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Summary

Hybrid entrepreneurship is a relatively new term referring to someone who want to try out his or hers business idea and entrepreneurial skill while still remaining at their wage-work in order to reduce their personal financial risk. In the academia this is quite a usual phenomenon where researchers and other academic personnel develop new ventures based on the research they are working on. This is largely possible due to something called the teachers exemption. What it means is that the intellectual properties invented by the researchers are fully owned by themselves. Another reason is that the individuals at the academia have permission to have secondary employments. As long as it is not competing with the university’s functions, the people who work in the academic have the possibility to pursue other interests on the side if they want to. However with all these opportunities and all, why are there not more entrepreneurs out there, coming from the academia? And what are the factors influencing the choice of pursuing hybrid entrepreneurship? From what we can tell there is a satisfaction among these individuals in their work. They have all the possibilities in the world to utilize their research and commit to the business activities. Yet many of the researchers are lacking in entrepreneurial abilities causing lots of valuable research to wait too long until it is being commercialized causing it to lose potential revenue. There is a wish and suggestion that more entrepreneurial education is given to not only researcher perhaps, but also every educational program. The academic environment is the perfect place to explore ones entrepreneurial interest and it should be the university’s responsibility to nurture it no matter what program you are attending or what position you are occupying. This could encourage people to pursue their dreams or at least learn the importance of critical assessment of your environment in order to find entrepreneurial opportunities. What we have concluded in this study is that hybrid entrepreneurship is a good method for someone who wishes to lower their financial risks when developing their own business. The method is already unconsciously used by researchers at universities to some extent and we suggest that the universities become more active in trying to encourage more of this. Researchers have probably the best conditions to apply this strategy as they have the teachers exemption to give them all the rights to their intellectual property. The university also have good connections to incubators that can help these researchers with initial funds and knowledge to start up their new venture.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In this introductory chapter we will explain the underlying knowledge for choosing this subject and also present shortly the current view of closely connected theories due to the fact that our chosen subject does not yet have a wide array of studies explaining it.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Entrepreneurship as a concept is relatively old and has been mentioned in very old writings by Cantillon as early as in the eighteenth century (Ripsas, 1998, p. 105; Wenneker and Thurik, 1999, p. 32). It is no coincidence that it was during this period of time that the notion of entrepreneurship started to appear since the legal and institutional conditions changed to be more beneficial for entrepreneurs (Wenneker and Thurik, 1999, p. 38). Even in today’s economy entrepreneurship seems to be of significant relevance and continue to contribute in several different areas. It has been said to contribute a significant driver of global economies (McGourty, 2009, p. 207). Furthermore entrepreneurs seem to generate more employment opportunities than non-entrepreneurs of comparable sizes and to more efficiently produce innovations of higher quality than their equivalents (van Praag and Versloot, 2007, p. 377). All this indicates that entrepreneurship still has an important role to play and we see no indication that this is about to change anytime soon.

Entrepreneurship is however a risky undertaking which puts the entrepreneur at risk to be affected of personal financial consequences (Hall and Woodward, 2010, p. 1163; Iyigun and Owen, 1998, p. 455). The risks involved in entrepreneurial ventures lead us to assume that it is likely that people will be deterred to engage fully in entrepreneurial activities because of the personal risk. Yet there are compromises to make, that we think might help to lessen the aforementioned disincentives, to entrepreneurial entry. We think that hybrid entrepreneurship is one of those compromises. Folta, Delmar and Wennberg (2010, p. 254) defined hybrid entrepreneurs as:

“Individuals who engage in self-employment activity while simultaneously holding a primary job in wage work.”

To have a salary from a wage work in parallel with running your own business should work to diminish the risk of personal disaster for the entrepreneur. Not that the entrepreneurial activity in itself should be less risky but that salary from the wage work would lower the risk of leaving the individual at hand destitute if the venture fails. Regardless of how hybrid entrepreneurs affects personal risk it seems to be of a significant importance within the field of entrepreneurship since studies have shown that somewhere between 77 % to 91 % nascent entrepreneurs have a wage work when they start up their business, depending on the economic state in the given country (Acs, Arenius, Hay and Minniti, 2004, p. 29).

An aggravating circumstance with the approach of hybrid entrepreneurship is that in developed countries it is rare that private companies encourage its employees to develop their own business in their spare time. A study by Kaplan and Strömberg (2003, p. 292) show that venture capitalist use non-compete covenants in about 70 % of cases when signing contracts with their investees. The reality is often so that the organization tends
to allow employees to come up with internal innovations applicable by the company itself. A phenomenon which is called intrapreneurship and simplified is entrepreneurship within existing company or organization (Parker, 2009, p. 20). Especially young and old workers are more likely to commit to intrapreneurship rather than entrepreneurship (Parker, 2009, p. 31). From the corporate point of view the notion of employees taking their acquired knowledge and potential innovations to start their own company are seen as a threat to the own organization (Marx, 2011, p. 688), which works as an incentive for companies to find ways to prevent those threats to be realized and one way to achieve just that seems to be the use of non-compete covenants. These covenants are signed agreements between the corporation and the employee that makes sure that the latter are not allowed to join competitors or to set up their own company for a while after that they quit their current employment (Garmaise, 2011, p. 376; Marx, 2011, p. 707; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 426).

The situation with non-compete covenants seems quite different for people working in the public sector. The public sector and entrepreneurship are not two phenomena that are generally associated with each other (Pärna and Tunzelmann, 2007, p. 109). It is uncommon that employees within the public sector transition into entrepreneurship (Özcan and Reichstein, 2009, p. 614). Because of the disinclination of public employees to transition over to entrepreneurial activities one could assume that specific non-compete covenants never have been necessary. Furthermore it might be safe to assume that the public sector is not as affected by competition as it is in the private sector which also suggests that these clauses are not as needed. Though there seems to be some instances that waive this predominant notion. In the academic world the state is different and a substantial amount of researchers and scientist are engaged in entrepreneurial activities (Stuart and Ding, 2006, p. 98). Sweden has somewhat different preconditions when it comes to entrepreneurial activities originating from university research because in Sweden it is the academics that are the holder of property rights of their research even though it is conducted through their employment (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 647). Granting the academic the rights to intellectual property might seem like a substantial incentive for academic entrepreneurship but with it follows several circumstances that acts as disincentives. These disincentives are for example that since the university is omitted from the property rights they have no interest in seeing research at their faculty commercialized and thus leaves the academic to take the full brunt of commercialization themselves and might even try to further discourage entrepreneurship (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 647).

However there seem to be some issues that could arise from an excessive encouragement to academics to take their research commercial. If the overall focus is on the commercial viability of the research it might jeopardize the academic quality of the research (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 642). It seems to us that it might affect the quality of the education but on the other hand will the majority of the students’ most likely end up in the private sector and a business perspective on things during the education may not be all bad. However do we see that there might be a risk that a commercial objective might divert focus from basic research important on a societal level but which has no real commercial viability. We do nevertheless believe that if an entrepreneurial atmosphere could be nurtured without deteriorating the academic quality of the research it would mean great utility for the society, since it seems plausible to assume that new jobs would be created due to the university spin-offs and a more innovative private sector directly affiliated with the industry that the spin-offs belong to.
1.2 PROBLEM BACKGROUND

In this part of the introduction we want to introduce the reader with a short background information regarding the subjects and theories that are related to our research question. We will start with introducing some of the related theories to form a platform of information regarding entrepreneurship and the differences between some methods of transaction into it. In the end we introduce the entrepreneurship barriers in private companies also known as non-compete covenants.

1.2.1 ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Entrepreneurship is a well-researched subject and “what is an entrepreneur” has been defined by several researches along the way. Blanchflower and Oswald (1998, p. 24) notes that “the simplest kind of entrepreneurship is self-employment.” Others have more detailed explanation of entrepreneurs, like Schumpeter (as cited by Eroglu and Picac, 2011, p. 146) who defined them as “individuals who exploit market opportunity through technical and/or organizational innovation”.

For a long time the entrepreneur has been researched in order to understand what makes an entrepreneur. Over time studies have identified some characteristics that separated the entrepreneur from other individuals. However there are a lot of definitions of the entrepreneurs personal characteristics as well as different outlooks which are presented below in table 1 (Landström, 2005, p. 17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneur Characteristics</th>
<th>Table 1. “Different ways to see the entrepreneur as an individual” (Source: Landström, 2005, p. 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The entrepreneur as a hero</td>
<td>The entrepreneur has an intuitive ability - a sixth sense - and some congenital abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entrepreneur as driven by unique abilities</td>
<td>The entrepreneur is driven by a number of unique abilities, motives and attitudes, like a high performance motive, independence and optimism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entrepreneur as an innovator</td>
<td>The entrepreneur’s behaviour is innovative, which means that the entrepreneur is a creative individual who discover new opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Entrepreneur as a leader</td>
<td>Entrepreneur has the ability to organize a new venture and lead the individuals that are involved in the venture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.2 ENTREPRENEURIAL RISK

When it comes to the relationship between entrepreneurship and risk-taking behavior Knight were the true pioneer and has laid the foundation for a lot of subsequent studies in this theoretical field (Kihlstrom and Laffont, 1979, p. 720; Hvide and Panos, 2014, p. 213; Macko and Tyszka, 2009, p. 472). The traditional view of entrepreneurship and risk-taking is that entrepreneurs are more inclined to take risk in their endeavours; otherwise
they would choose wage work instead to circumvent the additional riskiness that entrepreneurship brings (Kihlstrom and Laffont, 1979, p. 720). Later studies have confirmed this perspective (Hvide and Panos, 2014, p. 213; Macko and Tyszka, 2009, p. 483-484 and 586). Another interesting aspect that have been shown is that less risk-averse entrepreneurs tend to develop firms that perform worse than entrepreneurs that are less prone to risk-taking (Hvide and Panos, 2014, p. 213).

1.2.3 ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS

Entrepreneurship does not necessarily have to imply an individual spotting an opportunity to utilize and develop a venture around. Entrepreneurship can exist in all kinds of places. Entrepreneurial thinking seems to be able to happen everywhere where people are aware of its environment and have an imaginable mind and the possibility to impose changes. From our experience, from what we have read, seen and heard, we get the feeling that individuals at organizations are becoming more anti-bureaucratic and are starting to have more and more ideas and opinions on how things are running, while at the same time the management themselves are starting to understand the importance of listening to their employees and take their advice in order to improve its organizational processes. Just look at how things were a couple of decades ago, where strict rules and bureaucracy ruled the industries and now companies like Google are utilizing the brilliant minds of their employees to further innovate at a fast pace.

Intrapreneurship, also known as corporate entrepreneurship and corporate venturing, is the development in which small and/or individual groups are put together in order to revitalize and develop innovative new products, services or processes for the organization (Felicio, 2012, p. 1718). Nielsen, Peters and Hisrich (1985, p. 182-185), quite early, laid out some reasons for using intrapreneurship in the organization. What they noted was that intrapreneurship can innovatively help realize and implement secondary activities to the organization, which are not centrally related to its central mission. They also mentioned that intrapreneurship can shorten response time and help the organization get rid of the tendency to compromise rather than making sure the best solution is adopted. It is somewhat strange that it has taken such long time to understand the usefulness of utilizing the innovative minds around you, like the ones from the employees of a company. According to us it was not until the organizations like Apple and Google that the view of an open minded workplace was turned into something positive. It is the same feeling that makes us think that the bureaucratic environment that has permeated organizations for a very long time has equally long limited and restricted the innovative power of employees. Teofilovic (2002, p.1) mention that this is a common assumption among citizens however the public organizations are improving and modernizing and are finding ways to improve efficiency.

The public sector is generally linked to bureaucracy who is perceived as something that is not positively correlated with entrepreneurship and is restricting the employees’ innovativeness (Pärna and von Tunzelmann, 2007, p. 109; Özcan and Reichstein, 2009, p. 606-607). People working at public organizations are usually looking for job security and tend to be comfortable working with a low variety of tasks and a high hierarchical environment. Additionally, research has shown that people working in the public sector are especially dissatisfied with relations at work and how little recognition they get from their supervisors for their accomplishments (Özcan and Reichstein, 2009, p. 606). However in the academic world the situation seem a lot different. A lot of scientist and
researchers are capitalizing on their research and becoming entrepreneurs (Stuart and Ding, 2006, p. 98). This might be due to the expertise their carrying in their fields of research. The same expertise could allow them a better view of the market and potential opportunities which gives them huge advantages to capitalize on that specific area.

1.2.4 ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF FUNDING

When the entrepreneur wants to conceptualize his or her idea there are a couple of options to finance the project. Unless the entrepreneur is enough wealthy to come up with the funds him- or herself s/he has to turn to others in order to reach a sufficient amount of funds to get started. According to Winborg and Landström (2000, p. 235-236) small business owners have received a lot of attention from policy makers and researchers because of their importance in economic growth and job creation. They also point out that these small business owners have problems with external financing causing restrictions in development and growth.

Bootstrapping is a concept of initial financing that suggests that the entrepreneur is incapable of attracting external financing from the beginning of the project and therefore needs to look at internal funding options like for example personal savings, borrowing from friends and family, taking out second mortgages and using of their credit line. This strategy is however not sustainable as the venture’s grow and can quickly exhaust the entrepreneurs finances as told by Smith and Smith. It is more likely that in the growth phase the entrepreneur has enough merits in order to find external finances (Smith and Smith, 2004, p. 30).

Additionally there are other funding strategies like taking a bank loan or approaching a venture capitalist. It is more common for entrepreneurs to take bank loans as told by Winton and Yerramilli (2005, p. 51) but in any new venture there are a lot of risk which will require a lot of monitoring from the investor, however the banks are usually far less intensive when it comes to monitoring compared with the venture capitalist. The reason for this is that the banks are mostly focusing on covenant violation and deteriorating performance while venture capitalists impose more restrictions to the entrepreneur in order to avoid or minimize bad outcomes (Winton and Yerramilli, 2005, p. 52).

A fourth option is to find a business angel. Business angels are wealthy freelancing individuals interested to invest in early-stage projects. Angel investors put most of their trust in the entrepreneur and his idea and aims to realize an exit within 5-10 years through a successful firm sale or an initial public offering, IPO (Smith and Smith, 2004, p. 33).

These alternative ways of funding are usually used in different stages of the development of a company. However we want to show the different methods of funding in order to view them in a perspective of financial and personal risks. No matter whom you borrow money from you either put yourself in financial risk, or are responsible for other individual’s money which could perhaps result in psychological risk (Özcan and Reichstein, 2009, p. 607).

1.2.5 NON-COMPETE COVENANTS AND TEACHERS EXEMPTION

Non-compete covenants are sections in employee contracts which dictates that the worker are not allowed to compete with the corporation where the worker is currently employed (Garmaise, 2011, p. 376; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 426). This is something that

***
overrides the employees lawful rights which means that the covenants must be explicit and written (Estlund, 2006, p. 391). Prohibition to join or start competing firms during the person's period of employment and sometimes even for a period of time after the employment have ceased are usually included in these non-compete covenants (Estlund, 2006, p. 391; Garmaise, 2011, p. 376; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 426). These covenants are more common in certain sectors than others, like upper management (Garmaise, 2011, p. 378; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 425) and the technological industry (Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 425). Companies have their reasons for making their employees to sign non-compete covenants among which are that it is a means protect intellectual property (Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 427) and it also functions as an incentive for the firm to invest in its own human capital (Garmaise, 2011, p. 414; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, 427). It has been shown that when these non-compete covenants are enforced they adversely affect entrepreneurship (Samila and Sorenson, 2011, 436; Stuart and Sorenson, 2003, p. 197) and even works as an impediment for innovation (Garmaise, 2011, p. 408; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, 436).

Sweden has something that is called “exemption for teachers” (lärarundantaget) which is a law regulation that grants teachers affiliated to the educational system property rights to intellectual property created in their research (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 647).

Which means that the academics in question is free to commercialize their own findings if they so wish (Leong, Wee, and Yuen-Ping, 2008, p. 652). Something that looks like a strong incentive for academics to engage in entrepreneurial activities. There is however some issues that seems to arise with the Swedish structure. Which parties that has an incentive to partake in the entrepreneurial entry is arguably the foremost issue. If the universities do not get a share of the intellectual property they have no enticement to neither encourage nor facilitate entrepreneurship or transfer of knowledge to pertinent industries (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 647; Vedin, 1993, p. 26). Academics do not usually want to invest the time it takes to learn the needed business skills to successfully commercialize their ideas (Leong et al., 2008, p. 653). It can furthermore be expensive to commercialize since because with the process follows several associated costs that have to be covered (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 646). Having to handle all these matters on your own when you neither possess the necessary skills nor the resources to do so in an adequate way seem to compose strong a disincentive to engage in entrepreneurial activities.

1.2.6 HYBRID ENTREPRENEURSHIP VS. PART-TIME ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Entrepreneurship is a concept that can be frightening to some people. Taking a leap into the unknown, leaving the safe wage work behind, in order to follow your dream of creating a business from the start, is perhaps a big dream to some but not suitable for everyone. However there seem to be a method that minimizes the personal risks and still allows the entrepreneur to take off with his or her venture. This method is called Hybrid Entrepreneurship by Folta et al. (2010, p. 253) and explains the process where the entrepreneur builds his venture gradually while still having a wage-work. This way the individual can test the entrepreneurial entry and gain knowledge and experience during the start-up in order to learn about the ventures potential as well as the individuals own entrepreneurial characteristics and skills.
Another concept that could easily be mixed up with hybrid entrepreneurship is called part-time entrepreneurship. A part-time entrepreneur is recognized by having a normal wage job while balancing it with work with his or her own business at the same time (Petrova, 2010, p. 474). The question however is why there are part-time entrepreneurs? Research suggest that it is not a question regarding financial capital, that the individuals need to compensate a lower salary, but instead it is the human capital that is the driving factor, meaning the gathering of knowledge (Petrova, 2010, p. 488; Kim, Aldrich and Keister, 2006, p. 18). This concept is also quite interesting to us as we believe a lot of our people in our interest group may utilize this method. These types of people that fit into the part-time category are probably looking for the intellectual complement rather than the monetary one. We can therefore use these as a comparison against hybrid entrepreneurs.

Taking the information above into consideration there are some key differences between these two. The hybrid aims to try out his idea with as little personal risk as possible. This way s/he can get an understanding of the possibilities of the idea and the new venture as well as getting an insight into how it is like to be an entrepreneur. If the venture would to succeed the hybrid entrepreneur have gradually managed to build the venture without worrying about not having an income, which s/he would get from the wage work, and over this time period gradually work more and more with the business until finally be able to quit the wage-work and become entrepreneur on full-time. Comparing this strategy to the part-time entrepreneur the differences are quite obvious in the intentions of the individual. Part time entrepreneurs are aiming to complement his or hers current wage work with an intellectual stimulating challenge. This means that the individual never have any intentions of pursuing a career as an entrepreneur but rather stick to the wage-work while being able to satisfy other interests with a side venture.

1.3 RESEARCH GAP

When it comes to hybrid entrepreneurship we were not able to find a lot of articles bringing up the subject. The idea of gradually transitioning into entrepreneurship is something that apparently has not been researched a lot. It might not be a usual strategy but we think it has a lot of strategic potential. From the few articles we did find they are putting focus on the theoretical and empirical implications of the hybrid entrepreneurial entry strategy (Folta et al., 2010) and the incitements for having a part-time entrepreneurial venture (Petrova, 2012).

