

11^{ème} congrès de l'Académie de l'Entrepreneuriat et de l'Innovation

Intrapreneurship as a new way of work: an exploratory research

Exploring “Work Dimensions” for Intrapreneurs

Frank Rouault¹ and Hady Khalaf²,

¹ Practical Learning, Paris, France, 0033608717234, p.l.france@orange.fr

² Bel, Beirut, Lebanon, 009613548961, hadykhalaf@gmail.com

January 2019

Key words: Intrapreneurs, work dimensions, personal development,

Abstract

Abstract: Most organizations explicitly seek engaged employees who will act as intrapreneurs i.e entrepreneurs in organizations (Antonic, 2001) as they realize they need to change the ways people work to address their daily challenges, accelerate their transformation and serve their future ambitions. This is easier said than done and empirical work and coaching initiatives have triggered the hunch that the essential work dimensions of an intrapreneur match the core functions of any organization. To explore this intuition, we defined new work dimensions through coding practices from Grounded Theory (Glaser, Strauss, 1967) and conducted 40 semi structured qualitative interviews with managers, consultants and leaders in France. Our initial findings show a strong receptivity on these work dimensions for today's context and a growing importance in the future. This opens the way to additional research to explore the validity and reliability of these initial findings towards building intrapreneurs' work dimensions.

Introduction

Since the late 80's, competencies have been at the forefront of the performance conversation and organizations can find many Competency Providers that propose a myriad of options from the 67 competencies of Lominger to the 112 from DDI. Exhaustive lists of competencies become a challenge to handle due to two reasons: the human mind manages optimally seven plus or minus two items for any given subject (Miller, 1956) and today's recognized agile ways of working make it hard to focus on such a competency “spread”. Organizational thirst for engagement and for employees acting, as Intrapreneurs are is high on the agendas of all leaders looking to stay competitive and to innovate. This issue reveals itself as being very challenging to crack.

This paper focuses on proposing new work dimensions to enable any one within an organization to act thoughtfully as an intrapreneur. It reflects a first attempt to explore new work dimensions for intrapreneurs. The findings and limitations of this qualitative research

and its contribution to practice and theory are then discussed.

Literature review

Our volatile, uncertain, complex and, ambiguous context often described as VUCA makes all of us reconsider the ways we contribute through our work. Successful Organizations that succeed employ people who are engaged in the organization's performance and are able to conduct discretionary efforts (Kruse, 2015). Companies are more convinced today to shift their current ways of working towards unleashing everyone's capacity to act as a thoughtful builder of optimal value. In our consulting and entrepreneurial activities, we observe senior leaders change their approach to talent management and state they look for "game changers, rule breakers, innovators, change makers, self-starters, rain makers, entrepreneurs, intrapreneurs which is the word we hear the most. Sicotte, Delerue and Drouin (2015) state that entrepreneurship appears to contribute the most to performance and innovation portfolio management. Leybourne (2010) argues employees must act more like entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs. We have observed that since the late 1980s that the "competencies journey" has brought solid support for people's development. In such rapidly changing times, however, leaders realize they need to accompany a shift more towards supporting and equipping people with working dimensions that will provide spaces for them to take the initiative to grow, manage the daily complexity they experience, and engage as intrapreneurs who are entrepreneurs within existing organizations (Antonic, 2001). This is in line with Sharma and Chrisman (1999) who define corporate entrepreneurship as "the process whereby an individual or a group of individuals in association within an existing organization create a new organization or instigate renewal or innovation within that organization" (Seshadri, Tripathy, 2006). To shift towards being be such an actor, we know from our experience proposing innovation initiatives and creating three companies that one needs to act on all "fronts", and be able to juggle a myriad of diverse activities, including client prospecting, breaking traditional ways of working, initiating and following up on experimentation, recruiting and managing, as well as the more mundane aspects of management, to name just a few. So organizations who are succeeding on intrapreneurship are able to establish proper systems that structure the management of intrapreneurial activities. This means "thinking and acting as a system," as "system thinking focuses on recognizing the interconnections among various parts of a system and then synthesizing them into a cohesive view of the whole" (Anderson and Johnson, 1997). A system is viewed holistically as a complex network of interacting, reinforcing, and balancing processes (Lee, Green, 2015). To succeed in introducing intrapreneurial new ways of work, organizations must accordingly build new systems that turn traditional organizational functions such as Sales, Marketing, Production...into intrapreneurial unit. This means that these functions can be separated in terms of technical skills but are unified in terms of intrapreneurship work dimension.

We posit that for someone to act effectively as an intrapreneur in such a work context, the closest inspirational system to an intrapreneur at work is an organization or a business. A coaching event with a young business school graduate brought to light the importance of viewing one's work as a system leading to being an intrapreneur. That meeting sparked our desire to gather perspectives on "the organization as a system." We consulted the various quality management excellency models (such as those developed by the European Foundation for Quality Management, Malcolm Baldrige and Deming Institute) and through Grounded Theory coding techniques (Glaser, Strauss, 1967), concluded that organizations or businesses have a limited number of core "big functions" that characterize enablers and results, categories and principles of these respective models. They operate in specific(s) environment(s) and industry sectors. They have a client function they engage in to find, serve and keep the largest loyal customer base to generate sales; this would include sales, marketing, service functions. They have production functions that organize how they will

