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Abstract

Leadership development is a central theme within the organizational field and vast amounts of money and time are spent in pursuit of the magical formula, namely transforming the employee into a leader. The explicit view that leadership is for everyone to learn, has been the mantra since the turn of the century. Statoil ASA, a Norwegian multinational oil and gas company, has been researched on their internally developed leadership program, Become a Leader (BaL)-Level 3. The research question is: How does Statoil equip their leaders for the future through the leadership program, Become a Leader (BaL)-Level 3? Qualitative research has been the choice of methodology and a strategic selection of course participants have been interviewed. The main conclusion is, that the program is valid when it comes to equipping Statoil’s future leaders with relevant leadership development and leadership skills and tools. However, this finding rests heavily on the program being internally developed by Statoil’s own leadership unit. Moreover, this master thesis also questions that the necessary and crucial post follow-up does not take place after the course has ended. The follow-up is sorely missed by the course participants upon returning to a hectic work day.
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1 Introduction

Most of today’s companies, organizations and businesses, address the topic of leadership in some form or other. As long as the employees are more than one, it follows that there exists positions with different responsibilities. In other words, nearly everyone has a boss, manager or leader. Therefore, it is understandable that the topic of leadership is a popular theme within the organizational field as well as to the public.

Another perspective is that most of us, hold the role of employee. On average, it is perhaps, one of the most important roles we undertake and fill our lives with. It is a role that enables our livelihood, it can also make us develop skills and understanding of the trade we are in and finally, it can be a source of delight if the social milieu is satisfactory. A contributing factor to the social milieu, is the role of the leader. Usually, this role is seen in either black or white terms; one has a good leader or one has a bad leader. The importance of this role in terms of costs is difficult to estimate, but every employer has in their own self-interest to create a social milieu that is characterized as pleasant and supporting. Summed up, the better the working environment is regarded by the employees, the better the results are expected to be in terms of productivity. The leader is therefore a very important factor in establishing a good work climate. This, would again explain why leadership is such a popular topic and an industry in its own right. The topic leadership, pours out new literature to the public, consultancy firms provide leadership courses/seminars directed at companies and employees to better their skills as leaders. It has become rather ingrained that one should develop one’s leaders, and nobody wants to or dares to miss out.

This serves as my perspective and how I have come to understand the topic of leadership. It’s vital to businesses and a very interesting field within science, as the topic is of interest to many disciplines. Leadership may be viewed symbolically, in terms of power, structurally or individually. The leader position demands great responsibility in terms of being chosen by the system and can say something about how the organization wants to be acknowledged by society. Ultimately, the leader is seen as the face of the organization. The leaders are moreover, carriers of the organizations values, both internally and externally. This element of value, becomes more and more important in today’s era were sustainability and ethics are relevant to the public. Since the leader position means that one is higher in ranking than one’s employees, the element of power has always been fascinating, especially in earlier times.
when the position included more power to make and carry out decisions. Today, the position is different - and it would be more accurate to view it as a symbolic position of what image the organization wants to portray. There is no longer only one man at the top who runs a company, there is a board of directors who oversees the company’s activities.

In today’s organizational climate one can see governance and leadership as two parts which make up the organization’s whole. The two may be seen as the driving forces when it comes to the organization moving and pushing to reach its goals. It’s important to state that both concepts have to be reviewed in relation to each other, one cannot exist without the other. At the same time, it varies to which degree they are explanatory variables when it comes to direction. On the one hand, governance may be more called for when it comes to corporate sustainability responsibility (CSR), on the other hand leadership may be of more importance when it comes to change management and mergers. The pendulum swings in relation to the demands of the organization, shifting from more governance and less leadership, to more leadership and less governance.

This master thesis is concerned with the subject of leadership within an organization. Needless to say, my field of specialization is organizational sociology. Within this specialization, my interest has been drawn towards leadership.

There has always been developed new discourses about a subject, so also with leadership. Status quo with regards to leadership is to frame it within the context of positive psychology where the mantra goes that “leadership is for everyone to learn and enjoy”. This is something that has triggered my curiosity and thoughts, with regards to: Is this really for everyone to learn? Moreover, how does the “soft” relational leadership style relate to the “hard” core technical world of engineers? These thoughts are the underlining and back drop of this master thesis.

It is my part time job combined with my studies that has shaped my interest in organizations. The chance to observe and reflect upon “theory learnt and practice seen”, has spurred this interest for organizational learning. Subjectively speaking, I do believe it has enriched my perspective on organizations by enabling me to combine the two areas. It is from my experience with engineers, both students and full time employees, within public and private organizations, that have made me wonder about what happens when the world of the social sciences meets the natural sciences in terms of teaching the latter about leadership? This is
the subject which has been investigated in my master thesis and has been researched in the Norwegian multinational oil and gas company, Statoil ASA.

I began my master thesis in 2008 and it ends in 2017, which makes it possible for me to review my findings from 2008. Den Norske Stats Oljeselskap A/S was founded in 1972 and owned by the Government of Norway. It was established to explore and exploit the oil that was deposited in the Norwegian sector of the North Sea for the Norwegian society. In 2001 the company was privatised and made a public limited company. The company also changed its name to Statoil ASA and the government retained 81.7% of the shares. In 2004 and 2005, through further privatization, the government’s share was reduced. In 2008 Statoil had just merged with the Norwegian oil company Hydro Oil & Gas (2007). Statoil has gradually expanded to become an international oil and gas company, with a strong portfolio of assets outside Norway in Brazil, Angola, Tanzania and Canada etc.

I have interviewed participants in Statoil’s leadership program “Become a Leader - Level 3” (BaL 3). The program is developed internally, but with aid from external expertise. The unit that develops the program consists mainly of people with higher education within the social sciences. The participants are primarily different types of engineers. The qualitative data were conducted with a semi constructed interview guide.

Given the time and money that is spent on both developing such courses and the execution of them, I began to wonder what imprint do they leave on their participants? The more daring questions are: are such courses valid? and what is the outcome? It is my belief that when an organization develops and executes programs concerned with the matter of self-development, utmost mastery and respect has to be given due to the content at hand. Put in other words: are these programs justifiable due to their content and if so, how?

Today it seems that every self-respecting organization sends their leaders to attend leadership programs, either held by external consultants or internally developed, as is the case with Statoil. To my reasoning, a company that has their own unit for developing such programs, must mean serious business when it comes to how they view the development of their future leaders. One could believe that here it is not only a question of climbing the ladder based on one’s technical ability, but also that one’s social competence is at play and being developed. In sociological terms one could view leadership programs initiated by the organization as being a sort of “check-list”. The organization is making certain that every new leader undergoes the same program which allows for a sort of leadership warranty. Therefore my
main objective with this thesis, was to investigate how does BaL3 equip Statoil leaders to meet the challenges of the future?

As I have mentioned before, the time and money that goes into these programs are nothing less than admirable at first glance, no one can argue the obvious fact. But, it makes one wonder what kind of motivation and reasons lies behind such programs? Is there an ulterior motive for internally developed leadership programs? It’s a natural and legitimate question which arises when a large scale company has developed and designed their own mandatory structure for their future leaders. They have, by putting great emphasize on how they do leadership, accordingly raised the bar for how one may assume they view leadership; as something of pivotal importance. Accordingly, it is natural for an external onlooker to be intrigued and question why this focus and what are the effects? More specifically, does the course reflect Statoil’s leadership philosophy and the company’s focus on sustainable development and ethics?

I have tried to find out what has been done before with regards to research on my topic and little has come to the surface. Valuable tools for dissecting this topic are to be found within sociological theory. I have found Sørhaug (1996, 2004) and the two concepts; governance and leadership, to be valuable in developing a sociological perspective for the research question at hand. Governance and leadership give a plausible perspective as to which mechanisms might be said to lie behind an organization’s objective with internally developed leadership programs. They give a description at the macro level in terms of how one may view an organization. This thesis consist of three components; namely the organization, the leadership program and last but not least the participants. It therefore follows that another perspective with regards to the micro levels – the participants, has to be applied in order to give a fuller description. To look at this through the lens of the participants, I have come to find Sørhaug’s concept of “doubleness” relevant. The concept enables one to envision an agent who actively participates in how he or she interprets and constructs their identity as “leaders in the making” by participating in the leadership program. My theoretical perspective will be fuller explored in the chapter concerning theory.

The logic of the master thesis is the following: Chapter 2 - Method, deals with the method chosen for the research question at hand. I will describe the reasoning behind the chosen method. I will also disclose the process of collecting the data and the process of analysis.
In Chapter 3 - Theory, I start by outlining what I consider to be relevant theory for understanding the subject at hand. From there, I will outline two practical sociological perspectives on how to view leadership programs within an organization by using Sørhaug (1996, 2004) and the two concepts; governance and leadership.

Chapter 4 - Analysis, is organized in three major sections; “About the program: Become a Leader (BaL) - Level 3”, “Leadership development” and lastly “Post BaL 3, follow-up”. I present the relevant findings and my interpretation of these.

Last but not least, Chapter 5 - Conclusion, discusses the findings and tries to draw a plausible conclusion based on the analysis.
2 Method

In this chapter I will outline how I chose my research question and map out the process that then followed. The process involved several steps. Firstly, deciding on a research theme and getting the green light. Secondly, deciding on relevant methodology to conduct the research. Thirdly, the process of collecting the data. Fourthly, organizing the collected data. Fifthly, analyzing the data. I would, however, like to point out that the steps sometimes are more or less interwoven. I will be as honest as my memory allows and give as accurate a recount as possible.

I already knew that Statoil focused on leadership through the company’s web page, and did some investigation whilst working for them one summer, to find out how much emphasis the company really puts on leadership. What I found, was that they had an internal unit solely dedicated to leadership. I contacted the unit and had a lengthy telephone interview with the leader of this unit. The unit is not large, about 12 employees. My main focus was inquiring whether they had any program that dealt with the personal development of leaders. When I heard of Become a Leader (BaL) level 1, 2 and 3; I knew that level 3 was the research area that I wanted to pursue for my master thesis.

The program’s focus is the transition from colleague to first line leader. BaL level 1 and 2 deal with the administration and management side of becoming a leader, the different systems of governance that Statoil leaders need to know in their everyday work. BaL level 3, is marketed as a program dedicated to developing the leader when it comes to leadership. Moreover, also the mental process of becoming a leader, as in self-development. This strengthened my motivation to research BaL 3. The leader of the unit made two requirements that I needed to fulfill in order to be granted to write my master thesis for Statoil, firstly it had to be useful in the sense that the leadership unit could learn something from it regarding BaL 3, secondly the master thesis had to be written in English, since this is the company’s corporate language.

The leadership unit’s leader then sent me foils on BaL 3, which I studied extensively. I then had a long meeting with her and the administrative consultant at the unit’s office at Statoil Forus Øst, where we discussed the program Become a Leader - level 3, in greater detail. In order to remember everything that was said during the three hour long meeting, I used a
dictaphone. After returning to Trondheim, I listened to the interview and looked at the BaL 3 foils and tried to put myself in the mind frame of being a BaL 3 course participant.

Coming up with a useful research theme was easy, as the amount of money companies invest in leadership and what is gained in terms of results, is heavily debated. This became my overriding meta-question, how does one measure results when it comes to leadership self-development? To me the question is very interesting theoretically, since self-development is such an intangible area. This led me in the direction that I wanted to use qualitative method as a means to hear from course participants how this process was experienced by them. I searched in the following databases; BIBSYS, Sociological Abstracts, ISI web of Science and Scopus; to see what prior research was done on this issue. At that point in time not much had been done when it came to researching leadership self-development. I discussed my line of reasoning with my supervisor, who agreed, so I settled for qualitative method as my choice of methodology. I felt that I was embarking on a very interesting research theme, in a fairly unchartered area, forming my own research for a large Norwegian company.

I had now decided what area I wanted to look into and how I wanted to conduct my line of research. Then began the mental pondering of turning BaL 3’s focus on leadership self-development into a useful and interesting research question, that would interest Statoil so that I would get the go-ahead. Whilst studying the BaL 3 program’s foils my research question began to form. The program was indeed very interesting: testing the course participant’s personality types, conducting different simulations in order to enhance their leadership skills, having established leaders within Statoil giving lectures on leadership etc. What was there to research, at first glance; the program seemed to cover the basics and add some interesting flavor in way of hiring professional actors for one of the simulations to make them as realistic as possible.

I then studied Statoil’s web page and the BaL 3 program; something was left out. To me, the two did not add up 100%. On Statoil’s web page, they highlight being a global company, focus on sustainable development and ethics, equality in the form of no discrimination when concerning gender, age, ethnicity and religion etc. This I did not find being addressed in the BaL 3 program. I became curious to find out whether this was something that the course participants felt was lacking or not in the program. But, the question that really got me going was what Statoil does in the aftermath of BaL 3. They put high focus on leadership, having an internal unit dedicated to the topic of training the future leaders, sending them off on a six
day seminar to develop and train for the transition of becoming a Statoil leader, but when they have finished the course and returned to their everyday work, then what?

