

Annexes

ANNEX A - Researchers Position	339
ANNEX B - Reflection on Scientific Knowledge Production	340
ANNEX C - Complexity Science & Deleuzian Ontology as Meta-Theories	342
ANNEX D – Interview Partners	350
ANNEX E – Sample Interview Guide	351
REFERENCES.....	354

ANNEX A - Researchers Position

To apply a good practice from social psychology (Steinberg, 2005) I will make explicit my own position as a researcher as well as the impact of that position on the different aspects of the research. This practice is applied on the premise that there is no such thing as a neutral presentation of objective facts. As will be laid out in more detail in the methodology chapter, this research follows the understandings of (Collins, 2004) who proposed that there is no single universal scientific truth (when we are dealing with problems involving social interaction). Therefore all analysis, interpretation and explanation, as well as the way the problem is positioned and framed, follows a particular subjective standpoint depending on the researchers ontological and epistemological understandings (Markovâa, 1982).

My passion is the internet. Since I first encountered and used the net in 1993 (then aged 15), it has been the red line in my professional development and I enjoy being online and surfing the waves of information and the intellectual challenges involved in processing and understanding all that others have prepared for you to browse. I am aware of my optimism and enthusiasm when it comes to the potential of the meta-physical world created by the internet, and I believe my reflexive capacity as well as my realistic assessment of what is happening online and also an acceptance of what is not happening, allows me to formulate a decent understanding of the options and practices of internet based innovation currently available.

The other maybe even more fundamental passion I have is a thirst for knowledge. My master thesis was entitled "*The use of ICT for knowledge networking*" (Senges, 2002) and I reported on a pilot project case study in which we initiated a knowledge sharing community for United Nations professionals. The understanding of ICT and business I obtained during the masters program in business information systems, very useful, but I wanted to learn about the wider context and so I decided to pursue the PhD program on the Information Society.

I have a sincere interest in philosophy and ethics and therefore the holistic grounded theory approach that I have chosen was the only rational choice as I was determined to explore the subject of the research from all angles and to reach a certain meta-physical depth. This philosophical interest has also led me to reject traditional knowledge claims regarding mechanistic scientific theories for the realm of the social and especially the application of quantitative methods to measure social conditions. Admittedly, there are many relations and states that can be measured, but the statistical methods do produce an abstract (and supposedly objective) view of the research subject which (in my humble opinion) led to the emotionally cold, alienating and unsatisfying working conditions we experience today.

ANNEX B - Reflection on Scientific Knowledge Production

“The philosophy of the social sciences is at present in a most interesting phase of the history.

The world appears to be extremely diversified and fragmented. One could also say that we are in an interregnum and that there is no clear indication of who, if anyone, will be the victor” (Mouton & Muller, 1990)

The fundamental discourse about what constitutes knowledge and how scientific knowledge is defined in particular, has been going on within the scholarly community for many generations. I will not take sides, but a balanced position will hereto forth be attempted. Agreeing with Joubert, (1990) the relevancy of the produced findings and arguments are taken as the characteristics to evaluate the quality of the research. Professional interest (Foucault & Gordon, 1980; Goldblatt, 2004, p. 125) and discourse justifies the inclusion of information and arguments in the work. Without going into too much more detail, it can be said that truth is pursued and trust or credibility is sought through observed evidence and rational argument.

What is knowledge and what counts as knowledge? When reflecting upon this question it becomes clear that all knowledge production as well as all other knowledge operations are properly situated, as such all knowledge is widely enmeshed in the operations of power. Hence all knowledge is contentious and entangled in social power relations. It is never neutral and through means of scholarly discourse and communication it does always contribute to social change (Habermas, 1978). This research is aware of its context and intents to establish credibility through transparency.

Of course most of the arguments presented depend on the definition of science and subsequently scientific. Kvale’s definition of science is adopted: science is the methodological production of new, systematic knowledge. (Kvale, 1996, p. 60)

Greatest possible robustness of the findings is achieved through extensive triangulation (Seale, 1999). All four types of research triangulation outlined by Denzin (1978) are used. *Data triangulation* through the use of diverse sources of data; *investigator triangulation*, through peer consultation processes, focus group discussion and subject discourse and member validation, or “seeking agreement from actors as to the truth of a researcher’s account” (Seale, 1999, p. 63) as well as team reflection and retrospective in the action research aspect. *Theory triangulation* is implemented through the convergence of theoretic models from sociology, management and information systems research. And last but not least *methodological triangulation* through the application of grounded theory, as well as statistical and rational argument methods. On the outer level three sources of evidence are consulted (previous theoretic and empirical work, the university cases and the

phenomenological action research) each of them use a different methodology and thus cast an independent perspective on the concept of knowledge entrepreneurship.

