisions regarding his analysis of data (Yardley, 2015; Willig, 2013). This can happen in every step of the research process, from determining what questions to ask interview participants, to interpreting responses in a certain way, to choosing specific theory to explain data. In quantitative research, a researcher influencing his research is almost univocally negative. In qualitative research on the other hand, it is not necessarily positive or negative, especially within a contextualist framework. The researcher influencing his data is probably unavoidable, and a disclosure of the researchers' own interests, values, and assumptions should therefore be included in the text, allowing the reader to interpret the researchers' analysis, and make his own interpretations based on this (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992; Elliott et al, 1999; Willig, 2013; Yardley, 2015). Therefore, when necessary for the sake of reflexivity, statements regarding my assumptions and interests have been included throughout the text. This includes me being open about the fact that I have previously attended the workshop and have a relationship with House of Knowledge (disclosed in the method-chapter). The knowledge I have gotten from this has influenced my choices throughout the research process, and I believe this has strengthened the analytic process, since I have prerequisite knowledge useful for

understanding the experiences and reflections participants have when using Leap Canvas.

- *Context of participants:* By describing participants and their socio-cultural context the researcher opens for the reader to assess the applicability and relevance of his work. The backgrounds and perspectives of informants shape data, and should therefore be included as far as possible, without breaching confidentiality (Yardley, 2015). I would have liked to include more information on the informants but got somewhat restricted by internal confidentiality. This is explained in detail under the heading 'Informants' in the method chapter. Besides this, the context of the participants is explained as thoroughly as possible without breaching confidentiality. Furthermore, the fact that all informants are Norwegian and male can be a contextual factor influencing this research. I would assume the experiences and reflections are comparable with informants of other nationalities, but that is something further research will have to confirm.
- *Grounding in examples:* By using excerpts from data in the text, the researcher can show how the analytic procedure has happened, and how understanding of the data has happened. This ensures transparency regarding the fit between data and interpretation (Elliott et al., 1999). Participant excerpts has been used extensively to explain my analytic takes in the results-chapter, which I believe helps the reader to make an informed evaluation of my analysis.
- *Coherence:* Coherence is determined by the degree to which the study can be considered a consistent whole (Yardley, 2015). This is accomplished by being clear and arguing properly, while at the same time preserving the nuances in the data (Willig, 2013). Through presenting findings in a meaningful way, whilst 'guiding' the reader through the text, the researcher will achieve coherence, and credibility (Kitto, Chesters, & Grbich, 2008). I have aimed to do this through accounts of the relationships between the different parts of the theoretical framework, as well as aiming to make my analytic understanding as transparent as possible. Especially in this last chapter, when using the theoretical framework in relation to the participant data, I have aimed to create a consistent whole by making a clear case for this relationship.

- *Commitment and rigor:* It should be demonstrated properly in the research that the analysis has the necessary breadth and depth, as well as how data is collected and analyzed. Being transparent with data is necessary to achieve procedural rigor (Kitto, Chesters, & Grbich, 2008). Furthermore, it should be visible from the study that the researcher has achieved an adequate understanding of relevant theory, and of the methodological skills necessary (Yardley, 2015). I have aimed to do this by explaining all theory adequately, as well as by backing up all my analytic and explanatory accounts in the data itself and in the theory.
- *Transferability:* The usefulness of the study in relation to the studied phenomenon. This can be done by critically evaluating findings against similar contexts, as well as discussing relevance to current knowledge, practice, and research (Kitto, Chesters, & Grbich, 2008). Since there is limited research available on tools like Leap Canvas, and none on the tool itself, the evaluative criterion for transferability are limited. However, the research that is available is presented briefly, and related to this study when possible and judged valuable. The transferability aspect can, however, be discussed in relevance to current knowledge. Since current knowledge is limited, properly relating findings to existing knowledge and theory is valuable, and an objective of the study. This is done throughout, and most notably in this chapter. Furthermore, a section called implications for further research is included below.

Conclusion

In the beginning of the results-chapter, it was mentioned that experiences and reflections regarding Leap Canvas are interlinked. This has become even more clear throughout the discussion-chapter, seeing as the experiences of participants in this study are broadly centered around realizations that their knowledge is incomplete. It is through this experience that participants reflect upon the need for change and as such connecting experiences and reflections. What is more, this connection makes possible an argument for the Leap Canvas workshop creating knowledge and a subsequent intention to change behavior as well as organizational functioning amongst participants.