From what we have read, the public sector tends to be bureaucratic and hindering innovativeness (Pärna and von Tunzelmann, 2007, p. 109) and also the employees of public organizations are usually satisfied with that kind of work and might not inhibit the characteristics of an entrepreneur (Özcan and Reichstein, 2009, p. 614). However there seem to be an exception regarding entering entrepreneurship among academic researchers. The fact that academic researchers are working close to the labor market as well as their reputation seem to influence the interest of capitalizing on their research (Stuart and Ding, 2006, p. 138-139).

With the information from these articles we wanted to draw a parallel between the entrance to entrepreneurship from the public sector as well as the hindrance from non-compete covenants in the private sector to the theory of hybrid entrepreneurship and how
the individuals are thinking about uncertainty and risk when entering entrepreneurship while still working on the side.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTION AND PURPOSE

Our purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes from academic entrepreneurs and the external factors that affect them on their pursuit of hybrid entrepreneurship. We wish to draw parallels between university entrepreneurs and ordinary entrepreneurs in order to find similarities and differences to what makes them driven and successful. From this we develop our research question as:

*What kind of external factors affect the academic individual when pursuing hybrid entrepreneurship?*

In order to get a deeper understanding of the individuals that are involved in this kind of situation we want to take a deeper look into the characteristics of these people in order to see if they have anything in common with regular entrepreneurs. So for that reason we include a sub-purpose that says:

- *Does academic entrepreneurs have any distinctive characteristics?*

1.5 CHOICE OF SUBJECT

We who write this thesis are two students from the northern parts of Sweden with a genuine interest in entrepreneurship. Both of us is majoring in Business development which naturally lead us to find something within entrepreneurship as a subject for our thesis. During our studies we have several times been discussing the risks and characteristics of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship. Furthermore since we are both soon are about to finish our studies and enter the labour market, maybe as an entrepreneur, we find the concept of hybrid entrepreneurial entry very interesting.

Entrepreneurial entry means under what circumstances an aspiring entrepreneur gets motivated to start a new business, i.e. that the aspiring entrepreneurs expectation of performance for the specific endeavour have to exceed the estimated risks that starting up the new business would entail (McCann and Folta, 2012, p. 484; Dawson and Henley, 2013, p. 939). Additionally the estimates of inherent risk in start-up enterprises is not always correct and might be somewhat over-optimistic (Dawson and Henley, 2013, p. 939). Risk and the approach to risk taking in relation to entrepreneurship seem to be a widely discussed subject. A popular opinion is that entrepreneurs are more prone to take risks in regard to business than others (Kihlstrom and Laffont, 1979, p. 720) and regardless if that is true or not the notions of entrepreneurship and risk-taking are highly associated with each other.

This led us to wanting to investigate how you can be an entrepreneur with low personal financial risk and we believed that hybrid entrepreneurship seems to be a strong contender to achieve this aspect. Hybrid entrepreneurship is when the entrepreneur still has a wage work while building their own business on the side (Folta et al., 2010, p. 253). Moreover the concept of hybrid entrepreneurship is a relative new and unexplored research niche within entrepreneurship at large since previous studies have treated wage-workers and
self-employed as mutually exclusive (Folta et al., 2010, p. 254; Petrova, 2012, p. 474). Because this is a relative new research field with few articles written about it also contributed to our growing interest of the subject.

1.6 DELIMITATIONS

We have decided to only implement empirical data from Sweden as that is the country we are residing in. In addition to entrepreneurs from the private sector we will also look at academic university researchers because the teachers exemption and other facilitating conditions such as leniency towards time allocation intended for avocations and absence of non-compete covenants seems to make a beneficial base for hybrid entrepreneurship.
1.7 DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hybrid Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>A strategy in which an individual tries his entrepreneurial abilities and the opportunities of his ideas in order to minimize personal financial risk while still keeping a wage-work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>An individual who have an additional wage work outside his own venture because of financial restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapreneurship/Corporate Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>This is a wording for individuals within an organization with highly entrepreneurial abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compete Covenants</td>
<td>Clausal in employment contracts dictating that the employee are not allowed to join nor form a competing firm for some time after they have ceased to work for a company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Exemption (or Intellectual property rights of academic staff)</td>
<td>A legal exception for teachers that grants them the property rights to the research they conduct at a university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2. “DEFINITIONS” (SOURCE: AUTHORS)**
2. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter we will provide our pre-understanding of the subject as well as the theoretical perspectives regarding the research method.

2.1 PRE-UNDERSTANDING

The topic of pre-understanding is aimed to give the reader a perception of the level of understanding we inhibit before starting this study. It shows both our theoretical understanding as well as our practical understanding as knowledge and experience can provide different types of views of the subject.

2.1.1 THEORETICAL PRE-UNDERSTANDING

During our studies we have been reading a comprehensive amount of information and gained a good understanding about entrepreneurship, innovative organizational strategies, risk and many things in between. We thought that our theoretical knowledge from our studies would help us construct and find the best theoretical platform in order to give us a starting point in this thesis. The research subject is quite theoretical in its nature, as entrepreneurship is not an exact science and has many ways it can exist, therefore we wanted to find the characteristics of its users and the influences of the environment. However due to the lack of research in this subject we had to use our pre-understanding of entrepreneurial theory in order to locate connecting theories which we could use. Fortunately entrepreneurship is a well-researched subject and thanks to our pre-understanding we managed to build the platform we wanted in order to continue our study, however we have had to do the connections to hybrid entrepreneurship ourselves with the help of benchmarks borrowed from Folta et al. (2010).

2.1.2 PRACTICAL PRE-UNDERSTANDING

In our many years of studying we have had relatively little experience with actual practical entrepreneurship. We both have relatives, friends or acquaintances that have sometime been or are involved with entrepreneurial endeavours in some way or other. One of us has tried starting up his own business and has participated in a lot of business challenges and through that experience gained knowledge of what it usually is required from an entrepreneur. Other insights have come from actual entrepreneurs presenting their story through lectures and workshops. These have also been great in order to analyse where the difficulties lie and what encourages people to take the risk. With these backgrounds we then wanted to look at how you as an entrepreneur can minimize the personal financial risk which is something that is intimidating to a lot of people. Because we are quite involved in the subject there is a slight risk of personal feelings and opinions that skew the observations and the position regarding certain factors.
2.2 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

The research philosophy is intended to show the way we think of this research in a matter of the development of the knowledge.

In the social sciences all research makes what is called ontological assumptions. The ontological viewpoint is about the philosophical nature of the reality and of its social beings (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988, p. 509). Bryman (2011, p. 35-36) mentions two ontological viewpoint that have different perceptions of the social entities art or nature. One is objectivism where social entities should be perceived as objective, which means it is viewed as having an outer reality for the social actors and facts in which we cannot control. The other is constructionism which is based on the actor’s views and actions. The constructionist view, that we have chosen to use, is aimed to show that the social phenomenon not only are created from social interactions but are also in a constant state of revision. This means that the researcher creates constructions of the reality but the presentation can never be seen as final (Bryman, 2011, p. 37). The constructionist view is related to our interpretivist philosophy. We don’t see the data we receive as final or generalizable but rather as a construction of what some of our respondents have experienced in order to create an understanding for us of how and why they acted as they did. This way we will build a sociological and psychological insight on how hybrid entrepreneurs act and perceive their abilities and businesses.

Interpretivism is the philosophical research view which builds on understanding and interpretation of the world around us (Bryman, 2011, p. 32). Interpretivists argue that the world is consisting out of several realities. The realities are experienced by the receiver meaning everyone creates their own understanding in order to make sense of the world around them (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, as cited by Hudson and Ozanne, 1988, p. 509). Relating to our subject we want to understand the hybrid entrepreneurs in their motives for doing what they did when they started their businesses. We believe that each individual entrepreneur has his or her own reasons for what s/he did or did not do. The business situations are probably of a complex nature and would therefore have their own unique story, which we are interested in. Interpretivist are questioned regarding their generalizability of their research, however their response is that generalizability, in their case, is not crucial (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2003, p. 84). Neither in our case do we think our results will become generalizable. Especially within a subject like entrepreneurship where differences among the entrepreneurial individuals is what makes them hard to define. This means that there is no one perfect candidate for entrepreneurship but rather everyone is doing their own thing resulting in different types of successful entrepreneurs. Saunders et al. (2003, p. 84) also explains that the interpretivist position, in being able to understand peoples action, is necessary to explore the subjective meanings motivating them.

2.3 RESEARCH APPROACH

The deductive methodology approach is the researcher in question from what is known within the relevant theoretical field deduces an amount of hypotheses that will be tested through an empirical investigation (Bryman, 2011, p. 26). Meaning that the hypotheses have been derived from what different theories claims to be true and thereafter validated in relation to the data that have been collected for this specific study. The deductive
approach is not usually seen as the predominant methodology for qualitative studies (Bryman, 2011, p. 40; Hyde, 2000, p. 82) but we find that it has its merits in qualitative research nonetheless. Informal usage of deductive procedures among qualitative researchers is not uncommon (Hyde, 2000, p. 85). Thus we argue that we foremost use a deductive approach since we have quite an extensive literature review over different theoretical fields which we found relevant and drew from these when we created the framework for the study we are to conduct. We have composed a theoretical framework based upon scientific literature that explores and explains what research have been done regarding hybrid entrepreneurship and also related topics and other fields we found relevant for this specific study. We have furthermore used the theoretical framework to construct our interview template in order to formulate relevant questions to our interviewees. In our analysis chapter we will also check the empirical data we have procured through conducting interviews against what earlier research and theories has found and the conclusions we have drawn from that.

2.4 RESEARCH STRATEGY AND DESIGN

We are pursuing an analytical cross-sectional design for our study. A cross-sectional design, which is sometimes associated with a survey, allows the researcher to collect data from more than one case in a certain period of time. This data is then analysed in order to find connections or patterns between different kinds of variables (Bryman, 2011, p. 63-64; Saunders et al., 2003, p. 92). This method allow for us to compare specific characteristics among entrepreneurs and researchers to find a connection between them and hybrid entrepreneurs.

Usually authors separate the distinctions between qualitative and quantitative data (Saunders et al., 2003, p. 378). Silverman (2007, p.33-34) argues for the danger of assuming a fixed preference for the choice of method, saying that one is better than the other. He points out that method used will not predefine the quality of the study; rather the method used by the researcher should depend on what he wants to find out.

For our research design we have decided to choose a qualitative research method. As explained by Bryman (2011, p. 340) qualitative studies relies on words rather than quantitative number data. The qualitative research method is good to use when you want to see the social world from the perspective of the actor. The actors are individuals in organizations, doing their job, and what they do, see, hear and think will become the important elements of the qualitative research (Hannabuss, 1996, p. 22). Following that we have an interpretivistic research view and that we want to explore the topic of hybrid entrepreneurship we find that a qualitative research method is suitable in our case.
Research interviews should be carefully planned as there are numerous practical challenges. Before anything can start the researchers have to identify the respondents that are representative within the sampling frame. When the respondents are identified they need to be approached. Here it is possible that there are some practical issues that might emerge which cause issues or difficulties to the interview. The issues could be for example that people are busy; they may be geographically scattered or even that you are steered to non-representatives by gatekeepers in the organization. In order to gain access to the people you are approaching it might be necessary to inform them about what the study is about and assure them about the possible confidentiality that they have the rights to (Hannabuss, 1996, p. 24-25). In our case we were aware that getting access to people might not be so simple. Therefore we expressed our flexibility to those we contacted in order to make it easier for those potential interviewees to plan a meeting with us. We had the possibility to prioritize our interviews meaning we always could take our time to meet with the interviewees. In case of geographic unavailability we offered to take the interview by phone to extinguish the issue of distance.

When it comes to qualitative research there are some things to have in mind during the interview. According to Alvesson (2003, p. 14) it is important not to simplify or idealize the interview situation, thinking the interviewee is a competent and moral truth teller with the intention to act in regard of the science in order to produce the needed data. Additionally he mentions that without any means of theoretical understanding the results of the interview will rest on a shaky ground (Alvesson, 2003, p. 14). Hannabus (1996, p. 25) argues that the interview will be affected by how formal it is. By formal he means how structured it is by interview schedule, predetermined questions and how far open questions are provided. Another thing that is emphasized by Hannabus is the importance for the researcher to establish a rapport with the respondent. This can be described as the intent and purpose to inform the respondent and make him or her talk freely (Hannabus 1996, p. 25). He also briefly mentions a useful tip that at times you should give the respondent transitional information on how the question is related to the research in order to make sure the data you receive is fitting to your research. Our intention was to be prepared from our point of view, with the interview questions, in order to progress, however we left the interview the room to speak their mind. Our questions were intentionally structured to spur the mind with the interviewee. This way the interviewees were given the possibility to extensively explain their experiences. If the interviewee happened to deteriorate from the topic we provided open questions to stir back to keep the data valid to our purpose.

---

**Figure 1. “Distinctions Between Quantitative and Qualitative Data.” (Source: Saunders et al., 2003, p. 378)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Data</th>
<th>Qualitative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Based on meanings derived from numbers</td>
<td>- Based on meanings expressed through words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collection result in numerical and standardised data</td>
<td>- Collection results in non-standardised data requiring classification into categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis conducted through the use of diagrams and statistics</td>
<td>- Analysis conducted through the use of conceptualisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
There are two main types of qualitative interview formats and they are semi-structured and unstructured interviews (Bryman, 2011, p. 413). There are also structured interviews but they are regarded as quantitative since they usually consist of closed questions and/or questions with a few selectable answers (Bryman, 2011, p. 203). Since we want to explore hybrid entrepreneurship as a subject and that we want to partake of and understand our interviewee’s perception of the reality according to our philosophical research view we do not deem it fit to use the structured interview format as it will not let us delve as deep on the subject at hand to fulfill our information requirements. Semi-constructed interview do often have an interview template with explicit topics, and question related to each topic, that shall be debated but does ascertain the order in which the questions will be asked and the interviewee is free to formulate the answers as they deem appropriate (Bryman, 2011, p. 415). Unstructured interviews have something equivalent to an interview guide at all it usually only states which topics that shall be touched upon during the interview and solely contains initiatory questions to start off the interviewee which then are allowed to discuss freely about the subject (Bryman, 2011, p. 415). Follow-up questions are common in both the qualitative interview formats (Bryman, 2011, p. 415). We finally decided to use the semi-structured format, mostly following the reasons made in the previous paragraph. We wanted to be able to delve deeper in the different topics touched upon during the interview than the structured format would allow. On the other hand since we are quite unexperienced interviewers we wanted some form of order to fall back upon. Otherwise we feared that the interview might trace off to something completely irrelevant for our study or that we might fail to cover all the topics adequately. Semi-structured interviews seemed to offer enough flexibility to make follow-up questions and adapt the interview during the process so that we could capture the information we want and at the same time offer sufficient support to our inexperience in conducting interviews.

We constructed our interview template with several practicalities regarding qualitative interview templates in mind. Such as to create a logical order among the different topics that shall be discussed, to use a language appropriate for the interviewees, to have open questions and to avoid leading questions (Bryman, 2011, p. 415). We also included some follow-up questions in advance when we believed it would be commonly used. When deciding which specific questions to ask we used the different sub-chapters in our theoretical framework to deduce questions we thought were relevant. We did that to make sure our interview template covered all the different theoretical fields that we previously considered substantial for our study.

2.5 TRUTH CRITERIA

There are criteria for assessing and evaluating social science studies, a category this study falls under. The three most common criteria are reliability, replication and validity (Bryman, 2011, p. 49). These criteria are however more suited for quantitative studies and their pertinence when it comes to qualitative studies can be challenged since these criteria are often associated with measurements and absolute truths which often are at odds with qualitative research (Bryman, 2011, p. 351). Since our study's research design is the qualitative one we have searched for criteria more suitable for our study. There are researchers that have suggested the criteria trustworthiness to be used in qualitative instead of the quantitative criteria (Bryman, 2011, p. 352-353). Trustworthiness consists of four sub criteria credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Bryman,
It is this criterion that we have elected to use since we felt it would be more appropriate for our qualitative study. We have conducted interviews where no measurements have been made and where individual’s opinions and perspectives have been in focus. We did therefore feel that the usual quantitative criteria would not be adequate in our study and did instead settle with trustworthiness that is adapted to the conditions of qualitative research.

Credibility, equivalent to internal validity, is how well the researcher’s description of the social reality fits with the respondent’s view of it (Bryman, 2011, p. 354). It can be strengthened by respondent validation which means to send back the researcher description of the studied phenomena to the respondents for them to confirm the researcher’s perception (Bryman, 2011, p. 355). In our study did we ask every interviewee if they wanted a summary of the transcript of the interview and reported said summary to the 9 out of 12 interviewees that wanted one. In every case did the interviewees agree with our perception of what they had said during the interview. Hence is our opinion that the credibility is strong in our study.

Transferability corresponds to external validity meaning how generalizable the study is (Tobin & Begley, 2004, p. 392). However, does transferability differ significantly from the quantitative counterpart since there is no single correct interpretation (Tobin & Begley, 2004, p. 392). To achieve adequate transferability the qualitative researcher should provide a detailed description in order to supply the reader with a sufficient base for them themselves to assess the transferability (Bryman, 2011, p. 355). We have in our study tried to be as exhaustive as possible when describing our empirical findings to enable the readers themselves to assess the transferability. Since the teachers exemption is such an influential aspect for academic hybrid entrepreneurs we find the transferability of our study to hybrid entrepreneurs outside the academia, and thus excluded from the teachers exemption, not applicable in that situation. However, when it comes to academics at other colleges and universities in Sweden we are of the opinion that the transferability is good. Among other things because it is common that other universities also have science parks tied to them (Lindelof and Lofsten, 2006, p. 394) and that the different investment organizations mentioned by our interviewees where on a national level and not exclusive to Umeå. Regarding academics outside Sweden we find the transferability weak since the teachers exemption is unique to Sweden and that other factors as different cultures and such might affect the transferability.

Dependability which corresponds to the quantitative criteria of reliability is fulfilled by auditing (Tobin & Begley, 2004, p. 392; Bryman, 2011, p. 355). By that it means that the researcher should in detail account for the courses of action that has been taken throughout the research process so that other researchers could examine the quality of their approaches (Bryman, 2011, p. 355). We have tried to be as transparent as possible regarding how we conducted our study when writing our thesis so that readers can get full insight in our process. Furthermore we have had two work in progress seminars where other students and our supervisor have examined our work process and discussed what could be done to enhance the quality.

Confirmability which is comparable with objectivity means in the qualitative context that the researcher attempts to establish that they have acted in good faith due to that true objectivity is impossible to attain in social science (Bryman, 2011, p. 355). This means that the researcher should not deliberately let personal values influence the interpretations.
of the empirical findings (Bryman, 2011, p. 355) and that it should be evident that the conclusions is derived from the empirical findings (Tobin & Begley, 2004, p. 392). With our respondent validation it should be apparent that we have not let our personal values affect the first stages of our data processing. We have additionally strived to minimize the effect of our personal values throughout the thesis and by being open about our preconceptions we facilitate for the reader to themselves evaluate our endeavour in this aspect. Thus we hope to improve the confirmability of the results and conclusions in this thesis.
2.6 LITERATURE SEARCH AND SOURCE CRITICISM

It is important during examinations to always have an anchor to reality meaning theoretical concepts have to be put against real data. A critical examination is needed for all types of sources, from interviews to statistics. In order to have a feeling for the edges of the result that you are reporting you need to evaluate the materials used for the study. The purpose of all this is to make sure that the used data in the study is valid, relevant and reliable. To evaluate the resources for the study there are four criteria for source criticism. Contemporary requirement proves the actuality of the source. Tendency criticism is used to show what personal interests the author had of the issue. Depending criticism means that you control if different sources are dependent of each other. And lastly the authenticity postulate that you have to decide if the source is authentic or not (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 2011, p. 167-168).