So the focus of this research is to generate and communicate knowledge¹. Thereby it is attempted to use narrative and story telling as well as metaphors in order to communicate and create meaning and understanding. Observation, participation and experimentation are used to allow for understanding, which is then documented and verified through discourse with other scholars. The focus is on intelligibility and production of meaningful models and arguments, which serve as basis for discourse. Rigorous application of methodology and transparency of the applied research practice are taken serious and conducted with due diligence. However the statement of the John Maddox editor of the Nature journal, who stated: "Too many papers were awash with facts and numbers. The most serious enemy to clarity is the reverence for data. Writers are often so anxious that a date should be correct, but so utterly uncaring that what they say should be understood" (Joubert, 1990). It is attempted to provide a clear structure and presentation of the undertaken research².

¹ At the heart of the qualitative approach is the assumption that a piece of qualitative research is very much influenced by the researcher's individual attributes and perspectives. The goal is not to produce a standardised set of results that any other careful researcher in the same situation or studying the same issues would have produced. Rather it is to produce a coherent and illuminating description of and perspective on a situation that is based on and consistent with detailed study of the situation. (Ward-Schofield, 1993, p. 202)

² Because the researched phenomenon has emerged rather recently, is rapidly evolving and as all socio-technological phenomena highly dependent on unique conditions, it is not attempted to produce a traditional theory. Rather the instances are investigated with scientific rigor and due diligence within the scientific paradigm of complexity science. Therefore attractors, states and scenarios will be described (see below), which may serve as a practical framework to explain cases in similar scenarios. The main scientific contribution however lies in exploring and describing the plentiful theoretic and practical relations between the scientific fields. It is attempted to explain the interfaces, influences and interdependence between the perspectives contributing to the overall aim to enable trans-disciplinary scientific ontology. Delanty (2001) tells us that "unlike the modern researcher, the medieval scholar could claim to be able to read everything written." These days will never come again, however to counter the trend of higher and higher specialization and rather to build bridges and interfaces between the different elements of the house of knowledge in order to allow science to offer sustainable (well balanced) solutions, this work does not create new knowledge in the sense of scientific invention, but connects the existing and contributes to the understanding of a concrete problem. In this sense the presented work is meant to explore the connection between the existing theories and apply them in a real setting in order to allow for the exploitation of internet based innovations for knowledge practices.

ANNEX C - Complexity Science & Deleuzian Ontology as Meta-Theories

Complexity Concepts

Over many generations and based on the revolutionary research of Galileo, Newton, Descartes a very consistent linear, mechanistic view of the world has been established. The theories of this rationalist and nowadays traditional scientific school have been immensely successful in discovering and explaining the physical world. With its paradigm modern science and technology – e.g. electricity, air-jets, and the internet - was made possible. However, it is a reductionist, cause and effect approach to science. Thus organizations are seen as machines (translated to the social world as bureaucracies), and classical management theory, and scientific management treats them as objects.

Because this research is especially interested in the social perspective and hence in the role the people³ in an organization play in transforming that organization, complexity and Deleuzian approaches are appropriate, because they allow for the representation of the individuality of an organization and the many individuals, who are agents of the organizations *raison d'être*⁴.

In the following paragraphs the relevant concepts and features of complex systems and adaptive complex systems in particular, as well as their interpreted representation in the knowledge entrepreneurship at universities setting, are presented.

Complex system – Allen defined a complex system as ‘any system that has within itself a capacity to respond to its environment in more than one way. This essentially means that it is not a mechanical system with a single trajectory, but has some internal possibilities of choice or response that it can bring into play’ (Allen, 2001, p. 150). Another characteristic of the system term used in this research is expressed by Watzlawick: “each part of a system [...] is connected to all other parts, in such a manner that a change in one entity causes a change in all entities and therewith of the whole system” (Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 2000, p. 119).