I telephoned the leader of the leadership unit and presented my thoughts on the program and that I was curious about the discrepancy between Statoil’s web page and the BaL 3 content. Moreover, I addressed the seemingly missing follow-up on Statoil’s part of the participants after finishing BaL 3 and their return to daily work. After this, we had another meeting at the Statoil Rotvoll Research Center, where I presented my current ideas and thoughts regarding a relevant research question and methodology. The leader found my thoughts concerning the program valid and interesting, since this was a perspective they themselves had not looked into. I got the approval to pursue my research question as to how Statoil train their leaders of tomorrow – by researching BaL 3. To say the least, I was very humble and felt a bit daunted by the task, writing my master thesis for Statoil about their leadership training.

I now received lists of different BaL 3 courses which had been held and the name of the course participants and where they were organized. The leader of the unit advised me to choose the last BaL 3 course, since by then the facilitators had gained more experience in conducting the course. I followed her advice. Studying the list, I began to form the interview guide which was my tool in collecting the data. The names on the list gave me direction on how I outlined the interview guide. I saw that the lists comprised both international participants, Norwegians working internationally, different locations in Norway as to working offshore or onshore, different business units and lastly difference in age and gender.

These parameters lead me to choose a strategic selection of course participants to cover the variances in participants. Furthermore, the strategic selection of informants gave me direction as to which areas I wanted to explore in the interview guide. In agreement with my supervisor, we settled on eight to ten informants as a decent number in gaining enough data for my research question out of the 17 course participants.

2.1 The interview guide
The interview guide\(^1\) was divided into eight sections; “Background”, “Become a Leader (BaL 3)”, “Statoil and leadership”, “BaL 3 - it’s design”, “Network effect”, “Inner”, “Training /

---

\(^1\) See appendix 1, for the Interview guide
Simulation and Exercise” and finally ”Post BaL 3 – follow-up”. I used a semi-structured interview comprising both closed and open questions.

Firstly, “Background”, served as an ice-breaker when starting off the interview, I asked easy questions regarding personal background information in order to get both parties acquainted and adjusted to the situation. Moreover, I divided the informants into two groups with regards to age, “older leaders” and “younger leaders”. The point being to see if age as a variable played any significant role with regards to their answers.

I wondered whether they wanted to have a leader position within Statoil when they began working for the company. I wanted to see how conscious a decision about becoming a leader was on their part versus a necessary selection by Statoil. My thinking was that the more conscious the decision was for the informant, the more eagerness and learning would occur when attending the course and that this again would transpire in the interview.

Secondly, in “Become a Leader (BaL 3)”, I probed more into the question of whether course participation was one’s own choice or something that one’s supervisor wanted. Here I wished to explore the actor’s thoughts as to how self-elected the course is regarded versus something that the system, Statoil; had set up as a mandatory requirement in the training of their leaders of tomorrow. In other words, the more self-elected the course was on behalf of the informant – the more excitement regarding BaL 3 might be recounted in their interview. Moreover, I asked them what they gained from the course in hindsight and what they now think of BaL 3 looking back, and if it has had any impact on their leader role. Lastly, I asked about my own understanding of the course content and if they saw it as valid. My understanding was that BaL 3’s aim is three-parted; firstly to learn about Statoil’s leadership philosophy, secondly self-development and lastly training in leadership skills.

Thirdly, in “Statoil and leadership”, I wanted to hear their point of view on the course being designed internally, since this is rather unusual. Is it a strength or a weakness having their own co-workers giving the course? Usually, this is something that companies outsource to consultancy firms. Moreover, I was interested to hear their thoughts on Statoil’s leadership philosophy and if it coincided with their own. I was also curious to hear what they felt about the Statoil’s values and the new company values after the merger with Hydro.

Fourthly, “BaL 3 - its design”, concerns the layout of the program. Here it was interesting to get their thoughts on the composition of BaL 3 with regards to different business unit’s
representation, international participation, gender and age. I wondered if they thought that there were special thoughts behind the selection of course participation and whether they deemed the composition fruitful. I found it interesting to hear the actor’s point of view on utilization, as it is something that the system has developed.

Fifthly, “Network effect” is to check if BaL 3 has had a side effect in the form of networking amongst its participants, post course attendance. This could have been an unintentional effect of BaL 3, which would be interesting to explore.

Sixthly, “Inner”, has to do with the self-development aspects of the course. Here, they were presented with test results about their personality in the form of the Jung Type Indicator (JTI)². I wanted to hear if they found the test results adequate. Moreover, I wanted to hear how they found the exercise ”Reflective team”³. Since this is the part of BaL 3 that directly deals with self-development, it was important for me to probe into their thoughts on the matter, to hear if they found the content useful.

Seventhly, “Training / Simulation and Exercise” is where they are being trained on the development of leadership skills. Here, I addressed different simulations, exercises and coaching. Again, it was important for me to hear if they found them worthwhile, since it deals directly with their training as future leaders of Statoil.

---

² The Jung Type Indicator (JTI) is a brief, easy to administer, self-report questionnaire that has been designed to help people identify their psychological type. It has been developed using modern scaling techniques to provide a reliable and valid measure of people's preferences for the psychological functions. The JTI is an indispensable tool for helping people manage issues of personal change and growth. By providing insight into the fundamental psychological processes, the JTI stimulates self-awareness and acts as a constructive framework in which people can understand and explore their interpersonal and thinking styles. Within organisations the JTI can be used to enhance personal effectiveness and facilitate team building. The JTI questionnaire items are acceptable to people from a broad range of cultural backgrounds, providing a modern, reliable and valid measure of Jungian type. (http://www.jungtype.com/, 2017, 20.05)

³ Reflecting team is best described by Haley (2002): “reflecting team process invites the sharing of multiple personal meanings in a therapeutic context. Team members are encouraged to express impressions and ideas, and at the same time respect the views of each other” (p. 27).
Lastly, “Post BaL 3 – follow-up”; is one of the sections with the most important questions. It concerns the noticeable lack of a post BaL 3 follow-up, on behalf of Statoil, from my point of view. I wanted to hear if this was a fair assessment on my side or something they did not find to be relevant. I started the section by asking questions about their usage of the development plan and their appraisal interview post BaL 3 attendance. Then, I asked about critical topics that were not addressed in BaL 3, sustainable development, ethnicity, gender and corporate social responsibility (CSR). The reason for me asking about these topics, was that on Statoil’s web page they are listed as important aspects of Statoil’s way of doing business. Lastly, I ended the interview by giving the informants the opportunity to give their view in the form of feedback on BaL 3’s content and design. I do see that my line of questioning in this last section may have steered them towards giving me answers that they unconsciously thought I wanted, since I started the section with closed questions which emphasized a certain point of view. But, I ended the section with open questions so I feel that this outweighed me steering the answers in a certain direction. I might, however, have received different answers had I started this section with open questions and ended with closed ones.

2.2 Choosing the informants
When choosing informants, I chose strategic selection as preferred methodology. This would meet my requirements outlined in the interview guide. The parameters which had to be addressed where the following; international course participant, Norwegian working abroad, difference in work location as in offshore versus onshore, difference in working within different Statoil business units, approximately 50% male versus female course participants and lastly difference in age so that variance between “young versus older leaders” could be investigated. I succeeded on nearly all of my initial parameters for strategic selection of informants. Where I did not succeed was on getting an international course participant in the selected course, one had left the company; the other one I tried to reach on numerous occasions per telephone and by mail. I left messages with the secretary, but never heard back. On my remaining parameters I succeeded. I got a total of eight informants. The Norwegian stationed abroad who could convey the global aspect as to being a Norwegian working internationally, goes under the name “Ulrik”. As for working offshore I got the informant “Ola”, who had done so since joining the company. As for difference in Statoil business units, all; with the exception of two informants who worked alongside each other, worked in different units, ranging from trading, upstream (onshore) to downstream (offshore). Out of
the eight informants, gender was divided equally. Lastly, the parameter age was divided into two being considered “young leaders” (30-35), whilst the remaining six were placed in the “older leaders” (40-45) category.

After the strategic selection had taken place on paper, I began the process of contacting them and getting them to agree to do an interview for my master thesis. I started by calling each one and leaving a voice message, where I briefly presented myself and said I would send them an email with a request to participate. When they replied, I again phoned to settle an interview date. After the interview had taken place, I sent them a “Thank you for your participation” email. I conducted my first interview in Trondheim at Dragvoll with a dictaphone and the use of my interview guide on Mindjet MindManager (a visual mind mapping tool). Mindjet MindManager gave me more freedom to have eye contact with the informant and the use of a dictaphone definitely let me put all my focus on the informant. In Stavanger I conducted three interviews in one day and another the following day. This was a mental marathon as in overload of information. The next interview took place in Bergen with one participant. Then, after some time had passed, I had the last interviews in Stavanger with the two final informants. Statoil covered my travel expenses.

After completing the interview tour of Norway, began the process of transcribing the interviews. All my interviews lasted one hour and some even up till one and half. When the process was finally completed I had 400 pages of transcribed text. In other words, there was enough text to analyze\(^1\).

\(^1\) See appendix 2, for examples of interview transcripts on the topic concerning a follow-up, Post BaL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr. of Informants</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different parameters:</td>
<td>”Ola”</td>
<td>”Ulrik”</td>
<td>”Yngve”</td>
<td>”Dina”</td>
<td>”Per”</td>
<td>”Heidi”</td>
<td>”Laila”</td>
<td>”Unni”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International informant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian stationed abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offshore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onshore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different business unit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same business unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>”Young leaders”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>”Older leaders”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Analysis - organizing the data

Pondering how to most easily convey my research findings in the analysis, I chose to keep it neat and simple. I chose to organize the data by structurizing the collected data after the sections in the interview guide. There were several different approaches on my side; I organized the data in the form of a table, but found that it only served as a good illustrative tool. I decided to use the interview guide almost as a Rorschach test, by going through the interview guide’s questions chronologically, and then reading every informant’s answers to each question, I started to write down those answers which were interesting. By interesting I mean, the answers which either confirmed or debilitated my questions and gave some elaborate understanding as to why they answered the way they did. It was not an easy task deciding what was important and what was not, due to the fact that it is hard to distance oneself from the data and be objective and level-headed.

My choice of strategy was to keep repeating the research question in my head and if the answer advanced the understanding of it, then it was a keeper. After writing down the relevant answers, began the task of analyzing the answers. During this part, I kept asking myself; what does this tell me? I tried to lift their answers to a metalevel and sum them up in relation to the research question. But, it was difficult to trust my way of reasoning. During my academic training, this was nearly the first time I had to state in writing “my own voice” and stand accountable. This was mentally challenging and I needed reassurance and good guidance from my supervisor in order to believe in myself. When this was done, I structured the analysis to be better aligned with the theory chapter and my findings; in order to give the reader a better understanding of the thesis. Quotes from the informants have been used to illustrate and emphasize interesting and important findings.

2.4 Course description

Prior to the course date, the participants had to take the initiative to have a pre-conversation with their leader, where they were to address BaL 3 and what they should try to target when it came to developing their leader role. They also had to fill out the Jung Type Indicator (JTI) and send their scores to the leadership unit.

---

5 See appendix 3, for an overview of the course program Become a Leader (BaL) - level 3.
The course is a six day seminar, which starts off with a three day session at a location outside work. Then there is a pause for approximately one month, where they are to complete an exercise (the interim assignment), before meeting up for session two, which is a three day seminar at another location. The design of the first session, starts with a one hour long introduction of the program and a brief mingling session which serves as an ice-breaker. Then there is an hour dedicated to contracting the program, between the facilitators and the participants. After lunch there is an hour’s presentation of leadership in Statoil by someone who works within corporate management. Furthermore, “the Statoil book” is given a run through, the book (a small paperback consisting of 65 pages) covers how Statoil leads and conducts their business. When they start up again, they are assigned to their “small working group”, which consists of 4-5 members. They alternate between working in small working groups and plenum sessions. In the small working groups, they are divided according to parameters which the facilitators find unite them. For example, one group consisted of members dealing with offshore themes and another with internationally related themes. This session revolves around group contracting within their small working group. Then they are given their result of the Jung Type Indicator (JTI), which they completed before the program started. They discuss their results within the small working group after an introduction in plenum. This session lasts for two hours and 30 minutes. After a break, they are given a lecture on the CEO’s perspective which lasts for one hour and 30 minutes before there is dinner at 2000.

The second day, starts with a plenum lecture on communication and feedback. After a break, they start with the first simulation, where professional actors are hired to bring authenticity to the simulation - the session lasts until lunch. After lunch, two more simulations follow, until a break. The day ends with peer feedback notes, before dinner at 2000.

The last day starts with an external firm, which gives a lecture on communication and body language. After a lunch, they continue by working in the small working groups with peer feedback in light of the lecture given at the beginning of the day. They continue by revisiting their prework leadership challenges in view of what has been taught and learnt during these three days. In the afternoon, the interim assignment is explained, which has to be completed within a month, since session two then starts up. Then follows a summarization of these days and they are given an evaluation form to complete.
The second session, day 1 starts with a welcome in plenum. They then start in the small working groups with an informal dialog refreshing the previous session and initiating the exercise “Role analysis” which lasts for two hours until lunch. After lunch, one of the facilitators gives an hour long lecture on coaching. After a break, they start with a two hour long training session in coaching. They end the day with 30 minutes of summarizing.