produce and deliver their unique proposition to their clients. They engage in innovation functions where they continuously invent their “offer” and practices; this is often organized as Research and Innovation centers more or less centralized. They operate Support functions that help them shape, organize and track their people, financial and technical resources like IT departments, HR, Administration. They are piloted by Management and Leadership functions that allow them to focus and drive continuously their efforts towards their ambition. Hopefully, all these functions generate value creation as no organization can survive in the long term without creating value. We have presented this framework to +300 leaders, managers and knowledge workers in training sessions and have not received any criticism or negative feedback on these findings. These functions can take many shapes and forms according to the types of businesses and organizations, and we foresee it was key to try to associate these system blocs with anyone working. So to act as an intrapreneur, all these functions appear critical, but we were not comfortable with the use of the word “functions” to describe what an intrapreneur engages in daily. Based on feedback we have received, we have borrowed from the construction world an explicit vocabulary that enabled us to map the functions onto relevant “higher” level competencies or work DIMENSIONS for Intrapreneurs (Table 1). So, our first initiative was to define these new work dimensions through accessing the academic databases and search for Dimensions that would make sense. A screening exercise has been done to filter the top six dimensions that are closest to what “Intrapreneurial Ways of Work.

**Table 1
Business Functions and Work Dimensions**

| Business Functions and Critical Outputs (summary of our review of Organizational Excellency models) | Intrapreneurs Core competencies or Work Dimensions |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operate in one or many industry sector(s) • Client function • Production function • Innovation function • Support function • Management and Leadership function • Value creation output | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical specialist(s) • Relationship builder • Work architect • Opportunity Designers • Business meteorologist • Future maker • Engagement operator |

In essence, an organization is the description of how a group of people organize themselves to create sustained value and, in today’s context, to serve the 3Ps (people, profits, and planet) and respond to the societal issues arising from their activities (Maon, Lindgreen, Swaen, 2008). We believe that for organizations to address their constant challenges and for anyone to act as a connected intrapreneur or entrepreneur within an organization, people should engage and grow continuously in all these dimensions. We therefore define the dimensions as a set of practices that enable someone to perform optimally as an intrapreneur in one’s own environment. This discussion reflects the STROBE conversation (Strategic Organizational Behavior) developed by Ployhart (2015) which combines the human capital aspect, defined as the individual knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAO’s), and Organizational Behavior, specifically the constructs, processes and phenomena of micro-organizational behavior and organizational psychology (such as relationships, leadership, engagement, trust, fairness, to name a few). Thus, STROBE serves both the needs of the organization and the needs of the people as it covers people performance and organizational competitive advantage and combines company and individual focus (p 345).

In pursuing this line of reasoning, our first initiative was to access academic databases, searching for research articles that would tell us if the Dimensions would make sense and to what extent they would be relevant. For all the Dimensions, we were pleased to find publications that connected each Dimension to a contribution outcome. These dimensions are presented as follows:

Work Dimension 1 : **Relationship Builder**, which we define as the ability to feed and nurture the quality, quantity, and variety of contacts and relationships, the research suggests that there is a link between perceived communication satisfaction and employee productivity, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness (Campbell, White, Johnson, 2003). Furthermore, according to Snyder (2015), Building Relationships is a critical success factor among Fortune's 100 best companies. McKirdy (2008) has summed up this importance this way: the least expensive investment yet greatest competitive advantage to business is having better conversations about work. Companies are not isolated from their environment and business is becoming more connected and inter-dependent. Sellers and buyers cannot succeed at the expense of each other but with each other. Intrapreneurs brings relationship building at the center of their work. They use relationships as an asset to mobilize the organization toward the customer. A relationship builder is someone who brings the customer inside the company. Old ways of work separate the internal from the external work environment. Intrapreneurial ways of work unifies the internal with the external world in one system that act together.

Work Dimension 2: **Work Architect** as the ability and practice to continually achieve and enhance effectiveness (achieving the goal) and efficiency (using only the necessary resources) in all that we do with a sense of purpose. We found it is key to focus on (1) optimizing the effectiveness, integrity and efficiency of one's own work processes, (2) aligning one's own processes with those in other connecting departments, (3) ensuring the company processes are optimized, even if they are at the detriment of one's own processes, and (4) drive a culture of learning, flexibility and agility to serve job satisfaction, engagement, opportunities to learn for business development, autonomy, support for success, trust, and innovation (Galinski, 2016). Intrapreneurs are motivated by designing new ways of work to make work more effective, agile, aspirational and motivational. This work dimension is critical to accelerate intrapreneurial activities. This ability to design a new way to work turns them into Work Architects.

Work Dimension 3: An **Opportunity Designer** has the ability to capture information nuggets and ideas (creativity) and transform them into products and services that are sources of value (innovation). Hough (2014) mentions that the fewer resources one has, the more one must rely upon ingenuity. Antony, Duncan and Siren (2014) state there are two innovation buckets: (a) innovations that extend today's business, either by enhancing existing offerings or by improving internal operations and (b) innovations that generate new growth by reaching new customer segments or new markets, often through new business models. Mc Guire (2013) comments that creativity and innovation are a measure of value and inspire employees to greatness, but productivity is a measure of efficiency and relies on getting the most return on every dollar spent. Christ-Martin (2013) reminds us that people need freedom; otherwise, they end up with an organization that is highly efficient but not very adaptable or innovative. Intrapreneurs are able to make big things of nothing. They operate as opportunity designers and innovation masters as they succeed in building a culture of innovation . Cooper, Peake, Watson (2016) demonstrated that in small businesses, the extent to which firms focus on new opportunities, specifically, via strategic orientation and entrepreneurial culture, affects

confidence in innovation. In a large organization, a manager we interviewed observed, “an innovation culture with limited means will take you much further than a lot of means and no innovation culture.”