³ Furthermore it is important to point out that this study investigates the adaptation of innovations not just from a managerial perspective which tends to equate ‘the user’ with one homogeneous group. Instead it is tried to be sensitive to the variety of user grouped implicated in change (McLaughlin, 1999)

⁴ One interesting question to follow up on would be whether it is true that: The better the organizations reason is (collaboratively) defined and deliberated, the better drive an organization has.

Complex adaptive systems – CAS are special cases of complex systems which have the ability to ‘learn’ and change based on experience. Classic examples of CAS are as diverse as the stock market, the brain, or the immune system. Lately CAS approaches have been applied to social organizations and communities (Fuller & Morgan, 2000; McMillan, 2004; Stacey, 1996). Another property of adaptive systems is that they have many levels of organization. They have elements or agents which are seen as building blocks. What Holland means by that is that agents on one level become the elements of an agent on a higher level. For example an individual might group with others to build a project team or department etc. Adaptive systems are also constantly reconsidering and reorganizing themselves as they gain experience. *“Succeeding generations of organisms will modify and rearrange their tissues throughout the process of evolution. The brain will continually strengthen or weaken myriad connections between its neurons as an individual learns from his or her encounters with the world. [...] At some deep fundamental level, [...] all these processes of learning, evolution, and adaptation are the same. And one of the fundamental mechanisms of adaptation in any given system is this revision and re-combination of building blocks”* (Waldrop, 1994, p. 146).

Fractals - A new way of looking at the world was made possible with the advent of computers. They could deal with equations which before were believed to result in a un-ordered complete chaos (McMillan, 2004). When these non-linear equations were fed into computers, it turned out that while there was no result no order that fit the traditional mathematical paradigm, the result shows structural patterns – now known as fractals.

Euclidian geometry can describe and measure many attributes of the man-made-world, like houses, roads, computers etc. but it fails to describe and measure (with the appropriate accuracy) the fuzziness of nature, like trees, mountains, human physiology, clouds, coastlines, etc.. Mandelbrot's new geometry is a universal geometry that is capable of capturing these diverse and complex ‘living’ shapes. Several concepts of his geometry are introduced in the following lines: self similarity refers to the fractals *‘property of endlessly manifesting a motif within a motif within a motif* (Coveney & Highfield, 1995, p. 172). The important contribution fractal geometry makes to our understanding of chaotic systems is its holistic view. A hurricane which in one way is a violent storm, however ‘seen in fractal terms it is part of a vast continuum that extends from gust of air on a city street to the enormous cyclic systems that race across the planet’. So it encourages us to recognize the locality of our perspective or metaphorically speaking to reflect on the height from which our birds-eye view is looking down. Another relevant concept is that of the edge of chaos. It describes the space between order and chaos. *‘Biological life forms appear to exist in a balance between regularity and disorder. [...] Ants as individuals behave in a chaotic fashion. They rush about, have a rest, and then rush about again, thus moving from an active pattern to a stable or*

inactive one. But their individual behaviors reflect the overall pattern of the colony which as a whole has an orderly rhythmic pattern to it.'(McMillan 2004, p.23)

Because of the universality⁵ of the conditions (attractors) that give shape to the fractals, they have to be present at all levels. Hence only a holistic investigation of the matter is capable of explaining the system.

The fractal perspective on Universities

Following and expanding Clark's approach to take 'entrepreneurial' "as a *characteristic of social systems; that is of entire universities and their internal departments, research centers, faculties and schools*" (1998, pp. 3-4), the examination and description of the concept of entrepreneurship is applied and in general defined to be the same for individual human actors as well as collectives of human actors who are meant to be bound together by an institutional mandate and can be analysed as distinct and specific system.

This understanding is coherent with the conditions found in so called fractal mathematics, a strand of complexity science. Fractal systems show the same features when visually represented no matter whether using micro- or macroscopic lenses. Applied to organisations this translates to the understanding that the individual is a mirror of the whole and the whole as mirror of the individuals.

The 2500 year old parable of Indra's net, to which Daisaku Ikeda refers as a "beautiful visual metaphor for the interdependence and interpenetration of all phenomena"(Daisaku-Ikeda, 1996) illustrates this understanding from another angle. Charles Eliot recounts the metaphor of Indra's net, which is part of the Buddhist canon: "*In the Heaven of Indra, there is said to be a network of pearls, so arranged that if you look at one you see all the others reflected in it. In the same way each object in the world is not merely itself but involves every other object and in fact IS everything else*" (Capra, 1982). As in this parable the individual mindset and practice mirror the whole, hence the institutional macro-mindset and practices show the same features as the individuals; with the distinction of their relative inherent net structure.