Day 2 starts with reflections of day 1. Then there is a lecture given by an internal HR colleague, on Statoil leadership. The lecture continues with a discussion and group work, which lasts for two hours. After a break, there is a presentation by one of the facilitators on Statoil’s assessment interview, continued by group work. After lunch, they move outside and perform three activities until the afternoon. They finish the day with an hours lecture on “Transition to becoming a leader” by a Statoil leader.

The last day, starts with reflections of the previous day. They then join their small working group and start with the exercise “Reflective team”, which lasts until noon. Then they are given 15 minutes to write their “Development plan”. After lunch, they continue the exercise “Reflective team”. They finish writing on their “Development plan”, before ending the day with evaluation and closure.
3 Theory

The overriding question when it comes to any company, whether public or privately held, is how to coordinate an organization and to give this organization direction and momentum towards the goals that at any given time reign.

In today’s organizational climate one can see governance and leadership as two parts which make up the organization’s whole. The two may be seen as the driving forces when it comes to the organization moving and pushing to reach its goals. It’s important to state that both concepts have to be reviewed in relation to each other, one cannot exist without the other. At the same time, it varies to which degree they are explanatory variables when it comes to direction. On the one hand, governance may be more called for when it comes to corporate sustainability responsibility (CSR), on the other hand leadership may be of more importance when it comes to change management and mergers. The pendulum swings in relation to the demands of the organization, shifting from more governance and less leadership, to more leadership and less governance.

3.1 When does Governance Stop and Leadership Begin?

There is an ongoing discussion within the organizational field when it comes to the operational definition of the following terms: leadership and governance. I will try to sum up what is considered to be the main distinctions. Leadership is usually refrained to deal with leader behavior directed at subordinates. The term governance may be considered a fusion of both leadership and administration. Thus, in order to differentiate between the two; leadership and governance, the question that should be asked is - which functions does the leader execute? Moreover, one could say that the distinction between the two is that leadership is more person oriented, whilst governance – is more system oriented.

Røvik (2007) gives a more in depth operational of the two, for him governance is “a centralized, directive where influence is executed indirectly, amongst formal structures and formalized procedures and routines”. Leadership as a measure for coordinating behavior is defined as a ”decentralized, direct and often dialogue-based influence primarily performed in the relation between leader and employee” (p. 146). In other words, leadership is the means a leader uses in order to influence others, or to create results through others. The leader uses him or herself in order to exert influence, for example through social relations, values and
norms, or by appearing as a role model for his or her employees. Using Røvik’s definition with regards to the initially asked question: how to coordinate an organization and give this organization direction and momentum towards the goals that at any given time reign – could be answered through developing a program where it’s design and content incorporates both an organizations way of “doing governance and doing leadership”. This in order to secure that one’s employees are on the same page as the organization, with regards to governance and leadership.

On the one hand, regardless of the organizations size influence through a system needs a form of standardization, working independently of persons. Governance through systems gives stability across time and space, which is also often the purpose with governance: to exert influence independently of the persons and to be stable and predictable over time. On the other hand, influence from top executives always works through a person, in a relation, where authority and personal judgment forms the basic influence and where the relational conditions may have an impact on the effect of the influence. In modern organizations it is expected to a certain degree, that the leader is the presenter of change and development, rather than standardization and stability. In line with this, a leadership program is regarded as a valuable tool, taking care of the influence through a system – securing standardization and stability – as well as influence from the top executives – reaching out to all future leaders as to what one defines “to lead” to be –especially important in large organizations where personal contact is hindered due to geographical distance and time zones.

Having established leadership as person-oriented, where it’s the leader as a person – as one who acts to the best of his or her judgment; has become the main focus within leadership research as in the study of leadership behavior. It has been common to distinguish between two types of leadership behavior. Firstly, there is the behavior directly targeted at employees, which involves showing support, motivating and looking after their well-being – this is called the “showing of support behavior” (Bass, 1990). The other mode is “creating structure”, which involves defining one’s own role and also the roles of one’s employees, and to develop goals and communication forms within the organization, in other words a more indirect form of influence (Judge, Piccolo, Ilies, & Zedeck, 2004). The two modes of leadership behavior may also be looked upon as implicitly displaying leadership and governance. Where “showing of support” could be seen an expression of leadership and “creating structure” as an expression of governance.
The study of leadership has mostly focused on studying persons and the relation between them, there amongst the personality of the leader and typical patterns of behavior or types of leadership styles (Martinsen, 2005), employee characteristics and the relations between the leader and the employees, so called path-goal theory of leadership (House, 1996). Leadership behavior as a measure in recent research is not only defined as one person’s individual behavior, but also as an interactive phenomenon (Sørhaug, 2004). Moreover leadership is increasingly considered a tool for continuous change within organizations, where leadership as an influence often works through values and culture (Peters & Waterman, 1982). This signifies even more the personal and relational aspects of leadership. Leadership may therefore be executed directly as a relation through social influence and more indirectly through creating structures, values and ideology.

The empirical research regarding which consequences different types of leadership behaviour have on employees and organizational results, has also been concerned as to what may limit or enhance efficiency considering the different tools a leader may use. This points in the direction of the emphasis being placed on the role of the leader or leadership and it seems that any self-respecting organization of today does wisely in outlining their thoughts and interpretation of what “to lead” constitutes to them in order to validate themselves as a “serious” player on the global organization field.

3.2 Leadership and Governance as Tools
Due to the globalization, economical crisis and increased complexity with regards to relations of interaction, we may conclude that the need for governance, and the attention to possibilities regarding new ways of governing, have never been more in demand than today and will probably continue to remain so in the future. The relationship between organization and society, have been actualized through the term corporate social responsibility (CSR), which deals with an organization’s responsibility in relation to society. This relation may be taken care of through value based leadership, meaning leaders who practice CSR as a result of their own professional and ethical values. Here leaders are powerful symbols of the organization. The daily practices of the organization is, however, dependent upon the actions of the local leaders and the members of the organization. The governance of these, in line with the values of the organization is delegated to the HR – department. But the question becomes tricky when it today is discussed that the HR function is moved to a strategic level, in practice meaning that the HR function is moving towards more governance. What seems to
be taking place is HR’s prior functions as tasks revolving around testing and hiring of new employees, are now done in a new way, where tasks are structured and routinized. All processes dealing with the handling of employees are now in manuals, so the task of the HR personnel is to carry out the systems guidelines. This shift may lead to changing of conditions at lower levels of HR. Therefore it may be difficult to distinguish where the CEO’s value based leadership begins and where strategic HR comes into play with regards to the company’s CSR policy.

Leadership aims to persuade, renegotiate, being an advocate for the organizations ideology, creating consensus, being a conflict solver, being a ambassador etc. (Brooker, 2005). On lower levels of larger organizations, we may expect a lesser degree of direct governance as coordination is already being taken care of through systems of governance. At the same time, the leader as a person is very important at these levels because added value is created through continuous relations. This being said, it all boils down to how a leader develops roles and relations, and this again has bearing on how leadership and governance influences these levels. In other words, there is a direct cause and effect between how a leader develops his or her role and relations and the impact this has on the work environment. Luschčer & Lewis (2008) state that direct relations between the leader and the employees and the leader’s behaviour are of more importance at the operative level. The tools used at this level have therefore more to do with direct relations, like: communication, team work, participation and empowerment of employees. Bearing this in mind, it is reasonable to expect that leadership programs incorporate tools addressed to enhance the leader’s repertoire in order to deal with employee relations.

3.3 The Dynamics between Leadership and Governance.
Firstly, relations are by nature complicated and always changing, therefore cooperation is dependent on the development of good social relations on behalf of the parties involved. Social norms and trust is something that is developed between individuals and leaders use cooperation and communication as tools for influence and coordination. But, if the development of social norms and ethical values are insufficient in certain areas, for example in the case of affirmative action regarding women in Norwegian board rooms (2006) and rules regulating a company’s CSR, governance as an instrumental tool may take over and develop laws and rules regulating these kinds of areas.
A general tendency in modern knowledge based organizations is that mid-level managers who are given increased autonomy and authority for decision making – may see governance systems as a threat, where each new rule competes with the will and the possibilities for reaching independent decisions. Also, governance may be viewed as stealing time due to more administrative paper work. The two tools, governance and leadership could therefore create more pressure on the leader, instead of being seen as aids in execution of the leadership role. From another perspective, the two can work in conjunction in order to balance coordination and results within an organization. This breaks down to the following: that with the introduction of new systems of governance an equal focus has to be paid to leadership in order to uphold this balance. When it comes to how results are created, this may vary, but still the responsibility for results remains a leader’s task. A leader’s leadership task is to transform demands for results into values which give meaning and which may be communicated and used as guidelines within the unit the leader represents (Luscher & Lewis, 2008). Since results are often measured quantitatively, for example as economic results within a department, they are often insufficient as guidelines in the collective efforts to reach multi-faceted goals. Usually these kinds of results are proposed without a value based foundation. Leaders are therefore given a distinct challenge, since changes in governance forms and organizational structure demand continuous development of leadership competence and behavior to be adjusted to these changes. Given the state of affairs of organizations today, it therefore follows that the need for leadership development may increase proportionally with the development of new systems of governance.

3.4 Control and Productivity as Driving Forces
An important characteristic of governance as a tool is that it takes the form of standardization of behaviour, meaning regulating behavior for all actors. In organizational theory standardization is one of the most important tools for increasing the efficiency of organizational behaviour. The demand for increased control and transparency, has also to do with the exposés of corruption and unethical behavior amongst leaders. Therefore ethics have been given more attention in recent years. For the private sector this means increased demands when it comes to transparency and reporting in areas concerning the environment and CSR.
Some of the new tools of governance which are enforced in order to increase efficiency, may actually lead to expansion of the leader’s discretion. An example would be the annual appraisal interview where the leader rates the employee on different tasks and areas. It follows that if increased performance management actually means less direct governance over behaviour, this implies that increased demands for leaders at lower levels will be made with regards to leadership. Moreover, this also means that greater attention to training and development of leaders at lower levels will be something that needs to be addressed in order to maintain the organization’s desired direction and values. Increased demands for productivity can therefore only to a certain degree be satisfied by better systems of governance. In knowledge based organizations production benefits are derived at the operative level, where the professional competence is located (Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006). This may lead to increased decentralization and more flexibility which again can lead to a need for leadership training at these levels in order make sure that all levels are pulling in the same direction.

3.5 Innovation and Leadership Competence

Statoil falls into this category, since it is a company that competes globally and where a highly specialized work force is competing across borders for the next big oil reservoir. In a large oil company as Statoil, continuous need for innovation is an important driving force (Drucker, 1985). Innovation in this context includes both technology based methods of extraction, new products and services, new customers and markets and last but not least, new forms of organizing (ibid.). In the modern economical era, with globalization, the information revolution and stronger competition globally, the demand for all types of innovation is growing. Innovation by its very nature, demands the absence of standards, stimulates new thinking, change, new combinations and the introduction of risk. The relation between innovation and leadership is probably most clear in enterprises and industries which have to be at the forefront of their specific field, like technological high competence trades.

Research shows that in order for innovation to be successful, structured processes and active governance of organizational processes are called for (Froehle, Froehle, Roth, Chase, & Voss, 2000). Since it is fair to say that most of the economic growth is based on specialized competence at the operative levels, the leaders may lack the necessary competence
themselves in order to evaluate their fellow employee’s projects. Thus, leaders must lead in a
different way. This calls for the need for relational oriented leadership. In these environments
the leader’s role is more of an organizer for the employees, in practice being an inspirer, a
visionary and a builder of relations which influences through values. A highly specialized
work force may demand less central governance regarding the execution of their tasks, but
there is nothing that points in the direction of them being in lesser need for social support,
feedback and good social relations (Kuvaas, 2008). One may be inclined, due to the above
reasoning; to believe that enterprises high on specialist competence in general, means less
governance and requires more leadership.

3.6 Leadership and Governance
Selznick (1957) also gives a description of governance and leadership. Governance is about
making people follow rules and doing things right. Governance functions by other means
through correcting deviation. As opposed to this, leadership is about creating values and
upholding rules. Leadership is about making people do the right things. The essential
function for leadership is therefore not making people follow rules, but the handling of
exceptions. In other words, leadership sets the rules and frames when established rules and
frames are no longer enough or do not exist (Sørhaug, 2004). As Sørhaug (2004) eloquently
puts it, it is not possible to lead organizations without governing them. Without governance
there is simply nothing to lead. Governance without leadership does not know where it is
going, and leadership without governance does not get anywhere. This illustrates how
intertwined the two concepts are. According to Sørhaug (2004) one may be in danger of
doing things correct, rather than to do the correct things. This especially holds true when the
correct things are new, unfamiliar and maybe controversial. Leadership must develop a sort
of doubleness by managing both shorter and longer time perspectives and also take both
micro and macro perspectives into account. Sørhaug (2004) sums it up metaphorically;
leadership without governance is blind, but governance without leadership is empty. He
claims that one-sidedness regarding the two concepts and also practice, leads us to losing our
grip on the very nature of organizing – namely order and direction. The consequence may be
that organizations may find themselves in a situation of having order without direction or
direction without order. But leadership is the saviour, since its definition is being a personal
guarantor for the organization’s order and direction. It therefore follows that organizations
find themselves in an unpleasant state, on the one hand being in fear of being lost for
leadership and on the other hand, being fearful of being paralyzed by governance. The two,
governance and leadership; have to balance each other. Therefore, even if governance
becomes more important within organizations, this only makes leadership at the operative
level more crucial. In other words, the more one fills up an organization with new ways of
governing, one also has to, fill up on leadership. Overload of one over the other, will in the
long run not keep the organization afloat. One of the means for a large organization to
strengthen leadership is through leadership programs. Leadership programs have, however,
also the double task of structure and govern the future leaders according to the goals of the
organization and teach them leadership and leadership development.