Work Dimension 4: An **Engagement Operator** is defined as the ability to show, make, and seek engagements and commitments in everything you do. Yaeger and Sorrensen (2016) explain (1) the notion of engagement is a solid sign of performance because engagement is a strong predictor of work unit performance, (2) our achievements rely on all the small and large engagements and commitments we continuously make towards our clients, colleagues, boss, partners, etc., (3) we are constantly seeking engagements and commitments from others on all aspects of our actions to get them moving forward because we do not work in a vacuum and only perform through others. Landes (2014) defines engagement as the emotional connection that gets employees tuned in, turned on, and eager to go the extra mile. Falco (2016) remind us that what is important is the extent to which employees feel passionate about their jobs, are committed to the organization, and put discretionary effort into their work. Kruse (2015) state that employees are engaged when they care, and then they make discretionary efforts. Wilson (2014) comment that an engaged workforce turn in a better financial performance, and that emotional engagement trumps rational engagement by a multiple of four. Sanderson (2016) reflects that expecting the organization we work in *to engage us* is to transform ourselves into the victim role. Intrapreneurs commit and engage others in what they do.

Work Dimension 5 : For **Business Meteorologist**, we define it as the ability to anticipate and foresee trends, events, and data to best navigate changing conditions. Altabet (1998) invite us to focus on accuracy, usefulness, and control and go beyond delivering news to delivering the commentary that makes it actionable. Gus and Paulsen (2015) encourage to prepare for ups and downs and emphasize that downs are always sources of opportunities. Master (1999) speaks of trends and counter-trends and new categories of businesses and nouns used as verbs. Seifert and Hadida (2013) focus to seek an average point of view of three experts. Somani (2015) discusses acting versus reacting and being optimistic, and to have a contingency plan for when all hell breaks loose so you don't need to worry about them. An intrapreneur manages the weather conditions of the business to act boldly and wisely

Work Dimension 6: with **Future Makers**, we describe it as the ability to clearly shape a destination and bring all relevant stakeholders to engage in sync to get there. Craig (2015) states that the most important role of a manager to be the warrant of the organization's purpose. Ulwick (1957) says it makes sense to engage in the challenging act of developing a strategy, which is an executable plan of action that describes how an individual or organization will achieve a stated mission. Mintzberg (1978) speaks of a strategy as what a company does, not what it has planned to do and Hinterhuber and Popp (1992) as the evolution of an original idea according to circumstances that change all the time. Adams (?) states that your actions should inspire others to dream more, learn more, do more, and become more. An intrapreneur is a future Maker in the sense that he develops a vision or a purpose and acts towards achieving it alone and through others.

For **Technical Specialist**, we characterize it as the ability to develop a set of aptitudes and performance standards in a recognized branch of knowledge, such as architecture, computer programming, dentistry, etc. We found that being a technical specialist is the essence of a contribution in anyone's job. Gladwell (2008) proposed it takes about 10,000 hours to become an expert on a subject although there is also this stream of thoughts that reveal.

However, research has challenged this by showing expertise is built through the *way* you practice, rather than the *time* you dedicate to it. An intrapreneur ensures he builds his expertise in his chosen field(s).

When discussing intrapreneurship abilities, Gerstner (2018) summarized qualities that we empirically associate to the dimensions : “sensing opportunities, being innovative (Opportunity Designer); being persuasive, showing perseverance and flexibility (Engagement Operator), visionary (Future Maker) , being a promoter (Relationship Builder), spotting solutions to problems, being proactive, applying processes and procedures (Work Architect), looking for ways to create and solve problems (Business Meteorologist). The voluminous literature associated with the “dimensions” and our personal experience as entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs encouraged us to explore further and pose these “dimensions” ideas to practitioners and business professionals.

Research methodology and findings

We sought insights on the Dimensions from people with relevant jobs for businesses located in France. These included general managers, business unit managers, sales and marketing managers, consultants, learning and development managers, and HR directors. Our initial exploration was qualitative and followed the steps proposed by Yin (2011, p 7). This approach is qualitative, exploratory and follows a problem-oriented research. theory (Lawrence, 1992). Our understanding of the problem-oriented research is that it correlates to the approach of design science defined by Holmström, Ketokivi, and Hameri (2009) as research that seeks to explore new solution alternatives to solve problems, to explain this explorative process, and to improve the problem-solving process. The researcher is interested in developing “a means to an end,” an artifact to solve a problem. Either the means or the end, or both, must be novel. The design of Dimensions reflects this novelty. We adopted Lawrence’s approach as it represents for us the closest fit with the process and steps we are following. At this stage, our intent was to receive a first reaction from practitioners to these “dimensions”. In spring 2016, we conducted 40 qualitative interviews, either face-to-face or by phone, with respondents within our networks (appendix 1). These interviews consisted of presenting the “dimensions”, asking respondents if they thought these dimensions would be important for people’s performance today and in the future, how they would appraise their own current performance according to these “dimensions” using a simple Lickert 1-4 questions , and what they would recommend for optimal performance in each of the “dimensions” (Appendix 2). The data generated was reviewed borrowing coding techniques in the grounded theory approach to empirical research (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Hernandez, 2009). Saturation was addressed in terms of content and process through the 7+/-2 Miller model (1956). Our combined business experience made us comfortable sharing the initial findings and acknowledging that further qualitative and quantitative research is needed to address reliability and validity.