In this way the university is the entrepreneur of itself, like artists can frame themselves to be "*artist as art work*" as Piper (2003) rationalized in an essay about his 1970 *Catalytic* performance.

Yet another analogy often used in this context is the organisation as organism (Morgan, 2006, pp. 33-72) or even '*The world as social-super organism and its global brain*'

⁵ Universality is a concept pioneered by Mitchell Feigenbaum in 1975. It proposes that very different systems would 'behave in a similar way when moving from an orderly state into a chaotic one, in other words, that they behave in a universal fashion' Examples include numerical patterns (petals on flowers), patterns of form (ocean wave patterns) and patterns of movement (fish, snakes, etc) as well as fractal patterning (mountains, coast lines).

(Heylighen, 2000) – as developed by trans-disciplinary cybernetician Francis Heylighen. The former more common metaphor allows for the utilisation of the DNA as analogy for the mindset causing practice, memory and being in organisms and organisations. Heylighen's metaphor allows for the localisation of the individual and institutional being in yet another micro-/macro-perspective, which particularly favours second-order reflections as described in the ethics and sustainability mindset-attractor.

To sum this paragraph about the fractal perspective up; the phenomena/attractors worked out in this chapter have been found to be influential in micro- (individual) and macro- (institutional) contexts.

Sensitivity to initial condition (the butterfly effect) - While the discovery of fractals was received as an interesting but rather theoretical new insight, the whole 'movement' of complexity theory took off when Edward Lorenz from the MIT published his paper connecting the weather conditions with insights from complexity theory. Concretely, when Lorenz was running weather forecast scenarios on his computer and he changed some detail in the initial condition, the results might turn out completely different. This was quite surprising as there were an abundance of interrelated variables and it was thought at this time that changing some initial parameters would still result in a similar outcome as the majority of the systems forces stayed the same. The result of Lorenz observation has been labeled 'sensitive dependence on initial conditions' (popularly known as the butterfly effect).

There are two direct applications of this effect on the research setting. Firstly it results that each case and each individual has to be seen as unique because of the unique initial conditions. And secondly the approached level of understanding has to go beyond the individual case on a level of abstraction that explores the systemic attractors (forces) at work.

Strange attractors – 'basin' of attraction within which a range of similar but non-repeating behaviors take place, behaviors which seem to be magnetically drawn or pulls together within the basin – it has fractal properties. Basically what is described with the strange attractors is that even though the British weather is infamous for its unpredictability, there is a 'basin' which gives it the particularly English style of weather, in that it is clearly different and never behaves like the monsoon or desert-like conditions. *'Although the potential for chaos resides within every system, chaos when it emerges never moves outside the bounds of its strange attractor. [...] the chaotic behavior exhibited is not random and unrestrained, it has its own kind of patterning and its own form of determinism'* (McMillan, 2004, p. 20)

The fuzzy knowledge attractor

As the FU Chancellor assessed correctly (FU Chancellor 1), it is very difficult to measure knowledge and even more difficult to standardize measurements across disciplines. To

illustrate this point compare the different modus operandi of philosophy where very few publish in journals and journal citations are even less probable and publications in genetics were all results are send to journals and an average article is cited about 20 times. In the end it does not matter how many publications an academic has but how good they are. Hence to design any sort of cybernetic system for knowledge production in a university is very difficult because the measured feedback will always be one-dimensional.

Consequently the FU Chancellor explained that he intends “not to standardize the thinking but to standardize the processes” (ibid.). However, even that seems very difficult as the processes are closely coupled with the individual disciplines practices. Only the most basic administrative tasks – especially with regards to human resources and student administration – can be standardized.

When it comes to investigation, the assessment of UOC’s research development manager is affirmed: It is impossible to teach how to do research (UOC management 5); because it is a tacit knowledge that can only be learned from experience.

Emergence and self-organization - Emergence is the term used to describe the process of evolving, adapting and transforming spontaneously and intuitively to changing circumstances resulting in a new form of being of the complex system.