When we initially started to search for relevant literature after we had chosen our subject, hybrid entrepreneurship, we confirmed that the few amount of authors whom had written anything about the subject at hand were correct when they stated that not much research had been done within this niche field of entrepreneurship.

Firstly we went through the reference lists from the few articles that directly treated the subject to see what those authors based their research on and if it could be of any use for us with the approach to the subject of hybrid entrepreneurship that we had in mind. Furthermore we have to some extent reviewed the references an additional step, namely of those we found relevant in the first step, to try and capture as much as possible in this limited field of theory. Another significant reason to backtracking references is to find the primary sources to studies and theoretical models which are done to consolidate the scientific basis of our theoretical framework. This way we were able to follow the lineage of the theory and see how it has formed over time.

Due to the novelty of the subject we had to find other theoretical fields within the theme of entrepreneurship and had to try to combine them to get a sufficient enough theoretical base for our thesis. In the process to find these theoretical fields we firstly went through some that were obvious to us like entrepreneurial risk, part-time entrepreneurship and other means of funding. While we explored those, other fields we needed to examine became clearer. Throughout our search we wanted to keep our data as recent as possible to actuate the contemporary requirements.

We have primarily used Umeå University Library own search engine which have access to several databases such as Academic Search Elite, Business Source Premier (both from EBSCO) and also including the library’s own selection of available books. In addition we have also directly used EBSCO and Google Scholar when looking for useful articles. In regard of hard copy literature it has mainly been books on the subject of research methodology including explanations of ontology and epistemology that we have used.

When searching for articles to use we have worked meticulously to ensure that they have been peer-reviewed to get as credible sources as possible. In addition we have also used some reports and public inquiries when we have seen fit. Unfortunately we have not been able to exclusively use primary sources since they have not always been available. In these occasions it has been because the primary source had been written in a language none of us sufficiently fluent in or because the primary source was not possible to find or had only been available for purchase from sources we did not have access too.

* * *
2.7 KEYWORDS

We have used several different keywords while searching for relevant literature and in order to capture as much as possible we have experimented with slight changes in phrasing such as; entrepreneurial risk, entrepreneurial risk-taking, entrepreneurship and risk and so forth.

Non-compete covenants/contract/agreement, konkurrensklausul, lärarundantaget, teachers exemption, entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship, corporate entrepreneurship, hybrid entrepreneurship, part-time entrepreneurship, risk, entrepreneurial risk, entrepreneurial entry, entrepreneurship and opportunity, entrepreneurship in the public sector.
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter we will go through the theoretical framework, describing the theories in-depth in order to explain what they are and give our perception on their relation to our subject.

3.1 ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Over recent time entrepreneurship has been a hot research subject among the research community in order to understand what makes the entrepreneur different from other people (Burke, FitzRoy & Nolan, 2008, p. 93). To date there have been a lot of focus around who the entrepreneur is and what he does. However there is a problem in this simplistic approach which is that researchers are overseeing the presence of lucrative opportunities and enterprising individuals. The definitions today have focused too much on the individual alone and not including the different variations of quality of the opportunity. This results in questionable attributes that differs the entrepreneur from other members of the society because the attributes confuses the influence of opportunities and individuals (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000, p. 218).

An important factor of entrepreneurship is the opportunity. You cannot have entrepreneurship without an opportunity (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000, p. 220). The ability and knowledge to identify a new opportunity is extremely important for a successful entrepreneur. Familiarity with the chosen field allows the entrepreneur with the ability to recognize patterns as well as the confidence that the idea will take the shape that the entrepreneur predicted (Stevenson, Robertson & Grousbeck, 1985, p. 6). Casson (2014, p. 9) explains that the entrepreneur is discovering opportunities that s/he thinks no one else have spotted. The entrepreneur then invests his own money and/or money from family and friends in order to fund a possibly profitable project. From the outside such a project might seem risky; however the entrepreneur personally is most likely very optimistic and confident about the project and might perceive the risk as minimal. If the project would succeed then the entrepreneur will be rewarded by the market system automatically for the effort of capitalizing on the opportunity (Casson, 2014, p. 9).

Entrepreneurs have received the reputation as a gambler for his willingness to get in and out of a venture very quickly (Stevenson et al., 1985, p. 6).

However Casson (2014, p. 9) says that the common-sense view of the ‘opportunity’ is being challenged on its philosophical grounds. A suggestion has sprung that the opportunity is only in the imagination of the entrepreneur meaning that it does not exist independently of the entrepreneur. The philosophical questions that arises from the critics are: “What do we mean by the term opportunity?” or as some with a little more metaphysical nature put it: “Can an idea exist?” Casson explains that the answers to these questions are more contexts depended. Casson (2014, p. 9) points out that “[...] opportunities are just unexploited projects with profit potential, and that once they are exploited and the profit is appropriated by the entrepreneur, then no further profit remains.”

Alvarez and Barney (2007, p. 11) suggest that there can be two theoretical types of opportunities. The first is the one you discover, the other type you create. Both theories assume that the entrepreneur wants to exploit an opportunity. The discovery theory is
based on the imperfections in the market that arises due to changes in technology or customer preferences leaving an opening for the entrepreneur to exploit. According to the creation theory the entrepreneurs does not search for opportunities but rather they are using ways to create new products and services and observes the market’s response to their actions resulting usually in new markets and new opportunities for the entrepreneur (Alvarez and Barney, 2007, p. 13-15).

The question many scholars have asked is: who is an entrepreneur? After all the research that has been done the entrepreneur is definitely perceived as different from the non-entrepreneurs, and it is believed that this difference lies within the personality of the entrepreneur (Gartner, 1985, p. 699). Researchers however seem unable to unify a singular definition of the entrepreneur. What has been said about the entrepreneur is that he is independent and success driven with a lot of energy, persistence and self-esteem. Additionally the entrepreneur is often seen as a visionary and an inspirational and motivational individual (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991, p. 48).

Researchers have as mentioned earlier been eager to study entrepreneurs in order to understand what makes them successful. Now the successful entrepreneurs themselves have shared some of the characteristics they deem important to be successful. One may not have all of these characteristics but many of these can be learned through persistence and applying yourself. But what is true for any kind of success is the importance of hard work. One cannot excel in one’s profession without lots of repetition and training. (Stephenson, 2009, Entrepreneur.com). We wanted to provide this list in order to show the abilities that real entrepreneurs think are essential for pursuing and becoming a successful entrepreneur. There were no research that provided these experience based characteristics and therefore we thought that this list was perfect for our intention. These were the characteristics that they came up with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do what you enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Take what you do seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plan Everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Manage money wisely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ask for the sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Remember it is all about the customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Become a shameless self-promoter (without becoming obnoxious)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project a positive business image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Get to know your customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Level the playing field with technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Build top-notch business team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Become known as an expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Create a competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Invest in yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Be accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Build a rock-solid reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sell benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Get involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Grab attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Master the arts of negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Design your workspace for success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Get and stay organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Take time off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>“Limit the number of hats you wear (know what you are good at and what to delegate to others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Follow up constantly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. “25 COMMON CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL ENTREPRENEURS.” (SOURCE: STEPHENSON, 2009, ENTREPRENEUR.COM)

A lot of these abilities are connected to being a realist and making sure you enjoy what you do. With the enjoyment comes the drive and will to do well. Having these abilities...
will go a long way, however an important ability which is not exactly stated above is expertise in the subject you choose. On the other hand, where you do not have the expertise you should build a solid team around those weaknesses in order to complement you and your business. This way you will most likely increase your chances of success. If you have your businesses up and running it would not be a bad idea to work on your entrepreneurial abilities in order to make yourself a better entrepreneur as well as it could help grow your business. One ability that the most definitions agree on is the mention of risk-taking. Hirsch and Peters (1998, p. 70) notes that whether financial, psychological or social-risks, they are all part of being an entrepreneur.

3.1.1 ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND RISK

Entrepreneurship and risk-taking are two terms that have been associated and integrated with each other since entrepreneurship as a theoretical concept first emerged (Ripsas, 1998, p. 105; Wenneker and Thurik, 1999, p. 32). And since that the perception that risk-taking are fundamental component of entrepreneurship still seems prevalent today one might argue that the topic is of current interest even though some conditioning might exist. Entrepreneurial activities are a risky business since there exists a higher failure rate for such enterprises than wage work (Hall & Woodward, 2010, p. 1163; Iyigun & Owen, 1998, p. 455) which might lead one to assumptions that entrepreneurs differs in their behaviour towards taking risky decisions compared to the normative, i.e. wage workers. The entrepreneur is seen as an individual that has a disposition towards risk-taking that might result in higher yields when compared to the common wage worker (Kihlstrom and Laffont, 1979, p. 720; Hvide and Panos, 2014, p. 213; Macko and Tyszka, 2009, p. 483-484 and 586; Newman, 2007, p. 11). Entrepreneurs usually have higher self-confidence compared to non-entrepreneurs which also is a reason behind why they are more prone to enter into risky activities (Macko & Tyszka, 2009, p. 484).

We see that there follows some implications with this definition of the entrepreneur. If the entrepreneurs are keener to take risks, it could either lead to potentially higher profit or to a financial setback due to failed ventures which would result in greater spread of wealth distribution of the general public. Our reasoning is that since the added risk of failure in combination with the potential higher profit if successful in the venture it should result in greater deviations from the mean in both directions. The added risk of failure should result in individuals with less wealth than the common wage worker since a failed entrepreneurial activity should yield very little and may potentially result in debt. The potential of higher profits for the successful entrepreneur should on the other hand result in individuals with more wealth than the average wage worker. As stated before are entrepreneurial ventures risky endeavours compared to common wage work (Hall & Woodward, 2010, p. 1163; Iyigun & Owen, 1998, p. 455). It is therefore common for entrepreneurs to invest their own resources in their entrepreneurial activities (Hall and Woodward, 2010, p. 1165). These two factors in combination should make it feasible that there are entrepreneurs on the low side of the spectrum of wealth distribution since they invest so much of their own resources in ventures where there are a risk of failure and the result of such failure would mean a loss of those funds. It also signify that entrepreneurship means increased financial risks on a personal level since it is the individuals own resources that are invested in the business and failure could possible lead to destitution. Entrepreneurs are on average wealthier than common workers (Cagetti and De Nardi, 2006, p. 840; Cagetti and De Nardi, 2008, p. 289). Especially among the
wealthiest portion of the population are the entrepreneurs’ overrepresented (Cagetti and De Nardi, 2008, p. 289; Quadrini, 2000, p. 33).

Studies have shown that a disposition towards taking risks do not have to be of any significance when trying to explain larger inequalities in wealth distribution (Kanbur, 1979, p. 778-779). Even though entrepreneurship entails increased risk for potentially higher profits, if successful, it seems that it is not the enhanced inclination towards taking risks that makes an entrepreneur to perform well in the sense of accumulating wealth. Entrepreneurs that are willing to take fewer risks than other entrepreneurs have shown to perform better (Hvide and Panos, 2014, p. 213). Furthermore, the same category of entrepreneurs is more apt to save more of their income (Cagetti and De Nardi, 2008, p. 296). A reason behind why entrepreneurs tend to save more than non-entrepreneurs may be to create a buffer against the occupational hazards inherent within entrepreneurship (Quadrini, 2000, p. 34; Carter, 2011, p. 45). This conclusion compose a reason to why more risk-averse entrepreneurs saves more than the less the less risk-averse since it is reasonable that they feel a bigger need to safeguard against the uncertainty of future revenue.

In conclusion entrepreneurship entails that the person at hand are exposed to greater financial risks and that the entrepreneur are more inclined to take risks compared to wage workers. But since a too high tendency towards risk-taking results in worse entrepreneurial performances than the more risk-averse entrepreneur there seem to be a narrow pathway of moderate risk-taking to achieve the best performances.

3.2 HYBRID ENTREPRENEUR

Earlier research regarding entrepreneurial entry has, as implied by Folta, Delmar and Wennberg (2010, p. 253), been looked at as a dichotomous choice. Either you settle with wage work or you do not and start your own business. Folta et al. insist that recent studies show that entrepreneurs actually concur in both wage work as well as entrepreneurial activity while initiating the venture. They considered the theoretical and empirical implications of this entry strategy and labelled it hybrid entrepreneurship.

The strategy involves the individual’s preference to fully integrate into self-employment and test to see whether it is a context that fits the individual’s abilities, as well as to learn about the venture’s upside potential. This kind of strategy can be a good idea for people who want to limit their sunken commitment while discovering their unknown capabilities (Folta et al., 2010, p. 253).

Folta et al. (2010, p. 254) provided the notion that earlier research, that has divided up wage-work and self-employment into two exclusive groups, may have obfuscated the possibility that hybrid entrepreneurship is a first step into possible entrepreneurship. They then continue by specifying two reasons why the hybrid entrepreneur should be separated from the categories of self-employment and wage-work. The first reason suggests that the hybrid strategy is an opening into self-employment. As long as important learning takes place during the hybrid phase, the positive signal about potential prospects will inspire the hybrid to leave his wage-work, whereas a negative signal would most likely result in the abandonment of the striving for self-employment and go back to wage work. If no compelling signal is apparent to the individual in any way, in many cases, s/he may persist.

***
with the hybrid strategy. Secondly they present three theoretical rationales for why hybrid entrepreneurship might be systematically different compared to those that lead to enter self-employment or stay in wage-work.

A path to supplementary income is believed to allow an individual to combine his or hers wage-work with self-employment in order to earn additional income. This would mean that hybrids are similar to those workers with double jobs for the reason of economic hardship. Another possibility is that capable individuals such as university professors decide to engage in the hybrid strategy because of the opportunities to do so at a low marginal cost (Folta et al., 2010, p. 254-255).

A path to non-monetary benefits refers to the rationale that individuals take on secondary jobs in order to obtain non-monetary benefits that they otherwise would not have had the opportunity to get at their ordinary wage work. These kinds of non-monetary benefits are probably not exclusive to hybrid entrepreneurs, but has been discussed whether it is due to an unwillingness to let go of the wage-work because of high opportunity costs. This would indicate that hybrid entrepreneurs are less constrained by liquidity (Folta et al., 2010, p. 255).

A path to transition is the third and last rationale explaining that the hybrid entrepreneurship strategy could provide the individual with a safe transition into self-employment. With a continued connected link to the wage-work the hybrid entrepreneur can manage uncertainty while experiencing what it is like to run his own business. With the experience and information they gain off of the venture into entrepreneurship they still have the flexibility whether to expand or exit (Folta et al., 2010, p. 255-256).

3.3 PART-TIME ENTREPRENEUR

A part-time entrepreneur is a person who divides his work time between his own business and his ordinary wage-work. Petrova (2012, p. 474) suggest that these individuals are driven to have two jobs because of credit constrictions. She argue that the part-time entrepreneur is not generating enough cash and therefore require a normal job beside their own personal venture in order to satisfy the individual’s financial needs. Weinrauch (1982, p. 43) add that part-time entrepreneurs also might have a non-monetary objective. For the risk-takers and innovators these objectives can be for example responsibility, challenge and recognition. The reason is often to compensate for the lack of personal gratification at the ordinary job.

Petrova (2010, p. 64) provided a model where the part-time entrepreneur would be part of both self-employment and wage-work because of the unawareness of their entrepreneurial abilities ahead of time. At the beginning they would only spend a small amount of their time with their entrepreneurial business in order to limit the risk of losing their personal financial security in case it would not work out. Petrova concludes that the better entrepreneurs manage to create a well working and profitable business whereas the individuals with lower entrepreneurial ability will go back to wage-work.

Earlier studies have excluded the possibility that someone could do both wage-work and run their own business, and have instead have focused on either or. On the other hand, recent statistics have shown that the nascent entrepreneurs are likely to implement and
develop their start-up while they are still working (Petrova, 2012, p. 474). However there is a concern among employers that part-time entrepreneurs will use company time and resources for his side-line venture. Additional concerns regards tardiness, lack of absence and additional stress due to too many commitments (Weinrauch, 1982, p. 47).

In this paper we will make a distinction between part-time entrepreneur and hybrid-entrepreneur. A hybrid entrepreneur will be in a strategic state of transition and discovery, figuring out whether the individual is fit for the entrepreneurship context or if the venture has a commercial potential or not. The part-time entrepreneur will be considered as an individual who divide his time between self-employment and wage-work due to financial restrictions.

3.4 PUBLIC SECTOR AND CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Most people probably see entrepreneurs as the opportunist seeking, risk taking individuals developing their own company to make a profit. That is probably why public sector organizations, with its bureaucracy, restrictions and strict rules, are not seen as an entrepreneurial environment (Pärna & von Tunzelmann, 2007, p. 109; Ramamurti, 1986, p. 142-143). However according to Pärna and Tunzelmann the public organizations are modernizing and are developing creative and innovative ways to respond to citizens need for effective delivery. Because of the big focus of entrepreneurs in the private sector it does not mean that it is unimportant in the public sector. While you can find entrepreneurs in the public sector they are quite rare because of the fact that it is harder to succeed as an entrepreneur in a public organization than it would in the private sector (Ramamurti, 1986, p. 142).

Public and private entrepreneurs share a lot of personal traits like charisma, dedication, optimism, high levels of energy and proactiveness. However, compared with its private counterpart, the motives of the public entrepreneur differs quite a lot (Ramamurti, 1986, p. 145).

The Economic motive

The private entrepreneur is the owner of his own company and seeks profit to increase his wealth. This is the most common motive for the private entrepreneurs, but what happens when you are a paid wage-worker and cannot seek profit? As a public entrepreneur you become restricted in your aspirations to earn a lot of money and become rich, however it does not mean you cannot strive to help the organization become richer. Many researchers agree that for this reason of not having the possibility to create their own wealth, there are a rarity of entrepreneurs in the public sector. However not all entrepreneurial individuals are scared away by this factor. Many talented managers are more driven by non-economic award like power, prestige, a challenging job and the feeling to serve their country (Ramamurti, 1986, 145-146).

The Achievement motive

Entrepreneurs are shown to have the characteristics of wanting to achieve something out of nothing. Public entrepreneurs tend to have a more grandiose plan by attempting to do great and grand things. Compared to the private sector, the public sector does not have to
consider any profit motives for their projects. Some public sector projects would be improbable for a private sector organization to take on.

Another factor is that public institutions can more easily obtain external funding for projects that would mean taking on a lot of risk. This could be a result of the fact that governments are less risk averse or perhaps that they are too ignorant toward how risky the project really is. Ramamurti states that it is often easier to get funding in the public sector than in the private sector, especially if you are good at manipulating the government’s resource system (Ramamurti, 1986, p. 147). There are a couple of ways for public organizations to raise funds like for example the treasury, state-owned banks or by issuing government-guaranteed bonds (Gillis, Jenkins and Lessard, 1981, p. 265-267).

In many countries there are restrictions to private companies on how much and fast they can grow as well as laws against monopolies. For public enterprises on the other hand, these restrictions does not apply. Because public organizations have legitimate access to ministers and bureaucrats, this allows them an advantage in overcoming regulatory constraints that they otherwise are required to comply with (Ramamurti, 1986, p. 148).