Data analysis

On the first question on the key factors, criteria for being successful in a job as an intrapreneur, using grounded theory coding principles, we clustered the results into seven findings:

- Focus (success – share – accomplish – results – curiosity – work – reciprocity – goals – value – change – initiative)
- Energy (Fun – desire – drive – love – passion – perseverance – pleasure)
- Context (culture – opportunities – environment – politics – contract – resources – risks – processes)
- Ability (analysis – synthesis – problem solving – intuition – collaborative – involve – learn – adapt – get support – bounce back)
- Expertise (technical – competencies – skills – job – creativity – empathy)
- Perspective (step back – vision – purpose- anticipate - global view – exemplarity – action – proactivity)
- Network (right people – loyalty – trust – respect – stakeholders – teams – links – relationships)

Results to questions on actual, future importance and current performance

The results for the actual and future performance of each Dimension, the percentages describe respondents' answers to "Yes; No and Do not know". So all the 40 Respondents agreed Relationship Builder is important for their success today and in the future.

For the appreciation on actual performance using four steps reflecting mastery (an area of progress; a constant attention; a proficiency; a mastery to transfer), the first number represents the average answer of the respondents and the percentage represents the weight of the respondent's answers towards the optimal results. So for Relationship Builders, 3,4 is the average answer of the respondents and 85% represents a 136 out of 160.

| Dimensions | | Actual Importance | Future Importance | Actual Performance |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Relationship Builder | Yes | 100% | 100% | 3,4 > 85 % |
| | No Do not know | | | |
| Engagement Operator | Yes | 95% | 97,5% | 3,38 > 84,5% |
| | No Do not know | 5% | 2,5% | |
| Work Architect | Yes | 92,5% | 97,5% | 2,85 > 71,2% |
| | No Do not know | 7,5% | 2,5% | |
| Opportunity Designer | Yes | 97,5% | 100% | 2,76 > 69% |
| | No Do not know | 2,5% | | |
| Business | Yes | 82,5% | 90% | 2,27 > 56,7% |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|--------|-------|--------------|
| Meteorologist | No | 12,5% | 10% | |
| | Do not know | 5% | | |
| Future Maker | Yes | 95% | 97,5% | 2,65 > 66,2% |
| | No | 5% | 2,5% | |
| | Do not know | | | |
| TOTAL | Yes | 93,75% | 97% | 2,88 > 72% |
| | No | 5,41% | 3% | |
| | Do not know | 0,84% | | |

Summary of observations to results

We observed there was no rejection of any “dimensions” by the 40 interviewees and many participants commented on the importance of all dimensions. Respondents commented on an initial complexity of the wordings and on the fact that once explained, it was “not stupid, but surprising”; some liked the headlines and some commented that the weight of each dimension could be different from job to job. Dimensions appear to be more important in the coming years than they may be now; some even said that “the future is closer to our ancestors who did not have employment security”. Interviewees saw links among the dimensions; a respondent commented that “no one will be able to succeed without all these dimensions”. Some qualified the “dimensions” as tactical (relationship builder ; engagement operator, work architect, opportunity designer) and strategic (business meteorologist and future maker). They discussed profiles associated to dimensions as followers for two (relationship builder, engagement operator) and enabler for all 6 Dimensions. Respondents clustered them into thinking dimensions (work architect, opportunity designer, business meteorologist, future maker) and interacting dimensions (relationship builder; engagement operator); into soft and hard skills (soft: relationship builder; engagement operator; future maker – hard: work architect; opportunity designer; business meteorologist). Performance / importance gaps are higher in thinking dimensions (+20 points for work architect, opportunity designer, business meteorologist, future maker) than interacting dimensions (+ 10 points for relationship Builder ; engagement operator). Finally, several commented the dimensions “were present in the heart of many” and were critical to take the initiative.

This exploration represents an initial insight on possible intrapreneurship practices and we look forward to further our research towards validity and reliability, leveraging further qualitative and quantitative research. The limits we found in this initial exploration was that the Dimensions’ vocabulary was surprising to some interviewees and may need to be refined and more precisely defined; that the impact of organizational environments and cultures are not considered and specifically the culture of innovation and its link to intrapreneurship.

Conclusion

We were surprised by the initial positive reactions we received, particularly coming from these French practitioners because one of their cultural forces as a group can be summarized as *Doubling as a Method*.

We foresee the Dimensions could bring in the *academic perspective* additional meaning to the competencies, intrapreneurship and business performance conversations

The Dimensions could bring to *business* an additional option to review how work is conducted by all and how all can develop “space and a perspective” to take the initiative to continuously grow and act as an intrapreneur in an organization.

We believe empirically these Dimensions help address the issues of self-development, employability, and intrapreneurship in a practical manner and provide the means for people to engage in discretionary efforts in their own fields. We acknowledge rigorous further research should be done, and we look forward to the opportunity to engage into it.