Furthermore, across participants in this study, there seems to be an overall experience of Leap Canvas as being valuable to the organization. That might be as important as anything when aiming to answer the research question "*What are the experiences and reflections of*

Leap Canvas participants?" in the context of the aims of the Leap Canvas workshop. As has become apparent during this final chapter, what participants value is that which can ultimately inspire an intention to change, and in Leap Canvas these intentions arise because of social influence and knowledge. The combination of open discussion and knowledge creation seems to be an important part of what makes participants experience the workshop positively, and it is the reason experiences and reflections must be interpreted within a Knowledge Management framework. As such, the open discussion regarding IP and IPR competitiveness, and the knowledge this creates, has the ability to "*make the status quo seem more dangerous than launching into the unknown"* (Kotter, 1995, p. 60), opening participants to the idea that change is necessary. As was mentioned introductorily, it is not the aim of this research to find out if participants follow through with plans to change. Intentions to change and actually changing does not match perfectly (Sheeran, 2002), but what can be argued is that the Leap Canvas participants have a better understanding of the necessity of change, which seems to make them increasingly ready for change.

Implications for further research. One of the biggest strengths of this study might very well be its potential for influencing further research, not only Leap Canvas research, but regarding comparable tools, such as SWOT and Business Model Canvas, as well. As argued, it seems to be in the best interest of these tools and others like them to get more data supporting their efficiency. By using the themes from this analysis as a basis for creating larger, quantitative studies these potential studies can be more goal directed and reduce the chance of failure due to trying to measure an effect that does not exist, as Ajzen (n.d.) warns. Even if further research opts not to rely on a behavioral intention framework, it is likely that the findings from this study can guide construction of questionnaires and interview guides, as it is made clear how and under which circumstances participants experience gaining knowledge, and their reflections as to the subsequent use of this knowledge to pursue change.

References

Ajzen, I. (n.d.). *Constructing a Theory of Planned Behavior Questionnaire.* Retrieved from http://people.umass.edu/aizen/pdf/tpb.intervention.pdf

Ajzen, I. (1985). From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.). *Action Control: From Cognition to Behavior*. (pp. 11-39). Berlin: Springer-Verlag

Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179-211.

Ajzen, I. (2011). The theory of planned behaviour: Reactions and reflections. *Psychology and Health*, *26*(9), 1113-1127. DOI: 10.1080/08870446.2011.613995

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. M*is Quarterly, 25*(1), 107-136.

Ali, A., & Yusof, H. (2011). Quality in Qualitative Studies: The Case of Validity, Reliability, and Generalizability. *Issues in Social and Environmental Accounting, 5*(1/2), 25-64

Argyris, C. (1991). Teaching Smart People How to Learn. *Harvard Business Review 4*(2), 4-15.

Armenakis, A., & Harris, S. (2002). Crafting a change message to create transformational readiness. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 15(*2), 169-183. DOI: 10.1108/09534810210423080

Armenakis, A., Harris, S., & Mossholder, K. (1993). Creating Readiness for Organizational Change. *Human Relations, 46*(6), 681-703. DOI: 10.1177/001872679304600601

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic Analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 57-71). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Brinkmann, S. (2014). Interview. In *Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology* (pp. 1008-1010). Springer: New York.

Ching, H. & Faucel, C. (2013). Criticisms, Variations and Experiences with Business Model Canvas. *European Journal of Agricultural and Forestry Research 1*(2). 26-37.

Clarke, V., Braun, V., & Hayfield, N. (2015). Thematic Analysis. In Smith, J (Ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (3rd ed.) (pp. 222 – 248). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Coes, D. H. (2014). *Critically assessing the strengths and limitations of the Business Model Canvas* (Master's thesis) University of Twente. Retrieved from essay.utwente.nl/64749/1/Coes_MA_MB.pdf

Daft, R., & Lengel, R. (1986). Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design. *Management Science, 32*(5), 554-571.

Dalkir, K. (2005). *Knowledge Management in Theory and Practice.* Burlington, MA: Elsevier Inc.

Davenport, T., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Dennis, A., & Kinney, S. (1998). Testing Media Richness Theory in the New Media: The Effects of Cues, Feedback, and Task Equivocality. *Information Systems Research, 9*(3), 256-274. DOI: 10.1287/isre.9.3.256

Duncanson, K., Dip, G., Burrows, T., Holman, B., & Collins, C. (2013). Parents' Perceptions of Child Feeding: A Qualitative Study Based on the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 34*, 227-236. DOI: 10.1097/DBP.0b013e31828b2ccf

Elliott, R., Fischer, C., & Rennie, D. (1999). Evolving guidelines for publication of qualitative research studies in psychology and related fields. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *38*(3), 215-229. DOI: 10.1348/014466599162782

Elmes, D. G., Kantowitz, B. H., Roediger, H. L. (2012). *Research methods in psychology* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Elving, W. J. L. (2005). The Role of Communication in Organizational Change. *Corporate Communication, 10*(2). 129-138.