Individuals at public organizations are motivated by job security rather than extrinsic rewards such as pay raises and performance rewards; they have a bigger focus on helping the society (Perry and Porter 1982, Crewson 1995, Steinhouse and Perry 1996, Kurland and Egan 1999 as cited by Özcan and Reichstein, 2009, p. 605-606). In fact one of the most common characteristics among the public entrepreneurs is to help solving national and/or global issues. Instead of working to create ones wealth, public entrepreneurs are working in projects aiming towards helping the society which would affect a lot of people. Considering this as well as the fact that the view of the public sector is perceived as unimaginative and inefficiently managed, creates a challenging environment for public entrepreneurs to work in (Ramamurti, 1986, p. 148).

The Power Motive

Among the public entrepreneurs the strive for power is significantly higher than the private entrepreneurs whom are regarded as stubborn and regard independence very highly resulting in being prone to not take compromises very easily (Hornaday, 1982, as cited in Ramamurti, 1986, p. 148). This is one reason why private entrepreneurs probably do not fit into the public sector which relies much on teamwork and individuals both inside and outside of the organization. Even though both might seek some kind of independence the private entrepreneur obtains it by avoiding or minimizing dependencies and the public entrepreneur obtains it by overcoming dependencies.

What attracts entrepreneurs to the public sector is the challenge of acquiring power in order to get things done. A rare few might even see the position as a stepping stone into a political career. (Ramamurti, 1986, p. 148).

Research has shown that many public employees are dissatisfied with their work environment, especially when it comes to recognition for their work. This can result in diminishing motivation among the public employees as they feel impeded from being able to contribute to the organization (Perry and Porter, 1982, p. 92; Falcone, 1991, p. 386). Due to job dissatisfaction and tensions between employees and the bureaucracy of public organizations the employees are likely to leave the organization and become an entrepreneur (Freeman, 1968, as cited by Özcan and Reichstein, 2009, p. 606). The
problem is that public organizations are such regulated structures and implementing ideas from employees, that seem necessary, are very limited. The employees in these organizations have to accept that their creativity will have limited potential to produce results (Özcan and Reichstein, 2009, p. 607). There are several factors that would make an entrepreneurial exit viable. Such a factor could be that an individual that have had a bad match with work might seek to avoid the same mistake by looking for conditions in an organization that are different from the current one (Jovanovic, 1979, as cited by Fujiwara-Greve and Greve, 2000, p. 549-550). Additionally studies have shown that managers in private organizations value public employees’ skills that they have gathered in the public sector, less than managers in public organizations. An example of this is that people that have shifted from a public sector company to a private receives lower earnings increases than workers who do the opposite (Özcan and Reichstein, 2009, p. 607). Another factor however indicates that public organizations are more unwilling to pursue internally generated opportunities which open up incentives for individuals to take to the market (Freeman, 1986, as cited by Sørensen, 2007, p. 392).

3.5 TEACHERS EXEMPTION

As with many other countries Sweden have regulations that stipulates to whom the rights of intellectual property belongs to. In the case of intellectual property created by an employee as a function of his/her employment the employer owns the rights to that intellectual property (SFS 1949:345). This seems to be the prevailing standard the world over. However, in Sweden there exists something that is called “exemption for teachers” (lärarundantaget) which is a paragraph in the law about property that regulates the property rights of findings in research (SFS 1949:345).

“Lärare vid universitet, högskolor eller andra inrättningar som tillhör undervisningsväsendet skall inte i denna egenskap anses såsom arbetstagare enligt denna lag, dock att lagen skall tillämpas på sådana lärare vid Försvarsmaktens skolor som är yrkesofficerare.”

The aforementioned quote is taken from the law “lag om rätten till arbetstagares upfinningar” (SFS 1949:345) which roughly translated reads “law about rights to employee’s invention”. Just this part of the law dictate an exception in the overall law that is applicable for teachers that are in some way connected to the education system. This exception means that it is university teachers among others that will be proprietor of their own inventions regardless if they created them in their line of work or not.

Since researchers at universities also teaches it means that they are included in this exception of the law and have the right to the intellectual property they create themselves. This means that the researchers creating the intellectual property owns the rights to it and is free to commercialise their findings as they themselves wish (Leong, Wee, and Yuen-Ping, 2008, p. 652). This in extension would mean that they get all the profit from the entrepreneurial venture. Spontaneously one might think that a constitution like this would lead to higher incentives to engage in entrepreneurial activities since this should motivate the academic to direct their research towards findings with more commercial viability.

However there seems to be some studies that indicate otherwise. Goldfarb and Henrekson (2003) compare the situation of entrepreneurial activity originating from university
research in Sweden and USA. They point to several aspects of the Swedish system that seems to be impediments to entrepreneurial activity rather than incentives. Firstly when the universities have no share in the rights of intellectual property they have no incentives to facilitate researchers’ collaboration with the relevant industry or any other knowledge transfer (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 647; Vedin, 1993, p. 26). When the universities get nothing from the commercialization of their researcher’s intellectual property it is rather the opposite that is true since they only stand to lose, in that they might lose their academic personnel to the private industry. All in all this have led to a working community at Swedish universities that discourages entrepreneurial activity (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 647). Another reason behind this atmosphere of anti-entrepreneurialism could be that there is a perception among academics that doing research with higher potential for commercialization might affect the academic value of the research negatively. Goldfarb and Henreksen among others seem to be of the mind that a too strong focus on research with high commercial viability might endanger the academic quality (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 642). If that is a with-spread opinion amongst academics connected to Swedish universities it seems feasible that it works to underpin the anti-entrepreneurialism atmosphere. According to new studies this belief seems to be somewhat incorrect as the study find that a focus on commercial viability in the research doesn’t affect the quantity of publications nor the academic quality of said publications (Goldfarb, Marschke and Smith, 2009, p. 752). Though one might question how applicable the findings of the study is on a more general level since the empirical basis for the study is on meagre side (Goldfarb et al., 2009, p. 752). However, these are quite new findings and it seems reasonable to assume that the belief of incompatibility between commercialization pursuit and academic quality still is widespread. Although there have been noted that previously negative attitude within the academia towards entrepreneurship have started to change to a more positive disposition (Carlsson, 2002, p. 112). Since it have gone a considerable amount of time from when most of the literature were published to now we do believe these changes to have progressed even more to an entrepreneurial friendly environment.

Academics are not always interested in commercialize their research (Vedin, 1993, p. 27) and it seems reasonable to assume that this behaviour will be further enhanced if the academic in question operate in an environment that discourages entrepreneurial activities. As with the situation at Swedish universities at the beginning of the new millennia the academics did not receive many incentives from their surroundings to commercialize their research. Swedish academics have had difficulties in taking leave to pursue entrepreneurial endeavours and when they have done so their position with the university have not been secured which makes a failure in their project something that could greatly affect academic's life situation (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 647).

In other countries like USA and Singapore it is the universities that are granted the rights to intellectual property created by their academics (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 645; Leong et al., 2008, p.652). Thus the universities have a clear incentive to see the research conducted at their faculties commercialized since they stand to profit from it. It has resulted in universities establishing institutions to facilitate commercialization of their intellectual property and to cultivate an entrepreneurial culture at the said universities (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 645; Leong et al., 2008, p.649). Things these institutions do to facilitate commercialization is to engage in time consuming and expensive activities such as patenting, licensing, marketing which they also covers the monetary cost for (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 646) and providing necessary
network connections and lending credibility to the entrepreneurial undertaking (Leong et al., 2008, p. 650). Logically the academics would have more time to spend on what they are the most competent at, namely their own research, if they don’t have to disperse their focus to the business aspects. To remunerate and motivate the researchers whose work has led to the intellectual property viable for commercialization royalty-sharing schemes have been implemented (Leong et al., 2008, p. 652).

Reconnecting with how the situation in Sweden have been it seems that the burden of doing the business aspects falls on the academics themselves since the universities are reluctant to take part when they are excluded from potential profits. It is uncommon among academics to have adequate business skills to assess the commercial viability of their new findings (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 647) and then how to commercialize (Carlsson, 2002, p. 112) and furthermore few academics are willing to invest the time and effort it would take to learn the necessary skills (Leong et al., 2008, p. 653). Seeking patent can be expensive but excluding help from entities like patent agencies may result in patent application of such substandard that patents are not granted (Vedin, 1993, p. 117). Following this it seems reasonable that the failure rate of entrepreneurial activities stemming from the academic world would be larger when the academic have to manage all the business aspects themselves. With that in mind it seems feasible that it works as an additionally disincentive for the Swedish academics.

We see several implications that may follow with the teachers exemption. Firstly it would be great for researchers with an entrepreneurial orientation since they are free pursue whatever venture based on their research they wishes since they are the two sole owner to it. For less entrepreneurial academics however it would be disadvantageous since they would be left to pursue commercialization by themselves without any external support, something that might prove to be too great of an obstacle. And if they want to sell of their intellectual property to let someone else commercialize it they have to spend time finding a buyer which without a proper network might be difficult to find. On firm level it would be negative in the sense that firms wanting to procure intellectual property would have to search out single researchers instead of just going to an instance where everything would be gathered. In addition the researcher who holds the sought after intellectual property might not be willing to part with it for various reasons. When it comes to a societal level it could be positive if the teachers exemption attracts prominent foreign researchers. They might bring their research back home when they have something commercially viable but during their stay they would contribute to increase the quality of the universities. If seen to the commercial aspect it could be harmful if the owners of the intellectual property keeps it and do nothing with it, for example if they do not realize the commercial potential or if they do not dare to pursue it.

It does seem that there is some significant disadvantages with granting the researcher the property rights to the invention when it comes to encouraging entrepreneurial pursuits based on academic research. However, there are certain aspects to keep in mind that might be somewhat misleading as to how the different educational structures affect entrepreneurship stemming from the academic world. To be given complete rights to intellectual property to researchers can push them to be both driven and encourage to work with it or it will lead to social loafing where researcher have no intention but to work with the research causing losses in potential commercial breakthroughs. This affects the society as a whole as well when public funds leads to nothing and no new businesses are started.
Firstly since there are no institutions on university-level in Sweden that works with facilitating entrepreneurial endeavours from academic research there are neither no central registry over intellectual property transferred straight to existing firms (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 650), which means that the only measurement for Swedish university based entrepreneurship in the study is if start-ups originate from universities or not while getting information from the American university institutions for entrepreneurial activity gives an more accurate picture (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 650). A survey by AUTM has shown that approximately 90 % of intellectual properties from universities were commercialized in other ways than founding a new firm (1998, as cited by Goldfarb and Henrekson 2003, p. 650). With no easily accessible data over university to industry transfer of knowledge it seems feasible to assume that the perception of how well entrepreneurship works in connection with the two different educational structures are skewed in favour of the American system.

Secondly there are quite big differences in how the overall educational systems in USA and Sweden are structured in addition to where the right to intellectual property goes (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 653). The Swedish universities are almost all state-owned and the whole system is centralized with little flexibility when it comes to budget allocations which make it slow to react to changes in demands from the environment (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 654). The American university system on the other hand is independent which leaves the individual university with a great deal of freedom as how to conduct their operation in order to attain as much competitive advantage against the other universities (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 653). There is an intense competition between the American universities to attain monetary funding for research and such which have led to a positive attitude towards commercialization of university-produced knowledge (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 653).

Thirdly the business climate has been quite different in Sweden compared to countries like USA where Sweden have had a rather poor performance in sectors relevant to university based entrepreneurship (Henrekson and Rosenberg, 2001, p. 210). In Sweden these sectors have been dominated by a few large firms (Henrekson and Rosenberg, 2001, p. 211) which seems to have had an inhibitive effect on entrepreneurial activities stemming from university research (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 650). Not only industry sectors pertinent to university based entrepreneurship have a business climate that favours larger corporations. Due to rules and regulations the overall business climate in Sweden are really favourable for larger corporations while working as an obstruction for smaller companies and thus deterring entrepreneurship (Henrekson and Rosenberg, 2001, p. 217). There are few business angels and venture capital firms in Sweden (Carlsson, 2002, p. 116) which is a problem for young firms seeking funding. With the situation being as it is with the differences in the business climate in Sweden compared to North America it seems difficult to make a fair and impartial comparison of the teachers exemptions role in how well the knowledge transfer from universities to the industry works. In our opinion it seems that there are critical affecting elements on this matter that have little to do with the teachers exemption and thus might give it an undeservedly bad reputation in regards to its efficiency.

As of when this scientific article was published there were no private organizations that had filled the role that university based tech transfer offices play elsewhere (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 646). The Swedish government have however realized the importance of a well-functioning university to industry transfer of knowledge structure
In an attempt to help facilitate this commercialization process several Technological Bridging Foundations (Tenknikkrostiftelser) have been established (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 649). The government have also issued the universities in Sweden to start promoting entrepreneurial activities based on research conducted by their scientist (Carlsson, 2002, p. 112). Science parks such as Uminova in Umeå have been used by regional agencies to promote commercialization of university based research and it (Lindelof and Lofsten, 2006, p. 394). Science parks are intended to help technology based startups to reach better performance through facilitating the business aspects needed for commercialization (Lindelof and Lofsten, 2006, p. 390). Studies have shown that Swedish science park have not performed as well as their international counterparts (Lindholm-Dahlstrand, 1997, 1998, as cited by Carlsson, 2002, p. 118). These institutions seem to be intended to fill the same function as the different offices at university level in USA. There is though disadvantages in not having these institutions being on university level since the American counterpart also help to identify and protect intellectual property and as the universities in Sweden still are disconnected entirely from the property right and thus excluded from potential profits no cooperation on their part can be expected (Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 649).

3.6 NON-COMPETE COVENANTS

In a world growing increasingly more global with declining tenure among the highly educated workforce (Bidwell, 2013, p. 1077) and increased voluntary mobility of said workforce (Bidwell, 2013, p. 1078) it seems plausible to assume that corporations have cause to be concerned about getting their intellectual property diffused and thus losing their competitive advantage. A mean for companies to protect themselves against such occurrences are the usage of non-compete covenants.

Non-compete covenants are contractual agreements where the employees submit themselves to not compete with their current employer if they were to quit their job (Estlund, 2006, p. 391; Garmaise, 2011, p. 376; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 426). This usually means that the employee who have signed the covenant are neither allowed to work for any firm nor starting their own company within the same industry as their current employer after they quit working for them (Marx, 2011, p. 698). These prohibitive covenants are valid for fixed period of time after the employee stops working at the current firm and also for an explicit geographical area (Garmaise, 2011, p. 380). This seems to leave the employee in an exposed position if the person were to leave the current job but there are some regulations on how extensive firms can make their non-compete covenants. The limitations in the covenant may not exceed what is deemed as reasonable to protect the employer’s eligible interests, which in extension means that too restrictive covenants are invalid by default (Estlund, 2006, p. 393). Non-compete covenants are clauses in the employee contract that overrides the legal rights of the employee and thus have to be explicit and in written format to be valid (Estlund, 2006, p. 391).

The utilization of non-compete covenants are not the normative throughout all industries, but are rather confined to particular sectors. They are used when it comes to the highly educated workforce (Marx, 2011, p. 707) as executives, (Garmaise, 2011, p. 378; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 426) research and development workers, salespeople (Samila and
Sorenson, 2011, p. 426) and are also used in 70 % venture capital investments (Kaplan and Strömberg, 2003, p. 292). That companies in this range wants to make use of non-competes seems reasonable enough since one would assume it is within this range of workers that companies stand to lose the most of defecting employees.

Companies see several beneficial aspects from utilizing non-compete covenants, including the aforementioned protection of their intellectual property. The foremost reason for companies to use non-competes is to protect their intellectual property and from this perspective it can be seen as a complement to patenting and especially for tacit knowledge that is not patentable (Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 427). Additionally benefits coming of non-competes are that companies are more willing to invest in their human capital (Garmaise, 2011, p. 414; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 427) and that they protect important network connections (Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 428). Both of these aspects builds on that the employees will be less inclined to leave the company which reduces the company’s risk of loss in their human capital investments and loss of personnel with the important contacts (Samila and Sorenson, 2011, 427-428). Instead of creating incentives to stay with the company, impediments of leaving the company are implemented. Venture capitalists use non-competes to pressure the entrepreneur invested in to stay with the endeavour through making the opportunity cost of leaving to high (Kaplan and Strömberg, 2003, p. 292).

It seems that companies’ stands to gain at the expense of the employee when non-compete covenants are implemented. Workers might be compelled to take detours in their personal career since they are not allowed to work within the same industry as their former employer (Marx, 2011, p. 707). Taking into account that employees breaching the non-compete covenant have little effect on firm performance in competitive environments (Dawson, 2006, p. 45) it seems like an unreasonable harsh impact on the individual being forced to move or start working other industries. Wealthy individuals are less affected by non-competes since they can wait out the non-compete or buy it loose (Marx, 2011, p. 709). Furthermore employees who have agreed to non-competes are less inclined to invest in their own human capital (Garmaise, 2011, p. 408). Presumably since they might be banned from utilizing their acquired skills if they by some reason were to leave their current employer.

However, the non-compete covenant situation is not as black and white as it first seems with advantages for the company and disadvantages for the employee. Employees may underperform since they are not remunerated enough corresponding to their waiving of being able to join competitors or starting their own company (Motta and Rønde, 2002, as cited by Marx, 2011, p. 709). When it comes to company performance related to improving human capital it have been shown that employees investments in their own human capital have more effect on company performance than investments in human capital initiated by the company (Garmaise, 2011, p. 414). Which should result in suboptimal performance for the company if non-competes are used since employees become disinclined to on their own initiative invest in their human capital. When it comes to small firms and entrepreneurial ventures they seem to be negatively affected to a greater extent than larger firms by non-compete covenants. Firstly is it possible that entrepreneurial start-ups, where the entrepreneur in question left a firm who uses non-competes, might be subjected for legal action due to the firm trying to enforce the covenant even though the start-up doesn’t directly compete with the former employer (Stuart and Sorenson, 2003, p. 183). Secondly it is more difficult to attract competent
personnel to entrepreneurial enterprises in regions with non-competes since they efficiently bind these workers to their current firms (Stuart and Sorenson, 2003, p. 183) and if they were to leave their current firm they would be more likely to join another large firm since those are more able to protect them from enforcements of non-competes (Marx, 2010, as cited by Marx, 2011, p. 709). Additionally there are fewer venture capitalist available in regions with widespread usage of non-competes since there are less workers leaving their current employment to pursue entrepreneurial aspirations and consequently less potential investment opportunities (Hellman, 2007, p. 931). This should make it harder for nascent entrepreneurs to get their initiatives started. Finally it is harder to attract workers to an entrepreneurial venture which uses non-competes since the intrinsic characteristics of entrepreneurship means higher risk for failure which would render the employees in a difficult situation if they were impeded from seeking other jobs (Stuart and Sorenson, 2003, p. 183).

When considering non-compete covenants in regard to regional economy instead of individual workers or companies the negative effects seems to outweigh the positive ones. Enforcement of non-competes reduces the knowledge spillover effect due to weakened worker mobility (Samila & Sorenson, 2011, p. 428). Non-competes subjugates the effect that venture capital investments have on regional economy (Hellman, 2007, p. 931; Samila & Sorenson, 2011, p. 436). Furthermore does the occurrence of non-competes have a detrimental effect on entrepreneurship (Samila and Sorenson, 2011, 436; Stuart & Sorenson, 2003, p. 197) and works as an obstruction for innovation (Garmaise, 2011, p. 408; Samila and Sorenson, 2011, 436). It might lead to that competent workers chose to relocate to regions with more benevolent settings for worker mobility to ensure their personal career, hence vacating the region with non-compete covenants of competence (Marx, 2011, p. 709).

