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Abstract

Public bureaucratic organisations are under heavy critique for their alleged inability to respond to the challenges of contemporary society. Increasingly, scholars and politicians propose a market-based ‘enterprise’ alternative, which is argued to be the entrepreneurial and responsive opposite of bureaucracy. In this debate no attempt has been made at understanding, how entrepreneurship can be part of public organisations because of their bureaucratic characteristics as opposed to in spite of them.

In this study I search for a new understanding of entrepreneurship, as bureaucratic entrepreneurship. The research focuses on the role that public employees play, by asking how entrepreneurial acts are performed by public employees to make room for new kinds of practices in their organisation. The question is answered through a study of the two Danish agencies the Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation and the Danish Enterprise and Construction Authority. Using narrative interviews from the two agencies the complexity and drama of bureaucratic entrepreneurship is unfolded through stories of entrepreneurial practices.

Exactly drama is an important result of the analysis, which shows how conduct in the two agencies is governed by a highly implicit strategy for innovation. Upon this implicit strategy, the employees perform entrepreneurial acts with passion to produce new bureaucratic practices that lie close to and consistent with their bureaucratic ethos. The drama intensifies as the performances are conducted through three organisational characters, the manager, the bureaucrat and the entrepreneur, who conflict and converse in the process of developing the bureaucratic qualities of the organisation.

Bureaucratic entrepreneurship extends our practical and theoretical understanding, of how bureaucratic organisations develop dynamically on the basis of the actions of employees. The thesis shows, how the bureaucratic model involves a unique sense of both entrepreneurship and ultimately innovation. However, it also questions the dispassionate involvement we normally associate with the bureaucrat, and emphasise how scholars and public managers alike must be attentive to the drama of bureaucratic entrepreneurship.
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1 Bureaucracy under the gun

“These are not the best days for bureaucracy. Everywhere its demise is reported, demanded and, more often than not, celebrated.” (du Gay 2000, p. 1)

In contemporary time the word ‘bureaucracy’ has little to do with its original meaning. Often, bureaucracy is taken to be little more than the ‘excessively complicated administrative procedure’ (Oxford American Writer’s Thesaurus) of the organisational model, to which the name refers. In media and popular debate ‘bureaucratic’ has become a word, which seems to have purely negative connotation. As du Gay states in the opening sentence of his book In praise of bureaucracy (2000), little hope seems left for the concept and the model, which has shaped the very foundation of today’s organisations throughout decades.

The public system, which is more than anything synonymous with bureaucracy, is under heavy critique for its alleged failure to fulfil its purpose today. Interestingly the purpose and nature of public organisations seems to be changing; not as a direct result from pressure arising out of external phenomena, but as a result of the political and academic responses to these phenomena and the consequential discussion of public organisations (Casey 2004, du Gay 2000, Kallinikos 2006). No doubt, public organisations face increased pressure to produce answers to challenges prominent in society today. An increasingly aging population, economic crisis and the risk of losing entire generations to unemployment are just some of the current issues, to which the public system is constantly asked to produce responses. At the same time, we demand increasingly better welfare provided at continuously lower costs.

In the theoretical field, a wide range of scholars with different perspectives are trying to influence the discourse on, what the nature and purpose of public organisations are and should be. Undoubtedly, two of the most influential discourses over the past decades have been that of New Public Management (Kallinikos 2006) and the reinventing government movement (Osborne and Gaebler 1992), which brought with them market-based mechanisms, management ideals and techniques that would steadily transform bureaucracies into a more efficiently managed organisational model. Prominent to both movements is the belief that bureaucracy is out-dated and unfit to respond to the externally identified societal challenges, and that the solution is to mould public sector organisations on the basis of market mechanisms and private companies (Osborne and Gaebler 1992).

For Osborne and Gaebler the key device to succeed in this transformation of the public system, from an out-dated system to that of a healthy, vigorous organisation capable of
overcoming all the challenges we find in society today, is to entrepreneurialise, or enterprise up public sector organisations to be more efficient and at the same time more flexible. Enterprising up, however, means to introduce a corporate, or enterprise, version of entrepreneurship (Hjorth 2003), where employees would take on responsibility guided by (economically rational) incentives and not commands (Osborne and Gaebler 1992).

Parallel to this theoretical and political struggle, where authors and practitioners alike suggest different solutions for making public organisations more innovative, public organisations struggle to adopt new innovative measures and practices. There is an interesting paradox in the literature on public organisational innovation and entrepreneurship, as the most discernible literature suggests initiatives that will support innovation in spite of the nature and structure of public organisations and not because of it (e.g. Osborne and Gaebler 1992) – often disregarding the question of what the purpose and nature of public organisations are and should be.

Suggestions do exist that argue for a non-market view on the organisation of political execution and its marriage with entrepreneurship. Potts and Kastelle (2010) are not proponents of market-based reform to the public sector and propose an alternate perspective to increase entrepreneurship: “The public sector (unlike politics) is by definition not a market context but an institutionalized monopoly and monopsony.” (p. 123). Still, they remain loyal to an economic perspective of both organisation and entrepreneurship, suggesting that “public sector entrepreneurship verges on a contradiction in terms” (p. 124), because public sector organisations do not provide the adequate economic incentives. In other words, for entrepreneurship to come into existence there is a need for economic (or as they suggest reputational, its institutional equivalent) incentives that will drive the entrepreneur. An interesting and important conclusion they do reach is that while some suggest the public sector is not innovative at all, they find that this is not true; some parts of the public sector are highly innovative. The problem is that we lack both theory and studies to understand this.

The problem is that two discussions exist, which need to be bridged in order to fully understand the entrepreneurial and innovative agenda in a public organisation context. On the one side bureaucracy is the centre of critique in the discussion of what the proper mode of governance is of public sector organisations. On the other side entrepreneurship is in management literature being drawn into the same domain of economic rationality, as the correct way to make organisations more innovative (Hjorth 2003). What is needed is for both
discussions to be dislodged from the economic rationale and joined to help us understand the role of entrepreneurship for public bureaucratic organisations.

1.1 A need for re-investigating bureaucratic entrepreneurship

Where this thesis makes it grasp is exactly at the intersection of bureaucratic organisational analysis and entrepreneurship studies. Before we discard the bureaucratic model because it is deemed ill-equipped in a neoliberal economic perspective, where uncertainty is abundant and rules and procedures are tools of an almost ancient regime (du Gay 2000), we need to understand what entrepreneurship is, and can be in a bureaucratic organisation. In this thesis I take on the task of re-investigating the concept of bureaucratic entrepreneurship but on its own terms, where the concept is allowed to unfold in the empirical context without prescribing what it ought to be. This will allow us to see what entrepreneurship is and can become in its public context.

Entrepreneurship should not be marginalised to a matter of economic performance or efficiency, as the concept contains much greater potential than that (Hjorth 2003). The contribution in this thesis is thus, an attempt to view the public sector organisations from a perspective of entrepreneurship, meaning that entrepreneurship is understood as something both philosophical and sociological instead of merely economic. The objective is to find in the organisations that which is entrepreneurial and understand what it is and how it works. As entrepreneurship is inherently a human activity this means a focus on how the employees in the organisations take on entrepreneurial acts, and how these disturb, displace or move the practices of the organisations.

The research question that guides this thesis focuses specifically on the practices of the employees in public agencies, and how these influence the practices that form the organisation.

RQ: How are entrepreneurial acts used by employees of a bureaucratic civil service agency to make changes to the practices in the organisation?

The focus on acts of entrepreneurship by employees means that the study revolves around the everyday actions in connections to different tasks, where opportunities are exploited to make new practices possible in the organisation. This aspect of entrepreneurship enlightens us specifically on the organisational development of the bureaucratic organisations, and how the entrepreneurial contribution of the employees make new services, processes, products or mindsets possible. Because the role and involvement of the bureaucrat in bureaucratic
organisations is a central theme for many authors writing for or against bureaucracy (e.g. du Gay 2000, Kallinikos 2006 and Osborne and Gaebler 1992), this research question will shed important light on how entrepreneurship is performed in praxis in bureaucracies today.

1.2 A study of two agencies

The basis for answering this research question is an empirical study of two Danish public organisations, namely the Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation (ASTI) and the Danish Enterprise and Construction Authority (DECA)¹. Both organisations have been chosen due to a set of common characteristics as public and political organisations. They share a proximity to political decision-making at the level of the minister, while they also have direct contact with citizens and companies at an operational level through the services that they provide. In other words many of the traditional characteristics of public bureaucratic organisations, such as political council, policy development and public service are present in both cases.

The Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation is located under the Ministry of Science. The agency is involved in both policy and operational tasks. On the policy level it develops and advises the minister on matters of research and innovation, while on the operational level the agency organises the relationship between universities, provides grants for research and innovation, and collaborates with the private sector in order to develop the innovative capacity of private companies. The organisation is structured into five centres, two of which are involved in internal administration of the agency and three of which are involved with grants, policy and public initiatives. The centres serve a wide set of clients. On policy tasks the agency serves the Minister of Science through the ministerial department; communication, which is largely in written form through policy documents and briefs. The centres administering grants and operating initiatives serve both clients in the form of researchers, universities and private companies, and their respective research and innovation councils responsible for grant decisions. All centres are involved in policy development within their respective area of operation. The agency employs around 250 people distributed among the five centres and the management of the agency.

¹ Although the names have changed following the election 2011, I maintain the names as they were during the empirical study.
The Danish Enterprise and Construction Agency is located under the Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs. The agency is involved in developing policies on market terms for businesses in Denmark. Its operates with a set of policy initiatives, administration of laws, funding schemes, grants and policies in order to promote business development, innovation and entrepreneurship. The agency covers different areas of operation, such as regional development, business development and the construction industry, all structured into different centres within the building. Most centres are involved in both policy development and administration of funds and grants, which are targeted private businesses. Policy development, concerning policy initiatives on private businesses and market terms, is an important task for the agency, which provides initiatives to the ministerial department and the Minister of Business and Economic Affairs. The Minister is thus a key client to the agency on policy affairs, while private companies are a direct client in connection to funding schemes and grants. Just as for the ASTI, communication involves a great deal of written material, which can be said to be the primary product of the organisation.

1.3 An outline of the paper

In the next chapter the methodology behind the thesis is unfolded. A thorough reflection on the ontological background for the study is performed on which the analytical strategy and research methods are elaborated. The thesis rests on a narrative method revolving around the stories told by the people in the organisations. In the empirical material a series of central themes became relevant, upon which the choice of theory rests. A set of central concepts from the fields of entrepreneurship and bureaucracy theory were especially relevant to the stories in the empirical material, and these concepts are elaborated and discussed in the third chapter.

The concepts are then used in the analysis to unfold and develop the stories in the empirical material in order to answer the research question. The answer relies upon an analysis of how the context and structure of the organisation governs the conduct of the employees, and how the narrators in turn make use of entrepreneurial practices to break this conduct and allow for new kinds of practices.

Following the analysis I return to some of the questions that have been highlighted in this introduction. I reflect upon the theoretical implications of the analysis and the insight that we gain from it. The question of whether the bureaucratic model can be entrepreneurial is an important underlying question for this thesis. I therefore return to this question in the end,
where the outcome of the analysis will help us understand the connection between entrepreneurship and bureaucracy.

2 Messy, multiple, mystical methodology

The purpose of this thesis is to contribute to a greater understanding of what bureaucratic entrepreneurship is, through an empirical analysis of public organisations. This requires that the concept of entrepreneurship is re-contextualised and contrasted with bureaucratic theory. In other words there is an inherent construction of new meaning to this thesis, which necessitates a rigorous attention to the underlying methodology. Exactly because social science as a discipline is such a messy field (Law 2004), sensitive attention to methods is needed, not in order to make sound judgements, but to allow for the complexity that the social world presents us with as researchers.

The research question guiding this thesis focuses specifically on acts and practices. However, in an organisational context the importance of acts does not only arise as an outcome of the event of the act itself. It is constituted through the meaning that we assign to the events that transpire (Czarniawska 2002). This emphasises a particular social constructive perspective of organisational analysis that requires a study of meaning assigned in language (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009). How acts are used to create new practices requires an empirical study of how employees assign meaning to the acts that they have performed. The empirical study in the ASTI and DECA therefore relies on interview-based methods, to explore the entrepreneurial acts as events that have transpired. The analytical strategy and philosophy of science highlight the construction of meaning that occurs in the interviews vis-à-vis the entrepreneurial acts.

The study has been performed along abductive lines (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009), where a general reading of theory on bureaucracy and entrepreneurship has informed an explorative empirical study. From the empirical study key issues pointed to central concepts from theory, which have been investigated in the following chapter and used for analysis of the empirical material.

This chapter starts out with a substantiation of the type of knowing (Law 2004) we can legitimately have about bureaucratic entrepreneurship and organisational contexts. The reason for this is because the type of knowing we can make about entrepreneurship depends on how we perceive the study of organisations (Law 2004, Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, Roulston
Afterwards I review the interview-based method behind the empirical study and the practical implications it has for the research. In the end I present the strategy for the analysis of the empirical material.

2.1 About knowing, reality and truths

We constantly take the world out-there for granted in our day-to-day acts (Law 2004). However, when making attempts to analyse and make claims about complex matters, such as organising, we must make an effort to view the world through more reflexive perspectives (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009), because organisational analysis tries to capture a world consisting of countless layers of behaviour, emotions and beliefs. Human complexity reaches far beyond what any linear perspective is able to explain (Law 2004). Our research should therefore be open and creative, just as the sociality that we aim to study.

When considering organisation studies and organisation theory, our modes of research are very much defined by the paradigm to which we adhere (Morgan 1980). From an interpretive perspective it is the *experience* of reality and sociality, which is important, more than any reality existing externally or being distinct from human experience. This paradigm distinguishes itself from especially the functionalist perspective (where organisations and organisational actors are studied for their deliberate behaviour) by accentuating construction of meaning through interpretation.

“Words, names, concepts, ideas, facts, observations, etc., do not so much denote external ‘things’, as conceptions of things activated in the mind by a selective and meaningful form of noticing the world, which may be shared with others. They are not to be seen as a representation of a reality ‘out there’, but as tools for capturing and dealing with what is perceived to be ‘out there’.” (Morgan 1980, p. 610)

Morgan critiques what he refers to as the orthodox approach in organisational theory, which has not come to realise its own inability to question the underlying assumptions of the functionalist metaphor, which guides its inherent research. By thinking of the organisation as a mechanism or an organism, we are smitten to believe that organisational action is involved in purposeful functions. An alternative metaphor is especially interesting to touch upon here. It is what Morgan (1980) refers to as the organisation as a *language game*, denoting that organisations should be studied on the basis of the words, thoughts and actions constituted by individuals, with the purpose of conferring it meaningfulness. There is an interesting connection via the focus on act and practices to the perspective of Czarniawska (2002, 2008).
She emphasises the study of *organising* (as opposed to studying organisations), as how social practices constitute identity and sociality within an organisation. As others have pointed out, this construction is a process through language, where dominant discourse structures our ability to create the world and our identity in it (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009). Reality in this sense is therefore something enacted and multiple through our involvement with it (Law 2004).

If realities are produced or enacted, they are inherently something dependent on both relations and social context. Realities become the result of a process of social deliberation (Law 2004, Latour 1983, Latour and Woolgar 1986). All of this points to the foundation of Law’s (2004) argument, which is that the world around us, in its fabric, is fundamentally multiple. Reality is not something static or external. Instead we must envision reality as part of a creative social process (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, Latour 1983, Law 2004). In the relation between reality, knowledge and truth Alvesson and Sköldberg argue for a post-modern perspective, where we acknowledge the inherent social dimension of all three components in our methodology:

> “Truth is therefore not abstract and other-worldly, but concrete, particular and sensuous – while at the same time being open, in an ongoing state of new creation by the actors, transcending the boundaries between the ordinary and the fabulous” (2009, p. 204)

Whatever truths we claim to uncover about bureaucracy, entrepreneurship or organisational socialities, we must accept that they are spatial and temporal – dependent on social context, but existing as the liberation of illusion (Law 2004). As reality is multiple, truths are abundant (but not Truth with a capital T), but only as knowledge, which is contextual. The role of the researcher and author is to savour the multiple realities enacted through the empirical study, conjoin these with their social organisational context and elaborate them as useful theoretical insight.

### 2.1.1 Subjectivity and subjectivation

> “[…] Subjectivity is something unstable, contradictory – a process rather than a structure […]. How we speak and how others address us constitutes our subjectivity at any given moment, contingent upon the various discursive fields from which language emanates and in which we find ourselves.” (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, p. 195)
Our claims about the world are not just mere expressions of our view on the reality, which we experience. As Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009 and Alvesson 2003) argue, language, actions, emotions and opinions are not subjective expressions of an inner reality, but are continuous constitutions of subjectivity. Different contexts or discourses will allow certain identities to be more or less prevalent. Subjectivity is “the individual’s conscious and unconscious thoughts, emotions and perceptions, her self-insight and attitude to the surrounding world.” (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, p. 195), and as such subjectivity and the enactment of multiple realities are tightly interwoven in a game of language.

Although disagreement exists about how (de-)central a role we should ascribe the subject (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, de Certeau 1984, Law 2004), the subject possesses some ability to disturb or “make touches” (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, p. 195) to the discourse. This corresponds to the participant role in the social deliberation of realities (Law 2004), from which both reality and subjectivity emanates. In analysis of empirical studies we should allow the individual a certain performative power (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009). If reality is enacted, then subjectivity, as a process, connotes a performative, participant ability to the individual to affect the process. Therefore we cannot demote the individual to a purely passive role, at the whim of, and determined solely by, any momentary stable discourse. Subjectivity, then, becomes an expression, which is “limited in time and space” (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, p. 195).

Butler (1999) argues for a performative perspective on identity. Its ontological status is based on its expression, meaning that there is no stable external (or internal) existence of the identity or subject, other than through acts and language giving it name or form in a web of social relations. The study of identities, such as the entrepreneur and the bureaucrat, should therefore focus on the contextual enactment of the identity by the individuals studied. However, through language, acts and gestures, a generated identity established through discourse may be resisted, emphasising those subversive acts, which resist power performed over it (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, de Certeau 1984).