According to Nonaka (1988) self-organizing teams are essential to enable organizational transformation. It should be noted (Stacey 1996) that self-organization is different from self-managed or empowered teams. For Stacey the synergy effects of the division of labor are logically why institutional organizations occur. An organization is the place, which is *'self-organizing, relating between people in which power, politics and conflict of ordinary, everyday life are at the center of cooperative and competitive organizational processes through which joint action is taken'* (2000, p.8)

Allow me to use the example of emergence to elaborate on the practical usefulness of the complexity approach for our understanding of real social/living systems/organizations. Mintzberg and Waters (1989) distinguish between deliberate and emergent strategies. Emergent strategy means those aspects of strategy that are actually implemented and sometimes stand in real contrast to the one plan decided at the point of strategy formulation. Ideally, the pattern of the deliberately developed plan can be observed in the flow of decision making but also in the complex reality inhabited by emotional and irrational actors. However, this is of course, never 100% the case. Sometimes these deviations occur because of rational re-interpretations of conditions, and othertimes, because of intuitive moods, happenstance and serendipity. Consequently, a deliberate strategy is a set of planned and intended interventions, thusly developed to reach well-defined defined objectives. Now in a military scenario the implementation of the strategic plan depends mainly on unforeseeable

influences on the external system. In 'normal' conditions the hierarchical structure of the military bureaucracy will allow for the implementation of the plan. However, if you have a more dynamic, political and federalist system, such as a university, all strategies and objectives are perceived, reflected and acted upon by all stakeholders. McMillian (2004) notes that in a university "*individual units have sufficient autonomy to pursue their own strategic change activities without reference to any central vision or plan*" (p.69). Thus you have a much higher feedback and self-organizing condition. Hence, to analyze organizations focusing on the emergent strategy and to describe the conditions with the evolutionary concepts of complexity will deliver insights into the natural, the fuzzy aspects of social organization.

The edge of chaos –complex systems always exist in a state which maintains a certain chaos (entropy) while at the same time allowing for emergent processes to happen. One classic example of a system being at the edge of chaos is the emergence of life on earth. The water needed to be fluid and have a certain warmth for the proteins to form; in case the conditions were as such that the water was frozen, or if it was so hot the water would have become steam, no life could have emerged. Scientists believe that for each complex system there is a certain fuzzy domain between other states in which it flourishes. When applying the concept of the edge of chaos to universities we return to the key question for universities in the beginning of the 21st century: What is their mission or what is their purpose – to use the metaphor of water, how can they ensure the maintenance of the right temperature for optimal knowledge (life) to evolve. When they become too hot – meaning they take in too much energy from the market and business, they become vaporous; when they focus too much on the liberal arts (e.g. philosophy) and knowledge as an end in itself, they lose their relevance to the practical problems of society.

Deleuzian Ontology

What scientists started to develop as complexity sciences is reflected in philosophical themes like the ontology of being, immanence and other questions of cosmology. The great discourse on the ontology of being has its beginning with Heraclitus, a proponent of a pre-Socratic cosmology, who stressed 'the only constant is change', and Parmenides, his successor, who insisted on a natural reality which is permanent and unchangeable.

Chia (1998) suggests that after more than 2000 years, and amidst many contrary insights, the static worldview has gained dominance over truly procedural understandings. The dominance of the mechanistic worldview became truly dominant after Newton was able to describe the physical laws of motion using stable entities, because this scientific revolution (coupled with other scientific discoveries) enabled the technological advancement that enabled the exponential economic growth and social transformations of modernity. However, it is exactly that perception of *being* (things are in one particular way) in comparison with the

ontology of *becoming* (things constantly develop and change), a concept where movement, process, and emergences, are core characteristics of reality; Such fundamentals are addressed by complexity theory as well as by Deleuze and other philosophers⁶.

Terminology and concepts from philosophy, and especially Deleuze, are combined with concepts from complexity theory to analyze and describe the conditions and practices of knowledge entrepreneurship in universities. The following building blocks from Deleuzian philosophy are transposed:

The **logic of otherness** describes the way a nut only makes sense when understanding and taking a bolt into consideration; applied to the university one has to take into consideration that it (as an institution/system) only makes sense when seen in its environment (politics, economy, society, competitors, etc.). The concept can easily be related to the demarcation between the 'other states' between which the complex adaptive systems exist at the 'edge of chaos'.