3.7 The Leadership Mandate
Since leadership is a guarantor for the organization’s order and direction, this implies that the
function rests on a mandate. A mandate consists of the following; namely an assignment and
authorization. Both describe and limit responsibility for a given task area and assign authority
to fulfill the responsibility. Leadership, by its very nature, finds itself in situations where real
and divided responsibility amounts to more than its given authority (Wildavsky, 1984, in
For example one could argue that external and internal complexity adds pressure to
leadership functions. Complexity has a general tendency to increase unpredictability and
make it harder to develop robust mandates. According to cybernetic regulation theory: it is an
orderliness that a system must embody enough variation to handle variation (Ashby, 1956, in
Sørhaug 2004). This means that the leadership role needs to be developed accordingly.
Ideally the role has to be tailor-made in order to handle the known and unknown territory that
goes along with it. Also, since one does not know what lies ahead, leaders and employees
must together take chances in the development of new practices and tools which are aimed at
realizing the organizations values, under changing and unpredictable circumstances.

3.8 Identifying Leadership
According to Sørhaug (1996) leadership contains a component of management which cannot
be reduced to governance, and thus cannot be formalized. This component is deeply and
unavoidably personal. To carry responsibility and gain trust is about carrying the
consequences, independently of what oneself would have meant, wanted or done. All
members of an organization are carriers of doubleness. They are both a person and an
organizational position (or more) which embodies the mandate they have been given. Moreover, for leaders this doubleness can become utterly intimate and an interwoven process of identification (Sørhaug, 1996). Leaders are by definition of their role, entitled to give their position a personal design. They have to embrace themselves as leaders. Identification between person and position is tight and sticky. Leaders do not have the possibility to distance themselves from their position and say that they are just acting a role. Sørhaug (1996, 2004) uses a religious vocabulary to describe this process. Leaders embody the organization and its values. They are literally ”values made flesh”. The leader’s decisions melts both position and person together, and leaders personify organizing as an institution. Both the representative and the performative collide. There becomes an identity between “is” and “does”. The leaders no longer own themselves. They now belong to something “higher” and they somehow become this “higher’s” property. Thus, leaders; by embodying the leader position have to become both something more than themselves, but also something less than themselves. (Sørhaug, 1996). Leadership programs could be seen to have a role in this transformation and creation of leaders embodying the values of the organization.

3.9 The Question of Control
Complete control of execution of tasks are impossible and the more complex the tasks are, the more impossible is the use of direct control forms (Clegg et al., 2006). By nature, control of execution has to be more simplistic than the actual execution itself. This reasoning validates to a degree the use of indirect control forms by an organization and one example can be the use of leadership programs in order to make sure that all leaders are given the same training in how to execute their role. Sørhaug (2004) argues that effective organizing has to be a balance between control and trust. Organizing develops effective systems of governance, combined with enough room for leadership and participation, so that they may adapt to environments experiencing moderate change. So if a leadership program is a form of indirect control of the training of future leaders, this system should contain equal amounts of leadership training and training in systems of governance, in order to be equipped for moderate change.

3.10 The Question at Hand
There are three different ways in which one could imagine leadership programs have an effect on their participants: they could either resist, reinforce or rewrite the course content.
The capacity of the leaders to reflect and evaluate the program’s content in relation to their work life, means that one could hope they develop a subjective sense of who they are as a leader, also the constraints and opportunities made available by the role and the contradictions of these. Moreover, it is in the sense-making activities where leaders and employees continually renegotiate meanings and goals through practical actions, that the meaning of work and the identity of the leader is constructed. Therefore it is possible to view leadership programs from a consensus perspective, as a possibility for self-development and the learning of different tools necessary for the leader role or alternatively from a conflict approach, as an expression of a new way of executing control over future leaders, by the top management.

This model serves as an illustration of the components in this master thesis. On the one hand, is the employer; Statoil which has developed a leadership training program for its future leaders. On the other hand, is the program participants; the future leaders of Statoil, who are enrolled in the leadership training program. The system and the actors meet in the intersection; the program, which is designed to develop the participant’s leadership skills. The program serves as a “meeting place” where the system conveys its message regarding what it holds to be true for a future leader within its company. The actor meets the system’s idea of what a future leader within this organization entails and is represented with different tools designed to enhance and develop their leadership skills.
It’s my objective to try and highlight this perspective through a sociological lens. This perspective serves as a starting point in order to describe my research question at hand, namely: How does Statoil equip their leaders for the future through the leadership program, Become a Leader (BaL) - Level 3?
4 Analysis

4.1 About the program: Become a Leader - level 3

4.1.1 Background

All eight informants shared some commonalities. They were all married and the majority had two children, whilst “the residuals”, two to be exact; had three. Five of them were graduate engineers, whilst two were business graduates and one had a master’s degree in social sciences. All of the graduate engineers had attended the same major Norwegian University for their academic training. With regards to age, there were two groups, one group consisted of five informants within the age category: 40-45 (“older leaders”), whilst the other group of three, were within the age bracket: 30-35 (“younger leaders”).

Nearly all the informants said that their choice of education was a conscious decision. All in all, what the commonalities tells us is that the demographic lay out does not vary much within the segment future Statoil leaders, with regards to education and personal status. It is fair to assess them as a fairly homogeneous group.

To what degree was Statoil as an employer a goal in itself? Did their choice of employer seem to be a conscious decision or was it left to chance? Statoil was a conscious decision for nearly all of them, where the following parameters were mentioned as positive as to why Statoil was a preferred employer: opportunities within the organization due to its size, and also a very good choice for an engineer wanting to work offshore. Especially, Statoil’s size and the numerous opportunities within the organization was something which was held in high esteem by the informants. Dina said Statoil was not a goal in itself, but pointed out that within the region of Stavanger; Statoil was seen as a company in a class of its own. The driving force for choosing Statoil was finding a strong professional environment where the co-workers had the same formal training. As Dina put it: “the internal job market is so big compared to what it is externally, if you want to live in Stavanger”.

4.1.2 Motivation for leadership

When it came to leader positions, the picture was more varied. Four of the informants did not want a leader position, whilst only one was clear as to wanting such a position. The
remaining three gave ambiguous answers as to taking on a leader position. Starting with the latter, Ola stated that such a position was not something he really wanted, but then he saw a position with a job description that was interesting, which happened to be a leader position. Dina on the other hand, stated that wanting such a position was something of a double-edged sword. When she first started it was very important for her to work solely with the professional part, meaning understanding the trade etc. Within her department, human resource responsibility was structurally linked to where one was within the organizational chart. She herself did not have formal human resource responsibility whilst attending BaL 3, but four persons did report to her. Thus, she felt the need to incorporate the dimension of leadership into her knowledge base. This has led to her wanting the HR aspect of the job more, but she has been very reserved in pursuing tasks where the human resource responsibility gets too big and where she is left with no professional tasks.

Per gave a different description as to why he had taken on a leader position. When he started in Statoil that was not a goal in itself, but with his previous employer he had gained both formal and informal leadership experience. He had also participated in a leadership course. This experience made him not dismiss the idea of taking on a leader role, because he did find the role exciting. He felt that he knew the role. When asked to apply for a job and so did, he felt he had already in principle accepted becoming a leader.

The one informant who clearly stated that taking on a leader position was a goal in itself, was Ulrik. He had always thought that at some point he wanted to take on such a role. As a person, he said, he liked to be involved in what happened. For him it was only natural, given that one spent so much time at work to be a part of the action, so to speak. Thus, it seemed logical to take on such a position. Also the fact that he liked working with people and enabling them to perform to the best of their ability, played a role. He therefore applied for such a position, motivated by a previous course in Statoil where one had to figure out whether or not one wanted to join a professional or a leadership pipeline. This course had given him time to consider which career pipeline he wanted to participate in.

The remaining four had not wanted to take on a leader position. The two youngest informants, Unni and Yngve said they did not want a leadership position when they started in the organization. Yngve recounted that he had never expressed any desire for a leader position, least of all in any development discussion. Heidi also stated that she did not have a yearning towards becoming a leader; she had worked with things that interested her and therefore believed that interesting tasks were a bigger driving force than leadership.
Laila had a different take on why she did not want to be a leader. She held a leadership position with her previous employer for several years, and was in Statoil looking forward to working professionally again within a large unit sharing the same formal training. In her own words she felt she had “been there, done that” when it came to holding a leader position. She had held nice titles, so that was no longer attractive.

In their accounts I do not see a parallel running from choice of education to wanting a leader position. There is only one informant, Ulrik, who expresses such a linkage. Ulrik is the only informant who has a different academic education than the other course participants, namely the social sciences and expresses clearly that he likes working with people as his sole job focus. For the rest it was more or less a natural development. As for the three informants, who give interpretive answers, Ola, Dina and Per; I would argue the case that their choice of a leadership position has presented itself as interesting in spite of their education and not due to their education.

4.1.3 Selection process

All informants were aware of why they were selected for the training program and also who were more or less responsible. Their answers as to why they were chosen range from performance, ability, visibility in the process, experience and caring nature. All see their own leader as the main contributor as to why they were chosen, but also lateral managers and colleagues were mentioned as having contributed. In their answers as to being selected, the informants who in the first place did not want a leader position are the ones who give the most interesting answers to the process of being selected. Their answers revealed how they view the process surrounding the selection for the course.

Yngve, recounted that he had gained insight into the selection processes which took place behind closed doors. Apparently there was a list of possible future leader candidates. After being selected he had seen his name on such a list. In his case, the leader position was advertised for a long period of time without any applicants. Finally, the leaders contacted candidates individually, probably based on the list. He thought that the reason for him being on the list might be that he signaled that he wanted new challenges.

Laila, the informant with more than a decade of leadership experience, prior to starting to work for Statoil, verified Yngve’s reflections. She said it was no secret that it had been challenging to get professionals to become line managers within Statoil. The first line leader
position was not held in high esteem amongst the professionals. As she came to know the company, people were not exactly queuing up to become line leaders, and this was especially true for people with heavy professional backgrounds who wanted to stay within their professional field.

4.1.4 Statoil’s leadership training

Only, one informant, Per had a prior course which focused on leadership. Ulrik had taken a course which dealt with leadership themes, but he did not view it as a leadership course. He saw his education as leadership oriented, since it involved a fair degree of organizational psychology, leadership and “soft subjects”. Unni had, after completing BaL 3, taken a new leadership course by Statoil. When asked how the last one compared to BaL 3, she emphasized that BaL 3 was much better, meaning more exercises and more professional in terms of leadership.

When it came to having taken the pre-required courses BaL 1 and 2, most of the informants, had done so prior to BaL 3. Laila, on the other hand, took them after completing BaL 3. None of them elaborated on the courses, but Laila made a point that she considered herself very fortunate being given the courses so early in her leader position. When attending BaL 3, she spoke to leaders who had been leaders for several years who said that “this is something we should have had years ago”. She therefore felt fortunate as she had only been on the nomination list for a little more than a year.

Only two of the informants, Dina and Yngve had actively chosen the course themselves and only two others were appointed, Ola and Unni. The remaining four said they were nominated, but that they would actively have chosen the course themselves if they had not been nominated. Laila gave a good idea as to why BaL 3 was held in so high esteem. She viewed it as important, since there are several demands and expectations on being a leader. She referred to the Statoil book to emphasize the point she wanted to make, that being a Statoil leader was demanding especially if one wanted to execute the role properly according to the Statoil standards. Thus, she wanted to learn about leadership so that she could try to do what was expected of her in the leader role. Moreover, she felt that she grew into the role the right way, in accordance with the company’s expectations.

Dina also stated that the course was sought after, thus nomination was something she actively had pursued. There was a long waiting list in order to attend BaL 3, implying the necessity
and quality of the course. To Dina her motivation for wanting to attend BaL 3 was to learn more about leadership. The same was the case for Yngve, who said that for him to take on a leader role equaled learning about leadership since he had no knowledge of this field.

As for Ola and Unni who were appointed, Ola knew that course attendance was mandatory at some point when becoming a leader. Unni was aware of the course and was appointed and selected right after taking on a leader position. Upon attendance she learnt that some had waited for many years in order to participate. When probing her about attending the course so quickly after becoming a leader, she said it was a good thing, but at the same time acknowledging that the course content was not easy to master. She elaborated by saying that the other participants were much older than her, and that they therefore exhibited a different kind of security and confidence in the leader role. She was uncomfortable in the course setting, but afterwards she was able to benefit from those experiences.