These discussions about the sociality and relational sides to our realities suggest that any empirical study should also be focused on an active, or performative, reality. Performative thus contains a double connotation as it both suggests entrepreneurship to be part of realities, which are only momentarily stable, and that entrepreneurship as a concept in itself becomes an expression through language or practices encompassing a productive or resistive force (Law 2004).
2.2 Accessing through analysis what has been othered

Method, then, is not about a fixed and knowable representation of an external reality or set of undisputable facts. To produce statements is to enter into dialogue with stories by interviewees and the subjects of the empirical research. The process (just as reality) is more elusive, as the straight-forwardness of realist research is abandoned for the complexity of sociality, which requires a different set of tools in order to develop and analyse empirical material (Alvesson and Kärreman 2007).

Stories or depictions produced through empirical methods represent the enactment of realities, which at the same time involve subject and sociality. Different stories contain different elements (people, objects, processes, contexts, language) and may be told in a variety of ways (Roulston 2010). Through narrative analysis we may unfold that which is made present in the stories, the elements that are made absent, and that which is othered or that one is simply blind to (Law 2004). This reflects the double side of the analysis of enacted sociality, where we must find both the expressions of sociality and those expressions, which do not find voice or are made impossible by discourse (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009).

2.2.1 Unlocking stories through interviews

Over eight days from the 24th October to the 31st October 2011 four visits were conducted in total at the two organisations. Each organisation was visited twice with three or four interviews planned for each visit. A total of 16 interviews were conducted, three of which were preparatory interviews with office managers. The visits alternated between the two organisations so that the first visit was with the Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation, the second with Danish Enterprise and Construction Authority and so on.

At the Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation four employees from the Centre for Strategic Research and Growth were interviewed at the first visit to the organisation. During the next visit three employees from the Centre for Science and Infrastructure were interviewed. The two centres service research councils, administer large amounts of research funds and are involved in policy development. The Centre for Science and Infrastructure is primarily involved with administration of grants, where the Centre for Strategic Research and Growth is more involved in innovation and research policy development. Access to

---

2 See appendix for a list of the interviewees and respective organisations.
employees was negotiated through the office managers of the centres. Prior to the visits both office managers were interviewed to establish an understanding of the offices, their management structure and significant issues.

At the Danish Enterprise and Construction Authority eight interviews, distributed over the two days of visit, were conducted with employees from the Centre for Business Development. Similar to the study at ASTI access to employees was negotiated with an office manager, who was interviewed between the two visits with the organisation, due to planning circumstances.

Through previous employment in the year 2009, I have personal experience with the work in the Centre of Science and Infrastructure, which provided knowledge about the ASTI, but also required a more open approach to the interviews to prevent any prejudice to dominate the conversations. Similarly, a previous study and interview with an employee in the Centre for Business Development has provided knowledge (albeit a limited amount) about DECA, which eased the entry to the interviews.

The choice of in-depth interviews with employees is a resulting compromise of access, availability and capacity. The time constraint of the thesis, and the amount of invested time that could be legitimately expected by each organisation, did not allow for longitudinal studies. However, the interviews provided ample opportunity to create valuable empirical material, both through the stories told and semi-structured follow-up questions.

The interview acts as a complex relation that allows the researcher and the interviewee to assume a certain subjectivity, which fosters the development of empirical material about the people involved and the topic studied (Alvesson 2003, Alvesson and Kärreman 2007, Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, Law 2004, Roulston 2010). Although the actual interviews were a delimited context in time and space, the relation and dialogue extends beyond the borders of the interview, both as dialogue transgressed the time-span of the interview and transgressed the context and roles of interviewer/interviewee.

The interviews were focused on the interviewees’ narratives (Alvesson 2003, Czarniawska 2002, 2008, Law 2004, Rosenblatt 2003, Roulston 2010). The interviews have been used to generate situated stories involving activities or practices of entrepreneurship in the two respective organisations. The narratives have all to some degree involved a setting (the organisation or centre in question, but also the time of the events and related events), a series of involved actors (the narrator, colleagues and superiors, clients, councils and the ministers), and important artefacts (e.g. documents, laws and regulation), which have been linked
together to form a story about the introduction of new practices, which in some way or another affected the organisation.

As preparation, each interviewee was asked to think of a situation or event, during which he/she was involved in the development and implementation of new initiatives, policy, processes or mindsets to their organisation. Furthermore, they were asked to consider the events around their involvement; who else had taken part, to what purpose they were working and how it had worked out. These preparations were the basis of each interview, and formed the backdrop against which the interviewee was asked to tell the story. Afterwards, the stories were elaborated through semi-structured follow-up questions on interesting issues. Between each day of interviews the interview guide was revised on the basis of field-notes from the interviews about topics that were of particular interest, with the purpose to develop the framing of questions.

“A continuing challenge for the interviewer is to be open-minded, to decenter from one’s own realities so as to be able to move into realities that are not only different from one’s own but also surprising, alien, uncomfortable, a direct challenge to one’s thinking, disgusting, horrifying, anxiety-provoking, boring, or otherwise difficult.” (Rosenblatt 2003, p. 229)

A challenge arises in the post-modern interview, because a disagreement may occur between the perspective and purpose of the interviewer and the interviewee. While the researcher may discard any belief in one sole truth and external reality, the interviewees may very well experience their reality as true, and think that what the researcher is doing, is to seek that exact truth (Rosenblatt 2003). In early contact with ASTI and DECA, and while negotiating access, there was an eagerness to interview me as to what my exact topic was (although in the early stages of contact the topic was still quite elusive), so that the ‘correct’ employees and stories could be found. As a response to this challenge, extra care was given to establish the purpose of the research and the overall definition of the interview topic, after which the interviewees were asked simply to begin their stories.

Presenting the concepts, as opposed to presenting the puzzle and motivation behind the research, has framed the research situation with very different outcomes (Alvesson 2003), necessitating reflection on the framing of the interview-situation. For some interviews it was necessary to establish a more specific framework prior to the interview, while for other interviews some time was spent on dialogue reaching an agreeable and common topic for the interview.
All interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed for the purpose of making possible an overview of the empirical material, note-taking, color-coding for thematisation and the move between interviews during the practical analysis. The transcriptions focus on the narratives, meaning that introductory comments by the interviewee have in some cases been written in note-form. As all the interviews were conducted in Danish, there has been a need for subsequent translation of quotes, which have been relevant for the analysis. These translations have been made in careful relation to the interviewee’s revealed intention with the comments, while sentence structures have subsequently been reviewed so that the quotes follow English grammar³.

2.3 A dramatic strategy for analysis

The strategy for analysing the empirical material goes hand in hand with the ontological foundation of the thesis. In the interviews, the sociality of the two organisations is rendered narrative by the employment of specific language to construct stories (Alvesson and Kärreman 2007, Law 2004, Roulston 2010). Exactly because the combination of entrepreneurship and bureaucracy is dramatical, as it is filled with emotion and unexpected events, I draw primarily on a combination of Burke’s dramatism (1945) and narrative and organisational analysis by Czarniawska (2002, 2008 and 1995 as Czarniawska-Joerges). The purpose is to accentuate and analyse the drama that develops when entrepreneurial practices are performed in bureaucratic organisations. Common to these scholars is the heavy emphasis of sociality in the analysis, not only between individuals, but also as the attention to relations between subject, object and context in different variations.

Through his pentad Burke (1945) invokes in the narrative (or drama) a way to understand and unfold motives, through a relationship between the five narrative elements act (the entrepreneurial practices in the narrative), scene (the centre, the organisation and particular time of the event), agent (the narrator), agency (the specific techniques that make up the practice) and purpose (what the narrator aims to accomplish or seeks to change). As Burke argues, this approach to social analysis does not prescribe a predetermined philosophy, but provides a framework for understanding the social aspect of human interaction. His approach aligns very well with the ontological basis of this thesis, as it makes use of the performative

³ See appendix for a list of all original and translated quotes.
aspect of sociality, and highlights the enactment of relations between context, individual, objects and events.

Similarly, Czarniawska (2002) is interested in how narratives are used to make sense of organisational realities, with a special emphasis on how identities are constructed and made coherent through narratives. She argues that identity within organisations today is both de-centred and multiple, but in stories the narrator is allowed to focus an identity for him/herself through the story – however momentary or contextual it may be. The emphasis of certain qualities to the scene and the act co-constitute the identity of the actor/narrator in the narrative (Burke 1945, Czarniawska 2002). Czarniawska (2008) adds with emphasis how identity is often established through similarity or differentiation to other people, periods of time or states of being.

Although from different perspectives, Burke and Czarniawska argue for a relational approach to narratives, where people, places, actions and artefacts are drawn together to construct and express notions of identity and motive. Though the narrator may not have been consciously aware of purpose or motive at the time of action, the narrative allows the narrator to develop a motive behind the act, which is employed within the narrative as a cause of events. How we make order of things after their actual event may thus contribute greater influence to our onward path than the cognitive process prior to the event.

While narratives have not necessarily been present in the empirical material as complete and coherent stories, they appear as fragments of coherent storylines in statements and comments (O’Connor 2004). Practically, more or less delimited narratives have been identified and thematised according to their relevance to the research question and by use of the vocabulary developed in the theory. The overall themes have been developed as a conversation between the theoretical concepts presented in the next chapter, and the progressively occurring points in the empirical material. The dramatist framework has been employed in this relation to structure the analytical points.

In his text on new approaches to organisational research Alvesson argues in favour of a more reflexive mind-set for analytical method, using metaphors to emphasise different perspectives nested in the empirical material. This reflexive pragmatism involves “[…] working with alternative lines of interpretation and vocabularies and reinterpreting the favored line(s) of understanding through the systematic involvement of alternative points of departure.” (Alvesson 2003, p. 14). Traditionally organisational research has predominantly relied on the organism or the mechanism as a metaphor for interpretation, picturing the organisation as a
system with focus on structures or function (Kärreman and Alvesson 2004, Morgan 1980). To move beyond these perspectives the metaphors employed in this analysis have taken the shape of three theoretical and narrative characters, embodying different organisational logics. This combination of character as identity and as organisational logic has made them relevant as analytical tools, both in relation to the narratives as organisational realities and in relation to the interview as a social construct.

3 Practices, strategy, ethics and conduct

During the empirical study and as part of the preliminary analysis of the material, a set of theoretical topics has become especially relevant to the empirical material. As part of the abductive method these topics have been continuously revisited while developing the research question and the research question as such is therefore used to frame the theoretical perspective on the analysis. The research question and empirical material points towards four themes that need to be linked in order to answer the question in full. The four themes are all linked to the relationship between entrepreneurship and bureaucracy, and are: strategy (as social practice), entrepreneurial practices, organisational conduct, and ethics or ethos of organisational behaviour.

Entrepreneurship is for the purpose now adequately understood as coming alive to and transforming standard practices of coping with our world (Spinosa et al. 1997). During the generation and analysis of the empirical material there has been a continued return to entrepreneurial acts and practices⁴ (de Certeau 1984, Spinosa et al. 1997), which have taken a central role in the narratives. In relation to entrepreneurship, another field of organisational theory has emerged, namely strategy. Strategy has emerged as the counterpart to entrepreneurial practices both in a theoretic sense (de Certeau 1984), and as the empirical context for the practices. This involves conceptions of strategy, such as social practice of interpretation and coping (Chia and Holt 2006) and force-relationships formed as a technology of government to govern conduct (de Certeau 1984, Rose and Miller 2010).

---

⁴ I use both acts and practices. There is an important distinction between the two, but for the analysis their importance is the same. An act may ontologically refer to a single event or action (such as used by Burke 1945), where practices are organised human activity characterised by meaning, given its social context (see Schatzki 2005 for an elaborate ontological review).
The empirical material involves a great deal of bureaucratic elements, mostly as references to the type of conduct, which is expected of a bureaucrat (du Gay 2000, Kallinikos 2006). The bureaucratic model is relevant in several ways, but most importantly through its characteristics as a mode of governing the conduct of employees. In this chapter I review different perspectives on what determines the conduct of public employees and how the governance of conduct is performed by use of the bureaucratic model.

A final topic that surprisingly emerged in the narratives, which will also receive attention in this chapter, is ethics; what constitutes good behaviour (MacIntyre 1984). The narrators continuously drew upon notions of the ‘good’ act in stories (essentially their organisational ethos, du Gay 2008) to highlight or explain certain actions. In this chapter I explore various positions on ethical considerations in different (organisational) contexts, because the analysis will show how entrepreneurial acts and practices involve a conflict, which is ethical in character.

Embedded in the foundation of the research question, and in the framing of the thesis in general, there is a clear contrasting of the different fields with the advancement of neoliberal economic rationalisation. Several of the concepts are in their conception related to this contrast, meaning that there is a need to review this contrast in the literature on the four theoretical concepts as well. Each concept therefore contains a contrast to the rational choice perspective as part of the distinction and definition in order to relocate them in relation to this thesis.

3.1 Extricating entrepreneurship from the managerial

Exactly because the entrepreneurial practices are so central to this whole thesis, it is only fair to engage in an elaborate theoretical quest in this chapter. I embark on this quest through a tracing of the entrepreneurship concept and its context, and a contrasting with what can be referred to as the enterprise version of entrepreneurship (Hjorth 2003). While enterprise in the introduction was mostly linked to the debate about bureaucracy and government, the same rationalisation has taken its toll on the entrepreneurship debate and it is necessary to draw upon the contrast between perspectives in order to introduce entrepreneurship in the right sense to this thesis.

But why is enterprise discourse so integral to understanding entrepreneurial acts, if the latter is sometimes in nature the very opposite of the former? It is because in the very language of management theory is nested an attempt to discursively alter the meaning of entrepreneurship
by use of enterprise. For the narratives from the two organisations the same can be said; in several stories the language of enterprise, or management, is prominent but simultaneously paradoxical to the entrepreneurial acts. I mean to make explicit here the distinction between the different approaches to entrepreneurship so that the concept may be dislodged from the enterprise perspective.

“Enterprise and entrepreneurialism occupy an absolutely crucial role in contemporary discourses of organizational reform where the major principle of organizational restructuring is the attempt to introduce market mechanisms, market relationships and market attitudes within the organization.” (du Gay et al. 1996, p. 267)

It is in the discourse on enterprise and management we find the beginning of the distinction, between what Hjorth (2003) calls the ‘managerial entrepreneur’ and the ‘entrepreneurial entrepreneur’. To arrive at this distinction, we must first trace the discourse on the manager and the proliferation of enterprise in the debate on organisational reform. Managers may seem as an almost integral element in organisations, but as argued by du Gay et al. (1996) the manager has not always existed and “what it means to be a manager varies historically in relation to changing conceptions of the activity of management and the associated techniques and practices that bestow upon these a material reality” (p. 265). As they argue here it is exactly the consequent techniques and practices bestowed upon an organisational character, through their relation to the definition of the proper organisational form that makes up the character.

The current ‘enterprise’ version of organisational reform centres on introduction of market mechanisms, as the a priori sole solution to the uncertain challenges to more rigid and inflexible ‘bureaucratic’ organisations, caused by globalisation (du Gay 1994, 1999, 2000, 2004, 2008, du Gay et al. 1996, Frederickson 1996). It is the “subtle imbrication of ‘economic rationality’ and ‘behaviourism’ to produce a method of programming the totality of governmental action.” (du Gay 1994, p. 659). The purpose is to reform organisations to become flexible and effective through market mechanisms, so that they may stand up to the challenges put forward by their proponents. The instrument to be used is contractualisation; the delegation of responsibility (and through this accountability) to a distinct unit of management (du Gay 1994, du Gay et al. 1996). Thus the manager becomes an important character in the organisation to ensure proper conduct along the lines of economic rationality to guarantee economic efficiency. For entrepreneurial government, the various roles of the employee are reduced to that of the manager, who must in effect be an entrepreneur; but an
entrepreneur of the self (du Gay et al. 1996, du Gay 2000, Hjorth 2003). The lot of the employee is to continuously better ones own human capital, to be moulded to the environment in order to achieve optimised performance (du Gay 2004, du Gay et al. 1996, Rose 1999). There is a marriage between the manager and the entrepreneur into managerial entrepreneur, who is an economically rational being – a *homo economicus* – constantly calculating upon him/herself; businessing for oneself, but as a subject of the enterprise, following corporate conduct (Hjorth 2003). Through the grasp of neoliberal thought and writing on organisational theory, ‘choice’ was introduced as a fundamental characteristic of human nature, which in turn prepared the ground for the calculated administration of organisational behaviour (Hjorth 2003, Rose 1999, Rose and Miller 2010). This construction places the manager in a key role as the expert of process and manipulator of interest, the one organisational character, which can govern according to the prescriptions. The identification of globalization as an all-consuming phenomenon of uncertainty to which organisations must respond, is a condition that places the entrepreneur in a central role along with management (du Gay 1994, Hjorth 2003). Combined with a proliferation of management writings on innovation and entrepreneurship, the marriage has been made possible (Hjorth 2003).

But as the entrepreneurial is turned economic and married with management, it is also made measurable vis-à-vis performance. The entrepreneurial therefore only appears in a controlled, or managed form, where it adheres to corporate goals (Hjorth 2003). The trick used in enterprise discourse (and for Osborne and Gaebler, 1992, in particular) is to juxtapose the bureaucratic (old and bad) with the entrepreneurial enterprise (new and good). This juxtaposition is a recurring (to some almost religious or teleological) rhetoric throughout management studies (O’Connor 1996). It is this juxtaposition of ‘bureaucratic’ with ‘enterprise’ that allows them to enter the manager (as the managerial entrepreneur) so religiously as the saviour of failed bureaucratic organisations. But it is also a further marriage of the bureaucrat, the entrepreneur and the manager, where it is a takeover by the private domain of the public, only to see that the bureaucrat is lost in the marriage along with all of the qualities the bureaucrat brought about.

The entrepreneurial entrepreneur, or genuine entrepreneurship as coined by Spinosa et al. (1997), is something entirely different, exactly because the proliferation of the neoliberal economic rationale is not the foundation of his/her existence. As a distinction between the two characters one can say that, where the managerial entrepreneur (or deficient entrepreneurship)
acts in accordance with the rules of the game, the entrepreneurial entrepreneur makes a play on the rules of the game.