Immanence (a classic philosophical term used to discuss the inner perception of identity and consciousness) can be seen in relation to the 'sensitivity of condition'. Chia (1998) illustrates its meaning with the example of the picture '0 through 9' by Jasper Johns. The leitmotiv of the painting is the logical and historical connectedness of reality. The painter begun by painting a zero, followed by all primary numbers 'superimposed' on top of each other, each leaving its particular characteristics on the canvas. The painting is a comprehensible representation of Deleuzian immanence; the way each number exists and only makes sense in reference to and as part of a sequence with the others. There are two practical interpretations for this study: the way each case (each manifestation) is unique and can only be understood by observing the whole in a systemic way (Senge, 1990) and secondly it can be interpreted to propose the perception that all present states have all history immanently as part of them and are as such immanently and constantly sensitive to the initial condition.

One last and maybe most applicable concept Deleuze developed is that of the rhizome. A rhizome can be interpreted as analogous to the complex system entity. It connects any point to any other in an essentially heterogeneous collective assemblage of occurrences which are called 'bulbs' and 'tubers'. It might be helpful to think of a flock of birds (school of fish, herd etc.). But 'there are no points or positions in a rhizome, such as those found in a structure, tree, or root. There are only lines' (Deleuze in Boundas, 1993, p.31). To propose a scientific interpretation, Deleuze sees the rhizome consist of waves such as the quantum ions, which make up all matter. In the same way as these fundamental elements of the mechanistic

⁶ On a similar tangent Mason (2005) assesses that complexity theory echoes Foucault's emphasis on "polymorphous correlations in place of simple or complex causalities" .

scientific paradigm are technically never static⁷, the lines of the rhizome are only vibrations, only existent as substance when measured but truly always changing.

So Deleuze views change as subtle, agglomerative, often subterranean and heterogeneous (Chia, 1998). Reflecting on this assessment, I see internet innovations as a good object of study, because many of them are incorporated as an individual motivation and their organizational incorporation and usefulness is diffused 'by word of mouth'. This 'epidemic' spread resonates in Chia's analogy that "change spreads like a patch of oil" (ibid. p.14)

⁷ Or, in fact, show even more dubious properties of particle and wave.

ANNEX D – Interview Partners

Research Objectives	Political Dimension	Practice Dimension
Entrepreneurship in Research	-Responsible for Research Strategy & Oversight (Vice Rector Academic)	-Responsible for Intellectual Property Rights and Royalties -Responsible for Private Sector Relations & Spin-off Creation
Transformations caused by the internet	-Responsible for Information and Communication Technology Strategy & Implementation	Webmaster
Entrepreneurship in Education	- Responsible for Student Affairs (Community, Alumni) - Responsible for Teaching Strategy & Implementation	Student representative
Entrepreneurship in University Administration	-Responsible for Administration	-Responsible for Human Resources -Responsible for Fundraising

Table D.1 - List of Case-Study Interview Partners

Additionally, key actors have been identified by requesting recommendations from the initial interview partners.

ANNEX E – Sample Interview Guide

Note: The interview guide reproduced here contains the core questions. Naturally, the interviews were conducted in English, German and Spanish, respectively. Also, some questions that were targeted at the specific ambit of work of the informant have been added. Additionally, variations of these questions been were in the case of the UOC student interviews and the LSE student focus group.

Introduction

The theme of the research is: **Knowledge Entrepreneurship at Universities**: organisational practice and strategy in the case of internet based innovation appropriation.

The general question investigated in this case study is: **How is the process of introducing internet based innovations into LSE happening?** (And, what is the current use of the internet at LSE?) I am especially interested in understanding the practices from a strategy and knowledge sharing perspective.

The interview is structured in four parts. Firstly, I will ask some questions regarding **organisational culture and strategy development**. Secondly, there are some questions that deal **with innovations/opportunities**. Thereafter, I am interested to learn about **LSE communication and knowledge sharing**.

Questions

Setting

1. What is your background & responsibility?

Questions

LSE as an Organisation

2. What are the reasons to come to LSE?
3. What was your expectation, and how long did it take you until a "real understanding" of what LSE is about emerged?
4. In your understanding, is there something like the LSE project? What is it?
5. What/Who are the motors of change?
6. Is LSE one entity (an ant population), a flock of birds or a fishing ground?

Knowledge entrepreneurship

7. Does LSE support staff who want to tackle new projects?
8. How do you find knowledge opportunities (mailing lists, websites, working groups, conferences/external awareness)
9. Is there support/training for the planning/strategizing of career?
10. Do you think there is room and/or opportunities to experiment? (Lockin/open minded)
11. What about communication? What kind of formal and informal communication channels are there? What is the tonality?