All of the informants were aware of what BaL 3 represented prior to course attendance, namely developing as a leader. To me this is a testimony to the clarity and marketing of what the course signifies within the company, and therefore an indirect acknowledgement to the unit who has developed the course. It seems to have a very good reputation which is being marketed by word of mouth; literally. Due to beneficiary experiences, former course participants make a point of wanting their future leaders to undergo BaL 3. It’s fair to argue that all of them understand that the course is sought after and not easy to get into. It’s anticipated and valued.

When asked why they think Statoil wants their future leaders to take BaL 3, their unanimous answer was in order to become better leaders. Laila elaborated that within her unit, it was not a question of attending or not attending the course. This is due to the fact, that the leaders within her unit saw it as crucial that new leaders were given a good foundation as to what it meant to be a leader in order to execute good leadership. It had therefore become the norm within her unit, to nominate future leaders to BaL 3. The real question was, when was there a place available for the participant to attend.

When, I asked what they thought of the course being purely a duty orchestrated by Statoil, this question baffled them, due to its direct nature. It sort of threw them off, and by their reaction they seemed somewhat disappointed in me for even asking such a question about their employer. Just their mere reaction spoke volumes as to their loyalty and the high esteem in which they held their employer. It nearly felt as if I said something bad about their parents.
Nevertheless, they did answer. Half of the course participants were bewildered by the question. They all expressed true disappointment towards Statoil if this was the intention of BaL 3. None of them, however, felt that this statement bore any truth. Ulrik saw it as a fantastic offer on behalf of the company, since it gave them as individuals a real opportunity to learn about themselves with regards to leadership. Unni adhered by stating that she did not think one is forced to participate, but saw it rather as a unique possibility when being a leader. To her it was one of the benefits of becoming a leader, that one was given such an opportunity.

4.1.5 Leadership training as recognition

When asked whether they felt that course nomination signified a confirmation by Statoil of their worth for the company, they agreed with the statement that by being nominated, Statoil validated them. In other words, they saw the BaL 3 selection as a recognition by Statoil believing in them. Per said it rather eloquently; ”Statoil wants to develop the best possible leaders which can move on within the Statoil system and develop a good culture”. He felt noticed and recognized in terms of being given the possibility to develop himself. Laila also adhered to the recognition factor and made her point by addressing the cost of participation and the time being given off work. Phrased differently Statoil gave both time and economical resources with regards to BaL 3, and as she saw it, it was because Statoil believed in leadership training. Unni viewed her BaL 3 nomination as recognition, especially upon learning that the other participants had waited a long time in order to attend the course. For her this translated into a motivational factor. Laila saw it in light of the pre-selection process. She perceived the thorough process as a recognition of Statoil wanting to invest in one. Thus, they felt honoured in getting nominated.

Did the course nomination influence their motivation for a further career in Statoil? Most of them answered positively. Dina said it influenced her motivation in a positive way. Per also agreed, but added that being a leader was not a goal in itself, but rather an exciting challenge. To Ulrik it meant that Statoil showed that they believed in you by either giving a pay rise or increased responsibility, or a type of development course. It was all part of building a perception of Statoil as a good company to work for. It translated as a company that took you seriously and wished to invest in you. It boils down to a win - win situation for both you as an individual and for Statoil. Laila said BaL 3 had not directly influenced her with regards to a
further career in Statoil, but it had provided her with more security in her leader role. By security she referred to gaining an understanding of what is expected of her in terms of leading. Moreover, that she could evaluate her own performance with regards to Statoil’s expectations.

All of them took the initiative to have the pre-conversation, since it was part of the mandatory pre-course task. When asked about whether the pre-conversation increased their motivation, interestingly enough it only did so for the two youngest participants, Yngve and Unni. Both of them said that their leaders had recently participated in BaL 3 and were good at following up and being motivational. Unni saw it as a cause and effect, due to her leader’s engagement, she was extra motivated to participate. Yngve saw his leader as being aware of the importance of developing people and thus setting aside time for this. His leader had also taken BaL 3 and was therefore very clear on it being a good course which one benefitted from and yielded good results.

I asked if they still held a leader position, and if so, could BaL 3 be said to have had an impact. Everyone still held a leader position, even the ones who did not want such a position in the first place. What was even more interesting was that some of them gave praise to BaL 3 for playing a role in continuing their motivation to hold such a position, either as having an indirect effect or as a direct contributing factor.

Unni mentioned that BaL 3 made her more conscious of herself, leading her to the notion that she could work more on understanding herself. She stressed the importance of getting to know one’s strong and weak sides, and that these insights bettered one’s performance as a leader.

Ulrik confirmed BaL 3’s concept of gaining insight in oneself. By understanding one’s weak and strong sides as both a leader and a person, you were able to reflect on which qualities you have. The strong sides you possessed as a leader could be further strengthened and the weak sides could be improved. He thought that these types of courses were really important in order to grow into the leader role and also in discovering what one enjoyed doing, how one dealt with meeting different types of people and challenges which arose in the leader role. In his everyday work, he felt that having mentally reflected upon holding such a position, gave him a form of security. The importance of the recognition factor was that there were others who had met a lot of the same challenges and one therefore felt there no longer was something wrong with oneself.
Per was the one who was most clear on acknowledging BaL 3 for having a direct effect on him holding his new leader position. It was the assurance of what one should be aware of as a leader, and the confirmation of certain things, that consciously made him use the BaL 3 experience to take on and navigate his new leader role in a different direction. He mentioned the importance of refreshing typical course elements, since one literally walks into a course with a different consciousness when having experience as a leader. He enlightened his statement by recounting that this was not the case when he attended his first course. He lacked the experience and therefore did not understand what he was supposed to do with the course content. Thus, in his case it was vital to have hands on experience in order to transfer the course content to everyday leadership work.

Dina regarded the course as important, since it set aside time to deal solely with leadership. One felt very privileged when one was able to take time off work to go away for six days to concentrate only on leadership and oneself. So, indirectly, she had come to understand more of who she was and what’s important for her and thus, BaL 3 had an indirect effect.

The informants were a fairly homogenous group who wanted to work for Statoil. Their choice of education had been a conscious decision. However, when discussing the motivation for leadership, I do not find a linkage between education and wanting to become a leader. It is a position which happened in spite of their academic choice and not due to.

Although, one of the participants wanted a leadership position, this participant has not displayed any more eagerness when it comes to the course content compared to the others. So my hypothesis, that if one wanted a leadership position when starting in Statoil would transpire in more participant involvement, falls through. They all, whether or not wanting the position, show the same degree of eagerness and gained valuable knowledge from attending BaL 3.

They all identify why they were selected for BaL 3 and by whom they were selected. I initially wondered if the course was self-elected and if so, would this manifest itself in more engagement regarding BaL 3. The majority were selected, and had they not been, they said they would have actively chosen the course. Their engagement regarding BaL 3 is evident. What BaL 3 attendance entailed, is of no mystery, they all knew what awaited them. They also had the same understanding of why Statoil wanted their future leaders to participate in BaL 3; it was in order to become better leaders. No one felt that the course was a duty orchestrated by Statoil. The participants saw the leadership training as recognition and
validation of them as future leaders. So much so, that that they all answered positively to BaL 3 playing a part in furthering their careers. When it comes to the pre-conversation, they remembered it and also that they themselves took the initiative. However, the pre-conversation only increased the motivation for the two youngest leaders. This is the only time were the age category “younger leaders” yields a difference. Maybe, the pre-conversation increased their motivation due to their young age and lack of experience. When asked whether they still held a leader position, all of them did, also the ones who did not want a leader position in the first place! Moreover, they all said that BaL 3 has played a direct or indirect role as to them holding leader positions.

BaL 3, as a leadership program, can be viewed as a governance entity by the system, Statoil. Røvik’s (2007) operationalization of governance as “a centralized, directive where influence is executed indirectly, amongst formal structures and formalized procedures and routines”, makes this a valid perspective. Furthermore, his operationalization of leadership as a measure for coordinating behavior, a “decentralized, direct and often dialogue based influence primarily performed in the relation between leader and employee” (p.146), is also relevant in describing their experience. From this definition of leadership one can view BaL 3, as a platform where the facilitators and the participants interact aiming at coordinating leadership behavior. By viewing BaL 3 with these terms, governance and leadership, one is given a good understanding of the program. The system, Statoil’s perspective for BaL 3, can be seen as standardizing a formal structure where procedures for making future leaders of tomorrow, is addressed. Through this lens, the program is a static entity. But, when the program is set into motion by the facilitators and the participants, when exercises and simulations are carried out, the program becomes a flexible entity, where leadership is direct and dialogue-based. It’s in this intersection, where the program starts, that the static system and its flexible actor’s meet. Governance and leadership takes part in the production of Statoil’s leadership philosophy and becomes something more, it secures the organization in taking care of training leaders of tomorrow. BaL 3, becomes the system’s carrier of how one view’s leadership.
Sørhaug (2004) states that leadership without governance is blind, but governance without leadership is empty. Sørhaug (2004) makes a point of the very nature of organizing - namely order and direction, that organizations may find themselves in a situation of having order without direction or direction without order. In relation to organization and leadership development, one can say that an organization not addressing leadership is empty and without direction and that an organization only addressing leadership through values and culture, without governance, is blind and without order.

### 4.1.6 Statoil’s leadership culture

BaL 3 is a course that translates Statoil’s leadership into practice. In other words, BaL 3 is literally hands – on, since it provides both lectures and training exercises, all dealing with Statoil’s way of doing leadership. BaL 3 represents the interface were the system’s notion of leadership meets the future executers of Statoil’s leadership culture. How is Statoil’s leadership philosophy understood and perceived by their future leaders?

I addressed Statoil’s leadership philosophy and the participants take on it. What were their thoughts on its development and did it correspond with their own views on leadership? Ola said humoristically that his own view on leadership matches Statoil’s fairly well, as to him being slightly brainwashed by the system. He commented that one now delivers along two axes when it comes to results. The first deals with delivering the product i.e. what is
measurable as output. The second axe is about how one delivers. For him this translated into not just reaching the goal, but it also took into account how one reached the goal. For him Statoil leadership was the result of two things, firstly good old Norwegian common sense and secondly how to behave as a person. As he saw it, if one accomplished these two one had done very well, resulting in a well-functioning organization. Yngve made the same remark as Ola, concerning deliverance along the two axes. He found the balance between focus on human issues on the one hand and hard core deliverance of results on the other, to be a good balance. He believed that other companies presented the same view, but Statoil had shown over a long period of time that they were actually good at taking care of their employees.

Per was more cautious, stating that it was a very clear philosophy. He elaborated that it was a very useful tool for knowing what was expected of one, but, also quite demanding in view of it being very comprehensive, clear cut and specific. Due to this, it may be perceived as insurmountable goals. There were so many elements, that one wondered if it was at all attainable. Juggling, seeing the bigger picture and at the same time keeping in mind all the important details, and feeling that if one made compromises due to a hectic workday, one failed to be a good leader. For Per, this was a challenge as to how leadership was formulated. For him it was important that there was clarity around the demands of being a leader, but this being said, that the company also followed up as to how one should interpret these demands. What does it mean to execute good leadership on a daily basis in Statoil’s terms? One was always faced with choices as a leader, and reality was not as clear cut as Statoil’s written leadership philosophy. To Per it was nearly impossible to succeed on a daily basis, based on what was written about Statoil’s leadership philosophy. One had to know what was important and what was not. Specifically, what were demands, guidelines and goals; translating these differences with regards how to execute the leadership role, was of paramount importance.

Ulrik agreed with Statoil’s leadership philosophy however, he also acknowledged that it set the bar very high for individuals. He believed that many leaders felt that they had to be superhumans in order to live up to Statoil’s expectations. At the same time he felt that many leaders felt that they fell short and were not able to live up to the expectations.

Heidi meant that Statoil by writing down its leadership philosophy, made it all the more serious. Putting in writing that leaders had to be dedicated about everything they do was a very high demand. Statoil at the same time did not want them to burnout. She made the same observation as Ulrik, hearing of leaders that felt the bar was set way too high; that the
demands upon the leaders had become very big shoes to fill. Some of them felt that they were not able to meet them, but nevertheless felt the pressure since they were written down as something one must meet. She herself viewed them as something one aspired to be, something one had in the back of one’s mind whilst making decisions, but acknowledged that by being written down one might feel a pressure to be superhuman. She had heard signals to this effect, and that some felt intimidated by them. However, she felt that this was how Statoil leaders should be. They should try to act in accordance with the demands.

Laila made the same comment as Heidi, Ulrik and Per, namely that the bar was set very high when it came to the demands of being a Statoil leader. It was good that one always had something to reach for, but it was a double-edged sword since one had to look out for those who pushed themselves beyond their capacity. Overall she found the demands to be satisfactory, but on a daily basis they could be challenging. She said that some of the expectations of being a leader were without a real mandate. By this she meant that Statoil dictated operating parameters with one hand, but at the same time removed part of their leader’s decision mandate with the other. At the end of the day, there was not much that one was allowed to decide. She contributed this to the establishing of so many control routines where several decisions were made by the HR department. This lead to frustrations as a leader, since one’s mandate did not really allow for reaching the expectations set for being a Statoil leader. She did however, understand the need for control routines within such a large company, but stressed that in order to really live up to the Statoil’s leader expectations, one should be given a higher degree of freedom when it came to decision making. Sometimes it was a bit blurred as to what one could actually decide as a leader, due to the fact that there was always someone else who had to be involved and had to approve one’s decision. There was always control on top of control.