Evans, M. & Ali. (2013). Bridging knowledge management life cycle theory and practice. *International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management and Organisational Learning 2013. 156-165.* Retrieved from https://issuu.com/acpil/docs/icickm2013-proceedings-issuu1

Evans, M., Dalkir, K., & Bidian. (2014). A Holistic View of the Knowledge Life Cycle: The Knowledge Management Cycle (KMC) Model. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management 12*(2), 85-97.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Geertz, c. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. USA: BasicBooks

Gettier, E. L. (1963). Is justified true belief knowledge? *Analysis, 23*(6), 121-123.

Girard, J., & Girard, J. (2015). Defining knowledge management: Toward an applied compendium. *Online Journal of Applied Knowledge Management*, 3(1), 1-20.

Heisig, P. (2009). Harmonisation of knowledge management – comparing 160 KM frameworks around the globe. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 13*(4), 4-31. DOI: 10.1108/13673270910971798

Helms, M. M., & Nixon, J. (2010). Exploring SWOT analysis-where are we now? A review of academic research from the last decade. *Journal of strategy and management*, *3*(3), 215-251. DOI: 10.1108/17554251011064837

Henwood, K. and Pidgeon, N.F. (1992) Qualitative research and psychological theorising, *British Journal of Psychology, 83*(1): 97–112. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8295.1992.tb02426.x

Ichikawa, J. & Steup, M. (2017). The Analysis of Knowledge. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Ed). Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/knowledge-analysis/

Kitto, S., Chesters, J., & Grbich, C. (2008). Quality in Qualitative Research: Criteria for Authors and Assessors in the Submission and Assessment of Qualitative Research Articles for the Medical Journal of Australia. *Medical Journal of Australia, 188*(4), 243-246.

Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail. *Harvard Business Review, 73*(2), 59-67.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA.: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Madill, A., Jordan, A., & Shirley, C. (2000). Objectivity and reliability in qualitative analysis: Realist, contextualist and radical constructionist epistemologies. *British Journal of Psychology, 91*(1), 1-20.

McEachan, R., Conner, M., Taylor, N., & Lawton, R. (2011). Prospective prediction of health-related behaviours with the Theory of Planned Behaviour: A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology Review, 5*(2), 97-144. DOI: 10.1080/17437199.2010.521684

McQueen, R. (1998). Four Views of Knowledge and Knowledge Management. *Americas Conference on Information Systems 1998 Proceedings.* 609-611. Retrieved from https://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1631&context=amcis1998

Meaney, M. & Pung, C. (2008). McKinsey global results: Creating organizational transformations. *The McKinsey Quarterly, 7*(3), 1-7.

Miller, V., Johnson, J., & Grau, J. (1994). Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *22*(1), 59-80. DOI: 0.1080/00909889409365387

Montaño, D. E. & Kasprzyk, D. (2008). Theory of Reasoned Action, Theory of Planned Behavior, and the Integrated Behavioral Model. In K. Glanz, B. K. Rimer, K. Viswanath (Eds.). *Health Behavior and Health Education: Theory, Research, and Practice* (4th ed.) (pp. 67-96) San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Nonaka, I. (1991). The Knowledge-Creating Company. *Harvard Business Review. 69*(6), 96-104

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization science*, *5*(1), 14-37.

Nonaka, I., & Von Krogh, G. (2009). Tacit Knowledge and Knowledge Conversion: Controversy and Advancement in Organizational Knowledge Creation Theory. *Organization Science, 20*(3), 635-652. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.1080.0412

Oreg, S., Vakola M., & Aemenakis, A. (2011). Change Recipients' Reactions to Organizational Change: A 60-Year Review of Quantitative Studies. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 47*(4), 461-524. DOI: 10.1177/0021886310396550

Osterwalder, A., Smith, A., Clark, T., Pijl, P., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business model generation: A handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers*. Hoboken, N.J: John Wiley

Polanyi, M. (1962). Tacit knowing: Its bearing on some problems of philosophy. *Reviews of modern physics*, 34(4), 601-616. DOI: 10.1103/RevModPhys.34.601

Polanyi, M. (1966). The logic of tacit inference. *Philosophy, 41*(155), 1-18.