Appendix

Appendix 1 - Profiles interviewees

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Independent HR consultant 10 years as independent HR VP for retail + Lawyer 35 years experience luxury– textile – food – consulting female French date interview 11-3-16 | Consultant marketing communication 50years old male French 100% service marketing communication design interview on 16-3-16 | Advertizing boss entrepreneur 35 years experience in advertizing male French interview 16-3-16 | Independent HR consultant 20 years experience female media – radio – consulting – industry – public services interview 11-3-16 | Business owner Advertising and communication 30 years male French interview 16-3-16 |
| Business owner 35 years recruitment luxury – textile female French interview 16-3-16 | Entrepreneur 40 years training interim female French interview 29-3-16 | Manager 40 years army, telecom, training, management male French interview 24-3-16 | Consulting & services Independent coach 20 years experience female French 23-3-16 | Legal and project management Professional associations Training 20 years experience female French 22-3-16 |
| Business owner 40 years sales training entrepreneur Swedish male interview 14-3-16 | First job 1,5 year experience Marketing consumer goods and software b2b French Female Interview 13-3-16 | It, techno, consulting, manager 40 years experience male French interview 22-3-16 | Project expert manager it telecom 20 years female French interview 22-3-16 | Entrepreneur events & communication 15 years male French interview 22-3-16 |
| Training and HR 40 years experience Media – environment Male French Interview 22-3-16 | Training HR Manager Telecom 40 years experience female French interview 21-3-16 | Hr manager Telecom – industry – services Female French 21-3-16 | Manager Recruitment, interim, call center Female French Interview 25-3-16 | Entrepreneur IT, software, technical, consulting 40 yrsrs male french interview 18-3-16 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 16 | | | | |
| 35 years expérience manager, transports, logistics, purchasing male french interview 17-3-16 | 45 years expérience pharmaceuticals, training, management, Customer service female french interview 24-3-16 | 1 year expérience engineering female french interview 16-3-16 | 35 years expérience consulting, training female french interview 29-3-16 | 30 experience sales and engineering + www hi tech male french interview 24-3-16 |
| Sales + training Pharmaceutical + luxury + retail 15 years expérience female french interview on 14-3-16 | Pharmaceuticals med tech 15 years expérience HR female French interview 25-3-16 | 20 years expérience HR training sales luxury brand female French interview 25-3-16 | 35 years expérience Training hr , business leader entrepreneur Education Female French Interview 29-3-16 | 35 years banking international management female French interview 13-3-16 |
| Marketing Insurance 25 years expérience female French interview 5-4-16 | General management, marketing, finance, coaching 40 years expérience food, hotel , consulting male French interview 4-4-16 | Consultant trainer manager distribution business school 30 years expérience female French interview 31-3-16 | 20 years expérience luxury retail and training + consulting female French interview 31-3-16 | 35 years press – public service – training general manager – sales male French interview 18-3-16 |
| 25 years expérience recruitment hr, training pharmaceuticals, consulting female French interview 5-4-16 | 20 years expérience project manager telecom female French interview 16-3-16 | 30 years expérience hr industry services education female French interview 15-3-16 | 25 years sales management advertising coaching French female interview 18-3-16 | 20 years training and hr luxury female French interview 18-3-16 |

Appendix 2 Interview guide

Profile :

Name

Work

Experience

Industry

Male / female

Nationality

Date

Questions

According to you what are the key factors or criteria's that enable someone to be successful in his job as an intrapreneur?

- We are **Relationship Builders** where we continuously nurture our contacts, develop new ones and enlarge our channels of communication with others. We earn the right to be trusted and preferred partners in our and in other cultures through our continuous engagement towards others and our ability to help them better address the issues they face.
- We are **Engagement Operators** where we take and seek commitments on a project, an idea, a meeting, and a coffee. Here we stick to what we say as we know our word is GOLD. We invent and deliver promises. We are predictable in our engagements while keeping our secret sauces to reach our commitments.
- We are **Work Architects** where we design our activities, we invent and improve the way to conduct our work, we question our practices and by trying new ways that help us be more effective and efficient. We seek to combine a dual focus on goal and process to reach the goal.
- We are **Opportunity Designers** where we organize the information nuggets we catch from all walks of life and organize them into ideas, concepts, models and tools that hopefully make sense to others and help them see a form of value. We nourish our ability to capture insights and are avid learners and designers of our worlds.
- We are **Business Meteorologists** where we anticipate the trends, forces and events that affect positively or negatively our journeys and use our resources in a thoughtful manner to achieve our goals and realize our dreams. We prepare ourselves and anticipate our resources so that we can navigate nice weather conditions and heavy storms and crisis.
- We are **Future Makers** where we invent the destinations and the experiences of our respective journeys so that we can land the desired shores we invent for ourselves and the ones around us... We seek to involve the minds around us to share the journey and make sure this is an opportunity for all.

Relationship builder

Do you agree this dimension is important for your success now ? Y/N

Do you agree this dimension will be important for your success in the years to come ? Y/N

How do you think others would rate your performance in this dimension?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1 this is an area of progress | 2 Pay attention this is important |
| 3 you're doing fine, continue | 4 this is a strength others can learn from you |

What would be 3/5 recommendations you could make to master this dimension ?

Engagement operator

Do you agree this dimension is important for your success now ? Y/N

Do you agree this dimension will be important for your success in the years to come ? Y/N

How do you think others would rate your performance in this dimension?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1 this is an area of progress | 2 Pay attention this is important |
| 3 you're doing fine, continue | 4 this is a strength others can learn from you |

What would be 3/5 recommendations you could make to master this dimension ?