Unni made the case that if Statoil did not have such a focus on leadership, it would be easier to be a solo player. Statoil gained by having a more governed form of leadership, the opposite would not be very potent. The organization had to have a degree of direction.

Statoil’s leadership philosophy is thus very clearly communicated within the company. All the participants understand what it means to lead the Statoil way. It is a philosophy which resonates with all of them, but half of them elaborate about the high demands which are set. They mention great concern about the written Statoil book, which leaves leaders feeling that
they either must be “superhumans” or fall short when it comes to meeting Statoil’s expectations as to what is means to be a Statoil leader.

There is a very interesting distinction between the two last answers, where Laila addresses that the governance aspect of being a Statoil leader may be heading in the wrong direction, against Unni who states that Statoil’s way of governing leadership gives the company direction. These two very different statements about governance in relation to leadership, opens for interpretations. It makes perfect sense for a company to standardize influence of future leaders through a system working independently of persons and across time and space. This fits with the term earlier introduced, governance; creating structure in the form of a system where influence works independently of persons and is stable and predictable over time. BaL 3 may be understood as a standardized system to influence Statoil’s future leaders as to how leadership should be done the Statoil way, across time; being a stable structure in training Statoil’s future leaders. This perspective is in line with how Unni views Bal 3, the program governs leadership in the right direction. A program such as BaL 3 secures the system’s need for standardization, stability and the influence from the CEO as to what one defines “to lead in Statoil terms”. It is still valid to raise the aforementioned concern of expectations set too high, especially being true of large companies, where the degree of discrepancy between the company’s leadership philosophy and the feeling of mastering one’s job should be down to non-existing. Again, the more discrepancy between actor and system – the more unsatisfactory “noise” will arise.

Sørhaug (2004) claims that one-sidedness regarding the two concepts governance and leadership, leads us to losing our grip on the very nature of organizing – namely order and direction. The consequence may be that organizations find themselves in a situation of having order without direction or direction without order. The two, governance and leadership; have to balance each other. Since leadership, is a guarantor for the organization’s order and direction, this implies that the function rests on a mandate. A mandate consists of the following: an assignment and authorization. Both describe and limit responsibility for a given task area and assign authority to fulfill the responsibility (Wildavsky, 1984, in Sørhaug, 1996, 2004). According to Laila when it comes to the leader role, governance has become the dominate concept and practice, at the expense of leadership. In other words, the role now has too much order and is given too little direction. The reality of the leader role is too much order in the form of control, and too little authorization to enforce the leader’s responsibility. As long as the two concepts within the role, are not perceived as balanced, it follows that the
leadership mandate is at high risk as being conceived as existing only on paper and may thus result in “noise” within Statoil. In modern knowledge based organizations middle level managers are given increased autonomy and authority, but at the same time are experiencing being overwhelmed by new guidelines that the system wants them to implement. They therefore experience being overloaded with administrative work and feel their workday consists of working more as an administrator than a leader. This tendency and experience is shared by many of the informants. They felt that in their everyday work there was no time left to lead, since most find themselves implementing new guidelines and filling out forms. They therefore felt that the title leader was misleading as to what their workday actually entailed, being mostly filled up with administrative tasks and reporting results.

4.1.7 Values – now and then

The prior values before the merger were: Professional, Truthful, Imaginative, Hands-on and Caring. The new values after the merger were: Courageous, Open, Hands-on and Caring. All of the informants found the values to be in accordance with their own normative system and they therefore considered them recognizable and transferable to everyday work. The reduction from the former five values to the new four did not really make any significant change, since the underlying meaning was still the same. That being said, two of the informants expressed that they missed the value termed “professional” which signified integrity.

Per elaborated on the values saying that he viewed them to be of vital importance in relation to how Statoil should run the company and its culture. Being clear on what was expected in terms of values, said something about what one was not willing to compromise on. This translated to everyday work, i.e. when working on a project. Here it was important that the leader signaled that values were the overriding guidelines and that one worked within their parameters. The values were what gave work direction. It was therefore important to have the values written down in the Statoil book, so that leaders and colleagues had the possibility to deliberate if they were working in accordance with these values. The values gave a reference point and were headliners to how Statoil wants their employees to perform, which in turn gave one security within the organization. Ulrik provided another perspective since he worked abroad. He was convinced that having the values as guidelines for Statoil leaders was very useful and good. When working in Norway he viewed them as “something that goes
with part of the territory” aka an organization. Now, being stationed abroad, he saw their importance in a new light and the challenges they posed when conducting business internationally. Statoil’s high business moral lead to frustration amongst the employees since results were measured along two axes, reaching results and how one reached them. It was the behavior measurement that lead to frustration and had been a challenge, since this line of thinking posed new questions which they were not accustomed to.

Per viewed the Statoil values to be of vital importance in relation to how Statoil should run the company and its culture. To him values are what gives work direction. Luscher & Lewis (2008) state that a leader's leadership task is to transform demands for results into values which give meaning and which may be communicated and used as guidelines within the unit the leader represents. Clarity as to what the Statoil values mean, seem to be given by the system and understood by the actors.

Ulrik, working abroad, experienced problems when Statoil’s values and guidelines interfered with how business is conducted abroad. He experienced a shift in how one viewed the values when working nationally versus internationally. The shift is going from seeing them as “something that goes with part of the territory” to the challenges they pose when conducting business internationally. Ulrik found himself in the midst of two different cultures. He wanted a forum for leaders where they could discuss topics of this nature freely, moreover, he would like to see such a post in BaL 3. According to cybernetic regulation theory: it is an orderliness that a system must embody enough variation to handle variation (Ashby, 1956, in Sørhaug, 2004). This means that the leadership role needs to be developed accordingly. Ideally it has to be tailor-made in order to handle the known and unknown territory that comes along with it. It may seem that the leadership program BaL 3, does not address enough leadership variation to handle the unknown, as in being a Norwegian working abroad and experiencing two different cultures clashing when it comes to values. Sørhaug (2004) argues that the essential function of leadership is not to make people follow rules, but to handle the exceptions. In other words, leadership sets the rules and frames when established rules and frames are no longer enough or do not exist. The aspect of being an international organization, where BaL 3 trains Statoil future leaders, seems not to take seriously the challenges when it comes to the program training international future leaders.
4.1.8  BaL 3 - its design

In this section I wanted to see how the design of BaL 3 worked for the informants and how the composition of participants was perceived with regards to the following parameters: the different units represented, the international participation aka ethnicity, gender and age.

When it came to the different unit’s representation at BaL 3, they all found this to be positive and fruitful. The differences contributed to broadening one’s horizon and it would not have been so easy opening up to fellow colleagues based on the course content. That being said, three of them also expressed negative views. Ola stated that he on arrival was a little taken aback by the composition of the group. His initial thought was that it was too “broad”, since it ranged from international to everything in between. He was a little surprised, because there were very few offshore leaders; it actually turned out to be only himself and one other. He would have liked to share his experience with more offshore leaders. He did not feel that he had much in common when discussing experiences with international course participants with a totally different educational background, as he would have with someone with the same professional background. However, this changed when they were divided into small working groups for the duration of the course. In these groups they were organized according to more or less the same type of work.

Dina experienced, however, that in her working group there seemed to be one informant who did not to want to be there. This was demanding, because she was unsure whether he was shy or uninterested. It proved especially demanding in sessions when they were paired together. She also saw that there were challenges in the small working group with international participants and contributed this to the language barrier and different cultural backgrounds.

Per commented on the same aspects. He saw the challenges as being caused by differences in academic background for the person in question, and that this could explain his disinterest. Nevertheless, he thought that the company could have had a better process initially by outlining the background and goal for BaL 3, in order for the participation to be based on own initiative and not mandatory company participation. To his way of thinking a better initial process would yield stronger motivation of the participants. That being said, the course facilitators did a good job in getting the participant in question “on board”.

The negative views expressed about the different unit’s representation had to do with dissimilarity. All the three participants mentioned above, expressed that similarity between
the course participants when it comes to professional and cultural background, work unit, language, and motivation resulted in better usage of the program.

Most of the participants expressed negative views about the international participation. Ulrik saw it as a precondition that the participants spoke the same language and that this in turn gave rise to a better understanding and people opening up more. Yngve addressed the difference in cultural background which he felt was more of a hindrance in this specific setting given the nature of the course. Heidi commented that it would have been more beneficiary for the international course delegates to participate in a course where there was more international participation.

The common denominator had to do with the language barrier. Although they all speak and write English in their everyday work, this is a more technical English. Given the nature of BaL 3’s course content which deals with self-development, this demands another vocabulary and phrasing that is unfamiliar, since English is their second language.

None of the informants had any problems with gender, quite the contrary and their unanimous reaction showed that gender was clearly not a problematic issue.

Since five of the informants were “older leaders” (40-45), and three of them were “younger leaders” (30-35), I wanted to learn whether the informants felt that “age and experience” played any role when addressing topics such as leadership and self-development. Only Unni who was “a young leader”, felt that she was very young and that this may have been a disadvantage. She would have preferred the course participants to be closer in age. Her answer, I interpret to relate more to lack of leadership experience than having to do with age.

I asked if they had any particular thoughts about the composition of participants and could they see any trace of the organization’s values and culture in the design of BaL 3. Ola interpreted my question to concern the small working groups in which they were placed. He said that it was clear to him that they were placed in reference to units dealing with the same topics in their daily work. Per, on the other hand understood my question and saw it as the goal for the course design, to have as diverse a composition as possible in order to represent the organization. Ulrik stated that he saw the course participants as employees on the same level, sitting down and discussing challenges they met. Furthermore, he said that he saw it as the organization wanting to get hold of new leaders and shape them to the degree one could shape them, and to give them useful ballast in their new role.
Heidi did not feel that the goal of the course correlated with the composition of participants. She thought that the reasoning was that “here is a program which shall be executed and we have x number of participants we need to get through.” Moreover, she stressed that she had the utmost respect for the persons who designed the course and maybe they were not able to take all considerations into account.

My research shows that the design of BaL 3 functioned satisfactory for the participants because of the organization of work in small working groups designed to reflect their everyday work unit. If this was not the case, the informants would have felt more of a discrepancy between themselves and the other leaders, which again may result in a more dissatisfying course experience. Whereas gender and age distribution are not seen as a problem, the representation of the different units and international participants are more problematic. Especially the latter poses problems due to the language barrier and differences in cultural background. Heidi raised a valid point when she asks what is the purpose of BaL 3, is it to develop future leaders self-insight and train them for different scenarios, or is there more to it; that one wants to shape them according to the organizations values and outspoken agenda? This can be the case with ethnicity, since Statoil in recent years stresses that it is a global company. It seems to me that this would be wisely debated against the question “what is the purpose of BaL 3?” and that the answer to this question should be clearly stated when starting the course, if one chooses ethnicity to remain part of BaL 3’s design.

4.1.9 Leadership training as a network effect

A more implicit aim for the course could be to create a network and a platform where future leaders could meet and interact when it came to topics dealing with questions and thoughts regarding the leader role. This was not an outspoken intention in the design of BaL 3 on behalf of the leadership unit, but could be viewed as an indirect positive consequence of BaL 3.

Over half of the informants knew participants previous to course attendance, and two of them actually worked within the same unit. Three of them did not know anybody. All the informants said unanimously that they got to know the others fairly well, especially in the small working groups. Unni elaborated that she was surprised as to how well one got to know
each other in such a short time. Laila contributed this to the degree of openness and honesty which was a pre-condition for the personal discussions within the small working group.

I wondered if they had had any post-contact with any of the other course participants. Here they were divided. Ola had not had any post-course contact, but mentioned that they were supposed to have a meeting, but that this was cancelled due to few being able to attend. He continued by emphasizing that for him it was more natural to have contact with his own leader-network. The same point was made by Laila, who added that within her leader-network they had all attended BaL 3. Per also mentioned that there was talk of meeting up post BaL 3, but that this did not happen due to the merger between Statoil and Hydro. He phrased it as “the structural follow-up as intended, did not happen”. The two youngest leaders, Unni and Yngve mentioned that they had not had any organized form of contact post BaL 3. Unni also confirmed the intent of meeting up post BaL 3, but that this did not happen, much to her dismay. When there had been contact, it had been more of a technical nature, but they were all cordial when and if they bumped into each other.

There are two things that stand out. The small working groups worked well in establishing a very good climate enabling the participants to open up, allowing for self-development. This created a good basis for networking between the participants. Some of them were disappointed that the intended follow-up did not take place. These informants were also the ones who did not have a good leader-network to turn to. On an overall level it is interesting that going to a course with this kind of theme and hardly knowing anyone, does not seem to have a negative effect in terms of it being a positive learning experience. This is probably due to the good climate the facilitators were able to establish within a fairly short time. Moreover, it implies a level of professionalism on behalf of the facilitators, which may be linked to the leadership unit being an internal unit within Statoil, implying a very good understanding of how the business works.