There is though a caveat to the previous sections about non-compete covenants that have to be mentioned. The caveat in question is that the peer reviewed articles used to explore and describe this field solely originates from Canada and USA and hence they are discussing how non-competes affect the North American scene. Thus there are no peer reviewed literature that directly discuss the non-compete situation in Sweden, there are however some literature that touches this subject. Fahlbeck (1992) leaves his remarks on the legal aspects concerning non-compete covenants according to Swedish law. A paragraph in the Swedish law of contract makes non-competes indirectly valid and thus enables the usage of them in contractual agreements (Fahlbeck, 1992, p. 79 & 104). Similarities with the North American situation can be seen since the effects of non-competes is not something companies can expect if they have not come to a contractual agreement with the employee. The boundaries established have be reasonable for the non-compete covenant to be valid and the fairness are assessed based on time, industry and geographical limits stated in the clause (Fahlbeck, 1992, p. 116). Assessment of the validity of the non-compete seems to be done on the same aspects in Sweden and North America. The usage of non-competes are not a common thing in Sweden according to Fahlbeck (1992, p. 131) but later literature states that non-competes in employment contracts are becoming a more common occurrence (Smitt, 2004, p. 92). Even though it seems feasible to assume that the usage of non-competes are not as widespread in Sweden as in North America we deem that the similarities in the other mentioned features are enough to make the peer reviewed literature applicable to the Swedish scene concerning non-compete covenants. However, there is no difference that might affect the applicability. In Sweden there is a supplement to the agreement that regulates non-
competes covenants which state that the employer have to cover the losses the employee would have to endure if the non-compete are enforced (Smitt, 2004, p. 94). The limit to this compensation is equivalent to 60 % of the employees’ former salary (Smitt, 2004, p. 94). This difference which arguable makes it less appealing for companies in Sweden to utilize non-competes since it brings a monetary cost could be one reason to why usage in Sweden are not as widespread as in North America. The effects of non-competes if applied on the other hand should remain the same, though with the possibility that it would be more preferably to merely out wait the non-compete in Sweden since they don’t suffer the full extent of being unemployed while getting compensation.

3.7 THEORETICAL SUMMARY

This theoretical summary is intended to clarify the theoretical relations to our research question and purposes. As many of the theories are quite comprehensive and involves several approaches we want to highlight the most important aspects of these.

Entrepreneurs has been researched for a long time (Burke et al., 2008, p. 93) in order to find a unified explanation on what they are and why they are so much more successful than non-entrepreneurs (Cunningham & Lischeron, 1991, p. 48). Entrepreneurs seem to possess some extraordinary abilities that enable them to see and act in ways that works in their favour. However the common focus on the majority of studies seems to have looked at the full-time entrepreneurs and their success stories, as well as what makes them so successful. We, on the other hand, want to try to move the focus, for our study, toward the new and want-to-become entrepreneurs and how they can minimize personal risk for when they start to develop their venture. We believe this is a less researched area, deriving from the few articles we have found, but it is nonetheless a very important one. If more people are aware of the hybrid method of trying out entrepreneurship we think that we will see more entrepreneurs will take the step into the world of self-employment.

One thing that inevitable faces all entrepreneurs is risk (Ripsas, 1998, p. 105; Wenneker & Thurik, 1999, p. 32). An entrepreneur faces more risk than ordinary wage-workers due to the fact that the entrepreneur constantly challenges the market with new product and services (Hall & Woodward, 2010, p. 1163; Iyigun & Owen, 1998, p. 455). On the other hand the entrepreneur possesses a huge amount of confidence, compared to others, leading them into believing in their ideas even if it means putting up with a lot of risk (Macko & Tyszka, 2009, p. 484). The same risk, on the other hand, can also possibly yield into greater fortune as well (Hall & Woodward, 2010, p. 1163; Iyigun & Owen, 1998, p. 455), which could possibly be one reason why entrepreneurs are so eager to utilize the opportunities that lies ahead of them. However, successful entrepreneurs do not seem take unnecessary risks. Studies have shown that entrepreneurs that take less risk have greater chance of success (Hvide and Panos, 2014, p. 213). This could possibly imply that entrepreneurs are good at calculating the risks and make sure that if they would fail it would not prevent them from getting in the entrepreneurship business again.

In order to fund the development of one’s venture and test ones entrepreneurial abilities there is a strategy called hybrid entrepreneurship. This strategy works as a test in order to safely see if you as an individual are fit in the context of an entrepreneur as well as to see if the project has an opportunity of success. In this strategy the wannabe entrepreneur keeps a wage-work on the side to have something to fall back on if something would fail
(Folta et al., 2010, p. 253), however in the end, we believe that the hybrid entrepreneur is aiming to fully commit to his own venture. Similar to the hybrid entrepreneurship strategy there is another term called part-time entrepreneurship which refers to another type of entrepreneurial strategy. A part-time entrepreneur divides his time between a wage-work and their own venture. They do this usually because of financial restraints, meaning they are working double jobs in order to earn some extra income (Petrova, 2012, p. 474). This is where the part-time entrepreneur differs from the hybrid entrepreneur. Each of them has different goals with their entrepreneurial businesses and most likely inhibits different abilities. The hybrid entrepreneur seems to be, according to us, more similar to the full time entrepreneur, having high levels of ambition, self-confidence and the drive to finish something.

All this is however not as easy as it may sound. In organizations there is a term for in-house entrepreneurs called intrapreneurs or corporate entrepreneurship. This type of entrepreneurship refers to innovative ideas from employees to update and modernizing the organization’s products and processes (Ramamurti, 1986, p. 142). In most public eyes however the public sector organizations are perceived as bureaucratic which restricts innovative thinking (Pärna & von Tunzelmann, 2007, p. 109; Ramamurti, 1986, p. 142-143). On the contrary, in public organizations in Sweden, usually universities, researcher’s ideas are affected by something that is called the teachers exemption. This regulated stipulation gives researchers the rights to all their research, meaning they have the opportunity to commercialize a potential idea or project (SFS 1949:345). This creates lots of opportunities for the Swedish researchers to take their research onto the market while still have their position at the university to fall back on. We see that this situation fits perfectly into the hybrid entrepreneurship theory. Looking back at the private organization and their business culture there are probably quite usual for organizations to have an open minded culture allowing for ideas to flow. But on the contrary to the public sector, the private sector cherishes and protects their in-house ideas making it difficult for employees to develop competing firms (Marx, 2011, p. 698).
4. PRACTICAL METHOD

In the following chapter we will explain the choices of practical methods we have decided to use and why we have done so. It will include choice of interviewees, design and construction of the interview template as well as the processing of the collected data.

4.1 CHOICE OF INTERVIEWEES

There is no statistical or contact informational database about hybrid entrepreneurs. Therefore we have had to distinguish an easy to find group of entrepreneurs that have or had the possibility to implement a hybrid strategy. With this in mind we found out about university researchers and their advantageous conditions. They have the right work settings in order to utilize the hybrid strategy to its fullest. Not only are they researching new areas in which new innovations can become commercialized by the researchers themselves, they are also encouraged by the university and the teachers exemption law to take their research and innovation into the private market. This proved to be our most valuable source of finding hybrid entrepreneurs. Those who came from the academic side ranged from them who had a firm only for consulting to them who had taken leave of absence to explore the potential of their business idea. We did however not explicitly limit ourselves to only university based hybrid entrepreneurs even though the majority of our interviewees ended up being from the academic side. We did also, for this research, conduct interviews with entrepreneurs, fully integrated into their own businesses but with a history of hybrid entrepreneurship. This provided us with multifaceted perspective on hybrid entrepreneurship and the characteristics and circumstances that distinguish hybrid entrepreneurs from part-time entrepreneurs. Since it was only two of our interviewees that were not directly connected to the academia and that they still had some experience with that area we elected to not divide our interviewees into separate groups but have instead chosen to treat them as a homogeneous group.

The interviewees can only tell their story from their own perspective and experience while we can only interpret that same information from what we are told. This makes it difficult to keep the results objective. However we will do what we can to handle the data in an objective manner. Qu and Dumay (2011, p. 238) notes that it is important not to take interview results out of their context, in which they were gathered, in order to avoid trying to make them objective. Denzim and Lincoln (2000, p. 12) adds that in interviews, the information that is gathered is filtered through language, gender, social class, race and ethnicity lenses. This means that the interviewees cannot give an account for the entire society but only through the experience of his or her own actions.

It is important to indicate that it is really difficult to provide a completely objective research paper. Because this paper is based on a qualitative research with interviews from a number of people we are expecting it to be somewhat subjective. Bryman (2011, p. 44) tells us that with close connections with the respondents comes greater risk of sympathy where the researcher develops a personal connection and a feeling of solidarity which could result in difficulties in separating the role of researcher and the personal opinions and feelings of the individuals. Out of all the interview we had only one was known before by us authors. This tiny deviation will not cause an excessive effect on our final conclusion as it is only one of many.
4.2 INITIATION OF THE INTERVIEWS

In order to find the right individuals to contact for an interview we have asked around among people we knew in our networks that could possibly have an idea of anyone fitting into the description of a hybrid entrepreneur. As an example did one of the authors know an entrepreneur that had experience with hybrid entrepreneurship and we did contact entrepreneurs that have held guest lectures at Umeå University. In order to find the academic entrepreneurs we contacted the university administration and requested the registry over teachers and researchers that had reported a side-line business. We decided to email the possible interview candidates, asking if they had the interest and time to sit down and do the interview. We wanted to be flexible and let the interview candidate decide if they wanted to do the interview in their offices or by phone. Before every interview we greeted them kindly and introduced the idea behind our project. It seemed that among many of our interviewees the theme of the project lied close at heart to them and showed that by being very open and engaged while talking about the subject. After each interview we thanked the interviewees for their time and asked if they were interested in getting a summary of the transcript as well as the finished study which many seemed glad to accept.

4.3 THE QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

When it comes to analysing qualitative data there is no standardized approach. Qualitative research has quite diverse nature to it, indicating that there are a couple of different strategies to deal with the qualitative data (Saunders et al., 2003, p. 379). Tesch (1990, as cited in Saunders et al., 2003, p. 379) grouped these strategies together and divided them into four different categories:

1. Understanding the characteristics of language;
2. Discovering regularities;
3. Comprehending the meaning of text and action;
4. Reflection.

These categories portray only a couple of strategies that differentiate the approach to qualitative analysis. In some approaches there is a preference for high structure levels whilst other approaches adopt a much lower level of structural approach. Other approaches can be for example highly formalised, others can be proceduralized and some rely on the researcher’s interpretation of the data. In the above four approaches the top two are considered analytical strategies that require a lot of structuring and follows a strict set of procedures. They are also associated with strategies that are deductive in nature while the other two are related to the inductive approach with no prior information to direct the analysis (Saunders et al., 2003, p. 379-380). These distinctions of differentiating approaches have been put into a simple graph.
Before commencing the analysis of the qualitative data Saunders et al. (2003, p. 380) suggests a number of common features to the processes of analytical approaches. One of these typical features they mention involves the researcher to, while collecting the data, categorize them into meaningful and related parts. This allows for a systematically work throughout the analytical process and essentially meaning transforming the nature of the data in order to allow the researcher to:

1. comprehend and manage them;
2. integrate related data drawn from different transcripts and notes;
3. identify key themes or patterns from them for further exploration;
4. develop and/or test hypotheses based on these apparent patterns or relationships;
5. draw and verify conclusions

(Saunders et al., 2003, p. 380)

With no kind of classification of the data there is no way of knowing what is being analysed. Additionally there will be complications regarding making meaningful comparisons between the data (Dey, 1993, p. 41) Elaborating on these aspects Saunders et al. (2003, p.381-385) argues for the following general sets of processes:

Categorization, the first activity, meaning that putting the data into meaningful categories, possibly derived from the theoretical framework of the project, allows the researcher to see an emergent structure developing from the research project to help organize and analyse the data further.

‘Unitizing’ data, which is the following activity, is made up of attaching relative pieces of data, also known as units, into each befitting category. This, so called unit, can be made up of a number of words, sentences, paragraphs or other kinds of chunk of texts. This process is made to purposely guide the researcher in his project and make it more manageable and comprehensible.

Recognising relationships and developing categories is the third process in which the researcher is engaging in the analysing process of his study. As the classification of data comes together, bits and pieces are being put into their respective categories, creating a conceptual framework which can be used in an analytical way (Dey, 1993, p. 46). During the process of the study the researcher will most likely continuously work on the categories generating a hierarchical system, which will eventually help create the explanation for the objective of the research (Saunders et al., 2003, p. 383).
Developing and testing hypotheses is the final process of data analysis. As the researcher delves into the information in order to find patterns and recognise patterns between units and the categories the natural thing to do is to develop hypotheses on why it is so. However actual testing of the hypotheses is required in order to draw any conclusion on these connections. (Saunders et al., 2003, p. 384; Silverman, 2006, p. 13). It is important to note however that a single association between two data variables does not infer a causal connection and should therefore be tested against alternative examples to test and verify its validity (Dey, 1993, p. 50; Saunders et al., 2003, p. 385).

With the extensive empirical data we collected we tried to follow these steps for analysing qualitative data. After summarizing the interviews we created categories in which we gathered paragraphs and sentences that belonged to the type of category. These were categories were: **advantages and disadvantages with being an entrepreneur, development of their firms, entrepreneurial attributes, financial methods, influences from external actors, intrapreneurship, non-compete covenants, non-financial support, reasons behind starting a firm and goals for the future, teachers exemption** and a category we named **miscellaneous** where we gathered interesting data not related to any of the other categories. We constructed the categories as such in an attempt to have a direct or related connection between the categories and our research question and purpose. From these categories we could then review each answer and compare them to the other answers from all the other interviewees. This way we could then relate to the theories and see what was connected to other theories and what was not. The differences and likenesses could then be analysed to see if they made any sense and if they proved to be valuable to the study. The analysis consisted really of comparing answers and see what were the common links between the interviewees themselves as well as the theoretical view of things. We tried to identify and lift up common concerns that we noticed were coherent among the interviewees as well as pick citations from single individuals that was providing a depiction of the general idea or issue. It was also important to us to compare our entrepreneur interviewees with the researchers that we talked to in order to see the signs of entrepreneurship among the researchers.

In order to strengthen the credibility of a qualitative study in which there was participants one could do a respondent validation (Bryman, 2011, p. 354-355). A respondent validation is when the researcher reconnects with the participants of the study to share the results to get a confirmation from the respondents that the researcher’s perception of the empirical is correct (Bryman, 2011, p. 353). In our study we did this by sending summary of the interview transcription to the 9 out of 12 of our interviewees that had agreed to partake in the respondent validation.

### 4.4 INTERVIEWEES AND SAMPLING

Since the great majority of our interviewees come from an academic background and most of them still holds employment at the university the pervading perspective on the various elements of entrepreneurship in chapter five will be from an academics standpoint.

Due to wishes from some of our interviewees to remain anonymous so they could express themselves freely we have decided to omit which interviewee who has said what in our sections following the description of our interviewees. We choose to do so since even if
someone would be able to identify any of our interviewees through our brief presentation of them it will not be possible to connect them to any specific statement in the upcoming sections. Furthermore did we elect to make all interviewees anonymous in order to get some consistency in chapter 5 and also not to weaken the anonymity of the few that wished to be just that. We are aware that it weakens the scientific credibility to structure our empirical findings the way we have done in chapter 5 but that is a cost we have to take since we weigh it higher to respect our interviewees. Due to our interviewees being anonymous one could argue that the credibility might be weakened because the interviewees could say things that the otherwise wouldn't stand for but we do not deem it likely since that most of our interviewees did not care if they were anonymously or not. And regarding those who did, they wanted to be anonymous because they had some criticism towards their working environment and did not want to offend colleagues and such.

We used all our connections and databases we could get our hands on in order to get contact information to people to interview. Most of the interviewees came from the university registry of teachers and researchers with secondary employment. We picked and contacted as many people as possible with no regards to gender, age or institution. We did this convenience sampling since the supply of researchers engaged in entrepreneurial activities is limited and these people tend be rather busy individuals. Thus resulting in that we could not be fastidious in our sampling. Since we did a convenience sampling instead of probability sampling the generalizability of our study will be weakened (Bornstein, Jager and Putnick, 2013, p. 361; Bryman, 2011, p. 350). Furthermore convenience sampling is weak at identifying sociodemographic subgroups (Bornstein et al., 2013, p. 361), meaning among other things that we might have missed institutions with distinct cultures that could have added to the study or that we only found those specific institutions. Although we find the latter improbable since we have interviewees from several quite different institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview nr.</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>40min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>30min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>40min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>40min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Senior Professor</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>35min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>50min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>45min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>35min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>25min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>45min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>50min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>25min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TABLE 4. “INTERVIEW SAMPLING” (SOURCE: AUTHORS)*
4.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical concerns will always permeate research, all the way from planning the study and seeking access to individuals and organizations, to analyse and reporting the data. Ethics is a code of behaviour that refers to the researcher’s behaviour in relation toward those who comes in contact with the work either as a subject or a reader (Saunders et al., 2003, p. 129). Having an ethical consideration about the research devolve upon doing well and avoiding harm (Orb, Eisenhauer and Wynaden, 2001, p. 93).

Qualitative research tries to view the world from the subjects’ eyes and experience, and it is the researcher’s intention to observe and interpret the subjects in their natural environment, which is described as an emic perspective (Field & Morse, 1992, as cited by Orb et al., 2001, p. 94). An acceptance of this description would infer that the researcher see his participants as autonomous people who agree to share their stories willingly. A balanced relation between researcher and subject would encourage trust, disclosure and the awareness of possible ethical issues (Orb et al., 2001, p. 94).

Bryman (2011, p. 131-132) talks about a couple of principles that shows the framework of ethical principles when attending to research:

The necessity of informing means that the researcher should beforehand educate his subject in what the study is concerning. It also includes that the subject should be informed regarding all his rights about partake in the research, like for example, the participation is entirely voluntarily and they have the rights to drop out of the study whenever they like to.

The consent requirement refers to the need of having the agreement from the subject regarding his or hers participation. Sometime the subject is under age and then the researcher needs to get the consent from the subject’s parents or legal guardian.

The confidentiality agreement. This principle says that all information gathered from all the subjects should be handled with the utter most confidentiality. If personal information is handled it have to be stored in such manner that other people are not able to get their hands on it.

The use requirement is saying that everything gathered about individuals can only be used for the research.

Throughout the interview process we have had these ethical considerations in mind but may not have followed them to the letter. However we thought that showing respect and ordinary manners go a long way and will most likely portray us as considerate and professional. For an example did we explain what our study were about and asked if it were acceptable to record the interview but we did not explicitly express that participation is completely voluntarily which instead was left implicit in the atmosphere that the interview were conducted in. Furthermore have we heeded all concerns about being anonymous and omitted statements that were uttered in the spur of the moment but that the interviewees were uncomfortable with in later stages, in one case some information that were confidential.
4.6 METHOD CRITICISM

Hybrid-entrepreneurs are quite a distinct niche of people within entrepreneurship. That made it at first quite hard in order to find these people. In our case we were able to get the impression that the description of a hybrid-entrepreneur fitted in with researchers at the university whom had taken or tried to take their research commercially. Through the university administration we got hold of a public register of researchers who was active in additional self-employed activities which we used to decide who to take contact with for potential interviewees. However this restricted us quite heavily to almost only the academic industry. We managed through our personal networks also to get in touch with active entrepreneurs who had experience going through the phase of hybrid-entrepreneurship. This gave us some reference points at least to compare against and to widen the perspective of hybrid entrepreneurship.