Work architect

Do you agree this dimension is important for your success now ? Y/N

Do you agree this dimension will be important for your success in the years to come ? Y/N

How do you think others would rate your performance in this dimension?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1 this is an area of progress | 2 Pay attention this is important |
| 3 you're doing fine, continue | 4 this is a strength others can learn from you |

What would be 3/5 recommendations you could make to master this dimension ?

Opportunity designer

Do you agree this dimension is important for your success now ? Y/N

Do you agree this dimension will be important for your success in the years to come ? Y/N

How do you think others would rate your performance in this dimension?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1 this is an area of progress | 2 Pay attention this is important |
| 3 you're doing fine, continue | 4 this is a strength others can learn from you |

What would be 3/5 recommendations you could make to master this dimension ?

Business meteorologist

Do you agree this dimension is important for your success now ? Y/N

Do you agree this dimension will be important for your success in the years to come ? Y/N

How do you think others would rate your performance in this dimension?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1 this is an area of progress | 2 Pay attention this is important |
| 3 you're doing fine, continue | 4 this is a strength others can learn from you |

What would be 3/5 recommendations you could make to master this dimension ?

Future maker

Do you agree this dimension is important for your success now ? Y/N

Do you agree this dimension will be important for your success in the years to come ? Y/N

How do you think others would rate your performance in this dimension?

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1 this is an area of progress | 2 Pay attention this is important |
| 3 you're doing fine, continue | 4 this is a strength others can learn from you |

What would be 3/5 recommendations you could make to master this dimension?

What other comments would you like to add?

|

References

- Altabet, R. (1998). The forecaster as a key member of the strategic planning team. *The Journal of Business Forecasting Methods & Systems*, 17(3), 3–6.
- Anderson, V. Johnson, L. (1997) *Systems thinking basics: from concept to causal loop*. Pegasus Prerss, Waltham, MA.
- Antoncic, B. (2001) Organizational processes in intrapreneurship: a conceptual integration. *Journal of Enterprising culture*. 9(2), 221-235
- Antony, S.D., Duncan, D.S., & Siren, P.M.A. (2014). Build an innovation engine in 90 days. *Harvard Business Review*, December , 59–68. Retrievable at <https://hbr.org/2014/12/build-an-innovation-engine-in-90-days>
- Campbell, K.S., White, D.C., & Johnson, D.E. (2003). Leader-member relations as a function of rapport management. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 40(3), 170–194.
- Christ-Martin, G. (2013) Out with the old, In with the new management model www.industryweek.com p 34-36
- Cooper, D. Peake, W. Watson, W. (2016) Seizing opportunities : the moderating rôle of managérial characteristics on the relationship between Opportunity-seeking and innovation efficacy in Small businesnes *Journal of Small Business Management* 54 (4). 1038-1058.
- Craig R.T., 2015, The Constitutive Metamodel: A 16-Year Review, “Communication Theory”, 25(4).
- Falco, M. (2016, March 15). Executive training should focus on engaging employees. *Executive-based Leadership*. Retrievable at <http://executionbasedleadership.com/blog/>
- Galinski, A. (2016) How to speak up for yourself https://www.ted.com/speakers/adam_galinsky
- Gerstner, T.L. (2018) Why we should be teaching entrapreneurship (intrapreneurship) in a ll our marketing classes *Association Annual Conference Proceedings*. Spring2018, p164-164. 1p
- Gladwell, M. (2008) *Outliers* Penguin Books, London.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Guse, G., & Paulsen, C.J. (2015). Responding to a down AG Economy. *AgriMarketing*, November/December, 34.
- Hernandez, C. A. (2009). Theoretical coding in grounded theory methodology. *The Grounded Theory Review*, 8(3), 51–60.
- Hinterhuber, H.H., & Popp, W. (1992). Are you a strategist or just a manager? *Harvard Business Review*, January/February(1), 105–13.
- Holmström, J., Ketokivi, M., & Hameri, A. (2009). Bridging practice and theory: A design science approach. *Designs Sciences*, 40(1), 67.
- Hough, K. (2015, January 9). The dichotomy of creativity. *Talent Development*, December 54–58.
- Kruse, K. (2015). The ROI of employee engagement in healthcare. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/kevinkruse/2015/02/26/the-roi-of-employee-engagement-in-hospitals/#6a6f867e54ce>
- Landes, L. (2014). Getting to the heart of employee engagement. *Tactics*, June 17.
- Lawrence, P.R. (1992) “The Challenge of Problem-Oriented Research”, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol 1, No. 2, pp 139-142.
- Lee, L.S. Green, E. (2015) System thinking and its implications in enterprise risk management *Journal of Information systems* 29(2),195-210.