3.2 Undoing the proper through entrepreneurial practices

The entrepreneur and the manager take up centre stage characters in the enterprise discourse, but if we want to search for entrepreneurial entrepreneurship, or genuine entrepreneurship, we must look for practices, which can only be found in the peripheral. The most interesting writings on entrepreneurship are found in the play with the borderline, the peripheral or the other. It is practices that make their move in the gaps of the proper (Spinosa et al. 1997, Hjorth 2003). The practices of the entrepreneur have an almost ontological sense to them. As with methodology it is a play on the other, where something is hidden, unavailable, concealed within what we see. There are great similarities between being able to perceive the other that Law (2004) writes about and the practices de Certeau presents in his book The Practices of Everyday Life (1984). The practices that de Certeau writes about are tactics, the circumstantial breaking through a fracture in the ‘proper’ that makes space for new meaning, manipulates its place, making it different from what it was before. It is a perspective that focuses on the relation between production of images and consumption, where, through consumption, we produce new images. It is not an acting in the world, but an acting upon the world, where it is our making use of ‘systems of production’ that is interesting.

“In reality, a rationalized, expansionist, centralized, spectacular and clamorous production is confronted by an entirely different kind of production, called “consumption” and characterized by its ruses, its fragmentation (the result of the circumstances), its poaching, its clandestine nature, its tireless but quiet activity, in short by its quasi-invisibility, since it shows itself not in its own products (where would it place them?) but in an art of using those imposed on it.” (de Certeau 1984, p. 31)

Although tactics are a producing force it cannot produce for itself an entirely new world to act upon, for in its definition it is the acting upon a place, a strategy, which is “the calculus of force-relationships which […] assumes a place that can be circumscribed as proper” (de Certeau 1984, p. xix, original emphasis). Tactics are momentary practices, fragmented because they play on circumstances, where the proper presents events that can be turned into opportunities. Tactic is an ‘undoing of the proper place’ through poaching on these opportunities, however, only momentarily, because “what it wins it cannot keep” (de Certeau 1984, p. 37). To the entrepreneur de Certeau’s tactics are everyday creativity that makes a play on the place in which the entrepreneur is located to create in it a space that allows for
new practices or meaning. It is creativity because the tactic does not possess an image of itself, and must therefore always make of the other something new; it is always becoming, it is movement, never static in a mode of being (Hjorth 2003). Here there is a clear break with the rationalised economic, or enterprise, version of entrepreneurship, which is married to management in its attempt to realise, or resemble, corporate goals.

It is in the DNA of the practices that we find the difference between the two versions of entrepreneurship. It is in the difference between resemblance, or realisation, and actualisation (Deleuze 1988). The managerial version of entrepreneurship is an instrument of corporate control. It is manageable, where the employee seeks to better ones own capital to fulfil organisational goals (Hjorth 2003). These are obtained through resemblance, as the product of the managerial is an attempt to resemble the goals of the organisation. The entrepreneurial or genuine entrepreneur acts upon an idea in a temporary state, producing an opportunity. The idea is never an exact image, but is becoming through its actualisation; the idea is virtual (Deleuze 1988, Hjorth 2003). It is multiple in the sense that it holds potential. The possible is realised, but only in the image of the possible, which it must resemble, while the virtual is actualised through a process of creation through differentiation (Deleuze 1988), thus making the distinction in its essence about creativity.

In Disclosing new worlds – Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action, and the Cultivation of Solidarity Spinosa et al. (1997) present a related perspective on the practices of the entrepreneur, which also departs from the relation between the place and the entrepreneur. While de Certeau (1984) and Hjorth (2003) make the distinction between place (as force-relationship or strategy) and space (the creative space established through the cunning use of tactics to poach on the place), Spinosa et al. write about entrepreneurship founded on the relation between a disclosive space (based on the work of Heidegger) and the appropriation of style. These two concepts are essential to understanding their practices of the entrepreneur. The disclosive space is “a totality of interrelated pieces of equipment, […] used to carry out a specific task […] to achieve certain purposes, […] enabling those performing it to have identities” (Spinosa et al. 1997, p. 17). There is a great deal of meaningfulness involved, in the sense that meaning connects practices and objects (without the practice of working at a desk, the desk would have no meaning and merely be an object). They use the term style to denote the way practices fit together, constituting what things, people and activity are. The act of the entrepreneur is to make a change in style, meaning a change in coordination of practices with other practices, consequently means a change in meaning.
The opportunity in *Disclosing new worlds*, upon which the entrepreneur acts, occurs as the entrepreneur exhibits a sense of *heightened sensitivity* to a situation by sensing and being captivated by *anomalies*. These anomalies are what make the entrepreneur realise that practices and understanding prior to the anomaly was limited or less than the best. This form of entrepreneurship requires *involved experimentation*, something they oppose to detachment. Detachment is an intellectual extraction of ourselves from the imminent pressure of the moment (Spinosa et al. 1997). While it grants the ability to obtain a wider view and make intellectual analysis, it takes away our passion for the moment and our ability to adapt to change. For Spinosa et al. (1997), de Certeau (1984) and Hjorth (2003) passion and personal involvement are absolutely essential qualities of the entrepreneur. This is the key to sensing anomalies, seeing it as opportunity and acting upon it with practices that may be disharmonious to other everyday actions. “Thus successful entrepreneurs bring about social change by modifying the style of particular subworlds or the style of the society in general.” (Spinosa et al. 1997, p. 68). Spinosa et al. (1997) present three distinct techniques for this (see pp. 24-27 for elaboration of the three): 1) Articulation (sharpening a style), 2) Reconfiguration (changing a style from its margins), and 3) Cross-appropriation (adapting practices from one disclosive space to another). Common to the techniques is that they bring about new practices (or re-new old practices lost) through a change of style in the disclosive space. An interesting nuance to these entrepreneurial skills is the institutionalisation, to which the authors also refer. For although it may be assumed that institutionalising entrepreneurial skills would rid them of their value, they say it is quite opposite; it is when we normalise the anomalous, and thusly forget to be entrepreneurial, that our institutions grow stale. Returning to the term involved experimentation, we can see that to be a genuine entrepreneur requires us to be *skilfully coping* (Spinosa et al. 1997, p. 100) by engaging in a situation, not merely by being a detached observer. Through engagement the entrepreneur makes adjustments to ongoing changes but with heightened sensitivity, so that he/she may be aware of disturbances or anomalies.

### 3.3 Strategy as social practice and discursive use

Although I already touched upon strategy in relation to tactics as entrepreneurial practice, an unfolding of the term allows for greater insight to its complexity. The entrepreneurial practices that I have incorporated frame strategy as dominant language or proper place, denoting a discursive meaning to the term. In this section I elaborate on this aspect of strategy as a social construct and discursive element.
In the rational sense, strategy is taken to be the intentional long-term determination or goals of an organisation or company. While this notion is not necessarily untrue, the term also covers a much wider commitment and process than mere determination.

“The traditional rational perspectives on decision making take strategic decisions at face value, as the 'decisive' elements of an empirically observed rational process: at some point in the life history of a strategic change a decision or decisions are made that commit the organization to proceed in a certain way.” (Hendry 2000, p. 956)

Hendry argues that for many organisations, in particular bureaucracies, where rational decision processes are the norm, strategy is expected as a product of a rational decision making process, based on deliberation of such things as resources, environment and abilities. This perspective is restrictive, he argues, because strategy should be seen as a discursive element, always invoked through language to influence the actions of colleagues. As a social practice, strategy does not lend itself to objective timeless definition as “[It] takes its meaning from the social context in which it evolves and is, at any time, whatever people make of it.” (Hendry 2000, p. 970).

Strategy is in this respect a process of imposing (a cognitive) rational order upon past actions or experience. A similar view is found with Mintzberg and Waters (1992) that strategy is the retrospective ordering of past actions to organise the firm coherently. They argue that strategy emerges in day-to-day activities based on the actions taken by the entrepreneurs of the firm (meaning entrepreneurs in the business sense of the word). This thesis does not focus so much on the process of establishing strategy, but their point is interesting because it highlights the performative and social nature of strategy, and the effect a retrospective intelligent sense of strategy can have on future actions.

A similar view, but with more emphasis on the process of strategy conception can be found in the work of Chia and Holt (2006) on *Strategy as practical coping*. In their article they view strategy as a process rather than the product of it. Parallel to Spinosa et al., they highlight the idea of being involved with the moment; here termed dwelling (similar to *involvement*), also with a relation to the equipment available to us. Making (organisational) equipment available to us means an unobtrusive coping with the world in which we are immersed. Their argument is that much strategy work is constructed while dwelling in an involved everyday practice, whereas the rational decision-making on strategy is determined in the detached mode through deductive means.
In the sense of the versions I have presented here, strategy is both a discursive power/knowledge term that lends itself to use for influence on action, and it is a social practice of ex-post deliberating and rationalising over past actions. There is little rational decision-making over the term, only in the sense that building, or planning, may occur in a detached state of mind (Spinosa et al. 1997, Chia and Holt 2006). However, this detachedly constructed strategy will be exposed to consumption (in the de Certeau sense of the term) by employees and interpretation through dwelling (Chia and Holt 2006) as a production of meaning for the strategy. As Chia and Holt would argue, employees dwelling in day-to-day practices will have organisational equipment readily available turning the strategy-making process more explorative, resembling a kind of involved experimentation. Here it is evident how strategy becomes relevant to entrepreneurial practices, as the latter acts upon the former, while the former in some instances become a practical outcome of the latter. It is important here to return to the point that Hendry makes about the contextual nature of strategy. While strategy forms a context, a place, for entrepreneurial practices, strategy is not a constant, upon which we act. It is enacted in the context by a constellation of social actors. In the analysis this becomes relevant as strategy may be apparent in two ways – first as a social construct, as a detached intelligent abstraction (Chia and Holt 2006), which influences acts as a power/knowledge tool, and second, as the othered context of entrepreneurial practices (de Certeau 1984) only implicitly present.

A nuance should not be forgotten here. While Chia and Holt as well as Mintberg and Waters are involved with the process of establishing strategy, de Certeau is interested in the disturbance of strategy. For de Certeau tactics are the tool of the weak (de Certeau 1984, Hjorth 2003), exactly because these practices are movement, where strategy is a force-relationship that sustains a stable (not constant) place. While Mintzberg and Waters’ subject is definitely an entrepreneur in the business sense of the word, he is unlikely to be termed ‘weak’. We should therefore be attentive to the nuance between strategy as a social construct and strategy as the determination of a proper place. Though distinct they are not incompatible as an entrepreneurial understanding of strategy as a social construct would likely reveal tactical practices within the concept.

### 3.4 Conduct and its governance

In this context, conduct refers to the manner in which we behave and is important because it plays on the relation between the characteristics of the bureaucratic model and the relation to strategy as social practice to influence behaviour. Conduct is intended to help understand in
the analysis how the bureaucratic elements essentially frame a certain type of behaviour in the narratives.

In the literature on bureaucracy conduct is used in relation to different concepts such as organisational forms and specific organisational roles one can inhabit (du Gay 2000, Kallinikos 2006). However, conduct is perhaps most prominent in the context of power-knowledge relations and the process of making up behaviour and the governance of actions (Rose and Miller 2010). In this foucauldian sense, conduct becomes something governed, or to which the purpose is to make governable through making knowledgeable specific types of conduct (Kurunmäki and Miller 2006, Rose and Miller 2010). It is of course particularly interesting to explore its use in relation to bureaucracy – making possible a distinction of the conduct of the bureaucrat, the manager and the entrepreneur; roles, which have all been employed in both the theory and the empirical material. The key to understand then is how the conduct of the public employee is made governable, and which governance technologies are employed (Rose and Miller 2010).

There is a basic dichotomy between the manner in which people are expected to conduct themselves in a bureaucracy and in the entrepreneurial, or enterprise, form of government. In a bureaucratic context the basic characteristics of conduct are: “strict adherence to procedure, acceptance of hierarchical sub- and superordination, [and] the abnegation of personal moral enthusiasm” (du Gay 1994, p. 656). The adherence to procedure is an ongoing theme throughout the literature on Weber’s bureaucracy, and is concerned with the use of rational-legal rules as a power relation for the basis of legitimate action (Casey 2004). As Casey notes the conduct of the bureaucrat is based on “technical and professional expertise, and […] a non-partisan cosmopolitanism” (p. 62). However, it is important to note that these are of course traits of an ideal type, and that the practical exhibitions of these will vary along with the variation in bureaucracy in a given organisation (du Gay 2004). An important point by Weber is that this conduct is based on a belief in its basis – something, which is always complex and never straightforward (Casey 2004). The bureaucratic characteristics of an organisation govern conduct through socio-ideological, or discursive, and technocratic means (Kärreman and Alvesson 2004, Rose and Miller 2010).

With reference to what he calls a division of ethical labour, du Gay (2000) describes how the conduct of the ‘official’ is guided by a responsibility to the office, akin to an honour of this conduct. He emphasises how the conduct is influenced by a plurality of obligation, depending on the situation in the institutional milieu, while all require the abnegation of personal moral
inclinations and the impartial adherence to the office. The purpose of this conduct is to promote an organisation, characterised by formal equality, reliability and procedural fairness to cases (du Gay 2008), but also political accountability in a system of liberal government (du Gay 2004, 2008).

While Weber’s bureaucracy is characterised by the plurality of obligation, the conduct proposed by Osborne and Gaebler (1992) in order to re-invent government is oppositely singular. The conduct of the manager, the bureaucrat and the entrepreneur is lodged together by their ten principles for re-inventing government. To Osborne and Gaebler the bureaucrat, now deemed manager, and further an entrepreneurial one (making for managerial entrepreneurship), should exhibit market-oriented conduct in all aspects of public service.

“Entrepreneurial governments promote competition […], empower citizens, […] measure the performance of their agencies, focusing […] on outcomes. They are driven by their goals— their missions […], redefine their clients as customers and offer them choices […]. They prevent problems before they emerge […]. They put their energies into earning money […], decentralize authority […] prefer market mechanisms to bureaucratic mechanisms, [and] they focus not simply on providing public services but on catalysing all sectors […] into action to solve their community’s problems.” (Osborne and Gaebler 1992, p. 19-20, original emphasis)

These principles propose that all conduct of public employees should be defined as market-oriented, proactive and entrepreneurial (du Gay 1994), with a role involving purely economic aspects of performance, efficiency and audit (du Gay 2004). Their mode of governance is, however, not all that different as they employ belief in the market as socio-ideological control and market-based tools such as contractualisation as technocratic control. However, what Osborne and Gaebler (1992) propose is a more extensive governance of conduct as the pervasive ideological belief in market mechanisms permeates all aspects of conduct (du Gay 1994, Rose 1999).

3.5 The ethic and ethos of bureaucrats

The ethical aspect of organisational analysis is often implicit, as the definitions of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ lie inherent in the applied theoretical perspective. Ethics are relevant, as the narrators in the empirical material make claims to and reveal hints about the underlying motives of their actions. Throughout the stories different value judgments are employed to justify actions and entrepreneurial practices. A conflict arises in the narratives, which especially concerns the
relation between the individual and the organisation, and the ‘goods’ that are pursued. To understand this conflict I look to the theory for a similar conflict.

There is a dilemma with bureaucratic organisations concerning the ethical base of actions. Two views concerning the involvement of persons in the organisations oppose each other. In *After Virtue* (1984) MacIntyre critiques bureaucratic organisations, because he sees them as compartmentalised units. It separates the human from the definition of good behaviour or virtues in the organisation; it is behaviour and an ethic that we can ‘wear’ as a piece of clothing. MacIntyre argues that our actions in all parts of our lives must be based on a single ethic as a coherent person.

Opposed to this are the proponents of bureaucracy, such as du Gay (2000, 2008) and Kallinikos (2003, 2006). They argue that with the historical construction of the bureaucratic model, an important element has been the separation of the person from the role he/she inhabits. This separation serves both the person and the organisation, as it allows the organisation to structure the system by moulding the roles, and it prevents the organisation from being able to instil specific moral values upon the person.

While MacIntyre’s ethic is opposed, his language is useful for the understanding of the ethical dilemma. MacIntyre’s ethic is based on the work of Greek philosopher Aristotle and incorporates a framework of practices, goods and virtue. Through involvement in practices, we seek to obtain certain ‘goods’ in order to achieve the *telos* of the ethic. He makes a distinction between two types of goods that we may achieve through practices: external goods and internal goods (MacIntyre 1984). Internal goods are those we achieve from a practice for its own sake, while external goods we pursue for the sake of something else; the first are goods of excellence, while the latter are goods of effectiveness (Beadle and Moore 2006). While both ‘goods’ are indeed good, MacIntyre argues that only the internal goods let us reach our *telos* (MacIntyre 1984). Virtues, then, are the qualities we must possess and exhibit in order to achieve the internal goods of the practice (MacIntyre 1984, Beadle and Moore 2006).

There is agreement between MacIntyre and the proponents of bureaucracy that modern organisations have pushed an unhealthy ethic onto their subjects; an ethic defined along the lines of economic rationality and instrumental utility (Kallinikos 2006, Rose 1999). The involvement of the entire human into the organisation has introduced only the external good at the expense, and even in the language, of the internal good. Proclaiming that ‘excellence’ is the virtue of managers and employees frames it as something, which should be pursued for its
own sake. The predicament is that it is only framed as such. It introduces the economic rationale of the company internally to the human (Rose 1999), to produce an economic relationship of the person to him/herself in order to better ones human capital, making him/her a commodity (MacIntyre 1984) for the use of the company. MacIntyre speaks of this risk in the sense that through our institutionalisation of human behaviour we may be corrupted by the competitiveness of the institution. It is virtues such as justice, courage and truthfulness that must in turn strengthen us against this corruptive power.

This type of governance of conduct “[…] tacitly assumes that all values (or goods) are of the same nature, i.e. part of the same continuous and homogenous ethical landscape that makes them reducible to a common denominator, which is cardinal utility.” (Kallinikos 2006, p. 616). Kallinikos (2003, 2006) argues that the human being is not involved in its totality in modern organisations, in particular in the bureaucratic model, but is modular in this non-inclusive involvement, where a person’s social behaviour is linked to the role he/she occupies. The qualities of the bureaucratic model rely on a conduct guided by a bureaucratic ethos, which requires an individual’s impersonal involvement (du Gay 2000, 2008).

MacIntyre opposes this view with the argument that bureaucracies are instruments then in realising ends, which the bureaucrats cannot determine themselves (Beadle and Moore 2006). However, du Gay argues that although MacIntyre claims to present a view of the unified human being due to the underlying telos, this remains inherently fragmented or situated in the practices and institutions constituting personhood (2000, p. 27). As is argued by Willmott (1993), it is not the case that Weber’s (and thus du Gay’s) bureaucracy forces upon an individual ends that are foreign to him/her. Only through the process of critical reflection over different value-standpoints are we able to consciously choose a commitment. In an organisational context we do not unconsciously accept ends outside of our reach, but through questioning make allegiance to values we deem worthy.