It was interesting to learn that BaL 3 had not had side effects in the form of networking amongst its participants, post course attendance. However, half of them mention the planned post BaL 3 “meeting up” which did not take place. The “post meeting” was encouraged by the facilitators on the last day of the last session, regarding the small working group. But, it was not a mandatory “meeting up” arranged by the system. It’s plausible that a hectic working day leaves little time for a leader to plan a not obligatory “meeting up”. If the
“meeting up” was a mandatory post activity, it is fair to assess that the course participants would have followed up.

4.1.10 Getting to know oneself

Did they learn something from BaL 3? There was a unanimous positive answer to this question. More than anything they all referred to getting to know oneself due to the feedback they received from the other course participants.

Ola commented that he had no problem receiving feedback from others. Most of the feedback was positive, but he felt that there was too little focus on the negative. During the course, one got to know oneself better, learning one’s strong and weak sides, especially focusing on one’s strong sides. He made the point that he was well aware of his strong sides and that these were reinforced through the course. What he wanted and also argued for, was a bit more negative feedback. “How can I change this? And what happens when I do that?”

For Dina the main result of the course was the combination of knowledge of how to lead by delegating, learning and hearing from the others and also gaining increased knowledge about oneself in the exercise “reflecting team”, which taught her that one’s true colours shine no matter what. Ulrik elaborated that one got to discuss similar kinds of challenges when meeting people in the same position. One established a platform which he found very useful.

Heidi made the point that although she had encountered this kind of material before, it was always nice to refresh one’s knowledge, since one learnt something every time. She enjoyed the group exercises and seeing which role one took in such a setting. Being able to observe what went on, was useful in order to learn about oneself.

Laila had a different take on the group exercises dealing with role playing, she did not get much out of them. She found them unnatural and therefore hard to actually learn from. She acknowledged that this might be due to her personality. She learned most from observing what took place. It was the actually physical performance that made her cringe. She made the point that it was better to practice here and make mistakes, then to do them in real life. Ola shared similar thoughts and feelings regarding group exercises. He expressed the same kind of resentment towards the exercises, but saw the bigger picture in that these kinds of “difficult situations” that they trained for, would arise sooner or later in everyday work life.
Laila and Unni found coaching to be a very useful tool, which they learnt the most from. The technique and methods had given them a new way of interacting with their colleagues.

The participants had all gained considerable knowledge and understanding about themselves and their leader role. They emphasized different parts of the program to be more useful than others, but the overall picture is clear, everyone had gained something useful for their everyday practice as leaders. An overall majority referred to the leadership part of BaL 3 as being the most valuable in terms of learning how to be a leader of tomorrow. It is fair to assess based on the participants answers, that the unit’s placement on leadership development in the form of different exercises and techniques, are what was seen as most useful by the participants in their everyday work.

I asked what they thought of the course retrospectively; had it been useful for them as leaders and if so, what had been especially useful. When looking back at BaL 3 in terms of recollection, their answers varied considerably ranging from the good quality of the course staff, the establishing of network, specific exercises, learning the Statoil way of doing leadership, learning about the Statoil values, transforming from colleague into leader, receiving feedback, learning about coaching as a tool and last but not least learning about oneself. Constructive critique was voiced by Heidi mentioning that the follow-up post BaL 3, would have been greatly appreciated. In hindsight Dina would have wanted more on how to give negative feedback. Ulrik expressed that learning about Statoil was not useful, since this was being addressed on a daily basis. For him it was much more fruitful to learn about oneself as a leader.

In terms of what had been useful, they all addressed the aspect of getting to know oneself. They used phrases as reinforcing a process which had already started, establishing a platform and getting basic training which one can draw on later. This also included the role play exercises and finally the positive feedback from the other course participants.

What was deemed especially useful, was the feedback given on the last day in the last exercise; the reflecting team. Coaching also proved to be a very useful tool in everyday work life.

It is a fair assessment to state that the course proved to be valuable in learning how to do leadership. They all stated specifics when it came to remembering course material and they mentioned learning about oneself as of pivotal importance. Learning how to do leadership seemed to be intrinsically linked to learning about oneself. What had proven to be most...
valuable in terms of the course exercises was the tool coaching, which gets the most recognition. The exercise reflective team made a good runner up.

When it came to constructive critique of BaL 3, the participants were repeating what the other participants have already mentioned. It revolved around the lack of a “follow-up” post BaL 3, which did not take place, and learning how to give negative feedback. They mentioned that BaL 3’s sole focus should be on leadership and not how Statoil does governance and management, which they find to be addressed in the courses BaL 1 and 2.

Had BaL 3 had impact on them in their development as a leader and in their careers? BaL 3 had not had any impact on their careers, but they acknowledged that the program had played an important role in how they now executed their leader role. It had heightened their level of consciousness with regards to what it meant to be a leader. They mentioned coaching and the art of giving feedback as something they had used in their daily work. Laila said that the newly gained consciousness that one now represents Statoil, and was no longer a mere colleague, but a leader who at times represented decisions which one on a personal level did not agree with, was important. This refers to Sørhaug’s (1996, 2004) process of “values made flesh”. But the process is not complete, as Laila mentions there is still a distinction between being a Statoil leader and presenting decisions which one on a personal level does not agree with.

It is interesting to hear what the participants deem useful in hindsight; their answers may be summed up in getting to know oneself. They refer to the leadership part of the program as being most relevant and mention exercises and tools which have been pivotal for them, in order to develop into leaders of tomorrow. When the course has ended they find themselves back in a hectic work day with all this newly gained leadership training, where administrative paper work fills up their work day leaving too little time for putting into good use the newly gained leadership skills.

4.2 Leadership development

4.2.1 Inner

In this section of the analysis, I focus on the program’s leadership development, as in the exercises and tools which the participants are exposed to. The exercises and simulations are
where they are being trained on the development of leadership skills. The exercises vary from role playing different scenarios, to doing a 360 degree interview - the interim exercise and lastly learning and practicing the method of coaching. It was important for me to hear if they found the exercises to be worthwhile, since it dealt directly with their training as future Statoil leaders.

Another important part of the course, were tools which were meant to enhance self-development. There were two tools that were directly targeted at this, namely the Jung Type Indicator (JTI) and the reflecting team. The JTI questionnaire was sent out prior to the course and its results were handed out during the first session of the seminar. The results were then discussed within the small working group. I wanted to see what they gained from the JTI. Did they see it as a fruitful tool? Moreover, I wanted to hear how they found the exercise “reflective team”. Since this was the part of BaL 3 which was hands-on when it came to self-development, it was important for me to probe into their thoughts on the matter, to hear if they found the content useful.

I will start off with their training development as in the role playing exercises, then the 360 degree interview – the interim exercise and lastly coaching. From there on, I will move on to their self-development tools as in the JTI test and the reflective team.

4.2.2 Training / Simulation and Exercise

The simulations addressed scenarios which could arise when being a leader. The sessions involved the informant and a hired professional actor, playing the part of a co-worker with various problems. The simulation was called “the difficult conversation”. The majority of the informants were positive to the simulations and especially the youngest leaders would have wanted more of this. Ola remembered the simulation of “the difficult conversation” very well, and was quick to point out that these simulations made him feel uneasy, since he did not like role playing. Nevertheless, he saw that they served a purpose in starting reflections around difficult situations. Per referred to them as perhaps the most important leadership exercise. He saw them as the most demanding situations which may arise when being a leader. In this light, he found them very important and useful because they gave the opportunity to practice how to communicate. He felt that he could take a much more active role without the same fear as one otherwise would have experienced. In daily work one avoided these conversations, which were amongst the most difficult things one did as a
leader. Thus, Per saw these simulations as vital, learning how to handle the situations in the best manner both on behalf of the company, but also in accordance with oneself. Ulrik also saw the simulations as relevant and now tried to be more prepared before handling a difficult conversation. For him it was important to learn about the process of how to approach this kind of conversation. Every time he had attended this type of course, the facilitators were very clear as to how one should conduct this kind of conversation; however it was not always easy in everyday work. Yngve thought that it was very good that one had the possibility of doing this kind of role playing. He pointed out, however, that one learned more from these kind of situations when they arose in real life, but it was very useful having been through them and become aware of some of the techniques. For Ulrik the simulations were an essential part in this kind of course, and he would have liked more of them. Heidi agreed that it was important to train oneself for these kinds of conversations. She was also concerned with the employer role, because after all one was put in a position with a certain degree of responsibility. However, in these kinds of conversations one had to find out what was factual and not just draw easy conclusions in a hectic workday. This was of course uncomfortable and tough as a leader, but as part of the leader role one had to step into these kind of unpleasant situations. Unni remembered the simulation since she found herself in a rather hopeless situation and got really absorbed by it. She learned a lot from it, also by observing the other informants. It was useful training and a very good thing that the facilitators hired professional actors since this made the simulations authentic and professional.

The majority of the participants found the simulations to be important and useful. They mentioned that the simulations were useful in starting reflections around difficult conversations. Furthermore, they were given the opportunity to practice communication and learn how to conduct this kind of conversation. Moreover, it was useful to observe the other participants. A reason as to why the simulations worked so well for the course participants, probably had to do with their authenticity due to the hiring of professional actors. It is noteworthy that the youngest leaders would have wanted more simulations. This could perhaps be expected due to their lesser experience with these kind of situations as a leader.

### 4.2.3 Knowing oneself

The second part of the training for the future leader role involved an interim exercise which took place between the two seminars. The task was to interview four to six people about how
they were viewed as a leader and an individual. These people should be from either one’s own workplace, home or other arenas. When selecting interviewees, it was important that they knew one fairly well and that they would provide good and honest feedback regarding the expectations they had of one as a person. Half of the informants responded negatively when I questioned them about this exercise. Two were neutral and only two were positive. This exercise tops the list of “exercise with least impact”. Ola approved the exercise on the one hand, but on the other hand missed direct feedback. He adhered this to the readymade questions, which he found to be heavy and thought the exercise would have profited by simpler questions. Dina really liked the feedback she received due to their openness and the time they took in order to answer her questions. All in all, she did not find any of the program’s exercises very demanding on behalf of herself. The word of mouth regarding this kind of course before attendance was that the exercises were personally demanding and one felt turned inside out. Per compared the exercise to the pre-course conversation they had with their leaders before attending BaL 3. Due to this, he did not think that the exercise brought anything new to the table. Ulrik remembered the exercise and saw it as learning the importance of clarifying expectations. He acknowledged that when he entered his leader position he did not bother to clarify his colleague’s expectations. In hindsight he regretted that he did not clearly establish the level of expectations on both sides, from the get go. However, he aimed to do this the next time he got a new position. When doing this exercise in BaL 3, one became aware of the benefits. Laila remembered the exercise and thought it was okay, the challenge was, however, to get people to speak out. She did not feel that it gave her much, since she already had a rather good assumption of their expectations. However, there was value in getting one’s assumptions confirmed. Unni barely remembered the exercise. For her it was most useful interviewing someone who reported to her. So much so, that she had used this person actively as a sparring partner afterwards. This person’s feedback was most exciting since it was honest and concrete and came from somebody who was older than herself. She was brand new as a leader and the task forced her to put her head out which was both exciting and useful.

This is deemed “the exercise with the least impact” in BaL3. There is a clear distinction between those participants who viewed the exercise favourably and the majority who did not. A reason for this, might be that a positive outcome is dependent upon how well the interviews go, by that meaning getting people to speak out and when speaking, being able to give direct honest feedback.
4.2.4 Coaching

The second tool which was presented, was coaching. The participants were given a lecture on the theory and methodology behind coaching. They were then paired into groups of three, a triad; where one was assigned the task of coachee, the other coach and the third observer. The coachee was given the assignment of presenting a realistic issue that he or she wanted help in solving. All in all, they had two to three sessions in coaching. In contrast to the previous task, the interim exercise, this exercise was the one that was given unanimous praise from all informants. The tool of coaching surpassed the exercise reflective team.

Ola found it to be a good way of guiding people and a useable tool. In hindsight he recognized that his leaders must also have attended a course in coaching, due to the way they conversed with him. He had now and then used some of the thoughts behind coaching, but he acknowledged that he has used it too little. Dina had also not used coaching very much, but took from the exercise that when presented with a problem one always tended to jump to a conclusion rather than listening to and helping the coachee figure it out for himself. She and a colleague had an intention of coaching each other, but that fell through due to geographical distance. Per had used it to some degree, especially in terms of leadership. He had a leader group working for him which benefitted from coaching and he thus saw coaching as pivotal. Ulrik who was stationed in Europe, found it most useful in terms of those who were newly recruited. He tried to use coaching with his employees, but he found that in Europe the employees expected their boss to tell them what to do and that coaching therefore became a little unnatural. Due to his experience, he saw coaching as something which had to be worked on gradually. Hopefully one was able to plant a seed, where the effect would be shown through the course of time. Yngve had found coaching useful, but had not used it in a systematic way, as perhaps the coaching model aimed for. He used it more unconsciously, without referring to it as coaching; with those who worked for him. He made the remark that he was surprised that BaL 3 had not followed up coaching after the course. When I probed as to what he was referring to, he wondered why it was not used on a larger scale and more systematically towards newly-hired employees. On this notion he touched base with Ulrik and Per who had found coaching most useful when approaching newly-hired employees and new young leaders.