- Leybourne, S.A. (2010) "Improvisation as a Way of Dealing with Ambiguity and Complexity", *Graziadio Business Report* Vol 13, No. 3, pp 1-7.
- Mc Kirdy, C. (2008) *Competitive advantage: building engagement through better workplace conversations*, Human Resource Magazine. 20(2),10-12
- McGuire, K. (2013) Finding common ground between business goals and human potential. *Integral Leadership Review, November*. Retrievable at <http://integrallleadershipreview.com/10975-finding-common-ground-business-goals-human-potential/>
- Maon, F. Lindgreen, A. Swaen, V. (2008) Thinking of the organization as a system: the role of managerial perceptions in developing a corporate social responsibility strategic agenda *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 25, 413-426
- Master, M (1999) the future is now Across the Board march issue . P 78
- Miller, G.A. (1956) "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on Our Capacity for Processing Information", *The Psychological Review*, Vol 63, No. 2, Winter 1999, 81-97.
- Mintzberg, H. (1978). Patterns in strategy formation. *Management Science*, 24(9), 934–948.
- Ployhart, R.E. (2015) Strategic organizational behavior (STROBE): the missing voice in the strategic human capital conversation *Academy of Management Perspective*. 29(3), 342-356
- Saunderson, R. (2016). Is there something wrong with employee engagement? *Training*, Retrievable at <https://trainingmag.com/trmag-article/there-something-wrong-employee-engagement/>
- Seifert, M., & Hadida, A.L. (2013). 3 humans + 1 computer = best predictions. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(5), 28–29.
- Seshadri, D.V.R. Tripathy, A. (2006) Innovation through intrapreneurship: the road less travelled *Journal for decision makers* 31(1); 17-29.
- Sharma, P. Chrisman, J.J. (1999) Towards a reconciliation of the definitional issues in the field of corporate entrepreneurship *Entrepreneurship theory and practice* 23 (3), 11-27
- Sicotte, H., Delerue, H. and Drouin, N. (2015) "Performance of NPD Projects: Measures from Different Sources", Paper presented at 15th EURAM Annual Conference, Warsaw, Poland, June 17-20.
- Somani, S. (2015). Prepare for the worst: Project managers and sponsors must work together to limit damage from unwanted surprises. *PM Network*, 29(12), 23. Snyder, T. (2015). Insights from Fortune's 100 best companies to work for: 5 things every company can learn. *The Public Relations Strategist*, 2015(Spring) 12–14.
- Ulwick., A.W. (1957) *Business strategy formulation : theory, process, and the intellectual revolution /* Westport, Conn. : Quorum, 1999.
- Yaeger, T.F., & Sorensen, P. F. (2016). Enhancing employee engagement efforts. *OD Practitioner*, 48(2), 48–51.
- Wilson B.G. (2015, October 9). Energize your workforce: 10 ways leaders can take employees beyond engagement. *Business Chief*, Retrievable at <https://canada.businesschief.com/leadership/1522/Energize-your-workforce:-10-ways-leaders-can-take-employees-beyond-engagement>
- Yin, R. (2011) *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish* (pp 7, 50, and 77), The Guilford Press, New York.

- BiostaTGV. (n.d.). Student's test for paired samples. Retrievable at http://marne.u707.jussieu.fr/biostatgv/?module=tests/student_appar
- Bodell, L. (2014). *Soft skills for the future. Training and Development*, 68(3), 34–38.
- Canwell, A., Dongrie, V., Neveras, N., & Stockton, H. (2014). Developing 21st-century leadership skills. *Mworld*, 13(3), 38–43.
- Casse, P. & Banahan, E. (2011, September). 21st century team skills. *Training Journal*, 11–16.
- Clampit, P.G., & Downs, J.D. (1993). Employee perceptions of the relation between communication and productivity: A field study. *Journal of Business Communication*. 30(1), 5–28.
- Denzin, N.K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Feffer, M. (2015). What makes a great employer? *HR Magazine*, June 38–43.
- Fisher, J. (2012, February 1). Closing the soft skills gap in the 21st century employment. *Business People*. Retrievable at <http://www.businesspeople.com/Post/356/closing-the-soft-skills-gap-in-21st-century-employment>
- Gaunay, M., Lieblein, R., & Braun, P. (2015). What is the importance of a firm's dedication to its nearby community?. *Employee Benefit Advisor*, January, 8.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gendron, R. (2015, August 5). Build trust, then lead: From managing individuals to leading teams. Retrieved from https://www.hr.com/en/magazines/all_articles/build-trust-then-lead-from-managing-individuals-to_icyspfvm.html.
- Gore, W. (2013). 21st century skills and prospective job challenges. *The IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 7(4), 7–14.
- Gupta, M. (2015). A study on employees' perception towards employee engagement. *Globsyn Management Journal*, 9(1-2), 45–51.
- Harris, P. (2009). Help wanted: "T-shaped" skills to meet 21st century needs. *Training +Development*, September, 42–47. Retrievable at <https://www.td.org/magazines/td-magazine/help-wanted-t-shaped-skills-to-meet-21st-century-needs>
- Henville, N. (2012, September 1). Hard vs soft skills training. *Training Journal*. Retrievable at <https://www.trainingjournal.com/articles/feature/hard-vs-soft-skills-training>
- Hilton, M. (2008). Skills for work in the 21st century: What does the research tell us? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 22(4), 63–78. Retrievable at <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2008.35590354>
- Hough, K. (2015, January 9). The dichotomy of creativity. *Talent Development*, December 54–58.
- Jamail, N. (2015, January 9). The most desired skills of the future: 3 three things a leader can do. *HR.com*, | 32 (1), 39.
- Kalman, F. (2012, December 17). Has executive education gone soft? *Chief Learning Officer* 18–21. Retrievable at <https://www.clomedia.com/2012/12/17/has-executive-education-gone-soft/>
- Kar, A.K. (2011). Importance of life skills for the professionals of 21st century. *The IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 5(3), 35–45.
- Klie, L. (2016, January 1). IBM merges weather and business forecasts. *Destination CRM*. Retrievable at <https://www.destinationcrm.com/Articles/ReadArticle.aspx?ArticleID=108306>
- Kruse, K. (2015, February 26). The ROI of employee engagement in healthcare. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/kevinkruse/2015/02/26/the-roi-of-employee-engagement-in-hospitals/#6a6f867e54ce>
- Laker, D.R., & Powell, J.L. (2011). The differences between hard and soft skills and their relative impact on training transfer. *Human Resource Developments Quarterly*, 22(1),

111–122.