Ethics and virtue become important to the analysis through the common use of practices. While the writings of Spinosa et al. (1997) have previously been employed in regards to entrepreneurial practices, they further explicate the underlying meaning and purpose of these practices in relation to concepts of solidarity and community. Following from their use of style and practices of disclosive space, they argue that values and goods are present as concerns in our daily practices. Concerns are communal in the sense that practices are shared in a disclosive space, meaning that “concerns are constituted in our daily practices as the basis of our identity as members of a community.” (Spinosa et al. 1997, p. 119). What follows from
this in their argument is that for each role in society, the competence needed to inhabit that role requires us to exercise certain virtues to support our collective virtues. The entrepreneur is in their view required to exhibit the virtue of his or hers competencies to support the collective concerns related to that person’s role and identity in society. For the bureaucratic entrepreneur we find a dilemma in the theory, which must be dealt with in a practical context as the balance between the virtues and personal involvement and the ethos of the bureaucrat. While the theoretical dilemma cannot be solved it must be lived with, and the purpose is to use the conflict in the theory to develop a deeper understanding of how this conflict affects the practices of entrepreneurs in public bureaucratic organisations.

4 Implicit strategy and entrepreneurial practices

Having introduced both the methodological and theoretical foundations, which have been developed in close relation to the empirical material, I turn now to the analysis of the interviews conducted with the employees of Agency for Science Technology and Innovation (ASTI) and the Danish Enterprise and Construction Authority (DECA). Four themes were highlighted, to which theoretical attention was brought in the previous chapter. In this chapter I use the theoretical concepts to analyse the narratives from the empirical material. As the research question illustrates the purpose is to show how the explicit entrepreneurial practices, present in the interviews, are used to engage the implicitly existing innovation strategy in the organisations and make room for new practices.

The analysis revealed that the strategy was not explicit in the sense of written bureaucratic procedure (du Gay 2000) or reference to a strategic decision (Hendry 2000). Instead, it was something akin to a social construction governing conduct (Hendry 2000, Rose and Miller 2010) – i.e. it is highly implicit in the narratives. Theoretically, I have treated strategy as the counterpart of the tactics of entrepreneurial practices. The analysis therefore begins with an investigation of what constitutes the implicit strategy, and how it governs the conduct in the narratives because it is the frame for understanding what it is the narrators act within, upon and against in the narratives.

Entrepreneurial practices are at the centre of the research question and are likewise the counterpart of strategy. Both method and theory suggest that the entrepreneurial practices are the central element to the research question. They are the explicit acts of Burke’s dramatist analytical framework and the tactics and practices of entrepreneurial theory (de Certeau 1984,
Spinosa et al. 1997). While all interviews contained hints and notions about the implicit strategy, only a handful involved specific events of entrepreneurial practices. These narratives are the objects of the second part of the analysis.

As suggested in the theoretical chapter actions and behaviour in public bureaucratic organisations are based on a particular set of motives. The theory suggests it is through an analysis of ethics that we find the motives behind the practices. The third part of the analysis therefore focuses on the ethical claims in the narratives. It is through the analysis of the ethical claims that we can understand the reasons for the entrepreneurial practices and their relation to the implicit strategy.

Before I begin the analysis I first turn to the scene and the characters that are employed in the narratives. I introduce an overall plotline to situate the interviews in a common context. The analysis revealed three outspoken logics that were employed by the narrators to make reason of different events and actions. These logics are embodied by three theoretical characters (the bureaucrat, the entrepreneur and the manager), which I also introduce before the analysis.

4.1 Setting the scene; the two agencies

After all this theoretical discussion about bureaucratic organisation forms it seems to the least counter-intuitive, and almost hypocritical, to call an organisation a typical example of something so diversely defined as a bureaucracy. Nevertheless both the ASTI and the DECA resemble the traditional image of the term ‘bureaucracy’. Both agencies are involved in operational affairs and policy development. Both agencies are organised into a series of divisions and subsequent offices responsible for their respective areas of operation. And both agencies are located close to the political process in the ministries.

In dramatism it is suggested that the conception of the scene reveals much about the quality of the act and the actors within (Burke 1945). While having already described the organisations and the method used to conduct the interviews it makes sense to understand the timing and context of them. As the interviews took place after the parliamentary election of 2011, but before the new government had been announced and subsequently taken office, it was unclear whether any significant organisational or political changes to the areas of operation were going to take place.

The interviews revealed that this state of limbo gave birth to opportunities but also remained deeply rooted in the strategic understanding of the procedures in the two agencies. This provided a scene for the retrospective rationalisation (Mintzberg and Waters 1982) of how
they ‘normally’ initiate and develop initiatives, but it also provided an event that could serve as a crack in the strategy, and become the opportunity for entrepreneurial practices (de Certeau 1984). This quality of the scene is also reflected in the analysis of the strategy and the entrepreneurial acts. The narratives reveal a highly retrospective detached reflection of the strategy as scene for acts, while the entrepreneurial practices are narrated as deeply involved events (Spinosa et al. 1997).

The political nature of the organisations has shown to be important for the framing of purpose of different acts in the narratives. Serving both ministers, councils and external clients, the narrators are involved in an ongoing attempt to manage this multiplicity. While the research question simplifies this complexity with the relation between entrepreneurial practices and the social construction of an implicit strategy, I include the view of three different theoretical characters that find voices in the narratives in an attempt to retain the complexity in the analysis.

4.1.1 Introducing three lead characters to the scene; the bureaucrat, the entrepreneur and the manager

On to the set walk three central characters. Neither the set nor the characters are real, but they are all enacted through the stories. While the characters are theoretical, the narrators in the interviews draw upon the logic of the characters, bringing the different perspectives into existence, and confronting the perspectives with each other. The bureaucrat, the entrepreneur and the manager embody the different logics made available in the theory, but they are also expressions of different logics that bind claims and acts in the stories together.


The entrepreneur is one who acts and makes new acts possible. These are acts that change equilibrium, or expected paths, and allows for new practices to occur (de Certeau 1984). Acting relies on a deep involvement with the surrounding world (Chia and Holt 2006, de Certeau 1984, Spinosa et al. 1997) as it is an ‘acting upon’ the surrounding world. New practices become possible, where opportunities are found in the in-between of the surrounding world (Hjorth 2005), which is consumed to produce new practices.

The manager adheres to, establishes or makes changes according to strategy, through organising, planning and controlling (O’Connor 1996). Through strategy the manager re-
establishes hierarchical relations, where changes trickle down through strategic decision to operational levels. The manager produces changes through resemblance (de Certeau 1984) of strategic goals, which occur as practical interpretation and enactment (Hendry 2000, Mintzberg and Waters 1982). These interpretations do not poach but re-affirm the strategy.

All three characters can make changes to the organisation, but do so in different ways. The manager follows strategy, but as theory suggests, strategy is constructed in social relations (Hendry 2000), and through retrospective rationalisation (Mintzberg and Waters 1982). Both the entrepreneur and the manager cope (Chia and Holt 2006, Spinosa et al. 1997) with surroundings and in particular with strategy. The difference between their coping is that the manager interprets to reaffirm possible outcome (de Certeau 1984), where the entrepreneur displaces the strategy (de Certeau 1984, Spinosa et al. 1997). The bureaucrat has an important role as expert (Casey 2004, du Gay 2008), which is not found with the manager or the entrepreneur. The entrepreneur seeks anomalies and gaps in order to displace the strategy and make way for new practices. To the manager it is the economically efficient realisation of goals that is key (Kallinikos 2006). The bureaucrat also promotes efficiency, but efficiency with rules in order to establish fair procedure that treats clients equally; the goal is thus democratic and not economic (du Gay 2000).

The three characters are interesting and highly relevant as a tool to converse between the different logics present in the organisations. Though the perspectives of each character appear in the analysis it is not the identification of their perspectives, but the conversation between them, which is interesting. Therefore the characters are preserved for a distinct analysis of their conversation at the end of the chapter.

4.2 An implicit strategy for innovation of public affairs as social practice

There is no explicitly agreed upon strategy that determines how innovation takes place in neither the ASTI nor DECA. The rational decision that establishes the future innovation strategy of the organisations (Hendry 2000) is non-existent. The strategy found in the narratives resembles more a social convention, or a social construct used in relations to influence actions and govern conduct (Hendry 2000, Rose and Miller 2010).

I call the strategy an implicit strategy exactly because it is not clearly stated in the narratives or specifically referred to in a manifest form. However, the narratives converge around it, as practices rely on this social convention and conduct is shaped by it, through the technologies employed in the strategy (Rose and Miller 2010). A handful of elements have been
highlighted in the narratives by the bureaucratic theory as the establishment of the implicit strategy. Through these elements conduct is rendered material or made articulable and thus governable (Rose and Miller 2010). To understand how the strategy affects conduct I analyse each element individually, how it constitutes strategy and consequently review how the implicit strategy governs the conduct of the employees.

The strategy relies on a hierarchical link (Casey 2004, du Gay 1994, 2000, 2008, Kallinikos 2006) in the two organisations, positioning the employees in a certain place (de Certeau 1984). It spans time through the definition of intervals, where ‘possibility’ is available to the employees. And participation is determined through writing as a procedural practice (du Gay 2000) that defines the manner in which employees are involved in strategic action.

4.2.1 The top makes an order

“Often it [the innovation process] is classic desk-work. It is a process where the top makes an order and then the actual development work runs in rather narrow circles and is adjusted on the way back up. I think there is quite a lot of that.” (Interviewee D2, author’s emphasis).

The top, most often meaning the minister or the ministerial department, occurs in several of the narratives, with reference to how a process of developing new policy or new initiatives has been initiated. It is this top-down relation with ordering of initiatives that is the basis of the strategy for (policy and programme) innovation. It is a classic hierarchically structured bureaucratic characteristic (du Gay 2008), which emphasises the managerial aspect of the innovation. This vertical aspect of the structural relations is present in both theory and the narratives as the distinctive separation of responsibility in the organisation. Interestingly, other types of relations are absent from both theory (neither with du Gay 1994, 2000, 2008, Casey 2004 or Kallinikos 2003, 2006) and narratives. Networked relations appear peripherally in the narratives, but these and horizontal relations are practically non-existent.

Most bureaucratic theory contains hierarchical characterises as a basic element, but do not emphasise any particular implications. The hierarchical character in the narratives is outspoken in both a managerial (defined through goal-setting) and bureaucratic (through obligation) form.

---

5 For anonymity the interviewees have been assigned a code according to the organisation they work for. A refers to ASTI, while D refers to DECA. See the appendix for at full list of interviewees.
“It is our obligation to provide policy that fits whatever government is in office […] and it is also our task to make the minister look good” (Interviewee D2, author’s emphasis)

“We know that there is a constant need to develop something new […]. We have funds until the end of 2012 and we know that if some politicians are to say that they should have more money also after ’12, then we must also keep drawing attention to ourselves. So that’s a kind of driver that is always built into us” (Interviewee D5, author’s emphasis)

The hierarchical structure amounts to a high degree of obligation in the narrators’ roles as civil servants are obligated to serve the political interest of the government in office (Casey 2004, du Gay 1999, 2008). It also creates an inter-institutional relation, where the distribution of funds is a defining characteristic, necessitating the lateral attention of departments. The hierarchical relation is a defining part of how the narrators frame their attempts to construct new initiatives. As du Gay (2008) suggests this hierarchical characteristic is related to the responsiveness of the civil servants to political superiors, but it also reaffirms the internal orientation of the organisation concerning finance, as opposed to an external market orientation towards customers.

4.2.2 The relationship between the role and the office as place

There is an important connection between the verticality of the hierarchy and the role the narrators ascribe to themselves in the interviews. While the narrations show that the generic role of the bureaucrat is used with positive connotations the specific job-position as a role is employed as a definition of place in the organisation, in the de Certeau (1984) sense of the term, as something, which is held ‘in place’.

The role of the narrators makes its sway in two distinctive ways; as a definition of role qua job-position and as a definition of role qua departmental responsibility (du Gay 1999, 2000, 2008, Kallinikos 2006, Kärreman and Alvesson 2004).

The role (and place) of the bureaucrat as administrative officer in an agency is theoretically framed by the duties of the office (du Gay 1999, 2000, 2008) but balances with aspects of control, meaning a mix between bureaucratic and managerial notions. How narrators frame their role as administrative officers then also frames the conduct that entails from the role they carry as agents in the narrative.

“But as I said, I am only an administrative officer. There are limits to how much an administrative officer can change the systems overall. I don’t sit in
on the meetings where overall decisions about various things are made […] so there are limits to how much you can affect the system in the position I occupy” (Interviewee A7)

“In […] an administrative officer position I find it hard to see how you can experiment. […] I think there are positions in a house like this, where it is much more project-oriented than the position I have, which is more caseworker. But there are probably positions that are more entrepreneurial and where there is greater room for that stuff” (Interviewee A4)

Framed as being controlled (O’Connor 1996) and staying in place (de Certeau 1984), the quotes above from two of the employees at ASTI exhibit the restrained and highly managerial framing that the roles receive. The narrators frame their obligations and participation structurally, which influences how they perceive their own ability to make changes, i.e. become entrepreneurial. It is not the duties per se that frames conduct; it is rather the tasks or processes in which they do not participate, meaning that the conduct is negatively framed, as differentiation (Czarniawska 2002), with focus on what they are not a part of.

Used as reference to a certain location in the organisation, the office is also employed as a technology to keep the role of the narrator ‘in place’. This framing is performed with reference to certain processes in the organisation, which are location dependent, meaning that the involvement of the office in question in the strategy is location dependant. Responsibility and duties are assigned to departments or roles, not persons (du Gay 1999, Kallinikos 2006), which means that people, qua their position, play a certain part in the strategy and frames the narrator’s participation with certain functions. An employee from DECA framed the division of function between their own department and the ministerial department in the following way.

“When we come up with something, then their [the ministerial department] role is to say that they don’t think we should go forward with it. I don’t think of it as a limitation, more a sort of distribution of roles, and I am happy that I sit here, where we are the ones with the ideas and not the ones to bat them down.” (Interviewee D3)

Both the role and the department are influential characteristics of how a force-relationship (de Certeau 1984) is invoked through the strategy, which is important for the conduct and participation in innovation processes.

It could be argued that the positive framing of the division of functions, and the limitations it entails, is due to the interview-setting and the wish to display ones own identity or ones
workplace in positive terms (Alvesson 2003). However, the argument employed to underline the reason behind this distribution of function stems from the bureaucratic nature of the organisation (du Gay 1999, 2000, 2008), meaning that the narrator argues from the position of the bureaucrat, indicating a positive emotion towards the bureaucratic characteristics of the organisation – not the organisation in itself.

4.2.3 Waiting for a window to open

While role and department as place functions as technology of governance (Rose and Miller 2010) in a territorial sense, the term ‘window of opportunity’ is important, because it places the strategy in a relationship to time. The term is employed as a structural determinant that causes reactions upon its use in the narratives. Much of the opportunity-seeking behaviour in the narratives revolves around this ‘window’, which remains elusive until the moment it occurs.

“[..]We have all the different inputs in-house. Then you wait for a window of opportunity. Meaning, when is it you can see that it’s politically legitimate to propose something, and take it to the Minister’s desk. So it’s kind of a two-way process. Ongoing knowledge build-up and when there is channel of demand.” (Interviewee D6)

As the quote above from the employee in DECA suggests, the window of opportunity is not merely an opportunity that presents itself in the organisation, it is rather something the employees wait for. It makes a strong grasp on time and forms the conduct involved in the innovations strategy by suggesting different behaviour in different phases. Time is usually on the side of the entrepreneur (de Certeau 1984) as the momentary and advantageous use of events in which the entrepreneur is involved. Time becomes opportunity when anomalies are detected (Spinosa et al. 1997), but in the narratives the window of opportunity is not anomalous but structural and expected.

“Then of course there are times where it is more obvious to contribute with new stuff. We don’t know when the election comes, or when, all of the sudden, someone comes and asks us for input. We see it as important to continuously have something ready; that we are reasonably able to deliver on new initiatives. […] We have a feeling that a call [for new policy or initiatives] can come at any time without knowing when” (Interviewee D5)

Time is not in the favour of the entrepreneur, even though it is what one would expect (de Certeau 1984). This is because it is absorbed by the strategy as uncertainty (Beck 2006), which requires the employees to be constantly ready with initiatives if they want to exert their
influence when the window is open. The uncertainty is turned in to a rationalised expectance; as the expected window and the specific possibility it involves. The expectance is made structural through this expectance and thus becomes manageable as part of the strategy. This is opposed to the entrepreneurial sense of time, where the occurrence of opportunities relied on the temporary context (de Certeau 1984), and where the window of opportunity would remain always virtual (Beck 2006, Deleuze 1988).

I find it necessary here to make a distinction between the ‘window of opportunity’ in the narratives and the type of entrepreneurial opportunity we find in the theory. There are two important characteristics that make a distinction between the two forms of opportunity. First of all the entrepreneurial opportunity exists as a crack or gap in the strategy (de Certeau 1984, Hjorth 2003), and is therefore only detectable through submersion and involvement with the world (Spinosa et al. 1997). The opportunity expressed with the term ‘window of opportunity’ in the context of the narratives is an integral part of the strategy, and is expressed directly when it occurs. This means that although the narratives involve a search for this ‘window’ it resembles more an examination of the opportunity as possibility (Deleuze 1988) – of when and what is possible in the ‘window of opportunity’, rather than the attempt to use the opportunity to actualise something different or other.

The importance of the window of opportunity to the implicit strategy is that it is a mode of governance (Rose and Miller 2010). The consequence is easily identifiable because the question one must ask is only to try and see what happens in situations where the window of opportunity is closed.

“Then sometimes they [i.e. agency management] say that ‘it is really great’ and stuff like that, ‘but let’s leave it be for a while, and you have to focus on something else’.” (Interviewee D5)

An outcome of this is that the employees are forced to become experts of the strategy and the bureaucratic system (Casey 2004) to be able to navigate the scene, as the strategy spans across time, but also reproduce the strategy, when acting as bureaucrats in it.