Rafferty, A., Jimmieson, N., & Armenakis, A. (2013). Change Readiness. *Journal of Management, 39*(1), 110-135. DOI: 10.1177/0149206312457417

Renzi, S. & Klobas, J. E. (2008). Theory of Planned Behavior and Qualitative Research. *Dondena Working Paper (12),* 1-26. Retrieved from: http://www.dondena.unibocconi.it/wps/wcm/connect/Cdr/Centro_Dondena/Home/Working+Papers/Working_Paper_12_CdR_Dondena

Schubert, P., Lincke, D., & Schmid. (1998). A Global Knowledge Medium as a Virtual Community: The NetAcademy Concept. *Americas Conference on Information Systems 1998 Proceedings.* 618-620 Retrieved from http://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1634&context=amcis1998

Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention-Behavior Relations: A Conceptual and Empirical Review. E*uropean Review of Social Psychology, 12*(1), 1-36. DOI: 10.1080/14792772143000003

Smith, J. A. & Osborn, M. (2015). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In J. A. Smith (ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (3rd ed.) (pp. 25 – 52). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Stavroulakis, P. J., & Riza, E. (2015). Meta-calculations of Quantitative SWOT Analysis: A Crosstab Approach. *International Journal of Strategic Innovative Marketing*, *02*, 48-60. DOI: 10.15556/IJSIM.02.02.004

Tolich, M. (2004). Internal Confidentiality: When Confidentiality Assurances Fail Relational Informants. *Qualitative Sociology, 27*(1), 101-106. DOI: 10.1023/B:QUAS.0000015546.20441.4a

Tuomi, I. (1999). Data is more than knowledge: Implications of the reversed knowledge hierarchy for knowledge management and organizational memory. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 16*(3), 103-117. DOI: 10.1109/HICSS.1999.772795

Vance, D. M. (1997). Information, knowledge and wisdom: The epistemic hierarchy and computer-based information systems. *Americas Conference on Information Systems 1997 Proceedings.* Retrieved from http://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1519&context=amcis1997

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS quarterly, 27*(3). 425-478.

von Krogh, G. (1998). Care in knowledge creation. *California management review*, *40*(3), 133-153. DOI: 10.2307/41165947

Wang, S. & Noe, R.A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A Review and Directions for Future Research. *Human Resource Management Review 20*(2010). 115-131.

Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology* (3rd ed.). Berkshire: Open University Press.

Winograd, T. (1986). *Understanding computers and cognition: A new foundation for design*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2004). *WIPO Intellectual Property Handbook.* Geneva: Switzerland: World Intellectual Property Organization.

Yardley, L. (2000). Dilemmas in qualitative health research. *Psychology and Health, 15*(2), 215-228. DOI: 10.1080/08870440008400302

Yardley, L. (2015). Demonstrating Validity in Qualitative Psychology. In J. A. Smith (ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (3rd ed.) (pp. 257 – 272). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Zoellner, J., Krzeski, E., Harden, S., Cook, E., Allen, K., & Estabrooks, P. A. (2012). Qualitative Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior to Understand Beverage Behaviors among Adults. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, 112*(11), 1774-1784. DOI: 10.1016/j.jand.2012.06.368

Zott, C., Amit, R., & Massa, L. (2010). The business model: Theoretical roots, recent developments, and future research. *IESE business school-University of Navarra*, 1-43.

Appendix A

Participation Agreement and Information Document

Erfaringer ved bruk av LEAP Kanvas

Informasjonsskriv

Bakgrunn og formål
Formålet med dette forskningsprosjektet er å forstå hvordan deltakere på LEAP Kanvas oppfatter verktøyet i praksis. Som LEAP Kanvas-deltaker sitter du på erfaringer og opplevelser som vi gjerne ønsker innsyn i. Dine erfaringer kan være en viktig del av det forskningsbaserte grunnlaget vi ønsker å skape for verktøyet.

Dette forskningsprosjektet er et mastergradsprosjekt under arbeid- og organisasjonspsykologi ved Psykologisk Institutt, NTNU. Mastergradsprosjekter utføres av studenter under veiledning av faglig ansvarlig ved instituttet. Faglig ansvarlig for prosjektet er førsteamanuensis Fay Giæver

Hva betyr deltakelse i prosjektet?
Deltakelse i forskningsprosjektet betyr at du vil bli intervjuet av meg, Håvard Almås, om dine erfaringer og opplevelser knyttet til deltakelse på LEAP Kanvas. Intervjuene vil bli tatt opp, transkribert (skrevet ned), og anonymisert. Deretter vil opptakene slettes, for å sikre din anonymitet.

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?
Det vil ikke spørres om informasjon som gjør deg direkte gjenkjennelig for andre (slik som navn, bosted, alder osv.) i intervjuet. Hvis det i løpet av intervjuet allikevel kommer frem informasjon som kan gjør deg gjenkjennbar, f.eks. gjennom en kombinasjon av yrke og utdanning, vil dette ekskluderes fra transkripsjonen. Lydopptak av intervjuet vil kun være tilgjengelig for meg, og vil slettes så fort informasjonen er transkribert og anonymisert. Det forventes at prosjektet vil være ferdigstilt innen 01.05.2018, og innen denne dato vil all informasjon om deg være fullstendig anonymisert.