The method of categorizing parts of interviews and put them together in their respective categories gave us a good overview of the data. On the other hand it was quite a time consuming task after both the transcription and summary of that was completed. Additionally the interviews almost never kept a strict progression. Instead questions were answered a little bit everywhere and to later search and find these sentences and wordings that would be stored in their specific category was problematic as well.

Throughout the interview process we got better and better at performing the interview, especially when it came to coming up with non-standard question, that is questions that were not included in the interview document. However this happened mostly at the latter interviews. This can result in a lot of additional data may have gotten lost due to the fact that we were not able to develop the questions at hand.

Another aspect that has to be mentioned is the interviews were conducted in Swedish. All participants of the interviews had Swedish as their native language or had been speaking it for so long and were so proficient in it that it basically corresponded to having it as their native tongue. Consequently we do not find it like that any nuances were lost due to linguistic confusion during the interviews but since it were the authors that translated the citations in the ‘Empirical findings’ chapter it is plausible that some of the accuracy were lost in translation.

In hindsight it is always easy to see the mistakes or things you could or should have done differently. And for us it was our interview default questions. We did our best coming up with the most relevant questions that we could and added some during the interview process. However in the end we got the feeling that there were probably additional questions that we should have added to our default questionnaire. For an example did it became apparent in our later interviews that it was more to explore with the innovation system affiliated with the university than we had a first taken account of.
5. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Under this topic you will find the collected qualitative data of this study. The findings will be divided up in sections, first a presentation of the interviewees following a predetermined set of topics underlining the important questions asked during the interviews in order to create a structural format to make it easy to follow for the reader. The sub topics of this chapter provide combined thoughts and impressions from the interviewees.

5.1 INTERVIEWEES

Here we will present our interview subjects and present their past and present status as well as their view on their work situation now and then. As the norm prescribes we have decided to assign every interviewee with a fictitious denotation and since we will not be using these denotations anywhere else than in this section we settled with assigning a number for each interview.

5.1.1 INTERVIEW #1

The first individual is CEO for a telecom company which he helped started in the late eighties. Over the years the company has been through all kinds of corporate forms, from privately owned to owned by pension funds, and now it is owned by an American company. However the firm is run as a separate brand outside of its mother company’s main brand and is the only external brand outside of the concern. Before the CEO started this telecom company he worked as an electric consultant as well as a computer salesman. During this time he was also running a couple of smaller companies on the side. He was 16 year old when he started his first firm and has always had one on the side ever since. For this entrepreneur being self-employed has been more of a tool to do what he wanted and to realize a product idea.

5.1.2 INTERVIEW #2

This individual has his main employment at the university as an assistant professor but he combines this employment with an employment at the regional hospital as a chief physician. In addition to this he also run his own business but without taking out any salary from it. His intention was never to be self-employed but during his time at the hospital he noticed a problem from which he developed a solution. It started off as quite a simple version and it became quite appreciated which pushed him into making it better and better. In the end it required external help with the development of the product but the hospital was unable to financially help with such a project and because it did not come from a research he could not apply for any research grants. That was when he decided to start a private company in order to take this product further. The idea for this product came from a problem that existed at the hospital but it was developed during his free time. Now the product exist and is used in several hospitals in Sweden and now the product has shown potential to help in research as well and suddenly the project has connections to his university employment as well.
5.1.3 INTERVIEW #3

This person works at the University at 60%. In this work he supports his fellow teachers at the university to increase their pedagogical abilities in order to improve the learning for the students. From this work grew an idea that education and skills development takes place everywhere in this country by people with long experience within their own area of expertise. However they may not have the pedagogical ability to make sure this competence that they have is being met. So why not spread this knowledge in order to improve Sweden’s skills development. He is now working at this firm at 40% but has earlier taken a leave of absence from the university in order to work full time on his company for a year and a half. Earlier he started a business with his wife thinking they could combine their competences and work together. But when the opportunity arose to work with an external business there was no doubt he would say yes.

This individual has grown up in an entrepreneurial family, especially with an entrepreneurial dad. This has let him see the ups and downs of being an entrepreneur but also incite him into becoming an entrepreneur himself. He feels more comfortable working in the private sector, especially if it is with the right idea. At the university, and the public sector, his commitment is not really coming to its rights. Instead, a good idea is more encouraging to utilize his knowledge and to build something from the ground. The employment at the university stands for a security if everything else would fail.

5.1.4 INTERVIEW #4

This person is co-owner in a digital innovation firm and recently also started a consulting firm. Currently he is working with projects regarding how to increase innovation and entrepreneurship in the region. Before working as a self-employed entrepreneur he was employed at the university for a long time. Here he was assigned a lot of positions from lecturer to student counsellor. He then landed at the administration where he was able to work with his own assignments. This spurred the interest in possibly being self-employed. He realized later in hindsight that he was working more like an entrepreneur at the university and later he was asked to join a new venture which he thought looked exciting and decided to do. He asked for money for this project which he was granted and this made it easier to develop the company as he still had some kind of income until he could finally transfer completely to the own company. Coming from a genuine worker class family he never had the intention of being an entrepreneur but was probably pushed into getting into the entrepreneurial business by people around him who saw his entrepreneurial abilities.

5.1.5 INTERVIEW #5

This individual is mainly a teacher in applied physics and electronics but has also some research going on. At the moment he is running one company but has had one more a time ago. At the moment the company is working with marine testing equipment, which is not something that is related to his expertise or employment at the university. He never intended to become self-employed but rather slipped into the position because the case let him do it. Something that he pointed out was that he has for the majority of his life he has had a tendency toward working 2 jobs. He has had a secondary job within the private sector in addition to his teacher work at the university and when he quit that secondary job he thought it might have been some kind of grieving process that made him, and a friend of his, start this new business together. The will to be his own boss was something
that was attracting him very much. Due to his fulltime job as a teacher this new venture have required more or less leave of absence. The venture itself wasn’t based on an idea of their own but instead they found an interesting new product that they decided to invest in. Because they run this venture on the side of their own primary employments, they are not ready to invest heavily and make themselves dependent on the company which would require all their time. The full-time employment stood for the intellectual development and financial security while the start-up became like a test subject to try out ideas they themselves came up with.

5.1.6 INTERVIEW #6
This person is working as a head physician at 30% as he is a pensioner. He was first reemployed after pension at 50% but has now reduced it to 30% until the end of the year. In addition to that he is running two businesses, one which he started in the early 90s as a project together with a large pharmaceutical company. This project was the result of a research and was then later one reason for which he started the company. The other reason was to be able to separate the private economy from the business. So in the end it was more a practical reason why he started that company. The other business is based on the same research as the other but is mainly focus on developing a new medicine. This individual did not have any plans on pursuing a career as an entrepreneur from the beginning, rather the opportunity and practical convenience made it apparent that creating a company would be optimal.

5.1.7 INTERVIEW #7
This person is a full-time professor within the field of chemistry at Umeå University. The reason behind why he from the very beginning started his own company were to administer revenues from consultant jobs. It later grew to include additional activities beyond the original management of consultancy and at the same time other individuals became involved in the business. They sold off their company late in the first decade of the twenty-first century and he is now involved in another company that is connected to the innovation sphere affiliated with university. Both companies have been in the line of chemistry since that is where his expertise lies.

He grew up in an entrepreneurial family and thus has had good understanding in what it means to be an entrepreneur from an early age. Something that has immensely helped him during his own start-ups since he have had the understanding on what is necessary to get a company running, how much work that is required to achieve that and the mental attitude that comes from being raised in an entrepreneurial family.

5.1.8 INTERVIEW #8
This person is also a full-time professor at the department of chemistry and his academic career has always been his main focus. He have a firm that is solely his own that he started to administer revenues from consultancy and royalties originating from company based on research he was involved in. He is now, together with some of his research colleagues, also involved in a couple of other companies that have originated from their mutual research projects. Before he pursued his academic career he did consider pursue a career in the private industry so he has always been open for the possibility of transition to the private industry. Something that have been reflected in his academic work since he has
always wanted to see that his research result in useful applications and hence has directed his research more towards the commercially viable.

Even though he really enjoys working in the academic and as of now have no real intention to fully transition over to entrepreneurial endeavours he has no aversion against the idea if a realistic opportunity would appear. However, he does not really see the possibility of any realistic opportunity in the near future since his line of research requires immense funding to achieve commercial viability and the business situation in Sweden does not really allow for such funding to be available.

5.1.9 INTERVIEW #9
This individual is a university lecturer in clinical science and also work as a head physician at a hospital. He has his work divided into three equal parts consisting of clinic work at the hospital, researching and teaching. In his research he did some interesting findings that might have potential which lead to him seeking a patent for his intellectual property. He then started his own firm due to that being the most practical way to manage his patent. Which was the primary reason for why he originally started his own company but later on he has also used it to further the research towards something commercially viable. Something that has been the objective from when he first applied for the patent. Being a full time entrepreneur have in itself not been the intention and he would favour being able to stay with his employment at the university and continue his research through that route. However, if it would be required of him to transcend into full time entrepreneurship in order to get his intellectual property into a commercial product it he would not refrain from doing so.

5.1.10 INTERVIEW #10
This person is now a full-time professor at Umeå University in the department for computer science. He has been a professor for about 20 years and has before that been working in academia at different universities since he graduated. He grew up in a family where employment in the public sector were the norm and have had no entrepreneurial influences in his direct surrounding. It was first later in his life that i started his own firm as a way to manage various consultant commissions he had been hired to do due to his expertise as a professor and to separate this side-line business from his employment at the university. He has also been involved in another company that he and three others, whereof of one were a postgraduate of his, started. It was through the postgraduate’s research and their cooperation with the others that it became interesting to found a company. He helped in getting the company going but left his position in the company later on since he didn’t find the endeavour all to interesting for him. He has as of now neither intention nor desires to leave his employment at the university to pursue any entrepreneurial activity but he is rather content with his current position where he does consultancy on a smaller scale as a side-line business.

5.1.11 INTERVIEW #11
This person is an assistant professor at the university working in the institute of medical bioscience. He has a position as a junior group leader and is now in the phase of building up his research team. He is as of now involved in two companies whereof the first is only used to manage some consultancy that he does. The other one is a company that he have
started with his research team manage the intellectual property stemming from research since doing that through a company are more convenient than doing it by having all the individuals involved be joint holders of the patent. The objective with this company is to reach a commercially viable product based on the team’s research.

He has as of now pursued his academic career and if able will probably continue to do so as simultaneously running businesses. He is however no stranger to the idea of becoming a full-blown entrepreneur if opportunity arises and he has a plethora of entrepreneurial ideas that extends beyond his academic research. He is confident that he will engaged in new start-ups regardless if he continues with the academic route or going into the private market. Currently it is only entrepreneurial ideas originating from the research he is involved that have progressed from the conceptual stage. That since he can work with the research that lies as basis for the commercialization during his working hours compared to entrepreneurial ideas completely outside employment at the university that has to be allocated solely to his spare time.

5.1.12 INTERVIEW #12

This individual is a lecturer at the university within the field of computer science where he mainly teaches basic education. He started working in the academic basically directly after he finished his education and have been on some different institutions for about ten years before he ended up on computer science. Due to his interest in electronics, programming and such he took upon himself to help others with things like that. This activity grew to such an extent that the most practical way to manage it was to start a private firm to do it through. Another reason behind starting an own firm was to separate the “hobby” from his work at the university. During the 80s and the 90s he was involved with a couple of limited companies and a trading company but as of today he has left all positions in those companies. His private firm are currently dormant and he has no intention to take any initiative to make it active again, which lies in line with how he always have approached his side-line operations. Mainly that he have taken no action himself to find customers or companies to engage in but rather it is others that have found him via contacts.
5.2 ENTREPRENEURIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Almost all of our interviewees mentioned the importance of personal drive as an important characteristic for an entrepreneur. It goes pretty much hand in hand with being stubborn and the having the ability to finish what you started as one interviewee expressed himself. Being an entrepreneur was explained to us like a patient hiking where you have to stay with the project in wet and dry. To do this we were told that the personal drive is very important. However, they mentioned that you need to find your own drive, you have to question yourself what is it that you want to accomplish by doing this project. Finding that thing that makes you want to work on this in hard times even if it only gives you little or no pay at all, it will provide an incredible boost to the personal drive and ambition to create something from scratch, as mentioned by an interviewee. The general indication from the interviewees was that money usually comes afterwards and should not be the major drive for the entrepreneur. One of our interviewees said that: "if money is what you want then an ordinary employment is probably better, at least initially." The importance of personal drive was repeatedly told to us by many of the interviewees and also that with enough drive you can most likely successfully accomplish any kind of project or work, employed or self-employed. He continued saying: "if you are developing your own idea it is important to believe in it and yourself. The idea will not become a success overnight, you have to be able to realize that it will be difficult to value your own time. Developing something from the ground up will take time and will not be easy at all times and it does not get better by having a wage work as well. That is why you need to be persevering over time", and this was something that many of the interviewees agreed upon.

Another interviewee explained that in order to get customers the entrepreneur have to be able to sell. If the entrepreneur wants to be successful s/he need to be great at selling. This ability was also highly regarded among many of the interviewees as a very important trait. The interviewees said that if the entrepreneur cannot sell his or her idea and convince people that it is a good product then they will never get any job either. It was also generally agreed that this is probably the one thing most wannabe-entrepreneurs have most difficulties with. One interviewee put it like: "you need the courage to confront people as well as the confidence to stick by your product." Another one added that all people have different taste which is why persistence is important as well. He said: "you can be a great seller but it may not change the minds of people to buy your product. However the better at selling you are the easier it will get. Your social abilities have a big impact on your selling abilities". Some of the interviewees mentioned that if you have an easy time talking to people, and also like doing it, you will notice that selling ideas and products to people are not that much different.

Another characteristic that is prominent in entrepreneurship is charisma as one interviewee told us. He said that if you are a leader of a team, charisma will help you get your group of people to believe in what you believe in. He was sure that by being charismatic you excite people around you, both employees and customers, and this allows you to push colleagues to do better and customers will become interested in you and therefore your product.

Having expertise was also on a lot of our interviewees’ minds. They claimed without their expertise in their area they would not have been able to see the problems that were. This also came out as an important trait to have as an entrepreneur. You need to have a special kind of knowledge in order to see things others do not they said. This gives the
entrepreneurs an edge in finding opportunities to utilize and possibly commercialize, as mentioned by a couple of interviewees.

Some of our interviewees stressed that by being an entrepreneur you have to remember that a vital resource is the finance. They continued by saying that not everyone have a large amount of personal finances to fund their start-up. Most of the interviewees sought public grants in order to initiate their business. The important characteristic here is how the entrepreneur uses this money some of the interviewees argued. They believed that a good structure in your finances, organization and customer service will be important to run a business. Being enough risk averse allow you to take well considerate decisions and the money will not go to waste they said. The interviewees also emphasized that it is important to remember that you as a business owner have to take care of your customers because they are the ones paying your salary.

5.3 PROS AND CONS OF BEING AN ENTREPRENEUR

5.3.1 PROS

Our interviewees have mentioned several advantages with being an entrepreneur, owning or being involved in a firm. Firstly we have those interviewees that have been involved in some form of consultancy to private entities, companies or individuals, and/or being owner of intellectual property originating from their assignments within their primary employment, i.e. research or corresponding at the university. They have expressed that founding their own company, or co-founding a company, have been beneficial for them in order to be able to separate their side-line interests from their primary employment. Furthermore they have found that starting a company and doing things thorough is the best way to manage all the practicalities that comes from running a business-like operation such as consultancy or administering a patent. Especially when the intellectual property has been shared within a research team the most efficient way to manage it have been to allocate it to a company.

When it comes utilizing hybrid entrepreneurship the obvious advantage were that they could test their idea without risking their personal economy. Furthermore there were some that utilized hybrid entrepreneurship to build up their company and successively transition over to it when the revenue allowed them to. One interviewee told us that they were three of them that got together and started a company while they were employed and when their own company’s revenue could support one person they assessed who were most important for the company and let that person fully transition. When their company grew more the others could follow suit.

Another aspect that has been pointed out is that with running your own business is that you yourself are the deciding factor. You have the final say in what is to be done, how it will be conducted and you are free to allocate your time and effort as you see fit. This freedom has generally been perceived as satisfying. Moreover it has also been satisfying seeing something that you yourself have put a lot of effort into finally becoming successful or useful to others. It is additionally stimulating and challenging to run your own company since there is always new tasks and problems to handle.
Lastly there are also some other aspects that have been mentioned but not as commonly as them stated above. You get a wider perspective by getting to see how both worlds’ works. The interviewees have usually had great insight in how the academic world functions and through their entrepreneurial activities they get to see how the private markets works. Furthermore you get to know a lot of new and often interesting people and thus extending your personal network with contacts that are usually quite different than those from the academic side. Finally have making money been mentioned but often as a subordinate objective since it have been other aspects in entrepreneurship that have been more attractive.

5.3.2 CONS AND PROBLEMS

As there are advantages being involved with entrepreneurship there are also disadvantages as well as problems associated with starting new companies when you have a primary employment. According to our interviewees there are rarely any foresight when you conduct entrepreneurial activities, hence there is an uncertainty about the future and what it brings. There is no security regarding income and it is uncertain if you will be able to pay your bills at months end. Most interviewees said that they liked the safety in having a primary employment while testing their entrepreneurial ideas. Although several interviewees admitted that the uncertainty made them hesitant to pursue their entrepreneurial ideas on a greater scale since they were unwilling to take the risk it meant to leave their current employment. Some of the interviewees said that they never have had an idea they believed enough in to compel them to transition fully into entrepreneurship. Others however pointed out that it is this which are the difference between entrepreneurs in Sweden vis-a-vis in USA whom are, according to them, more prone to risk taking when it comes to get their ventures to become successful and meant that it was a bad thing. Furthermore they meant that the view on entrepreneurship was different in USA in the regard that if your entrepreneurial endeavour fails it is only to try again and they ascribe no negative attributes to it while in Sweden it is regarded as something bad and shameful if your business fail.

Another disadvantage is that running your own company requires a lot of work, usually exceeding the 40 hours a week which is the norm in a standard employment. Something our interviewees think are particularly problematic for entrepreneurs with a primary employment to account for. That makes tasks, regarding the entrepreneurial initiative, take longer than they should since they have neither time nor the energy to devote those resources that the company demands. Another recurrent problem we found during our interviews were that people coming from an academic background usually have little knowledge concerning how to conduct business, except those few that come from a family background where entrepreneurship was present. Learning the necessary business skills represents another impediment for a would-be-entrepreneur to overcome before they can concentrate on what they want to achieve with their venture. Most of those that voiced that as an issue also mentioned the innovation system linked to the university as being of good help with this particular problem.

It was mentioned that a general problem for entrepreneurs in Sweden is that there is a business climate that favours larger corporations at the expense of smaller firms. Rules and regulations stemming from the Saltsjöbaden Agreement in 1938 lend benefits to larger corporation while working as a detriment for smaller companies. Making it even
harder for start-ups and other small firms to compete with the giant corporations at equal terms.