4.2.4 Space integrated in the strategy

In structural terms the strategy forms a relationship, which produces the managerial and the bureaucratic; managerial in the sense that people and processes become manageable because they are ‘in place’ and bureaucratic in the sense that certain rule-bound practices become essential. An attempt to create space (Hjorth 2005) is integrated in the structural form of the
strategy, where the standard procedures do not apply (or at least apply to a lesser extent). Some of the narratives formed around two terms, which are formally integrated parts of the organisations. *Pilot-projects* and *consortium-projects* were used as narrative examples of contexts, where tools and resources were more freely selected. Pilot-projects were used as contexts to explain how more experimental forms of projects could be accepted, without being fully integrated in the standard procedures. Consortium-projects are a specific type of projects, which exist under the Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs.

“There is a consortium-project fund pool in [the Ministry of Economic and Business affairs], where a certain percentage of the agencies’ and the departments’ resources are pooled in a common pool, which then finances development-projects.” (Interviewee D6)

In the narratives both types of projects are used to legitimise an alternate type of scene within the organisations, where there is space to conduct initiatives through use of other practices, and where more radical ideas should be able to find room.

That this space occurs in the organisations is of course interesting, because they illustrate the attempt to allow for the organisational creativity (Hjorth 2005) that can integrate entrepreneurial practices in the organisations. This space allows for “projects outside the normal boundaries […] creating change-processes in a more long-term perspective, because day-to-day operations is often taken over by urgent tasks, so I see it as a liberation when you make these spaces” (Interviewee D4). While the structure of the position is loosened in the consortium-projects, and to some extent in the stories about pilot-projects as well, the formal procedure that characterises most of the development work persists. That the procedure remains formalised means that it is difficult to call the projects actual space in the de Certeau sense of the word. Space requires play, which is established by dispensing the rules of the surrounding world and the creation of own rules for the space (Hjorth 2005). For the pilot-projects and consortium-projects it means that there is a conflict between the attempt to create actual space for organisational creativity and the clutching of standard procedures. Ironically, pilot-projects and the consortium-projects are then perhaps the most visible and formalised examples of the implicit strategy, because they represent the exception to the rule.

### 4.2.5 Writing their way through the processes

A large part of the product for both organisations is written material in the form of preparatory documents, policy proposals, grant authorization documents, memos, reports and evaluations. Writing is as such an absolutely crucial practice for the narrators in the stories
they have told. Besides being a form of production, as writing produces documents, it is also a mode of operation bound to the rules (du Gay 2000, Kallinikos 2006), which is integral to the implicit strategy in the organisations. This practice is well integrated in the implicit strategy because it makes the process tangible and dislocates the process from the person; an important trait of the impersonal bureaucracy described in the theory (Casey 2004).

“I see an organisation where things have to go through many stages. There is sort of a case procedure you have to go through, where it has to be checked by a hundred people right down to the very last detail [...] and there are templates for how to write a memo and how to write this and that, meaning you have to follow these templates and there are very strict rules on what should be included in terms of case number and document number. [...] The problematic thing isn’t writing the text that needs to be produced but that horrid template it needs to be inserted into. [...] And it’s of course clear that it is necessary in a political organisation like this.” (Interviewee A4)

And how is this overcome?

“Well it isn’t, but it becomes, I wouldn’t say less irritating, but less scary.” (Interviewee A4)

The comment above from an employee in ASTI shows how both development and production are formalised through rule-bound procedure relying heavily on writing as the first and foremost practice. The comment also highlights that the procedure, although experienced as necessary, can be accompanied in the narratives by frustration. Becoming familiar with the procedure of writing is then a question of becoming expert with the bureaucratic system (Casey 2004).

“This challenge [the project in question] lands on my desk. My directors say ‘we must have something that targets this problem’, and then a whole lot of writing and documenting starts with my colleagues and me. And then we write and we write and we write, and then at some point there is a draft, which could be a solution. And from there on it passes through the whole system.” (Interviewee D2)

Writing (as a practice) is portrayed with different emotions in the narratives but the procedure that is illustrated remains the same, exemplifying that it is precisely the legal-rational, rule bound behaviour that is the key to the bureaucratic aspect of the organisations. The rules governing the practice are structured through templates and standards, objectifying them, making them technological. Governing conduct, but also changing conduct, becomes a matter
of adjusting technology (Rose and Miller 2010). As is indicated in the quotes this procedural practice requires a level of expertise (Casey 2004, Kärreman and Alvesson 2004) and familiarity with the practice in order to conduct oneself according to the procedure. This familiarity is similar to the ready-to-hand relation Spinosa et al. (1997) points out as the central quality of the deeply involved entrepreneur. The difference lies with whether coping is a means of conducting oneself according to the technology of governance, or whether coping becomes an antecedent for seeing and holding on to anomalies or gaps or gaps (de Certeau 1984, Spinosa et al. 1997).

4.2.6 Stating the implicit strategy explicitly

Thus far I have shown the (bureaucratic and managerial) elements that constitute the implicit strategy. Together, the elements form a coherent strategy, which affects the conduct in the narratives exactly because of its elements.

Through the retrospective rationalisation of social practice the conduct present in the narratives is rendered thinkable in the implicit strategy, which makes actions subject to governance (Hendry 2000, Mintzberg and Waters 1982, Rose and Miller 2010).

The conduct in the narratives is governed through a formalisation by writing, rendering the practice codified (Rose and Miller 2010). It is, however, also constituted as strategy through the practice and style it coherently forms as (Chia and Holt 2006). The fact that the practice of writing is the only formalised procedural element in the strategy highlights how the strategy is a social practice or convention (Hendry 2000). Governance of the innovation process is legal-rational through its bureaucratic characteristic, not by reference to a rational-legal decision, but comes clear as retrospective rationalisation (Mintzberg and Waters 1982) through reflection in the narratives. The hierarchical nature, focus on position and determination of time in the implicit strategy is what renders the conduct governable as place (de Certeau 1984), because these characteristics add a technology of governance that can be managed (Rose and Miller 2010).

As Chia and Holt (2006) highlight the implicit strategy that is formed in the narratives occurs as a consequence of the detached reflection inflicted by the interview context, but the implicit strategy, as social practice, remains a self-induced governance of conduct (Hendry 2000, Rose and Miller 2010). It is the ‘internalized predisposition’ (Chia and Holt 2006) of the implicit strategy, which is revealed through the narratives. This also reflects how the implicit strategy
influences the way the narrators frame themselves as experts (Casey 2004) or dwellers (Chia and Holt 2006) able to navigate within the strategy.

There is an interesting dilemma in the fact that the strategy incorporates notions of space through different project types, but simultaneously seems to prevent the exact behaviour the project-types seek to promote. Through these two project-types the narratives incorporate characteristics of organisational creativity (Hjorth 2005), but the two project-types still rely on the same formalised procedures when they reach a certain point. It is questionable whether the formal integration of the project-types and their formal definition promote the aspired practices or on the contrary encapsulate them. The narratives would suggest that the project forms promotes creativity in the innovation process, but in a reduced form compared to the playfulness (Hjorth 2005) and creative consumption (de Certeau 1984) we find in the space created by the entrepreneur.

It is clear that the strategy is both implicit in social practice and influences conduct through the elements that constitute it. The strategy also forms a context for entrepreneurial practices, an issue to which I now shall turn.

4.3 Explicit entrepreneurial practices

The strategy that occurs throughout the stories is revealed by implicit element and characteristics showing perhaps only a contour of what we may actually call a strategy. Contrastingly, the entrepreneurial practices that appear in the stories are quite explicit in their nature. Explicit in the sense that they appear directly as acts of either language or deed, where the narrator enacts entrepreneurial practices. In this section I introduce narratives from the empirical material that illustrate three different types of entrepreneurial practices from the two organisations.

The theoretical review of entrepreneurial practices showed how these practices are tactical in nature (de Certeau 1984) and that they can be so in different ways (Spinosa et al. 1997). All the entrepreneurial narratives involve a change in practice, however, not to the extent, where former practices were completely discarded or disregarded. While the tactical acts created space for new practices, these were intimately related to previous practices, and in particular their bureaucratic qualities. Consequently the analysis focuses on entrepreneurial practices, where the new practices created are related to previous ones. The narratives concern
First, each type of entrepreneurial practice found in the narratives is analysed with focus on how it is enacted and with what purpose. At the end of this section the bureaucratic characteristics that are the objects of the entrepreneurial practices are investigated as to how they appear in the narratives.

4.3.1 Resistance to make space

The first narrative of entrepreneurial practice is an example of how the narrator sees a ‘crack’ in the strategy, where an opportunity for other practices exists through resistance of structure the strategy imposes (de Certeau 1984). Resistance is the tactical consumption of forceful structure that obstructs its power, in this case the force produced by the hierarchy and procedure of the organisation. An ASTI employee, who works services a research council, performs the act. A main task is the ongoing administration of calls and applications for grants that the council receives, involving certain rules and procedures governing this task. In this case the narrative is concerned with how the organisation administratively deals with refusals, and the resistance to pressure for more complex procedure.

“The next large task that I think we should take on is that there has been critique of our reasons of refusal. [...] That they haven’t been good enough, because of the use of codes [procedural codes used for recognition of reasons of refusal], and that it needs to be much more detailed. To me that is not practically possible. You can’t ask these council members, who already spend I don’t know how much time on these applications, to produce a half page of clarification for every application they reject. It simply cannot be done and it isn’t practically possible. So I think you should work towards a way in the call [for applications] to write how the terms are and that you only provide a short reason – and that there has been an exemption to Danish administrative law’s rules for providing detailed reasons. That’s a protruding job, and where I think that we should challenge our law officers. They will probably not accept it easily. I don’t think you should always nod and say ‘yes, yes’. I think someone should challenge that [...] That is an upcoming project that I would like to take part in – to challenge our ministerial department and our own law officers.” (Interviewee A7)

---

6 Only one kind of entrepreneurial practice from theory involves a completely new style or practice, namely cross-appropriation (Spinosa et al. 1997).
In the narrative the law officers and the ministerial department become the representatives of the strategic rules and procedures that are the object of the agency in the narrative. Through the expertise of the bureaucrat (Casey 2004) the narrator argues with a concern for organisational resources and care for the council that the introduction of further procedure is not possible. However, this event is turned into an opportunity to change the practice altogether by the narrator, through the tactical use of the Danish administrative law.

The tactical act of creative consumption (de Certeau 1984) is a way to make use of, even corrupt, structure to make space for new practices. By obscuring the purpose of the administrative law through the desire for an exemption creative consumption is employed in the narrative. The governance of conduct through the administrative law is resisted with the purpose to reinforce the bureaucratic trust in the expertise of the civil servant (Casey 2004, du Gay 2008). The rule-bound behaviour is not suspended entirely, but the complete control of every detailed is avoided by through the reinforcement of trust in the civil servant.

Another example from the same employee shows again how resistance is used to make space for other practices. The specific narrative is linked to thoughts on the use of constant registration, and how increased digital registration of all accounts has been integrated into the procedures.

“Boy, do we register a lot more than we used to, because it is possible with the IT. The IT develops and you can do a lot more and so we also do a lot more. It costs time to do it every time […]. We must [..] constantly document, because what if there was a complaint [said with a sarcastic voice], where I would like to, well, let’s just take that reproach [laughs], as long as we treat our applicants well.” (Interviewee A7)

The procedure and rules are attempts to govern conduct in a manner that does not create mistakes. But the resistance here is used to balance between the rules and procedure as governance of conduct and the expertise of the administrative officer – a combination of technocratic and social control (Kärreman and Alvesson 2004). The theory suggests that both are key characteristics of the bureaucratic model, but does not suggest how to strike a balance between the governance of conduct and the trust in the expertise of the employee. The act of resistance becomes a way to establish that balance and return the system to the trust in that the administrative officers treat applicants well. Instead of seeing a complaint as a mistake, and ultimately failure of the system, it is consumed as a sign of strength of it.
It is interesting to notice that while ‘zero-error culture’ is a popular characteristic of public service, it is neither found as a characteristic in theory nor in the narratives. The narrator ultimately acts as an entrepreneur to reproduce the bureaucratic model, with a combination of procedure to establish the system and the trust in the impersonal fairness of the employees (du Gay 2000, 2008).

4.3.2 Articulation of a (entrepreneurial) style

The next narrative shows how a task, handed down from the narrator’s superiors, was used to allow for new practices among the colleagues. The task directly involved structuring the policy innovation process in an office of DECA, but was used by the narrator to articulate a certain style of practice involved in the process. The narrative balances between managerial, bureaucratic and entrepreneurial logics. Note how the narrator maintains the managerial and bureaucratic language when describing the act (‘structure and formalise’), while making use of entrepreneurial language when defining the purpose.

“I should maybe start by saying that the past year I have had, in fact, the task to structure and formalise a little bit the way we come up with new things […]. We all know how an analysis goes from 0 to 100. 100 is published, everybody’s happy. 0 is the start-line. […] We don’t have a 0 to 100 process on the policy part, so this fuzzy road – it’s fine that it’s fuzzy – it’s not about having it written down somewhere. It’s about people inside their mind knowing that there is a way […]. The important thing is that the 0 to 100 distance is known and comprehensible and that it exists. And then all of my bosses would say that this is not at all the important part here. They would say that [it is that] results come out of it – initiatives at 100 with financing and that the goal […] is reached. […] But to me it is a lot about that we didn’t even have a process […], it didn’t exist. It only exists when a whole group knows that this is what we are working for and there is a management that knows that this is being done.” (Interviewee D2)

Articulation brings out a quality of a practice, which has been forgotten or which is vaguely present (Spinosa et al. 1997). In this case the quality is the innovative capacity in the work the administrative officers perform. Perhaps it has been hindered by the implicit strategy, perhaps it is there but not recognised – nonetheless through articulation the narrator aims to allow for more innovative practices in the work. The task is initiated following the logic of the implicit strategy and the hierarchy of the organisation, but the act is tactical in the way the purpose is altered. The request is to formalise the process so that “results come out of it” – meaning policy. The narrator uses the request tactically to change the purpose (de Certeau 1984). In
effect the narrator alters the purpose so that the institutionalisation of the practice does not normalise the anomalous (Spinosa et al. 1997). The space is created through the articulation of the style of the practice; meaning how the narrator makes this concept of ‘the distance between 0 and 100’ known. The entrepreneurial act intends to implement an entrepreneurial characteristic into the bureaucratic style that is the strategy.

4.3.3 **Reconfiguration for the practice of a different identity**

By taking methods that are peripheral to the typical image of the bureaucrat and making them central to the job, an employee in ASTI acts to allow other types of practices to dominate the person’s role as bureaucrat (Spinosa et al. 1997).

“[…] Partly I have a curiosity […] and a large interest in talking to users, about what it is they experience out there. And that’s something we don’t have much room for here […]. Well, from my point of view we sort of sit behind these thick walls in front of the computer-monitor in this brown and heavy institution. As often as I can I try to turn things in the direction that we talk to our users. […] At the moment I am working on a [study design] to go out and visit the different [users]. […] We often experience that we receive questions about how to deal with [different] things, and we don’t know a thing about it, because we just sit here like these case-worker types who sort of administrate an initiative at the formal level.” (Interviewee A4)

The entrepreneurial practices in this narrative are in effect attempts to change the identity by differentiating it from a dominant practice (Czarniawska 2002). The caseworker image is employed as an identity from which the narrator wishes to differentiate. The differentiation is performed through reconfiguration of the practices that dominate the narrator’s work, making marginal aspects of involvement with users dominant in the role as bureaucrat (Spinosa et al. 1997). By creatively altering a task to include the perspective of clients, the narrator tactically changes the identity connected to the role as bureaucrat, but also differentiates across time away from the old image of caseworker, making the tactical act about becoming something other (Czarniawska 2002, Hjorth 2003).

These attempts to use entrepreneurial practices to reconfigure the style of the bureaucrat through differentiation have appeared for several narrators. The image of the bureaucrat they seek to differentiate from is not the image we find in theory on the bureaucratic model, but more that the negative image of the bureaucrat we find with authors such as Osborne and Gaebler (1992). Several comments during the interviews hint that the different offices would like to see themselves as something other than this image of a dusty old bureaucrat.
“In this house […] we would like to have the reputation that we don’t sit here and get dusty. And that we don’t forget that we are here for these [users].” (Interview D2)

Another employee from the ASTI expressed a similar intention.

“I think it is boring to be just an administrator. […] If you want to make a difference you also have to do something yourself” (Interviewee A3)

Although ‘being an administrator’ is not clearly defined the point stands out clearly that the narrator attempts to establish an identity, which is different from this stereotypical character (Czarniawska 2002). It is interesting that the practices associated with the type of employee the narrators aim to become – bureaucratic expertise, equal fairness to applicants, legal-rational procedure to structure tasks – are indistinguishable to that of the bureaucrat found with the bureaucratic model (Casey 2004, du Gay 2008).

4.3.4 Double role of bureaucratic objects

The fact of the matter is that bureaucratic objects and characteristics occupy a complex and contested role in the narratives. The two most evident cases are how ‘procedures’ and ‘documents’ appear in the narratives.

Registering and documenting were the object of resistance in the first narrative, where an overload of procedure was prevented through tactical consumption of law and the objection to the implicit notion that the system ought to be flawless. In the narratives of reconfiguration the stereotypical image of the bureaucrat was the object of differentiation. In the case of reconfiguration to allow more user-oriented practices in the work, the use of templates and documents during the process was also a target of critique, which reinforced the narrators desire to involve users. From these narratives it could seem that the bureaucrat is an unwanted figure to the entrepreneur, but this is actually not the case.

While documents take the place in the strategy as a technology of governance (Rose and Miller 2010) ensuring rule-bound procedure, registering and documenting is not exclusively a bureaucratic object. It is rather a management’s means of control through the ability to make actions measurable (Kallinikos 2006). When a narrator intends to take a reproach to avoid further registration and documentation it is the management control that is targeted rather than the rule-bound nature of the work itself.

The purpose of the entrepreneurial practices is not to altogether rid the organisations of bureaucratic objects, characteristics or practices. The control that comes with registration and
documentation as a mode of governance (Kallinikos 2006, Rose and Miller 2010) are what has been targeted with the entrepreneurial practices.

The entrepreneurial practices seem to have been employed to adjust the bureaucratic nature of the organisations while also establishing meaning and identity. By changing the quality of the organisation and the practice they also make space for expression of themselves (Burke 1945, Czarniawska 2002) and reveal the type of logic behind the narrative, in terms of the conversation between the entrepreneur and the bureaucrat. What is evident from the narratives concerning resistance, articulation and reconfiguration is that through the use of entrepreneurial practices, the narrators establish space that allows for practices or identity, which were incompatible with the implicit strategy.