Frivillig deltakelse.
Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke om deltakelse, uten å oppgi grunn for dette.

Om du har noen spørsmål utover dette, ta gjerne kontakt på mail haavarba@stud.ntnu.no eller telefon 92881714.

Samtykke
Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og er villig til å delta

---

(signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)

Appendix B

Interview Questionnaire Guide

- Først av alt, kan du fortelle kort hva du arbeider med?
- hvordan syns du workshopen gikk?
  - Var det givende/interessant?
  - Syns du det passet bra til bedriften du jobber i?

En viktig del av Leap kanvas er IP og IPR, hva er ditt forhold til dette?

- Ble du mer bevisst på rollen til IP og IPR?
- Mener du at dere har god kontroll på egne IP ressurser?
  - Har dit syn på viktigheten endret seg?
- Hvordan opplever du deres IP-strategi, er den tilstrekkelig?
- Tror du at dere klarer å tette de hullene som dere fant her?
  - Hvordan vil du bruke det dere har lært i dag i tiden fremover?

Nå har dere forsøkt å kartlegge utfordringer, og fortrinn, så jeg vil snakke litt om det

- Med tanke på utfordringer, kom det frem noen ting du ikke har tenkt på tidligere?
- Syns du at din rolle i å svare på disse utfordringer og fortrinn er tydelig?
  - Har du troa på at du skal få det til?
- Kom der frem noen fortrinn dere ikke har vurdert?
- ble du mer bevisst på de fortrinn dere som bedrift har?
  - evt. Hvordan opplevdes denne bevisstgjøringen? Positivt/negativt?
- **Hva syns du om prioriteringsplanen dere lagde?**
  - Hvordan vil du ta den i bruk i tiden fremover
  - Syns du det var nyttig å få en slik plan? Er det verdifullt for dere?

Nå har dere jo vært gjennom en workshop hvor samarbeid er veldig viktig, så jeg vil gjerne stille et par spørsmål om dette.

- Hvordan syns du samarbeidet i gruppa fungerte i workshopen?
  - Hvordan samarbeider dere vanligvis?
  - Noe som kunne vært bedre?
- Var dere on the same page?

Noe annet som kom frem i løpet av workshopen som var nyttig å ta med seg videre?

Appendix C

Original (Norwegian) Interview Excerpts

Informant 1

I1:"*Yes, I believe the continuous classification of what we are building regarding IP and protecting it accordingly, and being aware of that, is something that we are going to remember. Being conscious that well, really, that we are focused on what is most important to us, that concretizes our thoughts in what we are working towards, and what we protect. That is something that… we won't forget that now."*

Ja, jeg tror at det å stadig klassifisere hva vi bygger opp av IP og verne det deretter, og være bevisst på det, er noe vi kommer til å ta med oss videre, det å være bevisst på ja, egentlig at, at vi har fokus på hva er det som er viktigst for oss, det spisser jo litt inn tankegangen på hva vi jobber mot, og hva vi verner. Det er noe som ... vi kommer ikke til å glemme det nå

I1: Very fun, very nice way to pull some strings, and get some frames of reference Yes, really it was a bit like… it was a quick way to get through different opportunities "

Veldig morsomt, veldig fin måte å få, ja dratt i tråder, og fått litt knagger å henge ting på. Ja, egentlig en sånn litt sånn ... det var en rask måte å komme gjennom ulike muligheter

I1: *"[…] whether [newfound knowledge of IP and IPR] came from [facilitator] or if it came from the game…it comes from both of those, really. […] We were sitting there with [facilitator] too, and we got a lot of good advice from [facilitator]"*

Om det kom ut av [fasilitator] eller om det kom ut av spillet, det kommer jo ut av begge deler da. Vi satt jo der med [fasilitator] og da, og vi fikk jo veldig mange gode tips fra [fasilitator]

I1"*And that was something that I got out of the game, […] it made me very aware that we should rent out equipment and not sell it, that gives us an extra protection, since it allows us to control the market on the product"* (I1).

Og det var noe som jeg fikk ut av spillet her da, det er jo ikke helt det som er spørsmålet ditt i dette spørsmålet, men det gjorde meg veldig bevisst på at vi leier ut utstyr og ikke selger det, gir oss en ekstra beskyttelse, ved at vi kontrollerer dette markedet på produktet.

I1: "*And this [graphical representation of IP in the organization]is also a bit of a consequence of the game, that we've sat down and structured it like this, gotten to what IP we actually have. And it was the game that made us 'dig it up', [and think] what do we actually have?*

Men dette er jo også litt sånn følge av spillet da, at vi har satt og strukturert det sånn her, få frem hva vi har av IP. Så det var egentlig spillet som gjorde at vi gravde litt opp, hva er det egentlig vi har?