Technology (the internet) for knowledge practices

12. How is the internet supporting your knowledge practices?
13. The internet allows me to construct more knowledge
14. The internet allows me to construct better knowledge
15. Do you feel LSE is using the internet appropriately?
16. What are the demands/needs/expectations you have regarding the internet at LSE?

Knowledge Sharing

17. What are LSE's activities regarding encouraging collaborative learning (knowledge sharing) and personal information management (digital literacy/knowledge management)?

18. How is knowledge about "good practices" at LSE codified and disseminated?

[In closing]

Could I sit with one of your colleagues to see whether you can let me read some documents that are relevant to my research?

[Here comes a list of documents (policies, budgets, etc.) that deal with topics relevant to the development of the case study]

Could you recommend me a colleague who you consider entrepreneurial and who I might contact in order to organise an interview?

Thank you very much for your time. I will contact you once the case study has been developed in order to ensure a correct understanding and interpretation of your contribution.

REFERENCES

- Allen, P. M. (2001). A complex systems approach to learning in adaptive networks. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 5(2), 149-180
- Capra, F. (1982). The Turning Point. Retrieved 16.Apr., 2007, from <http://www.chebucto.ns.ca/CommunitySupport/NCC/SC3META.html>
- Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities : organizational pathways of transformation* (1st ed.). Oxford ; New York: Published for the IAU Press by Pergamon Press.
- Collins. (2004). Theoretical resources. In D. Hook (Ed.), *Critical psychology* (pp. xiv, 657 p.). Lansdowne [South Africa]: UCT Press.
- Coveney, P., & Highfield, R. (1995). *Frontiers of complexity : the search for order in a chaotic world* (1st ed.). New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Daisaku-Ikeda. (1996). Thoughts on Education for Global Citizenship. *Columbia University* Retrieved 16.Apr., 2007, from http://www.sgi.org/english/sgi_president/works/speeches/thoughts.htm
- Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging knowledge : the university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham [England] ; Philadelphia, PA: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act : a theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2d ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Foucault, M., & Gordon, C. (1980). *Power/knowledge : selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (1st American ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fuller, T., & Morgan, P. (2000). Moving beyond metaphor. *Emergence*, 2(1)
- Goldblatt, D. (2004). *Knowledge and the social sciences : theory, method, practice*. London ; New York: Routledge, in association with Open University.
- Habermas, J. (1978). *Knowledge and human interests* (2nd [English] ed.). London [etc.]: Heinemann Educational.
- Heylighen, F. (2000). The Social Superorganism and its Global Brain [Electronic Version]. *Principia Cybernetica Web*. Retrieved 26.Apr.2007 from <http://pcp.vub.ac.be/SUPORGLI.html>.
- Joubert, D. (1990). Towards a human sociology. In J. Mouton & J. Muller (Eds.), *Knowledge, method, and the public good* (pp. 76-94). Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews : an introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Markovâa, I. (1982). *Paradigms, thought, and language*. Chichester ; New York: Wiley.
- McMillan, E. M. (2004). *Complexity, organizations and change*. New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization* (Updated ed. ed.). London: SAGE.

- Mouton, J., & Muller, J. (1990). *Knowledge, method, and the public good*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Piper, A. (2003). Adrian Piper's Catalysis, personal electronic interview. In K. Araya (Ed.), *Walking in the City: The Motif of Exile in Performances by Krzysztof Wodiczko and Adrian Piper*: Concordia-University.
- Seale, C. (1999). *The quality of qualitative research*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Senges, M. (2002). *Nutzung von Neuen Informations und Kommunikations Technologien zur Wissensvernetzung*. TFH Wildau, Wildau
- Stacey, R. D. (1996). *Strategic management and organisational dynamics : the challenge of complexity* (3rd ed.). Harlow, England ; New York: Financial Times.
- Steinberg, A. (2005). *Emergent knowledge dynamics in innovation: Exploring e-business entrepreneurship after the dotcom crash*. London School of Economics, London
- Waldrop, M. M. (1994). *Complexity*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Ward-Schofield, J. (1993). Increasing the generalisability of qualitative research. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *Social research: Philosophy, politics & practice* (pp. 200-225). London: Open University/Sage.
- Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. (2000). *Menschliche Kommunikation: Formen, Störungen, Paradoxien*. Bern; Göttingen; Toronto; Seattle: Huber.