4.4 Purpose, ethos and personal involvement

It is important to understand the purpose and motives behind the different acts and practices found in the narratives. The purpose reveals the quality of the agent, but is also the constitution of meaning in the act (Burke 1945). As Burke points out, only through an analysis of the purpose may we understand fully the relation between the agent, the act and the scene, whether it is a relation of impersonal expertise (Casey 2004) or passionate involvement (Hjorth 2003, Spinosa et al. 1997). In the relation between the entrepreneur and the bureaucratic model there is a clear ethical dilemma concerning the person’s involvement with the organisation. The passionate involvement that is needed for the entrepreneur to detect anomalies or gaps in the strategy (de Certeau 1984, Spinosa et al. 1997) contrasts the notion that the duties, responsibility and involved are dissociated from the person (Kallinikos 2003). This dilemma is expressed in the narratives in two different forms: the first is how the narrators come to manifest their own involvement in practices, and the second is what purpose is served, or what goods they pursue (MacIntyre 1984).

4.4.1 A dilemma with personal involvement

One point recurred continuously to describe the reasons why the narrators had been involved with the different projects and initiatives. The main reason is that working with the initiatives and projects was fun. While fun is employed in the narratives to describe the motivation for participation in certain tasks, it also reveals a certain identity of the narrator. How the term reveals identity is important as it shows how the narrators frame their involvement with the organisation. Describing a task as fun has established identity in the narratives in two ways; as differentiation of the narrator’s identity (Czarniawska 2002) from the image of the ‘dusty, old
bureaucratic’ that I have previously dealt with, and as an expression of passion, personal interest and play (Hjorth 2003). In other words, how fun is used as the language of the entrepreneur.

“That was a really fun task, because it was a development task”
(Interviewee A7)

 “[The reason for participation] is because I think it is fun. I think it is fun to develop.” (Interviewee D5)

The spirit of bureaucracy, being “without anger or passion” (Swedberg 2005, p. 20) contrasts with these references to fun, which are clearly expressions of passion. Both in theory and in the narratives the impersonal characteristic of the bureaucracy and the passion of the entrepreneur (Hjorth 2003) are contrasts of each other.

Statements such as “I think it’s boring to be just an administrator” (Interviewee A3, author’s emphasis), contrasts the prominence of the term fun and indicates how the narrators seek to differentiate their identity from that of the administrator. While there is no exact explanation of what the alternative to being ‘just an administrator’ could be, it is clearly related in the narratives to ‘development tasks’. These are the development tasks that produce new policy initiatives, but also those found in the narratives of entrepreneurship that are used entrepreneurially to make space for new, but bureaucratic, practices. The passion involved in these tasks is linked to their function for the organisation, meaning that the passion of the entrepreneur is directly linked to the promotion of bureaucratic qualities. What is evident in the narratives is not the impersonality of the bureaucrat (Casey 2004, du Gay 2008, Kallinikos 2006). Rather it is narrators who are passionately bureaucratic as entrepreneurs. The passion that the entrepreneur invests in the practices (Hjorth 2003) to seek goods that are of concern to the organisation likens then the virtue that is required of the identity as bureaucrat to support the collective concerns of society (Spinosa et al. 1997).

4.4.2 The pursuit of a ‘good’

While the ‘good’ that the organisation pursues is expressed in the narratives as something external (MacIntyre 1984) such as welfare for the population or economic growth, the ‘good’ of the practices that the narrators engage in are marked by the internal qualities of the passion with which the narrators are involved.

It is undeniably difficult to distinct the internal and the external nature of the goods pursued in the narratives. The passionate involvement of the narrators in development tasks is likely the
closest exhibition of internal goods of the practices of the civil servant, those practices pursued for their own sake. However, these are not quite the internal goods that MacIntyre (1984) propose, because the practices in the narratives first become meaningful to the narrator when linked to the external goods of creating something of value to ‘someone out-there’.

“Generally I would say that we try to strive for, when we make something new, that it is because we have identified a need among our users” (Interviewee D4)

The only purely external good found in the narratives is an integrated element in the implicit strategy, namely the pursuit for new funding – something, which only occurs in the detached intellectual reflection or retrospective rationalisation of strategy (Mintzberg and Waters 1982, Spinosa et al. 1997). There are other examples of acts, where the good pursued is for the sake of something else, i.e. external goods (MacIntyre 1984).

“[…] One word – optimizing. So that we may do things as fast as possible and as efficiently as possible and with as few errors as possible. […] If from the beginning you optimized the processes so you minimized the possibility of error, then you would be helped along really well.” (Interviewee A7)

While optimizing may be an economic term, the use of it here is to describe the ideal of the efficient, or good, procedure – clearly a bureaucratic good (du Gay 2000, 2008).

What type of good this pursuit represents is, however, quite a complex issue. Efficient procedure can hardly be said to embody something pursued for its own sake, i.e. that it would be an entirely internal good (MacIntyre 1984, Beadle and Moore 2006). The procedure requires meaning to become valuable. Again there is a link between the deep involvement, experience and practical insight that can be found with entrepreneurial practices (Spinosa et al. 1997) and the ethos of the bureaucrat, who promotes the duty of the office and its legal-rational basis (du Gay 1994, 2000, 2008). The procedures, rules and norms for processes are implemented to benefit those, whom the system serves, meaning the councils, the clients and users and the ministers. The entrepreneurs invoke passion (an internal good) to make space for practices, which may have qualities of an internal good, but first become meaningful in their relation to constituents external to the practices.

“It is not my personal opinion, but from the point of view of the system – so that the system works. Sometimes it just makes it sound so bad when the civil servants try to influence, but it is from the point of what you could see work based on the existing requirements” (Interviewee A6)
“People […] really like to see that the empty screen that Monday, where nothing was written actually turned into something 12 Mondays later, and 100 Mondays later someone sat out there, who got something out of it”
(Interviewee D2)

While passion may be a central quality of the entrepreneur, du Gay (2008) warns us that enthusiasm borders to the pursuit of personal moral absolutisms. But in the narratives the passion as an internal good is contrasted by the narrators with the pursuit for external goods, or goods for the sake of the organisation or office.

“Well [the reason for taking on the task] is just because I think it is exciting [laughs] and that is of course a bad reason. Well no, but also because you have an idea that you can do something in a better way, then I find that you almost can’t help yourself. […] For me personally that it is exciting, what does the organisation get out of that, so to speak.” (Interviewee A8)

When we look to the ethos of the practices in the narratives, we find neither moral absolutism (du Gay 2008), coherent ethical persons (MacIntyre 1984), nor the modular impersonal bureaucrat (du Gay 2008, Kallinikos 2006). The goods that are pursued are not all of the same nature, and vary according to context, requiring the narrator to adjust the sense of value accordingly (Kallinikos 2006). The only constant value is the belief in the fairness of the systematic procedure (Casey 2004, du Gay 2008) that the narrators find to be central in all narratives. This belief is key to understanding how there can be an internal good to this practice – which is the passion with which the entrepreneur is involved.

Through the entrepreneurial practices and acts driven by passion the chaotic is rendered procedural and the static is undone. The ethos that we can find present in the narratives is an internal good (MacIntyre 1984) based on a conversation between the bureaucratic abstention from personal moral judgement (Casey 2004, du Gay 2000, 2008, Kallinikos 2006) and an entrepreneurial passion of the practice (de Certeau 1984, Hjorth 2003).

4.5 The conversations between the three characters

The narratives that I have included in this analysis present a series of conflicting views and statements, which seem incompatible in principle, but become co-operational in praxis. The bureaucrat, the manager and the entrepreneur all present themselves in the different sections of this chapter, and make their presence on the scene through the reasoning and relations the narrators enact between the context, the agency they employ and not least the acts and practices they invoke (Burke 1945). When the logics interact it is in a state of disorder as the
logics often oppose each other, but it is in this disorderly relation that moments of order arise. This interaction can be understood as a conversation, where the logics are employed in combination or alternatingly and ‘live with each other’ (Austin and Hjorth 2010). While they may not amount to consensus, the outcome is an organisational drama (Burke 1945) that shapes and develops the practices in the two organisations. This step, from the analysis that follows the theoretical concepts to an analysis of the conversation and drama between characters, takes us from a more contextual and specific level to an abstract level. The purpose is to open and prepare the empirical material to the reflection and discussion of its theoretical implications.

To begin this analysis of the conversations, it is interesting to note that the three characters are enacted differently. The entrepreneur finds expression as a deep personal involvement of the narrator to create meaningfulness from disharmonies (Spinosa et al. 1997), where passion (Hjorth 2003) is key, expressed as fun, to commit to creating space for new (bureaucratic) practices (de Certeau 1984). The bureaucrat and the manager on the other hand are expressed with a professional, impersonal (Casey 2004) distance that is conducive to reaching advantageous ends from the perspective of the organisation. This is not to say that the practices established by the entrepreneur are not advantageous to the organisation, but the motive to engage in the tasks is tied to the role for the other two characters (Kallinikos 2005) and not the passion, which is tied to the person (Hjorth 2003). Furthermore there is of course a difference in the type of acts the three characters perform, which is also the entry point to the drama.

4.5.1 A conversation in procedure of management and management of procedure – goal setting and hierarchy

In the strategy itself is an obvious conversation between the manager and the bureaucrat. The strategy is based on both views, involving hierarchical structure and procedural tools and processes, where top-down decisions define the focus of the strategy and the employees are constantly in a sort of ‘search-mode’, ready for the right time to contribute.

It is in the conversation between the bureaucrat and the manager that the technologies of governance are employed to govern conduct (Rose and Miller 2010). It is the managerial employment of hierarchy for subordination of employees (du Gay 2004, O’Connor 1996) and the bureaucrat’s preference of writing (du Gay 2004) that combines as technologies of governance.
The conversation between the bureaucrat and the manager also establishes the end towards which the organisations work. The end is however constituted as a pursuit of external goods (MacIntyre 1984), as the organisations work for the sake of something else, i.e. the benefit of someone external to the practices of the offices and departments of the organisations or the procurement of funding. Funding is a technology of governance (Rose and Miller 2010) in the sense that it is a financial instigation of control in the hierarchy, based on rational choice (Hjorth 2003, Rose 1999), meaning that it is a managerial pursuit for external goods. This voice of the manager has been more prominent when narratives involved close proximity to policy development processes. On the other hand, in the narratives with focus on users and clients the voice of the bureaucrat is strengthened in the sense that it has put focus on how procedures benefit users and clients or how procedures become fair.

4.5.2 A conversation between space for new practice and procedural implementation

The structuring, rule-favoured bureaucrat seems to be an unlikely conversation-partner for the tactical natured entrepreneur. This conversation is nonetheless important for the practices of the entrepreneur. Little literature on the bureaucratic model suggests how notions of entrepreneurship should accompany the characteristics of procedure, hierarchy and impersonal expertise; in fact the enthusiasm of the entrepreneur is what du Gay (2008) warns against, as it runs the risk of unifying the ethos of the bureau with the ethos of the market (du Gay 2000).

The conversation that has taken place in the narratives moves the relationship in a different direction. It is only in close conversation with the expertise of the bureaucrat that the entrepreneur becomes able to skilfully cope with the practice of writing and the procedural process and find the anomalies that establish opportunity (Spinosa et al. 1997). This conversation is the most important antecedent of entrepreneurial practices in the narratives. The entrepreneur is an outsider remaining unnameable in the bureaucracy (de Certeau 1984) because he/she embodies the imperfection of the model, but still the practice of resistance occurs as the bureaucrat sees for example the anomaly that registration becomes a matter of control more than a matter of procedural fairness (Kallinikos 2006, Rose and Miller 2010). But where the position of the bureaucrat, the rules and the written merely designate something static in a spatial sense, the entrepreneur resists, articulates and reconfigures to create movement and establish space for a new interpretation of the bureaucratic practices (de Certeau 1984).
It is clear in the narratives that the entrepreneur and the bureaucrat interact with each other particularly concerning their ethical foundation. The objectivity, impartiality and rationality of the bureaucrat (du Gay 2000) form the ethos of the bureaucrat and are the measure of the purpose behind the entrepreneurial practices in the narratives. However, it amounts to nothing without the passion with which the entrepreneur is personally invested in the practice (Hjorth 2003). The passion of the entrepreneur in the conversation is not a pressure to become other than the bureaucrat, but exactly a desire to become the ideal of the virtual bureaucratic – remembering that the virtual cannot become real, but must be actualised (Deleuze 1988, Hjorth 2003). The story of re-configuration shows, how becoming other (Hjorth 2003) through differentiation from the caseworker identity (Czarniawska 2002), implied becoming a new kind of bureaucratic. It becomes, then, an attempt to actualise the internal good of the practice of bureaucracy. In the situations framed in the narratives, where the narrator is unable to voice his/her ideal of the bureaucrat it is through the voice of the entrepreneur that this virtuality finds space to become actualised; through the practice of resistance, articulation or reconfiguration.

4.5.3 A confrontation between strict frameworks and exemptions and resistance

There is no conversation between the entrepreneur and the manager in the narratives – there is only confrontation. This is partly due to the theoretical foundation, where authors such as de Certeau (1984) and Hjorth (2003, 2005) frame the practices of the entrepreneur in direct opposition to the manager. However, this does not account for the expression of opposition between the manager and the entrepreneur, which is found in the narratives. In relation to the bureaucratic model the manager is the voice, which attempts to articulate an administrable man, which must be manipulated to obtain the goals of the organisation (Hjorth 2003). This attempt is most vivid through the invoking of hierarchy in the narratives, and the need to fulfil the goals trickled down through the organisation.

In the narratives the manager’s intention to manipulate behaviour to obtain managerial goals is confronted by the entrepreneur’s eagerness to allow for practices that establish meaningfulness and identity (Spinosa et al. 1997). The confrontation is provoked through disturbance (Spinosa et al. 1997), when aspects of a practice do not fit with the meaning that the entrepreneur identifies him/herself with. An attempt at increased control through rules beyond the need for rule-bound behaviour, or goal-oriented behaviour that corrupts the purpose of the bureaucratic procedure in the eye of the entrepreneur provoke the
confrontation with these managerial inclinations. These have been the situations in the narratives, where the two characters meet and conflict.

This conflict can also be seen as the conversation between the favouring of external or internal goods to the practice. The economically efficient obtaining of the organisations goals is the ethos of management (du Gay 2004), i.e. an institutionalised version of external goods, which is not linked to the quality of the practice (Beadle and Moore 2006, MacIntyre 1984). The entrepreneur seeks to re-establish the meaning of the practice, i.e. attempts to reaffirm the identity inherently linked to the internal good of the practice (MacIntyre 1984, Spinosa et al. 1997).

There are examples in the narratives, where only the manager is given voice, in cases, where control excludes passion (Hjorth 2003), and probably examples, where the implicit manipulation by the manager others both voices altogether. These are examples, where the institutionalisation of practices have normalised the anomalies upon which the entrepreneurs act and find expression (Spinosa et al. 1997). An interesting point is that the confrontation also is the birth of the entrepreneur, meaning that the confrontation also gives voice to the entrepreneur – just as the strategy is needed for the tactical act (de Certeau 1984). The drama that is enacted in the narratives reminds of a balance between the attempt to manage through the hierarchy, the writing, the setting of goals and the ethos of the bureaucrat, who intends to make use of the same objects and qualities to establish/carry out fairness. When the balance is uneven it becomes an anomaly (Spinosa et al. 1997), which the entrepreneur detects and therefore acts tactically to make space for new practices (de Certeau 1984) that allow for a new balance to occur.

5 Discussing the implications

Thus far I have focused on how specific practices of entrepreneurship have been performed by employees in the Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation and the Danish Enterprise and Construction Authority. In the analysis I detected an implicit strategy, which is highly influential on conduct in the two organisations. The analysis of entrepreneurial practices showed how these were used to allow new kinds of bureaucratic practices – a process, which is characterised by passionate, but organisationally nested ethical concerns. Through three organisational characters I unfolded the drama, which defines the delicate and
complex relationship between bureaucratic entrepreneurship and the implicit strategy. In this chapter these findings used to reflect on the theory to discuss its implications.

The exclusive focus on practices of tactical nature in the analysis precludes attention to the innovation that follows from the strategy. I therefore also return to the innovation issue in the discussion of the bureaucratic model, and how the analysis of both strategy and entrepreneurial practices has implications for our understanding of innovation in relation to the bureaucratic model.

Some important empirical elements have shown to contest the theory – especially time and timing, which are predominantly tactical elements of the entrepreneur (de Certeau 1984, Hjorth 2003) but rendered strategic in the analysis. I therefore discuss the theoretical and methodological design of the thesis and its implications for the analysis at the end of the chapter.

5.1 An ongoing search

The analysis suggests that the entrepreneurial practices are mostly related to the bureaucratic qualities of the two organisations. The entrepreneur performs acts, which are intimately linked to previous bureaucratic characteristics (Spinosa et al. 1997), but which are also making space for further bureaucratic qualities. There is an intimate consistency (de Certeau 1984) with the qualities of the bureaucratic model. This characteristic of the practice is inherent throughout the narratives and also means that there is no sign of cross-appropriation (Spinosa et al. 1997) of market-based mechanisms taking place as a result of entrepreneurial practices. While we may attempt to understand this entrepreneurship in terms of the strength of the bureaucratic ethos (du Gay 2000), this fails to appreciate the personal passion with which the entrepreneur is involved (Hjorth 2003).

The narrators extend or emphasise the basic qualities of the bureaucratic model, especially the trust in the ethos of the bureaucrat (Casey 2004, du Gay 2000, 2008), creating consistency with the model rather than the strategy (Chia and Holt 2006). Through the entrepreneurial practices the narrators draw out the internal goods (MacIntyre 1984) of the bureaucrat with a purpose to reaffirm meaningfulness and identity (Spinosa et al. 1997). The alternation between the logic of the entrepreneur and the logic of the bureaucrat in the narratives conflicts with both du Gay (2000, 2004) and Kallinikos (2006) as proponents of the modular ethos and multiple obligations of the bureaucrat and with the need for a coherent and virtuous ethic that MacIntyre (1984) proposes. While the theoretical conflict seems insurmountable the empirical
shows that when the drama unfolds the passion lives with the multiple obligations of the bureaucrat. By seeing the narratives as encompassing all three logics but through conversation the theoretical conflict is overcome by the narrator.