- Lazarus, A. (2013). Soften up: The importance of soft skills for job success. *Physician Executive Journal*, 39(5), 40–45.
- Long, D. (n.d.). *Le chi carré*. Retrievable at <http://web.umoncton.ca/umcm-longd02/TheorixDownload/chi2.pdf>
- Marsh, G. (2012). Soft skills and the future. *Training Journal*, 2012(February), 39-41
- Mayo, W.D. (2015, February 10). Soft-side leadership: Why is it always the hardest part? *HR.com*. Retrievable at https://www.hr.com/en/magazines/leadership_excellence_essentials/august_2013_leadership/soft-side-leadership-why-is-it-always-the-hardest-_i5zk211y.html
- Mintzberg, H. (1978). Patterns in strategy formation. *Management Science*, 24(9), 934–948.
- Performance. (n.d.). In *Business Dictionary's online dictionary*. Retrieved March 13, 2016 from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/performance.html>
- Pennington, G. (2013). Soft skills in the business and personal world. *EFMD Global Focus*, 7(3), 52–55. Retrievable at www.efmd.org/globalfocus
- Pink, D.H. (2005). *A whole new mind: Why right-brainers will rule the future*. New York, NY: Berkley Publishing Group.
- Ponterotto, J.G. (2006). Brief note on the origins, evolution, and meaning of the qualitative research concept Thick Description. *The Qualitative Report*, 11(3), 538–549. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR11-3/ponterotto.pdf>
- Ramousse R., Le Berre M., & Le Guelte, L. (1996). Introduction to Statistics: 5.2 Comparison between two samples: Student's t-test. Retrievable at <http://www.cons-dev.org/elearning/stat/parametrique/5-2/5-2.html>
- Rangnekar, S.S. (2012). Soft skills in management. *International Journal of Business Insights & Transformation*, 5 (1), 108–109.
- Robles, M.M. (2012). Executive perceptions of the top 10 soft skills needed in today's workplace. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 75(4), 453–465.
- Saunderson, R. (2016). Is there something wrong with employee engagement? *Training*, Retrievable at <https://trainingmag.com/trgmag-article/there-something-wrong-employee-engagement/>
- Sayer, K. (2016, February 17). More data, regrettably, does not mean greater accuracy. *Third Sector*. Retrievable at <https://www.thirdsector.co.uk/data-regrettably-does-not-mean-greater-accuracy/finance/article/1379720>
- Scher, S. (2008). Psychology 3530: Industrial Organizational Psychology Eastern Illinois University. Retrieved on March 13, 2016 from <http://www.ux1.eiu.edu/~cfsjs/social/iosyllabus.pdf>
- Schleicher, D.J., Smith, T.A., Watt, J.D., Casper, W.J., & Greguras, G.J. (2015). It's all in the attitude: The role of job attitude strength in job attitude–outcome relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4), 1259–1274.
- Seifert, M., & Hadida, A.L. (2013). 3 humans + 1 computer = best predictions. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(5), 28–29.
- Skill. (2019). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary*. Retrievable at <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/skill>
- Somani, S. (2015). Prepare for the worst: Project managers and sponsors must work together to limit damage from unwanted surprises. *PM Network*, 29(12), 23.
- Snyder, T. (2015). Insights from Fortune's 100 best companies to work for: 5 things every company can learn. *The Public Relations Strategist*, 2015(Spring) 12–14.
- Steckler, S. (2011). Influential strategist: Peter Block. *People and Strategy*, 34(2), 12–13.
- Stulberg, B., & Magness, S. (2017). *Peak performance: Elevate your game, avoid burnout, and thrive with the new science of success*. New York, NY: Rodale Books.

- Tewari, R., & Sharma, R. (2011). Managerial skills for managers in the 21st century. *Review of Management*, 1(3), 4–15.
- Thomas, A. (2014). Learning the skills of “can do.” *Recruiter*, 2014(January), 19. Retrievable at <https://issuu.com/redactive/docs/recjan14>
- Tubbs, A., & Hain, C. (1973). Managerial communication and its relationship to total organizational effectiveness. Paper for the Academy of Management, Atlanta, GA.
- Watson, H.J. (2015). Soft skills for professional success *business. Intelligence Journal, Student Edition 2015*, 9–13. Retrievable at <http://cs.furman.edu/~pbatchelor/csc105/articles/Student-Edition-of-the-Business-Intelligence-Journal.pdf>
- Wheless, I.R., Wheless, V.E., & Howard, R.D. (1984). The relationships of communication with supervisor and decision-participation to employee job satisfaction. *Communication Quarterly*, 32(3). 222–232.
- Xlstat. (2018, June 22). *Student's t-test for two paired samples*. Retrievable at https://help.xlstat.com/customer/fr/portal/articles/2062451-test-t-de-student-pour-deux-%C3%A9chantillons-appari%C3%A9s?b_id=9283