Those scientist that operate in fields that are very cost intensive and have long development processes, such as pharmaceuticals, consider the difficulty in getting financial support to be the biggest issue. As one of the interviewees stated:

“The biggest problem is financial support, financial support and financial support. The problem is that within Life Science in today’s Sweden it is very difficult, especially regarding pharmaceutical projects in early stage of development. It is incredible difficult to obtain support because everyone is so risk averse that they actually just want to step in when it is almost certain that the project will go all the way. [...] The research councils are also very reluctant to step in with money in this kind of project and even if you look at such a research council as Vinnova which is actually intended precisely for innovations so are they also disinclined to engage in this kind of project and the same applies for venture capitalists and so called business angels.”

Others have also raised the issue that it consumes a lot of time searching for potential investors, time which have to be diverted from the company's other tasks since they in the first place had a limited amount of time they could spend on their entrepreneurial activity due to their employment at the university. They say that business angels in Sweden are few, hard to find and if you should happen to find someone willing to invest, the available means are not sufficient anyhow. Another problem linked to this field is getting access to the necessary infrastructure for developing the product which in this case could mean advanced laboratory equipment.

There are several other issues which were mentioned by only a few or a single interviewee. As a scientist at a university there is a requirement that you have to publish scientific articles and after you have published your findings you will not be able to apply for patent for said findings. This leads to premature patent applications resulting in substandard patents and/or the patent life expiring before the product is fully developed. This affects younger scientists more severely as the pressure on them to publish their research is stronger since more senior scientist that already have several writings published can afford to wait with publishing their current research in order reinforce their patent base. Another problem that have been brought up is when there have been too many shareholders involved in the company due to that there was a whole research team behind the intellectual property leading to the creation of the company. Too few of those shareholders had any business skill leading to internal conflicts and inefficient management of the company. An additional problem that have been mentioned is that scientist takes much pride in their academic work and sometimes that tend to divert focus from other parts that have to be carried out in order to have a functioning business. Lastly depending on which institution the researchers are working at there will be different attitudes towards entrepreneurship ranging from those who encourage entrepreneurship to those who are oblivious of the possibility to engage in entrepreneurship. There was though no report of any institutional culture that frowned upon entrepreneurial activity.
5.4 FINANCIAL AND NON-FINANCIAL HELP

When it comes to financing and also developing their ventures our interviewees, who are largely university employees, have utilized the publicly owned business incubator located next door to the university. Here many entrepreneurs have received help in terms of financial grants in order to receive the money to start their business. They have also received help in form of business coaches who supply help with writing business plans and other business analytical tools. Due to the fact that university researchers are lacking business development skills the incubator has helped the researchers with these bureaucratic parts of starting up a business.

A few of our interviewees work in the health and medicine industry. In these industries new pharmaceuticals tend to have extremely long development cycles. This forces the researchers within the area to search funding in several rounds. They also usually require quite large sums of money. As for a newly started venture they have the possibility to apply for different kinds of grants, even from the EU. These funds help the researchers to get going with the development of their new pharmaceutical. In the long run though, more external help will be required to move on. These options was said to usually consist of business angels, venture capitalist or even larger drug companies. Unless additional grants are possible these options have to be considered some of the interviewees mentioned. Several of the interviewees stated that they have avoided private investor for as long as possible in order to build up something substantial. That because they want to give away as little control over the company as possible when they finally had to seek funding from private investors. If they were to involve private investors in the earliest stages of their start-up they would practically give away all control over the company since the funding would constitute such an large share of the company’s worth. Some of the interviewees who had the possibility elected to completely forego private investors to gradually and slowly grow their company. One interviewee used the money from sales of his previous company to fund his new enterprise.

A lot of the researchers use their knowledge for consulting others. These kinds of businesses do not require much of an investment and can easily be done with their own money. Other businesses was also started with own money, but it was money saved from their ordinary employment. These individuals also had the knowledge of both their craft as well as how to run a business. This understanding came from growing up in an entrepreneurial family. This allowed them to get an understanding of entrepreneurship from all angles, good and bad. Entrepreneurs with a good network have used their contacts in order to get mentoring on the business side of things. The mentors are generally entrepreneurs themselves and have gained a lot of experience through the years. By keeping a close network of cunning people around you can get the feedback that you need to hear in order to develop both personally as well as the company itself.

5.5 IMPACT OF EXTERNAL ACTORS

The response we got from the interviewees was that their environment, colleagues, family and so on, was not responsible for any push to become an entrepreneur or start a business. There seemed to only be an acknowledgment from this environment that they actually was doing anything business related. The common reason for the interviewees’ determination to start their own business was due to an opportunity they noticed within
their area of work or research. The exception to this came from the individuals have been raised in an entrepreneurial family. If you show interest in entrepreneurship the closest family members will help you on the way and push you to take the leap into entrepreneurship. One of our interviewees have earlier supervised postgraduates and noticed that those with a background of enterprising family members were prone to pursue entrepreneurship themselves and were often more successful at it than those that did not have the same background.

Those who have been in contact with the innovation system and the people around it seem to have a lot of communication with people in the business regarding the idea of starting a business and you become motivated by the same people. Moreover if you have been involved with starting up a business before, you become more willing to pursue that path again. Just experience among the researchers give them knowledge what is being done correct and what is not. This will help them next time to increase their performance. In America they have these tech transfer offices that look at the research results and decide what is patentable and what is not.

5.6 NON-COMPETE CLAUSE AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP AT THE WORKPLACE

According to the interviewees are non-compete covenants very important to innovative businesses, especially when it comes to research. Most of our interviewees had in some way been affected or protected by a non-compete. One interviewee explained that if a company in Sweden wanted to enforce a non-compete they still had to pay 60% of your previous salary for the period of time they prevented you to take another employment or engaging in a start-up. For the entrepreneurs and researchers it is a way to both protect their business from having employees trying to compete with the business through own start-ups. It is not seen as prohibitive for workers as they are generally loyal to the company and any kind of innovation they come up with is therefore owned by the company. However, according to some of the interviewees there might arise some issues if the R&D department and the management in high technology companies have communication problems. The management usually consists of business oriented people with little knowledge about the actual process of the company and might miss opportunities that the scientists see. Viagra and Losec were mentioned as two examples of pharmaceuticals that wouldn’t exist if the management would have had it their way and the employees stayed obedient since both projects were officially shut down and a prohibition against further development issued. If it were to come that an employee came up with an idea that he would like to create a business from, that do not have anything to do with the area where their current company work, they are probably ingenious enough to work around the problem of a non-compete in case they would have to.

The exception to this rule lies probably with incubators and accelerators. These companies do not benefit from prohibiting entrepreneurs coming to them. Instead they are an open organization and act as a tool for the entrepreneurs in order to get help with the ability to grow and continually develop their business.

Having an innovative workspace is generally seen as a positive thing. It stands for renewal and that you are doing something good hopefully. But it mostly comes down in what type of environment you work in. Having a very open minded workplace where you have the
opportunity and the time to contemplate on issues, might give you time to give more time
to think about entrepreneurship. Most of the interviewees agree that the innovative
entrepreneurial activities should not take time from your employed work. You have to
priority your task at your employed workplace before starting to philosophize about
entrepreneurship. If you have secondary employment it is just as important to stay away
from the university at an arm’s length distance to make sure that resources from both are
not mixed up, causing a breach in the clause.

Entrepreneurship at the workplace is one reason to have a non-compete clause. To make
sure intellectual properties stay with the company. In certain cases employees have gotten
the possibility to reduce their workload with their employer in order to investigate a
business idea they had. This way s/he could spend some time making a market- and
competitor analysis and decide if this is something worth to pursue or to let go and go
back to the ordinary wage-work.

5.7 THE TEACHERS EXEMPTION

There is a much divided perception among the interviewed businessmen and some of the
interviewed researchers regarding the Swedish law of teachers exemption. The
researchers who have utilized this exemption tells us that they can feel the advantages
and are positive to its purpose. It gives them the power and incentive to work on their
research and possibly take it commercially in the end. If they have had the opportunity to
work on the project all the way and they retain all the rights they probably would get the
drive to pursue the commercialisation of their idea. This exemption is often compared
against the American model. Over there the universities own the rights to the research. In
Sweden it might seem a little strange that the research should belong to the researcher
when the resources used have been paid by the university. However in America with the
universities involved it might become more difficult to start a business and it might as
well constrain the drive for the researcher. Although several of the interviewees that found
it useful for them personally did question the utility of the teachers exemption when seen
on a societal level and how many other academics that just sat on their intellectual
property without doing anything with it. A comparison was made to the American system
in which basically everything being published by the researchers was scanned for
commercial value by the tech transfer offices. The extent of the teachers exemption were
also questioned since the interviewees meant there were a grey zone in who are included
in the teachers exemption. Is for example undergraduates and research engineers included
or not? According to the interviewees is the university unwilling to establish general
guidelines and prefer to assess each individual case.

One interviewee explained that if there was no teachers exemption the alternatives would
lead to something of an innovation pool where the universities gather the research and try
to sell them. But a practical use of this does not really work as observed by one of the
interviewees. The universities are not able to run a business and to hold such a portfolio
with innovations is useless. For an example one of our interviewees mention that there
were companies who kept an eye on those portfolios and as soon as an unutilized patent
expires they were ready to exploit it. He said that they only waste tons of money to hold
patents and there is no researcher willing to take on any project when there are no
incentives for them to do so. It was also pointed out that for a patent to be really valuable
you must have the heads behind it too. If not you would lose the competence that created it and would be limited in our possibilities to further develop it. The interviewee continued saying another bad alternative to the teacher exemption would be if the universities did not pay the researcher at all for his resources. Instead the researcher would have to seek out governmental investments for an early idea which is uncertain to even become anything. This would then compete with other funding for hospitals for example which would be a much more socioeconomically strategy.

Many of the interviewees had their own thought about the teachers exemption on how it may be improved. One thing that came up was to create some kind of distribution between the university and the researcher. Let the researcher keep the majority to retain their incentives and drive to continue the research and strive for a commercialisation.

5.7.1 THE EDUCATION SYSTEM AND THE “INNOVATION SPHERE”

Those who have criticized the teachers exemption have also realized that it would do no good to just remove the teachers exemption and leave it at that. They point out that it would require extensive restructuring of the education system as a whole in Sweden to get a well-functioning alternative. They mean that the education system is not adjusted to administer intellectual property with the purpose of taking it to a commercial stage. One interviewee compared being a scientist with running a business since you have a group you have to manage and a limited amount of resources at your disposal that you have to use as efficiently as possible. To maximize the use of available resources is a foreign concept to most people in academia he claims further. Furthermore we were told there are some EU-projects that require a detailed project plan with elements of entrepreneurial aspects but training in such are not even attempted in Sweden and it falls upon the individual scientist to take initiative to learn it themselves. Another one among the interviewees was of the opinion that an element of entrepreneurship should be implemented to every education program at the university to raise awareness of entrepreneurship as an alternative. Additionally he meant the education system as it currently is have a dampening effect on the interest in entrepreneurship. He referred to a study in which nurses at the beginning and at the end of their education were asked where they would work. When they started approximately 50 % thought they would work in the private market, either employed by a private company or having their own business, but when they completed their studies there were basically no one thinking they would work in the private market. Another issue that have been raised with the entrepreneurial education that presently exists is that those who teaches entrepreneurship are pure theorists, meaning that they have no real life experience in entrepreneurial activities and how to run a business. Hence they cannot convey how to navigate the entrepreneurial setting and the problems and opportunities related to that setting in an adequate way.

When it comes to the innovation system affiliated with the university there have also been differing opinions and both praise and criticism have been voiced. Some have found the help offered very useful in their process of commercialize their research while other have found it somewhat faulty. We were told that in some cases it had resulted in that costly correction have had to be done in a later stage because they were not made correctly the first time. One interviewee mentioned having to involve a consultant in order to get further financial aid even though said consultant did not contribute with anything useful. The consultant did only consume time better spent elsewhere and the entrepreneurs were in the end forced to do what the consultant were supposed to do in the first place. A few
of the interviewees have expressed their disbelief in the innovation system’s ability to identify intellectual property with potential of commercial success which in their words have resulted in that several substandard projects with low commercial potential have been funded. One interviewee was convinced that when the innovation system first launched it occurred that scientists exploited it to get funding for purely academic research where they had no intention of commercialization.
6. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this topic we will analyse and discuss the collected empirical data and compare it to the theories and answer the questions we asked in the beginning of this paper.

6.1 EFFECTS OF HYBRID ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Hybrid entrepreneurship suggest a person try out his or hers entrepreneurial abilities and business idea while still having the comfort of a wage-work on the side (Folta et al., 2010, p. 253). From what we have learned throughout the process of this study is that it is quite common among university researchers to use their employment as a parachute in case any of their entrepreneurial ventures would fail. If their business is based on their research they have been able to gather funds from public grants, especially from special organisations focused on helping researchers getting their ideas to the market. This means that they don’t necessarily have to put in their own money to get things started. What this suggests is that within the academic world, at least, they have good possibilities to utilize these resources in order to fund their idea. At the same time they are still employed at the university. This shows that there is an intentionally strategy to minimizing their personal financial risk when attempting to start their own venture. This could increase the courage of the entrepreneur to accomplish greater success. Looking at it from the other side, if the individual is not fit to the entrepreneurial role the invested money, in large extent, is wasted due to the fact that resources and the intellectual property will never come of use.

There are some research areas in which time becomes a restraint for the researcher and the development of his or her product. In cases where a product takes years of developing and testing creates a situation where grants are not enough. The grants may only take a project so far and depending on how big it is and how many are involved with it additional funds will be needed sooner or later. In our study we have met people gone through all kinds of stages with their business. Some of the cases talk about looking for a bigger company in the same industry willing to invest in the company. This way you will get the additional funds for future development and research and possibly even external knowledge that might come in handy. Other alternatives would imply approaching a business angel or a venture capitalist. Either way, taking in additional investors, means the researcher will lose more and more control over the company. It seems really important to think about what is important to the researcher and the company and how it wants to operate in the future.

By having something to fall back to the entrepreneur can be less risk averse due to the fact even if they fail (Hall & Woodward, 2010, p. 1163; Iyigun & Owen, 1998, p. 455) they won’t risk losing a payday. Another aspect of this is that with this failsafe the entrepreneur might feel more self-confident and therefore pursue greater risk than would be possible otherwise (Macko & Tyszka, 2009, p. 484). If successful the benefits would also prove to be greater. There are a lot of researchers that utilize the opportunity to have a side business along their employment. However only a few of them are seeing potential value in their project.

Researchers have very deep knowledge about their subject and they seem to generally have quite distinct characteristics when it comes to their personalities. These characteristics do not always line up with the characteristics of a successful entrepreneur...
(Stephenson, 2009, Entrepreneur.com). Then is there anything that implies that researchers are good entrepreneurs? Almost all of those we have talked to do not really see themselves as entrepreneurs or having any kind of entrepreneurial abilities. Yet they seem to be presumed by the university and society itself to have the will and knowledge to start new ventures based on their research just like that. Many of the researchers we interviewed did not have the business training or experience to pursue such career. According to Goldfarb and Henrekson (2003, p. 647) and Carlsson (2002, p. 112) it is common that academics lack business skills. It was suggested that all educational programs should have some kind of entrepreneurial introduction or implementation to it. If it is a segment during every course or a week during the entire program does not matter. Even the slightest insight into entrepreneurship might provide the incentive to become self-employed. If not they can at least learn to think critically when they start working. These things can later lead to ideas that then becomes new ventures. But without the insight and courage to do so most of us will most likely end up adjusting ourselves to how it is. This goes for both students and researchers. Now researchers do have a golden opportunity to use this kind of hybrid entrepreneurship to take the step into becoming an entrepreneur.

External actors does not seem to be very active in encouraging entrepreneurship from what we have heard from our interviewees, at least within the academia where entrepreneurial traits seem unusual. On the other hand if you do not show any entrepreneurial characteristics that might provide the answer to why such encouragement is so rare. However if you are a researcher who comes up with a new idea that could possibly have a commercial usefulness would not that be an incentive among co-workers and family to be more encouraging toward pursuing a self-employment? The university itself is probably expecting such a pursuit from their researcher but they do not seem to encourage or put any demands to expand their research commercially. Sure it is nice of the university to be very political about it however the potential losses due to lack of strictness may be very expensive. If the university can be stricter about the research projects and the people who run them it might get rid of loafers who have no intention of doing anything with their research.

From a couple of our interviewees we gathered that growing up in an entrepreneurial environment let you perceive the different aspects of what it is like to be self-employed as well as most likely picking up some of the traits by observing the family members. This seem to teach the individuals the entrepreneurial characteristics and engagement needed and probably inspires him or her to one day become an entrepreneur themselves. The family aspects most likely play a big role in the support and encouragement of entrepreneurship. As they are the closest external people around you they surely have a big effect on how people perceive the world. If now the parents of a child are entrepreneurial in behaviour the child will probably take after the actions of its parents which will show more clearly in later stages of life when the now grownup seek to become an entrepreneur. However this external factor is not valid to our research question because it is not a factor that impact the individual at the academia when trying to pursue hybrid entrepreneurship.

A couple of our interviewees were running their side ventures more like a patent and finance holding company or even a consultancy. This is quite obvious not really an entrepreneurial pursuit. However it fits more into the part-time entrepreneur characteristics and motives (Petrova, 2012, p. 474; Weinrauch, 1982, p. 43). The part-
time entrepreneur is not very willing to take any risk and probably prefer having a wage-work. But the side company seem to exist more as a mean to satisfy the individual’s financial needs. We think this clarification further proves that there is a difference between part-time entrepreneurs and hybrid-entrepreneurs. And it is important that there is a difference and that it is highlighted as the latter is a relatively new term.

Non-compete covenants have generally been seen as something, if not positive then at least, absolutely necessary within the high technology industry and academic based firms by our interviewees. This is somewhat surprising since the literature view on the effects of non-competes is relatively negative. Among other things widespread usage of non-competes in a region seem to make it harder to hire competent personnel to entrepreneurial ventures (Stuart and Sorenson, 2003, p. 183) reducing the amount of accessible venture capitalists (Hellman, 2007, p. 931) and to generally impede entrepreneurship (Samila and Sorenson, 2011, 436; Stuart & Sorenson, 2003, p. 197) in said region. It is quite understandable for those who have been issuing non-competes since it was also apparent in the literature that companies perceive that they get various benefits from implementing non-competes. Such as protecting their intellectual property and tacit non-patentable knowledge (Samila and Sorenson, 2011, p. 427) and enabling the companies to invest in their human capital (Garmaise, 2011, p. 414). What is more interesting is that our interviewees were basically unanimously in their opinion that non-competes are an obvious implementation and essential within the high technology industry. We see several different reasons why this might be, and the first is that the usage of non-competes are inculcated to that degree that it have become a constant fact which is why its existence never is questioned. A second reason may be that, according to one interviewee, the situation is somewhat different in Sweden compared to North America. In Sweden in order to enforce a non-compete covenant and prevent a former employee to take up employment with a competing firm the former employer have to pay up to 60 % of the anterior salary to the former employee (Smitt, 2004, p. 94). This may discourage companies from enforcing non-competes since it comes with a cost for themselves while the non-compete signer do not end up in that a vulnerable position since they are being compensated for not being able to work. Both of these aspects would surely have a mitigating effect on the impact of non-competes in Sweden and making the affected individuals less reserved concerning non-competes. Another cause that we think lie behind why the interviewees were predominantly positive regarding non-competes is due to that most of them were academics where the academic environment and the teachers exemption works to additionally mitigate the effects of non-competes.