To understand how the conflict becomes conversation we need a closer look at the theory. While the bureaucratic model presents a democratically legitimate proposal for public governance it is still in its essence an ideal type for structuring organisational behaviour towards particular ends – i.e. the bureaucratic ethos for the purpose of a democratically accountable organisation (du Gay 2000). The enthusiasm that du Gay (2008) warns against is directly related to a personal passion for policy issues, which would leave the important distinction between the bureaucrat and the politician unclear. However, the most vivid examples of enthusiasm and passion in the entrepreneurial practices relate not to policy but to the qualities of the bureaucratic model and the bureaucrat.

Exactly here lies the issue. The bureaucratic model presents a production of technologies of governance, while it does not account for the consumption of the image (de Certeau 1984) of the bureaucratic organisation, which is produced. A basic trait of human nature is the utilization of these images, with which an inherent second production takes place, i.e. the consumption as production (de Certeau 1984). This is exactly the bureaucratic entrepreneurship I have shown in the analysis, where the narrators become passionately bureaucratic as entrepreneurs.

An interesting outcome of the analysis is the importance of the implicit strategy. An enormous amount of reflection concerning proper conduct is connected to the elements that constitute the implicit strategy. If conduct is governed largely through the elements of the implicit strategy, then the entrepreneurial practices are moments, where narrators break free from this conduct to readjust the bureaucratic model according to their ethos as bureaucrats and passions as entrepreneurs. Then governance of conduct cannot be said to be merely technical (Rose and Miller 2010) as there is an ethical acquisition and acceptance happening in the relation with the individual (Willmott 1993).

Remaining is, however, an important question, of whether our understanding of the bureaucratic model will lend itself to the inclusion of entrepreneurship. The issue is that the theory does not consider the practical implications of the model over time, where an organisation develops. The conflict between the ethos of the bureaucrat and the passion of the entrepreneur is therefore a matter of conflict between an ideal and a quite practical quality. But when we highlight the fact that the passion exhibited in the narratives is passion for the
bureaucratic qualities, then the conflict becomes cooperation. This requires a very subtle but important distinction between this passion highlighted in the analysis and a passion for specific policy issues or initiatives, which would be exactly the type of enthusiasm with which the democratic accountability of the model might be in danger. While involvement always entails a passion for the moment (Spinosa et al. 1997), the distinction lies with the person. The passion of the bureaucratic entrepreneur is a passion of the character employed, whereas the passion du Gay (2008) warns against is a personal moral passion for a specific case, initiative or client. This distinction requires of bureaucratic entrepreneurs that they are passionately bureaucratic in their involvement, but by the ethos and moral of the office; not a moral of their own.

5.2 Innovative capacity of the bureaucratic model

The analysis of bureaucratic entrepreneurship in the two organisations does not as such inform us on the innovative capacity of the two organisations, vis-à-vis the bureaucratic model. The analysis of the implicit strategy is focused on its effects in terms of governance of conduct, treating it as a technology (Rose and Miller 2010), which is largely stable or static, as it dominates a spatial dimension (de Certeau 1984).

The problem with the discussion and understanding of the innovative capacity of the bureaucratic model is that it is framed as whether the model has capacity for innovation, before or without asking how. And the answer to the question is usually repudiating (e.g. Osborne and Gaebler 1992).

While bureaucratic entrepreneurship reveals one aspect of innovation in the two organisations, a great deal of policy and service innovation is framed by and development through the implicit strategy. To understand how these initiatives develop we must understand the strategy not as a hierarchic technology of governance, but how it frames the politics of innovation, meaning the social deliberation of and dynamics of power in the innovation process.

The narratives have involved a great deal of innovation in the two organisations – as such it is not a question of whether the organisations are innovative or not. Instead the question is how the implicit strategy that has been analysed frames and influences the innovation that takes place. The elements of the implicit strategy – the hierarchy, ethos and practice of writing – govern the conduct in the two organisations, as the analysis showed, and consequentially frame the innovation process.
The hierarchic focus on political demand for new policy and initiatives establishes a type of fuzzy front-end of innovation, rendering time structural, where the employees continuously are required to invent. The analysis revealed that this usually is performed as a process of writing, but also that it involves a communicatory element in relation to the different clients and councils served by the centres. While consortium and pilot projects may not entirely constitute space for play in a sense that would foster entrepreneurship (Hjorth 2005), they foster a continuous initiation of innovation projects.

These elements prescribe to the employees a conduct (Rose and Miller 2010) of invention, which is key to the implicit strategy. The actual development and implementation of innovation is, however, a complicated process involving actors throughout the hierarchy. As such the implicit strategy frames the politics of innovation in the bureaucratic model in terms of conduct, but to understand the intricate dynamics of power in the innovation process different methods and theory are needed.

This aspect of innovation could not be revealed by the analysis as the research question framed the implicit strategy as a static element, and focused on practices of a tactical nature (de Certeau 1984). While the research question highlights the influence of the implicit strategy as governance of conduct (Rose and Miller 2010) it does not focus on the social processes at the micro-level around innovations that follow the strategy. An analysis of the politics of innovation in bureaucratic organisations requires a study of further participants to fully understand its dynamics (Czarniawska 2008, Latour 1983) and could enlighten us on the social dynamics of innovation in public organisations.

### 5.3 Discursively othered entrepreneurship

As several comments from the narratives suggest the influence of civil servants and the bureaucratic apparatus on policy development and political issues is a contested matter. The narrators are well aware of how they influence policy and councils, but they are also aware of the popular contestation of this influence. In the bureaucratic model, du Gay (2000, 2008) argues, bureaucrats form the frontline of the public organisation and their ethos requires them and their political management to engage in close interaction. This is the only way to establish a democratically accountable connection between the political level and the execution of policy – reminded of course that the actions of the bureaucrat and the politician are guided by two very different ethos (du Gay 2008).
However, the analysis of the implicit strategy has shown that exactly position and hierarchical place are important technologies of conduct, discursively othering (Law 2004) the issue of bureaucratic entrepreneurship on policy issues from occurring in the narratives. Narrators are more inclined to argue against their own influence by reference to the proper conduct of their ‘place’. While the analysis highlights entrepreneurial practices, it could be argued that in a wider context the resistance and reconfiguration that takes place in them are minor and harmless. So why do the narratives not reveal further instances of entrepreneurship, also on policy issues? A possible answer lies with the othering of bureaucratic entrepreneurship through the contractualisation of the hierarchical relationship.

A key element in the enterprise movement is the separation of policy from operational management (du Gay 2008). An empirical attestation of this separation is the managerial importance of the contractual relationship in the hierarchical implementation of goals throughout the two organisations. This feature of the hierarchical relationship was often referred to as one of the framework conditions guiding the work of the employees.

From a theoretical perspective this separation would render any success of bureaucratic entrepreneurship on policy issues a failure of the goal setting mechanism in the contract. The attention to fulfilment of goals rationalises discourse to preclude entrepreneurship (Hjorth 2003), instead directing attention to the governance of the implicit strategy. The consequence is that bureaucratic entrepreneurship on policy is othered (Law 2004) by the rationalising discourse of contractualisation. As a discursive effect, any story of bureaucratic entrepreneurship on policy would remain untold, as it would conflict with the enterprised, or ‘corrupted’, ethos that dominates the narrative. This could very well explain how come bureaucratic entrepreneurship does not involve policy issues in the narratives. It also shows that to understand this aspect of bureaucratic entrepreneurship observational methods are required in addition to the narrative interview.

The analysis suggests that the logic of the bureaucrat and the qualities of the bureaucratic model do not prevent innovation and entrepreneurship in public organisations. While the characteristics of the bureaucratic model form a technology for governance nested in the implicit strategy, this governs and structures the innovation process – but also makes possible a specific type of bureaucratic entrepreneurship focused on the adjustment and development of bureaucratic qualities. The logic of the manager and the ethical separation of policy from management (du Gay 2008) on the other hand are essential discursive influences on the entrepreneurial and innovative potentials of the public organisation.
5.4 **Strategy and tactics; same, same – but different**

While strategy and tactics have been employed opposite each other in this thesis, to highlight how entrepreneurial practices poach the strategy (de Certeau 1984), there is an interesting communal aspect among the writers behind both concepts. Spinosa et al. (1997) and de Certeau (1984) find an obvious relation where entrepreneurial acts are enacted to make room for new practices – an element, which has been the cornerstone of the analysis. However, the empirical material highlights the need for the bureaucrat to be deeply involved, in order to see anomalies and become entrepreneurial. The gaps that tactics make use of are parallel to the anomalies the entrepreneur detects when deeply involved.

Involvement is the cornerstone of both the entrepreneurial practices for Spinosa et al. (1997) and the social practice that establishes strategy with Chia and Holt (2006). I have employed entrepreneurship theory to understand how tactics disturb strategy in a perspective, where strategy is contextually established but otherwise static. However, the same theory could lend itself to analyse the social process of continuously establishing that very same strategy. This community between the theories, which is reflected also in the empirical material, highlights the point by Hendry (2000) that strategy is always what is made of it. As such the bureaucrat (and as bureaucratic entrepreneur) is involved with strategy both as something socially established through intricately involved coping (Chia and Holt 2006, Spinosa et al. 1997) and contextually imagined strategy, which is made use of and consumed for production of something other (de Certeau 1984). When the analysis emphasises the strategy as static it is precisely because this is how it is enacted in the narratives. Although ‘coping’ and ‘making use’ are similar (but with clearly distinct purposes in theory), the narratives have shown how the empirical complexity makes the distinction between the two less clear, and how this is dependent on the way the strategy is framed.

5.5 **Time is of the essence**

In the narratives time plays an absolutely essential role for the employees’ participation in the innovation process. As was discussed in relation to the innovative capacity of bureaucratic public organisations time is used as a technology of governance to manage the input of civil servants.

In theoretical terms, however, time is a tactical dimension because temporality and timing is the tool of the entrepreneur (de Certeau 1984). Strategy in this sense dominates a spatial dimension, but does not posses a dimension of time. What is curious is that time is rendered
structural in the narratives through a rationalisation of uncertainty into expectation (Beck 2006).

Perhaps time is best understood if it is not rendered static as a strategic element through uncertainty (Beck 2006) but instead as a dynamic dimension of the drama that unfolds. However, the narrative analysis has not entirely reflected this dimension. Where the narratives included entrepreneurial practices the intellectual detachment was abandoned by the narrator to allow for greater sensitivity to the dimension of time, which allowed for opportunities to arise. However, the same was not the case for narratives of policy development, where the logic of the entrepreneur was much less prevalent. The role that time plays in the narratives stresses the limits of the research design behind the thesis. Relying exclusively on interviews and narrative analysis means that ‘performance’ and ‘performative’ become narrative terms. Performance and process are collapsed around the event, or act (Burke 1945), in focus. The strength of studying the micro-processes of a particular event is what supports the analysis in this thesis, but the performative aspect of the system of actions (Rose and Miller 2010) is neglected in favour of a single act or event, described in the narrative, i.e. the performative is illustrated by the narrator around a single event and not by the relation between social actors in and between events.

The study of the politics of innovation in bureaucratic organisations could offset this problem with the narrative method employed in this thesis. Ongoing observations of social deliberations combined with narrative interviews could reflect how actors participate, coordinate, reflect and rationalise throughout the process of developing policy and service innovation. It could show how the implicit strategy is interacted with and where bureaucratic entrepreneurship becomes relevant to the policy process. The essential weakness with the narratives as sole research method is that acts become narrative constructions and does not specifically allow for the acts to relate over time. While the meaning of acts may very well be a construction (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2009, Burke 1945, Czarniawska-Joerges 1995, Law 2004), the interrelated influence of different acts and meaning constructions would show the power dynamics over time and how the act of several single narratives may form systems of acts over time (Rose and Miller 2010).
6 And in conclusion…

It is absolutely vital to understand how entrepreneurship influences modern bureaucratic organisations and how the dynamics of entrepreneurial acts shape the practices and procedures in civil service organisations. With a search for bureaucratic entrepreneurship we may come closer to understand, exactly how the strengths and qualities of the bureaucratic model are able to accommodate, through entrepreneurial use, the challenges bureaucratic organisations face on a day-to-day basis.

The purpose with this thesis has been to contribute to the ongoing discussion about how we organise public governance, with a perspective on entrepreneurship. With the intimate analysis of the two agencies the Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation and the Danish Enterprise and Construction Authority the thesis has in actuality been a search for a new understanding of what entrepreneurship is and can be in the context of public bureaucratic organisations. Because management writings have been influential on the understanding of the concept of entrepreneurship it has been essential that entrepreneurship be dislodged from the grasp of economic rationale from the very start. Instead the concept is situated with a perspective, where entrepreneurial practices are inherent to human nature as a means of engaging with the world instead of merely a managerial tool to accomplish organisational goals.

In this thesis I have emphasised the relation between acts or practices of entrepreneurship, and how these make new practices possible in bureaucratic organisations, because this reveals how the bureaucrat continuously influences the development of the bureaucratic organisation. This aspect of bureaucratic organisations helps us understand, how entrepreneurship in everyday acts affects the bureaucracy and influences organisational development. The study of the two agencies reveals, how the bureaucratic qualities of the two agencies are continuously reaffirmed and strengthened through entrepreneurial practices by the employees of the two organisations.

_The conduct of public employees concerning development and innovation is governed by a strategy, which only appears implicitly in the organisation._

What this study shows is first of all that conduct in relation to development of new initiatives, policy and services is governed by a series of technologies that together form a strategic influence. While the employees of the two organisations are well aware of the technologies, such as the obligation to serve the top of the hierarchy and the use of writing to move
processes forward, the intended conduct to which the technologies of governance amount remains only implicitly existing in the language and acts of the employees. The mode of governance is evident largely through discursive effects, in the way that the implicit strategy makes certain conduct proper in the relation to development and innovation. This also means that there are manners of conduct, which are othered from the practices of the entrepreneur. The evident example of this is the entrepreneurship on policy issues, which is inexistent in the empirical material. The discursive influence is codified by the technocratic modes of governance, which are embedded primarily in the practice of writing and the documents in the organisations.

The evident example of this is the entrepreneurship on policy issues, which is inexistent in the empirical material. The discursive influence is codified by the technocratic modes of governance, which are embedded primarily in the practice of writing and the documents in the organisations.

The practices that characterise bureaucratic entrepreneurship are defined, by the manner in which they are performed upon the implicit strategy, and the intimate consistency with which they are related to the bureaucratic qualities of the organisation.

Entrepreneurial practices are performed as a way of creatively consuming the implicit strategy that governs the conduct of the employees of the two organisations. The creative consumption is a means to change the purpose of the implicit strategy, from a managerial mode of control to a bureaucratic mode of establishing a responsible system. A key characteristic of the practices that are generated is that they are new to the organisation in which they appear, but clearly consistent with an image of the organisation as bureaucratic. As such the organisations are not being bureaucratic, but continuously becoming bureaucratic (Hjorth 2003) through the entrepreneurial practices.

The practices of bureaucratic entrepreneurship involve a contextual and ethical evaluation of what ‘bureaucratic qualities of the organisation’ means.

The actual act of bureaucratic entrepreneurship and introduction of new practices to the organisation means an ethical consideration of what ‘good’ the new practices contribute. This evaluation is ethical in the sense that it is balance between personal concerns for passionate involvement, expressed as a desire to contribute to the organisation and the constituents of the system, and organisational concerns for benefitting with a ‘good’ to the larger society, through the clients that are served. This ethical consideration is closely connected to the balance between legal-rational procedure, introduced to establish a systematic structure guaranteeing fairness, consistency and efficiency, and procedure, which introduce control at the expense of systemic trust in the bureaucrat. In this complexity the passionately bureaucratic entrepreneur is established. The anomaly or gap in the strategy, upon which the
bureaucratic entrepreneur acts, is the instance, where the introduction of procedure eliminates the systemic trust in the bureaucrat.

*The practice of bureaucratic entrepreneurship is an ongoing dynamic conversation between the logics of the manager, the bureaucrat and the entrepreneur.*

When entrepreneurial practices occur in the organisations it is at moments, where the entrepreneur acts upon the conversation between the bureaucrat and the manager, when the logic of the manager overtakes the conversation. Through the conversation, a balance of ethical concerns is made between the perspective of the entrepreneur, who attempts to make new practices possible, where opportunity and anomaly occur, and the bureaucrat, who intends the practices to be good for the constituents the system serves. The challenge for the entrepreneur is that “what it wins, it cannot keep” (de Certeau 1984, p. 37), which is why the entrepreneur needs the conversation with the bureaucrat, in order for the system to be able to recognise the practices generated in the space that the entrepreneur establishes.

### 6.1 Putting it all in perspective

It could be argued that the examples of entrepreneurial practices found in the empirical study are of little significance compared to innovations typically associated with entrepreneurship. I contend that such an argument would underestimate the importance of the everyday practices (de Certeau 1984), where organisational development is made possible in the public bureaucratic organisation by the actions of the employees. This is the level at which interpretation of rules, procedures and political intentions happens, and is as such the social interactions that produces the organisation. An argument with such an underestimation would also neglect the fact that, while the empirical study shows a particular kind of bureaucratic entrepreneurship in everyday practices, there may be many other examples of entrepreneurship also on policy, which have not found voice, because they are discursively othered by the implicit strategy – an interesting hypothesis, which may not find conclusive testimony in the empirical study, but is supported by the discursive dominance of the implicit strategy in the narratives.

What the empirical study does suggest is that there is definitely a basis for studying, understanding and developing innovation and entrepreneurship on the terms of the bureaucratic model. The bureaucratic entrepreneurship that is evident in the empirical study happens *because of* the bureaucratic qualities of the organisations (and because of the entrepreneurial inclinations of the employees) not *in spite of* them.
While others have rigorously argued for the continued relevance of the bureaucratic model for systems of government in liberal democracies (e.g. du Gay 2000) this does not make up for the need for public organisations, which are able to innovatively respond to societal challenges. But as the empirical study shows, both the need for, definition of, and process of innovation needs to be studied with meticulous care for the unique dynamics of public bureaucratic organisations. This aspect also reflects the need for further recognition of entrepreneurship as an actual element in public organisations modelled on bureaucratic characteristics. Elaborations on bureaucratic entrepreneurship through further studies could firmly position these practices in our theory on bureaucracy.