I1*: "There are a lot of tasks here that we were not aware of having to do, that arose through [facilitator] and the game"*

Det er mange oppgaver her som vi ikke var klar over at vi måtte gjøre, men som kom frem gjennom [fasilitator] og spillet da

Informant 2

I2: *" [...] so in relation to the goals we established in our timeframe, there were some things we listed that are going to be important, of which we have not been aware earlier. Whether this was brand new things or yeah, several of these things does at least surface, which might be more pivotal then ... then what we have previously discussed."*

Så når vi ser med tanke på de målene som vi satt der i det tidsperspektivet så var det noen ting vi satt opp som kommer til å bli viktig, som vi ikke har hatt noe mye bevissthet på før da. Så om det var helt nye ting eller ja, det kommer jo vertfall fram flere sånne ting som kanskje var mer avgjørende enn ... enn vi har snakka om før da.

I2:"*[...] well, I have a belief, and the other [person] has a belief, and then we see that we are not sure. That was maybe a bit ... those times when we did not agree, we found out that well, here is something that is not known, or that is not well enough communicated since we both don't know it"*

Jeg har et inntrykk og den andre har et inntrykk, også ser vi at vi er usikker, vi er. Det var kanskje litt der ... de gangene vi ikke var enig, så fant vi ut at ja her er det noe som enten er usikkert, eller som ikke er godt nok kommunisert siden vi ikke vet det begge to.

I2: "*[...]and that's feedback to [the facilitator] too, that he participated in the discussion on actions that can be taken on various areas. So that was useful, that it was both creating awareness* *about us, and learning and surveying of us, in addition to input from, and tips and learning from [the facilitator]"*

Det var jo også litt en tilbakemelding til [fasilitator] der da, at han var med i diskusjonen, at det var, om ting, tiltak vi kan gjøre på forskjellige områder. Så et var nyttig, at det var både litt bevisstgjøring om oss, og litt læring og kartlegging av oss, i tillegg til de inputs fra, og tips fra, og sånn sett læring fra han [ansatt HOK].

I2: "*[…]to be clearer regarding what we have good control over and what we do not control properly, and, well, which areas we have to work with, and tips as to how we can do it, […] what measures we can utilize on different areas"*

Bli litt mer klar over hva vi har kontroll på og hva vi ikke har så god kontroll på, også, ja hvilke områder har vi å jobbe med og litt tips til hvordan, hva vi kan gjør, det var jo også litt en tilbakemelding til [ansatt HOK] der da, at han var med i diskusjonen, at det var, om ting, tiltak vi kan gjøre på forskjellige områder.

I2: " […] *Yes, it was good to think about things that can happen, so that was an advantage of it, that we got to discuss 'yes, this could happen, what if it does happen, what do we do then?' so it's just about having talked about it, now we are better prepared on several things, just by thinking about scenarios, and discussing what could be done"*

Eh, ja, det var jo litt greit å få tenkt over ting som kan skje, så det var jo en fordel med det, at vi fikk drøfte at "ja, det her kan skje, hva om det skjer, hva gjør vi da?", så det er jo bare det å ha snakka om det, nå er vi jo bedre forberedt på flere ting, bare ved at vi har tenkt over scenarier, og diskutert litt hva man kan gjøre.

I2: "*We got to work on ... our concrete case, and we got to [think]both about potential problems and thoughts and such, and a bit on the solutions. So yeah ... I feel it was effective learning, and effective to come in and view and discuss those things that you…that are relevant to us."*

Vi fikk jobbet med ehm våre reelle caser, og vi fikk ... og der alt var greit så gikk vi fort igjennom, også stoppet vi der det var et tema å gå nærmere inn på, og da fikk vi tenkt litt, vi fra |bedriftsnavn] og så var det jo litt input fra [fasilitator] og da på de ... både på litt sånn problemstillinger og tanker og sånt, og også litt på lønningssiden. Så da ... jeg syns det var effektiv læring, og effektivt å komme å få sett på og diskutert litt de tingene som man ... som var aktuelle da

Informant 3

I3: Well, the importance of IP didn't necessarily become any clearer, but how we can use it to our advantage became clearer, since we got some new perspectives on this."(I3)

Nja, viktigheten til IP ble vel ikke nødvendigvis tydeligere, men hvordan vi kan nyttiggjøre oss av den bedre ble mer tydelig da vi fikk noen nye perspektiver på det

I3: "*Yes it helped in any case with thinking differently than just protecting technology. For instance, getting ownership of a standardization process, to make use of the technology for our self"*

Ja den hjalp hvert fall litt å tenke litt i andre baner enn å bare beskytte teknologien, for eksempel ifht. det å heller ta eierskap til en standardiseringsprosess, sånn at vi kan utnytte teknologien selv

I3: "*We got some new perspectives [on IP], but I don't know if it has that much to do with the way the process was done, or if it had to do with the input from he who led the process, it could be both"*

Vi fikk noen nye perspektiver på det, men jeg vet ikke om det har så mye med måten den prosessen ble gjort på, eller om det hadde med innspill fra han som kjørte prosessen da, det kan være både og da.