6.2 THE ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

Thanks to the teachers exemption the researcher owns all the rights to his or her research (SFS 1949:345; Goldfarb and Henreksen, 2003, p. 647). This is supposedly giving the researcher the incentive and drive to try and commercialize their idea. However probably due to the fact that little entrepreneurial training is given to the researcher, from what we could understand from our interviews, there is a risk that s/he just sit on the project without any intention of taking the idea to the market. This could indicate that there is a problem with the teachers exemption. That is not the only problem. There seem to be quite an agreement among those of who we interviewed that it is illogical that researchers should be 100 % entitled to their research when the university has paid for the expenses.
We agree as well that it seem strange and that it might cost the universities a fortune especially when the project’s does not lead to anything. The American model may give the universities all the rights but then what gives researchers the incentive to pursue its possibilities (Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 647)? It was suggested by one of the interviewees that some kind of division should be made, with the researcher keeping the majority of the rights, to be able to ensure that the drive and incentive still remained, and the fact that with the university gaining a small share they could get back some of the invested money which would enable the university to reinvest the money into new projects.

When it comes to the innovation system affiliated with the university there were both praise and criticism voiced from our interviewees. Something that we were able to discern is the fact that they who came from an entrepreneurial background or were entrepreneurial driven in general did overall express more criticism towards the efficiency of the innovation system. Those who admitted that they lacked business skills and/or were of low entrepreneurial spirit generally found the support received from the innovation system to be helpful. So when considering that in comparison to an international scope Swedish science parks have underperformed (Lindholm-Dahlstrand, 1997, 1998, as cited by Carlsson, 2002, p. 118). It seems to us that the innovation system offers basic support that is well needed among those with little or no experience of business while it still needs to be developed to reach its full potential.

According to Henreksen and Rosenberg (2001, p. 217) there is a business climate in Sweden that deters entrepreneurship and favours larger companies. There is also an absence of venture capitalists and business angels in Sweden which makes it hard to get funding for entrepreneurial activities (Carlsson, 2002, p. 116). Both of these aspects were also mentioned by a few of our interviewees. Since both the literature and our interviewees mean that this is an overall problem in Sweden for entrepreneurs we think that this circumstance might prove the teachers exemption as unjustifiable inefficient in promoting entrepreneurship from academic research. Sweden is a small market and our socialist politics might not favour investors in the same degree as it does in for example U.S. and this probably results in less money that investors are willing to spend on new investments. We have also far from the same amount of investors which is why it is important that there is help, in any way, to locate the few investors that are out there. Otherwise we are faced with a problem where there are investors that are willing to invest and entrepreneurs searching for investments but there is no bridge between them in order to find each other.

One thing that didn’t turn out as bleak as our literature on the subject suggested is the university communities attitudes regarding entrepreneurship at Swedish universities. According to Goldfarb and Henrekson (2003, p. 647) there exists a discouraging culture towards entrepreneurship at Swedish universities where the academics are basically peer pressured into abstaining from entrepreneurial pursuits. During our interviews there were no mention of any institution that had a negative disposition towards entrepreneurial endeavours and it was only mentioned once that an institution were oblivious of entrepreneurship as an option. This discrepancy might be because Umeå University is unusually open towards entrepreneurial pursuits compared to other Swedish universities. It could also be because we did not find the institutions that are negatively dispositioned since we contacted academics that have already engaged in some form of entrepreneurial activity for our interviews and it is possible there is institutions where the anti-
entrepreneurial peer pressure is so effective no one from those institutions have pursued any entrepreneurial activity and thus making them invisible for our survey method. A third possible reason for the discrepancy is that the academic climate has changed since the previous studies were conducted. Several initiatives have been made in Sweden to change the negative disposition towards commercialization previously reigning within the academic community to an encouraging one both by the government on a country level (Carlsson, 2002, p. 112; Goldfarb and Henrekson, 2003, p. 649; Henrekson & Rosenberg, 2001, p. 211) and on regional level by local instances (Lindelof & Lofsten, 2006, p. 394). Hence do we believe that it is the effects of these efforts that are the main reason behind why, according to our interviewees, the university is more open to a knowledge transfer from the academia to the business world. It has gone about 10 years since the literature stated such initiatives were being implemented and thus we think it feasible to assume that it have elapsed enough time for the effects to start showing.

6.3 THE ACADEMIC ENTREPRENEUR

A couple of the interviewees did not see themselves as entrepreneurs. They lacked the ambition to fully take on the task of running their own company and they did not believe that they inherited the correct entrepreneurial characteristics. Aside from that a big aspect proved to do with that they were getting older and they had a lot of responsibilities, making them less keen on risking their security. They did not want to risk the security they had with a wage-work by taking on something that would be very risky, like running their own business. However those who ran side businesses felt comfortable in having the engagements that they had making them more of part-time entrepreneurs. Their side business seemed to facilitate other kinds of interests rather than being a stepping stone to become a full time entrepreneur. On the other hand many of them wanted to keep an arm’s length between their wage-work at the university and their own business. This allowed them to separate these two works and the risking of any complications. The other group of interviews had a quite different situation. The major fact behind this was probably that they were a bit younger. This was indicated by their ambition and open mindedness. Even though they agreed that they were very happy with their employment at the university, which let them have a lot of freedom, they were not completely unwilling to, in the future, try to pursue self-employment through their current or future idea, as long as the idea showed promise commercially they could absolutely consider working full time as an entrepreneur. Just as the hybrid method is intended to be used (Folta et al., 2010, p. 255-256) these researchers strive for a safe transition between wage-work and self-employment. No matter the experience they have while developing a new venture they still have the choice to continue or exit without risking too much. However with more experience with start-ups the more successful are you probably going to be with your next one. That is why it is important to encourage researchers early to pursue taking their projects commercially. This could prove beneficial in many ways, both individually for the researchers but also for the university as they can show off these spin off businesses to increase their reputation. In a case where the university would share the property rights this could also mean additional resources pouring in. However if more researchers are applying for funding at the same time it might put a pressure on the organizations holding the funds. This would, and should, lead to stricter evaluation of the potential commercial value of the projects that comes out of research in order to effectively make use of the
available resources and not waste it on projects that beforehand could have been denied due to lack of potential.

The interviewees were generally satisfied with their employment at the university. This is why we believe that it is also probably a reason why researchers are very good at applying the hybrid entrepreneurship method. To keep their pay by doing something they enjoy is more than enough reason to stay while working on a side business. If they had not enjoyed their stay at the university it could more than likely cause them to leave, or transfer to their own business faster, if they had come up with a new business idea. Then the affection and enthusiasm of developing a new idea would overweigh the reasons to stay at a place where they did not thrive.

Many of the interviewees are researchers and university lecturers and therefore somewhat of an expert in their respective field. This gives them a competitive advantage as well as the ability to see opportunities to exploit that others may not. With expertise knowledge they have a deep understanding within their area of knowledge making them difficult to compete against. By utilizing their expertise and taking their research commercially they have all the possibilities to succeed in their business. Without expertise how do you know that what you do is better than anyone else’s product or idea? Without an understanding within certain areas how can you see what is working and what is not? This is certainly an important aspect to have in mind when looking for entrepreneurial opportunities. We like to think that people start looking for opportunities where they have some kind of knowledge at least. It is not impossible, if you do not have a certain kind of knowledge of a subject, that you can engage yourself in learning as much as you can and hope to find an opportunity in there somewhere. Ideally the entrepreneur could surround him-/herself with people, with knowledge in different kind of areas, whom can discuss their thought and ideas and together with the entrepreneur and together come up with new innovative ideas that would not have been able on their own. This idea could also prove the importance to actively gather researchers and entrepreneurial minded people in order to possibly grow ideas that can later turn into actual ventures.

Thinking about all the benefits researchers have, how fair is that academic have so many of these benefits when starting their businesses when others do not? If you are a non-academic and try to pursue a similar venture you are not entitled to the same research grants there is. However there are still other grants that can help you a little bit on the way. The sizes on these grants vary but are not close to those of the research grants. Another aspect is that there are cases where the university has entered and competed with the private market and ordinary people who have invested their own money and time to take them where they are now. It is not really fair that a big public institution with lots of money can support a researcher who has not put in a single dime to compete with these ordinary entrepreneurs.
7. CONCLUSION

Here we will give conclude our final thoughts about the state of our problematisation.

7.1 RESEARCH QUESTION AND PURPOSE

Our purpose of this study is to investigate the attitudes from academic entrepreneurs and the external factors that affect them on their pursuit of hybrid entrepreneurship. Our research question was formulated as follows:

What kind of external factors affect the academic individual when pursuing hybrid entrepreneurship?

In the academia people are surrounded by innovation and learning. As a researcher or academic entrepreneur in Sweden have, by law, complete right to their research and therefore the right to do whatever they want with it. However, though, good it sounds we can make a deduction that there are negative impacts on a societal level. It can involve research that never gets out because of the researcher. There can also be researchers using their position in order to keep their employment and thereof "wasting" public funding. Additionally there is a risk that a lot of money are wasted on maybe not-so-profitable ideas and when the university has no rights to the research that they are paying for they cannot reinvest money from successful spin-offs.

Researchers are largely very positive to the teachers exemption. Pretty much nowhere else in the world will you have the benefit of receiving full ownership of your research. However when it comes to the question if it is a viable method for encouraging entrepreneurship it shows a bit less promise. The teachers exemption provides teachers and researchers with full ownership of their ideas and projects they are working on. The university pays for the resources that make the research possible however they almost get nothing in return. The researchers that are enveloped in this policy generally do not seem to see the back sides of it because they are pretty much blinded by the benefits. The others that we have talked to as well as we can see some difficulties with it. We can only say, from our point of view, that the negative aspects probably weigh over the positive ones.

From what we can tell the university itself provides little encouragement to researchers for pursuing entrepreneurship or even hybrid entrepreneurship. However there are publicly owned incubators that are in partnership with the university that holds the resources to help researchers in their ambition to develop their idea. These incubators provide both initial funding as well as business coaches, to help with the bureaucratic business details. So even if the university is not directly helping, they do so through their partners. However the incubators only help those who are looking for it. There is no effort from these incubators to push researchers into taking their ideas commercially. Neither does the university. Our conclusion is that the help exist for everyone to utilize, but the university has to be more active in evaluating research projects as well as the project owners in order to get an understanding of what projects are potentially commercially viable and if so, does the owner has the right attitude to take this further. If not, the
university has to help the property owner to find options that can possibly take this project to the market.

Below in table 5 we provide a summary of the factors and their effect on the academic individual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Factor</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Allow the entrepreneur to minimize financial risk taking by working for the initial funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>An additional job means less spare time. It can also prove to be an issue of division of labour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Exemption</td>
<td>Allow the researcher to completely own his research and thus do what he wants with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Help</td>
<td>The possibility to gain professional help with business development as well as initial funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5. “IMPACTING FACTORS AND EFFECTS” (SOURCE: AUTHORS)*

7.2 SUB-PURPOSE

In addition to our primary purpose these topics are supposed to give our conclusion regarding our sub-purposes.

7.2.1 DOES ACADEMIC ENTREPRENEURS HAVE ANY DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS?

During our study we found that it is not as unusual with hybrid entrepreneurs as we first thought. Focusing on the academia we could see some common traits among the interviewees that we thought applied to the hybrid entrepreneurship method. It really came down to personal incentives. The young and ambitious individuals had a much more positive attitude towards one day gradually convert to a full time entrepreneurs. Their youthfulness also reflected in their drive to achieve. They were not afraid to push their limits and pursue an entrepreneurial career within their expertise. Compared to the older gentlemen the younger ones did not have the same amount of commitments which allowed them to think and dream and imagine themselves in more of an entrepreneurial future. So from our point of view we believe that researchers, that are not too old, not having too many commitments, who have a good insight about their own entrepreneurial abilities and with the drive and ambition to achieve something, embodies the type of personality that could pursue entrepreneurship. Additionally what is important for applying the hybrid strategy is to have a good understanding of financial risk. Being careful with money is important in order to do the right choices. Everyone we have asked also still felt a satisfaction with their employment at the university. They do not rush into things and therefore rely on the wage from that employment to reduce the risk of their start-up thus inclining that hybrid entrepreneurship is the way to go for them if they have a good enough idea.
7.3 FINAL CONCLUSION

We find that hybrid entrepreneurship is a viable strategy for individuals within the academia through which a wage work, that infer low financial risk while building up their entrepreneurial enterprise, have something to fall back on. As a strategy it enables people who during other circumstances would never pursue entrepreneurial endeavours and thus broadening the spectra of potential entrepreneurs. With the drawbacks that follow with hybrid entrepreneurship we believe that a suitable approach is to use this strategy to test your ideas before fully committing to it. Another suitable occasion to use hybrid entrepreneurship is when you have a venture where it is appropriate to slowly build it up without being necessitated to invest that much time in order to circumvent the hurdle that is the limits on available time that this strategy brings. The hybrid entrepreneurship strategy does come with additional workload. This is an important factor to consider if the researcher plans to start a venture on the side of his or her wage work.

Following that we deem that hybrid entrepreneurship is especially viable in Sweden where it seems that nascent entrepreneurs are more risk averse than in countries such as USA hence we mean that the reduced personal risk that hybrid entrepreneurship brings would enable more people to engage in entrepreneurial activities. Furthermore it is also an appropriate way of approach for scientist researchers and others affiliated with the academic world in Sweden who is affected by the teachers’ exemption. The fact that they are granted the full rights to the intellectual property originating from their research gives them a unique opportunity to utilize entrepreneurship. On the other hand these academics seldom possess the essential skills required to run a business. This is where the hybrid entrepreneurship approach lets them explore the commercial potential of their research and gives them leeway for the necessary learning process while the still have their employment to fall back on. As these individuals are planning their venture they need help with the development. This is where incubators and business coaches comes in. As partners with the university these organisations provide the researchers with the necessary knowledge that they themselves do not have.

We have identified four different external factors that play a role in the pursue of hybrid entrepreneurship in academia and these are risk, workload, the teachers exemption and the access to external help.
8. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter we will provide to the reader our recommendation toward hybrid entrepreneurship and suggest possible directions for future studies.

8.1 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Our study has largely been aimed toward the academia. It has looked into the entrepreneurial habits of researchers and other academic employees. The theoretical platform is built upon previous work by Folta et al. (2010) and has been applied to academic employees. This theoretical contribution can be used as an exploratory agent for universities or governmental institutions for the application of hybrid entrepreneurs as well as the teachers exemption. However we see this study as an extension to Folta et al.’s work as we do not provide any new hypothesis. We hope that our examining study will provide the reader with a deeper and more clarified substance of information regarding the subject.

There has been a significant resemblance between hybrid entrepreneur and part-time entrepreneur and many have expressed their confusion regarding them. We like to think that this study shows that there is a difference between these two terms and therefore should be used in their own correct situation.

8.2 FUTURE RESEARCH

We think that hybrid entrepreneurship is an interesting and relatively new term that should get more attention. So much research is going into the entrepreneurial characteristics and so on, however it would be interesting to look into the methods of hybrid entrepreneurship more deeply. For example the uses in other industries, other countries, how to maximize the efficiency, what are the success rates for entrepreneurs coming from different industry sectors that are using this strategy, how can industries and businesses improve themselves in order to increase the knowledge and willingness to pursue this hybrid method. Another perspective to analyze would be if innovative exhortations could lead to social improvements. For example would it be better if for the society as a whole if exhortations from the university to researchers could lead to more ideas, businesses and jobs. We believe there are a lot of aspects to be investigated that can benefit this subject.

8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

As many researchers seem to unconsciously apply the hybrid entrepreneurship method, when pursuing commercialization of a project, we like to see an improvement or at least an increasing positive attitude against providing help and education to people in the academics in their pursuit of becoming self-employed. This could lead to improvements in quality among the projects that are being funded and also encourage more academic personnel into becoming entrepreneurs. Considering the comfort of the teachers exemption it gives the idea owner too much freedom to do what they want with their
project which is paid by the academic institution. There lies an inefficiency here which have to be restructured.

We would also like to see some investigations regarding the teachers exemption if the current system really is the most optimal or if there are possibilities for improvement. This comes mostly due to the fact that there are voices describing their concern and mistrust in the system. We do not have the data or theories for coming up with a better solution, however this study, as previously mentioned, can be used as an exploratory agent for other studies regarding this issue. If the teachers exemption could be reanalysed and maximize its usefulness the society have a lot to benefit from it. This could lead to more jobs and greater budget for academic institutions to spend on education as well as research and development. However to say it will be so is dangerous, it could just as well turn out to lead to less research being done.

Additionally we would like to encourage researchers to take the opportunity to utilize the resources available to them in order to challenge the market with their research and ideas. Taking the opportunity to pursue entrepreneurship when they are still young and do not have as much commitments can give a lot of experience as well as the opportunity to test their own abilities while not risking too much. Making use of having a backup plan proves to be very valuable when trying out entrepreneurship. It will most likely help increase their courage to step out of their comfort zone and improve their self-esteem. Along with that attitude come more entrepreneurs with more ideas who can develop more successful ventures.


APPENDIX I. INTERVIEW TEMPLATE

- Vad arbetar du med/som just nu? (Egenstartat företag, anställd, etc.)
- Vad gjorde du innan du blev entreprenör/startade eget?
- Har du haft som mål att bli egenföretagare?
- Vad var ditt syfte med att starta eget?
- Vad gjorde du när du utvecklade idén? (Var det din idé? Gemensam idé?)
- Hur finansierade du utvecklingen av ditt företag?
- Är detta din första entreprenöriska verksamhet?
  - Var tillvägagångssättet för uppstart liknande vid tidigare verksamheter?
- Har du någon gång varit anställd och egen företagare samtidigt?
  - Varför? Vad är/var tanken om framtiden? (Gå över helt till entreprenörskap?)

- Vad var det största problemet enligt dig med att starta eget?
  - Vad är problemet generellt för nya entreprenörer?
- Vad har varit den största Fördelem/Nackdelen med att starta eget?

- Vilka entreprenöriska egenskaper har du enligt dig själv?
- Vilka egenskaper tror du är viktiga för en framgångsrik entreprenör?

- Har du varit inriktad mot att ta din forskning kommersiellt?
  - Hur har du tänkt finansiera denna kommersialisering?
- Är ditt företag en produkt av din forskning eller något annat?
  - Om annat: Hur tog du dig åt att utveckla det?
- Vad anser du om “lärarundantaget”? (Har det påverkat dig? Hur har lärarundantaget påverkat ditt arbete? Effekt på entreprenörskap i generell bemärkning?)

- Blev du uppmanad att starta eget från din omgivning (Arbetskamrater, arbetsgivare, familj etc.)?
- Har du erhållit någon icke-finansiell hjälp med att starta ditt företag? T.ex. med affärsplan, kontakter, etc.?

- Tror du att potentiella entreprenörer kan bli skrämda av att inte ha en kontinuerlig inkomst medan de utvecklar sitt företag?
  - Har du varit i en sådan situation?
- Vad är dina åsikter om entreprenörskap på arbetsplatsen? (Nyttigt? Bortkastad tid?)
- Vad är din åsikt om konkurrensklausuler? (Kontrakt som förhindrar anställda att utveckla egna företag som konkurrerar med sitt nuvarande) Hindrar det? eller är det bra?
  - Har du blivit påverkad av detta någon gång?