To public organisations this study reveals how public managers first of all should be aware of the implicit strategy nested in the structure of their organisation, and how this strategy is exceedingly important for the manner in which the employees of their organisation act. Therefore it is necessary to pay close attention to how the development of procedure, rules and services consists or conflicts with, or challenges the particular ethos of their organisation. As the empirical study showed, the conversation and clash between logics is an important dynamic to innovation and to entrepreneurial practices. However, the outspokenness of the logics of the manager and the bureaucrat should not be allowed to silence the entrepreneur. Both managers and employees must pay attention to the delicate conversation between the entrepreneur and the bureaucrat, if entrepreneurship is to flourish in public bureaucratic organisations. The articulation of how the implicit strategy affects conduct, and the articulation of, and room for, the passionately bureaucratic entrepreneur are key to encouraging a more dynamic public bureaucratic organisation.
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## 8 Appendix

### 8.1 List of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A1</td>
<td>Centre for Strategic Research and Growth</td>
<td>19 September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A2</td>
<td>Centre for Strategic Research and Growth</td>
<td>24 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A3</td>
<td>Centre for Strategic Research and Growth</td>
<td>24 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A4</td>
<td>Centre for Strategic Research and Growth</td>
<td>24 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A5</td>
<td>Centre for Science and Infrastructure</td>
<td>19 September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A6</td>
<td>Centre for Science and Infrastructure</td>
<td>27 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A7</td>
<td>Centre for Science and Infrastructure</td>
<td>27 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A8</td>
<td>Centre for Science and Infrastructure</td>
<td>27 October 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danish Enterprise and Construction Agency</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee D1</td>
<td>Centre for Business Development</td>
<td>26 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee D2</td>
<td>Centre for Business Development</td>
<td>31 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee D3</td>
<td>Centre for Business Development</td>
<td>31 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee D4</td>
<td>Centre for Business Development</td>
<td>31 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee D5</td>
<td>Centre for Business Development</td>
<td>25 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee D6</td>
<td>Centre for Business Development</td>
<td>25 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee D7</td>
<td>Centre for Business Development</td>
<td>25 October 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.2 Original and translated quotes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Original quote</th>
<th>Translated quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A3</td>
<td>“Jeg synes det er kedeligt at være bare en administrator. [...] hvis man skal gøre en forskel så skal man også gøre noget selv”</td>
<td>“I think it is boring to be just an administrator. [...] If you want to make a difference you also have to do something yourself”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A4</td>
<td>“[…] Dels har jeg sådan en nysgerrighed [...] og stor interesse for at tale med brugere, af hvordan er det de oplever derude, og det er jo noget som vi ikke har så meget rum til her [...] Altså fra mit synspunkt så sidder vi sådan lidt inde bag de tykke mure foran computerskærmen i den her brune og tunge institution. Så tit jeg kan komme til det så prøver jeg at få drejet ting over i at vi kan få talt med vores brugere. [...] Lige nu er jeg i gang med at arbejde på sådan en spørgseramme til at tage ud og lave besøg hos brugerne, [...] Vi oplever tit at vi får spørgsmål om hvordan griber man de her ting an og vi ved ikke en skid om det, for vi sidder bare som de her sagsbehandlertyper som ligesom administrerer et initiativ på et formelt plan.”</td>
<td>“[…] Partly I have a curiosity [...] and a large interest in talking to users, about how they experience out there. And that’s something we don’t have much room for here […] Well, from my point of view we sort of sit behind these thick walls in front of the computer-monitor in this brown and heavy institution. As often as I can I try to turn things in the direction that we talk to our users. […] At the moment I am working on a [study design] to go out and visit the different [users]. […] We often experience that we receive questions about how to deal with [different] things, and we don’t know a thing about it, because we just sit here like these case-worker types who sort of administrate an initiative at the formal level.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A4</td>
<td>“Jeg møder meget sådan en organisation hvor ting de skal igennem en masse led. Der er sådan en sagsgang hvor man skal igennem, hvor det skal tjekkes igennem af 100 personer helt ned til mindeste detalje [...]og der er skabeloner for hvordan man skriver et notat og hvordan man skriver ditten og datten [...] altå der skal man ligesom følge de her skabeloner og der er meget strenge regler for hvad skal der stå på den med sagsnr og doknur [...] Det problematiske er ikke at skrive den tekst der skal produceres men den der lede skabelon det skal sættes ind i [...] Og det er klart nok at det er nødvendigt i en politisk organisation som den her”</td>
<td>“I see an organisation where things have to go through many stages. There is sort of a case procedure you have to go through, where it has to be checked by a hundred people right down to the very last detail [...] and there are templates for how to write a memo and how to write this and that, meaning you have to follow these templates and there are very strict rules on what should be included in terms of case number and document number. [...] The problematic thing isn’t writing the text that needs to be produced but that horrid template it needs to be inserted into. [...] And it’s of course clear that it is necessary in a political organisation like this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A4</td>
<td>“I [...] en fuldmægtig stilling der synes jeg det er svært at se hvor man skulle eksperimentere [...] Jeg tror der er stillinger i et hus som det her hvor det er meget mere projektorienterede stillinger end den som jeg har som er mere sagsbehandler. Men der er sikkert stillinger som er mere entreprenant og hvor der er mere rum til den slags”</td>
<td>“In [...] an administrative officer position I find it hard to see how you can experiment. [...] I think there are positions in a house like this, where it is much more project-oriented than the position I have, which is more caseworker. But there are probably positions that are more entrepreneurial and where there is greater room for that stuff”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A6</td>
<td>“Det er jo ikke min personlige holdning men det er ud fra systemet for at systemet skal fungere. Så det kommer bare nogle gange til at lyde så slent når embedsværket prøver at påvirke men det er ud fra hvad man kan se fungerer i forhold til de krav der er”</td>
<td>“It is not my personal opinion, but from the point of view of the system – so that the system works. Sometimes it just makes it sound so bad when the civil servants try to influence, but it is from the point of what you could see work based on the existing requirements”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A7</td>
<td>Interviewee A7</td>
<td>Interviewee A7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Et ord optimering. Så vi kan gøre tingene så hurtigt som muligt og så effektivt som muligt og med så fejl som muligt. […] Så hvis man nu fra starten af optimerede proceserne så man minimerede muligheden for fejl så ville man være rigtig godt hjulpet.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;[...] One word – optimizing. So that we may do things as fast as possible and as efficiently as possible and with as few errors as possible. [...] If from the beginning you optimized the processes so you minimized the possibility of error, then you would be help along really well.”</td>
<td>&quot;Nej, hvor registrerer vi meget mere end vi gjorde før i tiden fordi det kan lade sig gøre med den ebd. Edb’en udvikler og man kan meget mere og det gør at man også gør meget mere. Det koster jo tid og gøre det hver gang […] Vi skal [...] hele tiden dokumentere for tænk sig hvis der kom en klage sag. hvor jeg måske godt kunne tænke mig jamen så lad os tage den næse (smågriner) så længe vi bare behandler vores ansøgere ordentlig&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Men som sagt jeg er jo også kun fuldmægtig. Der er grænser for hvor meget en fuldmægtig kan ændre overordnet på systemerne. Jeg sidder jo ikke til de møder hvor man træffer overordnede beslutninger om forskellige ting […] så der er grænser for hvor meget du kan påvirke systemet i den position jeg sidder i”</td>
<td>&quot;But as I said, I am only an administrative officer. There are limits to how much an administrative officer can change the systems overall. I don’t sit in on the meetings where overall decisions about various things are made […] so there are limits to how much you can affect the system in the position I occupy”</td>
<td>&quot;Det var en rigtig sjov opgave fordi det var en udviklingsopgave“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Den næste store arbejdsopgave som jeg synes vi skal kaste os over det er at der har været kritik af vores afslagsbegrundelser [...] At de ikke er gode nok fordi man bruger de der koder og at det skal være meget mere udførligt. Det er for mig at se ikke praktisk muligt. Du kan ikke bede de her rådsmedlemmer der i forvejen jeg ved ikke hvor meget tid på de her ansøgninger på at bruge en halv sides udredning for hver enkelte ansøgning de afviser. Det kan simpelt hen ikke lade sig gøre og det er ikke praktisk muligt. Så jeg synes man skal arbejde for at man på en måde i opslaget skriver hvordan vilkårene er og at man kun får en kort begrundelse at man har fået dispensation til at tilsidesætte forvaltningslovens regler for at komme med en meget udførlig begrundelse. Det er et arbejde der udstærk og hvor jeg synes at man skal udfordre vores jurister. Det vil de sikkert ikke kunne acceptere særlig nemt. Jeg synes ikke man altid bare skal niske og sige jaja. Jeg synes nogen skal udfordre det […] Det er et kommende projekt jeg godt vil være med i at udfordre vores departement og vores egne jurister.</td>
<td>“The next large task that I think we should take on is that there has been critique of our reasons of refusal. [...] That they haven’t been good enough, because of the use of codes [procedural codes used for recognition of reasons of refusal], and that it needs to be much more detailed. To me that is not practically possible. You can’t ask these council members, who already spend I don’t know how much time on these applications, to produce a half page of clarification for every application they reject. It simply cannot be done and it isn’t practically possible. So I think you should work towards a way in the call [for applications] to write how the terms are and that you only provide a short reason – that there has been an exemption to Danish administrative law’s rules for providing detailed reasons. That’s a protruding job, and where I think that we should challenge our law officers. They will probably not accept it easily. I don’t think you should always nod and say ‘yes’, ‘yes’. I think someone should challenge that […] That is an upcoming project that I would like to take part in – to challenge our ministerial department and our own law officers.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamen det er jo bare fordi det er spændende synes jeg [griner] og det er jo selvfølgelig en dårlig grund. Nej men altså også fordi at man har en ide om at man kan gøre noget på en bedre måde så synes jeg jo næsten ikke man kan lade være […] For mig personligt at det</td>
<td>“Well [the reason for taking on the task] is just because I think it is exciting [laughs] and that is of course a bad reason. Well no, but also because you have an idea that you can do something in a better way, then I find that you almost can’t help yourself. […] For me&quot;</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewee D2

"Folk kan [...] virkelig godt lide at se at den tomme skærm den mandag hvor der ikke stod noget rent faktisk blev til noget 12 mandage efter og hundrede mandage efter var det faktisk, så sad der nogen der ude som fik noget ud af det"

"People [...] really like to see that the empty screen that Monday, where nothing was written actually turned into something 12 Mondays later, and 100 Mondays later someone sat out there, who got something out of it"

Interviewee D2

"Jeg skal måske starte med at sige at jeg faktisk det seneste år har haft til opgave at strukturere og formalisere den måde vi laver nyt på [...]. Vi ved all hvorudan en analyse går fra 0 til 100. 100 er publiceret alle tilfælde, 0 er startlinje. [...] Vi har ikke nogen 0 til 100 proces på policy delen så den der smattede vej, det er fint den er smattet, det handler ikke om at det skal stå et sted, det handler om at man inde i hovedet på de mennesker ved at der er en vej [...]. Det vigtige er at den der 0 til 100 distance er kendt og til at forstå og at den findes. Og så vil alle mine chefer sige at det er slet ikke det vigtige her. de vil sige at der kommer resultater ud af det, initiativer ved 100 med finansiering og at målet med dansk iværksætteri bliver opfyldt [...]. Men for mig handler det rigtig meget om at vi ikke engang havde en proces [...]. Det fandtes ikke. Det findes jo først når en hel gruppe ved det er det her vi arbejder efter og der er en ledelse ved at der bliver arbejdet på det."

"I should maybe start by saying that the past year I have had, in fact, the task to structure and formalise a little bit the way we come up with new things [...]. We all know how an analysis goes from 0 to 100. 100 is published, everybody’s happy. 0 is the start-line. [...] We don’t have a 0 to 100 process on the policy part, so this fuzzy road – it’s fine that it’s fuzzy – it’s not about having it written down somewhere. It’s about people inside their mind knowing that there is a way […]. The important thing is that the 0 to 100 distance is known and comprehensible and that it exists. And then all of my bosses would say that this is not at all the important part here. They would say that [it is that] results come out of it – initiatives at 100 with financing and that the goal [...] is reached. [...] But to me it is a lot about that we didn’t even have a process […], it didn’t exist. It only exists when a whole group knows that this is what we are working for and there is a management that knows that this is being done.”

Interviewee D2

"her i huset [...] vil vi gerne have det ry at vi ikke sidder og støver os til, at vi ikke glemmer at vi er til for de her virksomheder"

"In this house [...] we would like to have the reputation that we don’t sit here and get dusty. And that we don’t forget that we are here for these [users]."

Interviewee D2

"oftest så er det klassisk desk-work. Det er et forløb hvor toppen bestiller og så kører selve udviklingsarbejdet i relativt snævre cirkler og bliver justeret på vej op igen. Det tror jeg der er rigtig meget af"

"Often it [the innovation process] is classic desk-work. It is a process where the top makes an order and then the actual development work runs in rather narrow circles and is adjusted on the way back up. I think there is quite a lot of that."

Interviewee D2

"Det er [...] vores forpligtelse er jo at komme på noget politik, der passer til den regering der nu engang er [...] og det er også vores opgave at ministeren skal se godt ud"

"It is our obligation to provide policy that fits whatever government is in office […] and it is also our task to make the minister look good"

Interviewee D2

"Den udfordring lander på mit bord oppefra og ned. Min direktion siger vi skal have et eller andet der skal rette sig mod det her problem, og så går der en hulens masse skrive og dokumentationsarbejde i gang hos mig og hos mine kolleger. Og så skriver vi og skriver vi og skriver vi og så på et tidspunkt ligger der en eller anden form for draft på noget der kunne være en løsning. Og derfra går den gennem hele systemet"

"This challenge [the project in question] land on my desk. My directors say ‘we must have something that targets this problem’, and then a whole lot of writing and documenting starts with my colleagues and me. And then we write and we write and we write, and then at some point there is a draft, which could be a solution. And from there it passes through the whole system.”

Interviewee D3

"Når vi kommer med noget så er deres rolle jo at sige at det synes det ikke vi skal gå videre med. Jeg synes ikke det er en begrænsning men mere en rollefordeling og

“When we come up with something, then their [the ministerial department] role is to say that they don’t think we should go forward with it. I don’t think of it as a limitation, more a sort
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>&quot;Generelt vil jeg sådan sige at vi prøver at efterstræbe at når vi laver noget nyt så er det der hvor vi har identificeret et behov blandt vores brugere&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Generally I would say that we try to strive for, when we make something new, that it is because we have identified a need among our users&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>&quot;projekter der ligger uderover de normale rammer […] og lave forandringsprocesser på det mere langstrakte perspektiv fordi hverdagen har det sådan med at blive taget over af her og nu opgaver så jeg ser det sådan som en befrielse når man laver de her rum&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;projects outside the normal boundaries […] creating change-processes in a more long-term perspective, because day-to-day operations is often taken over by urgent tasks, so I see it as a liberation when you make these spaces&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>&quot;Det er fordi jeg synes det er sjovt. Jeg synes det er sjovt at udvikle.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;[The reason for participation] is because I think it is fun. I think it is fun to develop.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>&quot;Så er der selvfølgelig nogle perioder hvor det er mere oplagt at komme med nye ting. Vi ved jo ikke hvornår der bliver udskrevet valg og hvornår er det vi lige pludselig, at der lige pludselig kommer en og beder os om at komme med noget input. Vi ser det som vigtigt at vi hele tiden har noget klart, at vi er rimelig leveringsdygtige i nye initiativer […] Vi har en fornemmelse af at der kan komme en efterspørgsel til hver en tid uden at vide hvornår er det&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Then of course there are times where it is more obvious to contribute with new stuff. We don’t know when the election comes, or when, all of the sudden, someone comes and asks us for input. We see it as important to continuously have something ready; that we are reasonably able to deliver on new initiatives. […] We have a feeling that a call for new policy or initiatives can come at any time without knowing when&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>&quot;Så kan det være nogen gange at de siger det er super godt og sådan noget lad os lige lade det ligge lidt og så må i lige fokuseré på noget andet&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Then sometimes they [read: management] say that ‘it is really great’ and stuff like that, ‘but let’s leave it be for a while, and you have to focus on something else’.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>&quot;Vi ved at der er hele tiden behov for at gøre noget nyt […] vi har midler ind til udgangen af 2012 så vi ved at hvis der er nogle politikere der skal sige at de skal have flere penge og så også efter 12 så skal vi også blive ved med at gøre opmærksom på os. Så det er sådan driver der hele tiden er bygget ind i os&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;We know that there is a constant need to develop something new […]. We have funds until the end of 2012 and we know that if some politicians are to say that they should have more money also after ’12, then we must also keep drawing attention to ourselves. So that’s a kind of driver that is always built into us”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>&quot;Alle de forskellige input dem har man i huset. Så venter man lidt på at der er et window of oppportunity. Altså hvornår er det man kan se at det er politisk legitimt at bringe et forslag frem, at bringe noget op på ministerens bord. Så det er sådan en tovejsproces. Løbende videnophygning og hvornår er der en afsetningskanal”</td>
<td>&quot;[..]We have all the different inputs in-house. Then you wait for a window of opportunity. Meaning, when is it you can see that it’s politically legitimate to propose something, and take it to the Minister’s desk. So it’s kind of a two-way process. Ongoing knowledge build-up and when there is channel of demand.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>&quot;Der er en koncerneprojektpulje i OEM regi hvor en bestemt procentdel af styrelsernes og departementets midler puljes i en føelles pulje som så finansierer udviklingsprojekter”</td>
<td>&quot;There is a consortium-project fund pool in [the Ministry of Economic and Business affairs], where a certain percentage of the agencies’ and the departments’ resources are pooled in a common pool, which then finances development-projects.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"jeg er glad for at jeg sidder her hvor det er os der har ideerne og ikke os der skal slå dem ned” of distribution of roles, and I am happy that I sit here, where we are the ones with the ideas and not the ones to bat them down."

"[..]We have all the different inputs in-house. Then you wait for a window of opportunity. Meaning, when is it you can see that it’s politically legitimate to propose something, and take it to the Minister’s desk. So it’s kind of a two-way process. Ongoing knowledge build-up and when there is channel of demand.”

"There is a consortium-project fund pool in [the Ministry of Economic and Business affairs], where a certain percentage of the agencies’ and the departments’ resources are pooled in a common pool, which then finances development-projects.”