I3: " *[...] these concrete scenarios which arise. Because then you get to stop and think 'yes, what if that had happened to us?' so that I found very positive. And even if we couldn't answer everything, there was a lot we could answer. And the answers we did have were not 100% [right], so that is definitely valuable."*

Disse konkrete sakene som kommer opp da. For da får du stoppe opp og tenke litt "ja, men hva om det hadde skjedd hos oss da?" så den syns jeg var veldig positiv. Og selv om vi ikke hadde svar på alt av det, så var det veldig mye vi hadde svar på da. Og de svarene vi hadde var ikke 100%, så det er absolutt verdifullt sånn sett da.

I3: "[…] *The process in itself is valuable, not necessarily the result that follows, but it creates more awareness regarding what you are currently doing. If you do a canvas process on IP, then you create through that process a conscious… a more conscious relationship to IP."*

Den prosessen i seg selv er jo verdifull da, ikke nødvendigvis resultatet som kommer etterpå, men det skaper mer bevissthet om det du holder på med. Hvis du kjøerer en kanvasprosess på IP, så skaper du jo gjennom det å ha prosessen en bevisst ... et mer bevisst forhold til IP da.

I3: "*It was fun, interesting. We got some new ideas and perspectives"*

Det var artig det. Interessant, Vi fikk frem noen nye ideer og perspektiver da.

Informant 4

I4: "[people said]*it was an eye-opener, especially the software people got several Aha! Moments*

Jeg tror det var ... og det var folk som sa det eksplisitt, at det var en eye-opener, ehm , spesielt disse software folkene da. Fikk en del sånne aha opplevelser

I4: "[…] *[facilitator] is very 'on', very engaged, and he is always watching what is going on and providing feedback, and I think that is necessary in this kind of workshop, that those facilitating the course is there and visible, [to make sure that] people do not sit in a vacuum, and doesn't progress"*

[fasilitator] er veldig på, veldig engasjert, og han følger med hele tiden det som foregår og kommer med innspill, og det tror jeg er nødvendig i en sånn workshop, at den som fasiliterer kurset er med og er synlig at ikke folk blir sittende i vakuum, og ikke kommer seg videre

I4: *" Experiences from the workshop last week with us, was at least that people were very engaged, and [they] discussed, and everyone participated"*

Erfaringer fra den workshopen i forrige uke med oss, var i hvert fall at folk var veldig med da, og diskuterte og sto og ... bidro alle sammen.

I4: " […] *the implementation is concrete as I said, that we are actually getting it digitalized, and therefore actually get it disseminated, and get it anchored in management, that is what is important here. […] I think that is how we have to work, try to anchor things high up, as high up as possible, as well as down on our baseline of workers, to make everyone more aware"*

Implementeringen er jo konkret i det som jeg sa, at vi faktisk får det i digital form og faktisk får det spredt og får det forankret i ledelsen, det er jo det som er viktig å få til her da. Og jeg tror det er sånn vi må jobbe da. Jeg tror vi må både prøve å få forankret ting høyt oppe, høyest opp som mulig, og ned på gressroten da, sånn at du får en sånn at alle blir mer bevisste da

I4:"*So it is absolutely clear that I discovered a lot of things which [was discussed], that I had not thought about previously […] So absolutely, the answer is yes, there was new information for me, and whether that was new things that no one had thought about earlier, I don't know"*

Så det er helt klart så jeg oppdaget jo hvert fall mange ting som kom på bordet som jeg ikke hadde tenkt over. Så absolutt, svaret er ja, det kom nye ting for meg, og om det kom nye ting som ingen har tenkt på før, det vet jeg ikke eh det kan jeg ikke svare verken ja eller nei til.

I4: "*You don't think about everything every day, so like, it's good to get some input, it's a diversity [of people], you know, a diversity which you pour from when you do group work*"

For det er ikke alt du går og tenker på til daglig, sånn at, det er greit å få innspill da, det er jo et mangfold ikke sant, et mangfold som du øser ut av når du har gruppearbeid

Informant 5

I5: "*a general increase in consciousness regarding the terms IPR, patenting, and freedom to operate is positive in the organization"*

En generell bevisstgjøring rundt begrepene IPR, patent, freedom to operate det ser man som eh en plussting å få gjort i bedriften.

I5: **"***What I think is often challenging, is that you do not feel the need for this knowledge until you need it, and then when a problem rises, you think 'we should have known this'."*

Det jeg tenker som ofte er utfordringen, er at man kjenner ofte ikke helt behovet for denne kunnskapen før man trenger det, også når det først dukker opp en problemstilling, så tenker man "dette skulle vi kunnet"

I5: "*So what I have done is that I have summed up input from the participants, that was six people, and then sent it upwards in the organization, so that they can evaluate what value it will have for us. So that's how I have continued working with it, processed it, concretized it, and gotten* *feedback that it is important"*

Så det jeg har gjort da er at jeg har summert opp en input fra de som var med, det var jo seks stykker, også sendt det videre oppover i organisasjonen, sånn at de kan vurdere verdien for oss. Så det er det jeg mener med at jeg har jobbet videre med det da. Bearbeidet det, konkretisert det, og fått tilbakemelding på at dette er viktig

I5: "*Yes, and risk reduction, by being precautionary, and the issues related to that, which we discussed during the workshop, and the importance thereof*".

Ja, og reduksjon av risiko da, ved å være i forkant, og problemstillingene knyttet til det vi tok opp i workshoppen, og viktigheten av det

5: *"The perception we have is that we are very happy with it. Erm, a lot of issues became apparent, which arise when you work with it."*

Oppfatningen vi har er at vi var veldig fornøyd med det. Ehm, ble tydelig en del problemstillinger som oppstår når man jobber med det.

Appendix D

NSD Letter of Approval

NSD

Fay Giæver
Institutt for psykologi NTNU

7491 TRONDHEIM

Vår dato: 20.06.2017 Vår ref: 54554 / 3 / BGH Deres dato: Deres ref:

TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 29.05.2017. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet:

54554	*Erfaringer ved deltakelse i fasilitert gruppediskusjon*
Behandlingsansvarlig	*NTNU, ved institusjonens øverste leder*
Daglig ansvarlig	*Fay Giæver*
Student	*Håvard Almås*

Personvernombudet har vurdert prosjektet og finner at behandlingen av personopplysninger er meldepliktig i henhold til personopplysningsloven § 31. Behandlingen tilfredsstiller kravene i personopplysningsloven.

Personvernombudets vurdering forutsetter at prosjektet gjennomføres i tråd med opplysningene gitt i meldeskjemaet, korrespondanse med ombudet, ombudets kommentarer samt personopplysningsloven og helseregisterloven med forskrifter. Behandlingen av personopplysninger kan settes i gang.

Det gjøres oppmerksom på at det skal gis ny melding dersom behandlingen endres i forhold til de opplysninger som ligger til grunn for personvernombudets vurdering. Endringsmeldinger gis via et eget skjema, http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvernombud/meld_prosjekt/meld_endringer.html. Det skal også gis melding etter tre år dersom prosjektet fortsatt pågår. Meldinger skal skje skriftlig til ombudet.

Personvernombudet har lagt ut opplysninger om prosjektet i en offentlig database, http://pvo.nsd.no/prosjekt.

Personvernombudet vil ved prosjektets avslutning, 01.05.2018, rette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Kjersti Haugstvedt

Belinda Gloppen Helle

Kontaktperson: Belinda Gloppen Helle tlf: 55 58 28 74
Vedlegg: Prosjektvurdering

Dokumentet er elektronisk produsert og godkjent ved NSDs rutiner for elektronisk godkjenning.

NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS Harald Hårfagres gate 29 Tel: +47-55 58 21 17 nsd@nsd.no Org.nr. 985 321 884
NSD – Norwegian Centre for Research Data NO-5007 Bergen, NORWAY Faks: +47-55 58 96 50 www.nsd.no

Personvernombudet for forskning

Prosjektvurdering - Kommentar

Prosjektnr: 54554

Utvalget informeres skriftlig og muntlig om prosjektet og samtykker til deltakelse. Informasjonsskrivet er godt utformet, men dato for forventet prosjektslutt (01.05.2018) må legges til, sammen med informasjon om at innen denne datoen skal datamaterialet anonymiseres.

Personvernombudet legger til grunn at forsker etterfølger NTNU sine interne rutiner for datasikkerhet.

Forventet prosjektslutt er 01.05.2018. Ifølge prosjektmeldingen skal innsamlede opplysninger da anonymiseres. Anonymisering innebærer å bearbeide datamaterialet slik at ingen enkeltpersoner kan gjenkjennes. Det gjøres ved å:
- slette direkte personopplysninger (som navn/koblingsnøkkel)
- slette/omskrive indirekte personopplysninger (identifiserende sammenstilling av bakgrunnsopplysninger som f.eks. bosted/arbeidssted, alder og kjønn)
- slette digitale lydopptak