Heidi remembered some of the coaching which was addressed. She had been introduced to coaching in other arenas, so she had difficulty in specifically remembering it in the context of
BaL 3. She found coaching an important tool, especially in opening up for others possessing good ideas and solutions. To her this equaled self-insight. On these grounds she found coaching to be an important tool in a leadership course such as BaL 3. Laila also found coaching useful and would have wanted to learn more about it and for it to be a more extensive part of BaL 3. She found the methodology very interesting and also liked that they were given the possibility to exercise the coaching technique. This was the tool that she had used the most in daily problem-solving and appraisal interviews. She saw the value in coaching as a very useful tool if used in the right way. Her job description was to develop her employees and deliver results to the organization and in that regard she saw coaching as crucial. She made the point that sending people on courses was very well, but in the end what mattered was how one executed leadership on a daily basis. Unni also found coaching useful in that one should not draw hasty conclusions. The technique of coaching was something that she had also used in off work arenas when things got a bit difficult. She found coaching to be very usable and also what she remembered best from BaL 3. After learning about coaching she thought that everybody should be given this valuable tool, not just leaders.

Coaching is the number one tool, as it receives unanimous praise from all the course participants. Moreover, it is also the tool that is best implemented into their daily work. Their answers of usage vary, ranging from unconsciously to frequently. They had used coaching indirectly and directly, and one participant had also found coaching useful outside work. They found coaching to be important, useful, pivotal and crucial. The two youngest participants mentioned that the tool was so valuable that it should be taught to everybody in the organization. Ulrik, experienced that using coaching abroad implies cross-cultural challenges. The way of business is more top-down from leader to employee, more hierarchy versus the flat structure which characterizes the Scandinavian countries.

4.2.5 Tools

JTI was the first tool that they were presented with. All the informants were positive and remembered the test very well. Moreover, they used the terms; relevant, to the point, a very good test, recognizable results, interesting and finally some surprises from which they learnt more about themselves. Ola said the result was something he had expected and it did not come as a surprise, adding that an engineer’s brain was rather predictable. He saw it as a confirmation of how he already perceived himself. Laila felt it served as a good ice-breaker
within the small working group and also a consciousness-raising tool. Per was most explicit about the positive aspects of the test results; he found it to be exciting, interesting and fun. He saw it as a confirmation of who he was and that it especially served as a clarification as into, “what kind of person are you?”

When summing up the JTI seems a good personality test that “hit the mark”. Its results proved beneficiary and there were some new personality traits which were highlighted. I would like to point out that it must be a really good test within such a setting, since it was the first exercise they were given. Phrased differently, a lot is at stake with the first exercise, since it sets the scene for how the program will play out. Will it have a flying start or ….?

Another aspect, is that these participants are quite unfamiliar with personality tests, which also confirms how well selected this test was.

4.2.6 Self-insight

The self-development tool, reflective team, was presented on the last day as their last exercise. It was a rather heavy tool which raised the bar regarding the quality of the facilitators. It was carried out within the small working groups, where one person sat with his or her back to the group, not being able to see them, only hear them. The group was given the task of providing positive statements about the person, but also constructive feedback/critique. Caution should be made due to the unusual exposure to one’s self; this was after all an exercise which was part of the BaL 3 design. Ethical questions which arose were if the individual had the opportunity to not participate? How much information was given prior to the exercise as to how it should be carried out? How did the system follow up the kind of “inner revelations” which were addressed? I asked the same questions as to how they experienced the exercise and if they considered it to be fruitful.

The reflective team; also received a high degree of praise from all the participants. There was also some constructive critique raised against this tool. The positive aspect was that all of them remembered this tool very well, both the impact and the importance of the tool. Ola expressed that he had actually looked forward to this exercise and feedback throughout the whole course. The feedback itself did not entail any surprises on his behalf. His positive traits were confirmed and strengthened; and some others became clearer. He had explicitly asked, prior to this exercise, that he wanted constructive and negative feedback, which he did not
receive. He wanted to learn more about what he should be working on and what he should change etc. The lack of constructive feedback, he contributed to the Norwegian culture; that one is afraid to give negative feedback. “We are very cautious of stepping on someone’s toes”. When the task started, he waited for the others to see where the bar was set, literally speaking. He could have been more direct, but he chose in light of the others feedback, to tone down his critical points. In light of this, he wanted a section on how to give negative feedback in order to improve oneself.

Dina felt that this exercise was very demanding, because one had to be very honest. One had to find the right balance between being truthful and not hurting somebody’s feelings. She felt that the key to this being a successful exercise lay within the group; that the group took responsibility for giving difficult feedback and being capable of receiving constructive feedback. If one had a fair degree of self-insight, it was hard to be surprised of the feedback one received. She summed up her thoughts by concluding that this kind of course depended on its participants and how much they were willing to contribute. Per made the same points as Ola, however he found that the positive emphasis of the exercise served its purpose as it strengthened one’s positive traits. He saw the lack of negative feedback as being more demanding and not part of the design of this exercise. Ulrik also made the point that people generally were not good at giving feedback, but he felt that the feedback he received was good and honest. He made the same point as Ola, that there could have been more negative feedback in order to learn. When participating in the course he was new in his role as a leader, and he therefore felt it was nice to hear that people believed that he was suited for the role. Yngve thought that everyone felt that it was a slightly uncomfortable exercise since one had to talk about others in a very specific way. However, he found the exercise constructive and good. It was also interesting to hear the others reflect on how one was perceived. Heidi said the exercise was a powerful experience and it was important that the group was a “safe” group to be in. Unni found this exercise very useful since they by now knew each other very well. She compared the exercise to when they started the course with a feedback assignment based on first impressions, which she found to be unpleasant.

The reflective team exercise also received substantial praise, but there was some noteworthy critique. More than once, its lack of negative feedback in order to improve as a leader, is mentioned. Interestingly enough, only the men address this issue. However, only one actively misses the lack of negative feedback. Others make similar points, but put it down to the demanding task of being honest. I interpret it as to do with variations of giving feedback per
Some participants found that this exercise should focus solely on strengthening positive traits, as Ulrik stated; “it was nice with positive feedback when being new to the leader role”. The feedback received did not come as a total surprise to the participants, as Dina mentions; “given that one has a fair degree of self-insight, it’s hard to be surprised”. Another point regarding the reflective team exercise, concerns the group environment and how pivotal this is to the outcome of exercise. The time factor plays into this, as Unni states that “the exercise was very useful, since they by now knew each other fairly well”. This kind of exercise would probably not receive any praise had it been done at any other time during the course. I see this exercise as only being able to succeed if a good enough climate has been established between the participants. Moreover, the facilitator’s level of professionalism are crucial in the successful execution of this exercise, since all the informants stress the powerful impact of the exercise. The quality of the facilitators, the group environment and the time factor thus seem crucial to the success of the reflective team exercise. The constructive feedback regarding this exercise deals with having its own section in the course where one learns about constructive feedback and implements this into the exercise. All in all, they found the reflective team exercise to be important, to have impact, be powerful and to give honest and good feedback.

I asked whether what they learnt in BaL 3 had proved useful in other parts of their lives. Six of the informants confirmed that BaL 3’s course content had affected their everyday life. Per stated that some things they learned were of a universal nature. He exemplified by mentioning communication; how to let others present their point of view and not draw hasty conclusions. To him this proved useful in relation to his family, especially with his children. For Ulrik it had been useful in his relation to his wife. He discussed what he experienced during BaL 3 with her and felt that this was beneficiary with regards to their relationship. He felt it increased the understanding of how one was as a person and how and why one reacts as one did. Yngve saw that it might have an impact on how he behaved outside work, but he had only consciously used what he learned at work. Heidi utilized this in her private life, making the point that it would not hurt to scrutinize one’s behavior at home, since this not only applied to work. She continued by saying that the feedback one received at work could be equally true at home. Laila emphasized a specific course technique, namely coaching. This had proved useful outside work; for her leadership was not something that just applied to work. Coaching for her, had given way to more constructive dialogue in other arenas besides work. Unni said that her husband claimed that she was easier to be around after having
participated in BaL 3. She had gained insight into how others think and this had also been useful outside work.

The majority said that their BaL 3 participation had transcended into other areas of their life, referring to the leadership training and the self-development. The specific training in coaching had proved valuable when communicating with one’s family – as in spouse and children. The dialogue was more constructive after having learnt the technique of coaching. The self-development revelations had given insight into how others think, which was also transferable to relations outside work. Summa summarum, as Per stated: “what we learnt at BaL 3, is universal by nature”. Summing up what the participants recounted, it is fair to say that the tools and exercises in BAL 3 not only had an impact on their professional lives, but also on their personal lives. Although only one explicitly stated that leadership is more than a leader title at work, the other participants implicitly confirmed this point. This has to be understood as leadership development not being restricted to the work domain, but also transcending into other parts of the individual’s life. Since the very nature of developing one’s self is plastic/moldable, it logically follows that one cannot confine development of self to only one sphere of one’s life. Receiving the leadership mandate, requires skills and development that may transcend the work arena. The very nature of leadership makes it unrealistic that boundaries confine the individual solely to this position.

There are two exercises in BaL3 where the participants are given the possibility to practice a technique which can actively be put to use in their daily work; coaching and the role playing exercise – “the difficult conversation”. The JTI test, the interim exercise and the reflective team, are static, meaning that in the JTI test they are presented with a result about their personality, in the interim exercise they are given answers by the interviewee about themselves and lastly in the reflective team, they listen to what is being said about them by their fellow course participants. The last three, explicitly target the individual and give the possibility for self-development.
Table overview of exercises and tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership skills</th>
<th>Leadership self - development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Static</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the theory chapter I start by introducing the two concepts leadership and governance as explanatory factors when it comes to managing an organization. These two factors are also seen in the content of the leadership course; BaL 3. On the one hand, one has tools and exercises designed to target a leader’s communication skills, development as a person; on the other hand, the participants are given lectures on Statoil’s governance principles - i.e. the appraisal interview; the Statoil’s values etc.

Moving on to Bass’s (1990), two modes of leadership behavior, support and task, can easily be seen in the BaL 3 program. BaL 3 addresses the showing of support specifically through the teaching of coaching and the simulations involving the difficult conversation. More indirectly, showing support can be seen as learning more about one self and this knowledge, translates into becoming better at understanding others. The other mode, structure, is given through lectures. By listening to the lectures from leaders in higher positions, the informants hear accounts of how they define their role and are given first-hand relatable information. Moreover, when they listen to the outlining of Statoil’s way of doing the appraisal interview, the leadership pipeline etc., they are handed a blueprint of how the system does structure - the Statoil way.

According to Martinsen (2005) leadership theory concerns itself with studying persons and the relations between them. BaL 3’s content can be seen as acknowledging this perspective, in the sense that it starts off with the Jung Type Indicator (JTI) - which is a personality test. Then BaL 3 moves on to different exercises and tasks in order to develop the future leader’s
communication and relational skills. Sørhaug (2004) states that leadership behavior today is considered to be more of an interactive phenomenon. This makes perfect sense, since leadership is not something which can be performed in solitude, thus when BaL 3 emphasizes learning the methodology behind coaching, the interim exercise and then ending the course with the exercise reflective team; they signal the importance of leadership as an interactive phenomenon. However, I want to point out that the course does not have any focus on different leadership styles. This may be a conscious decision on behalf of the leadership unit as to not wanting to mold their future leaders into a preferred leadership style. However, Statoil’s view on leadership shines through as preferring a style which focuses on dialogue and collaboration. This leads me to conclude that the overall thought behind the course is to present the future leaders with a set of relevant tools which can come in handy when embarking on their new position as leader.

Regarding innovation and leadership one could imply that the two go hand in hand when it comes to private enterprises, if one defines leadership to be direct, relational and influential in its orientation. Innovation is by its very nature flexible, dynamic and without standardization. Thus, in order for a highly specialized work force at operative level to be innovative, leadership must be carried out relational. This is the most pragmatic way of leading a highly competent workforce, where the leader role is more of an enabler for innovative processes. By enabler, the focus is on being an inspirer, a visionary and a builder of relations, influencing through Statoil’s values. Moreover, the more highly specialized the employees are within a unit the more one could be prone to experience difficulties when it comes to professional differences in academic fields, as shown in personal ownership and lack of cross departmental cooperation. As Kuvaas (2008) argues, a highly specialized workforce may demand less central governance, but still be in need of good social relations. This supports the leader role being geared towards relational leadership, in order to be functional.

4.3 Post – BaL 3, follow-up

The participants made a development plan on the last day of BaL 3 as the last thing before leaving the course. The intention of the development plan was not clearly phrased by the leadership unit when I interviewed them. However, my understanding was that it was a personal tool for reflection as to what was important for the informant in question. The reason
why I inquired about subsequent use of the plan was to map out how the informants, in their hectic workday; utilized the BaL 3 content. I wanted to target how the system had followed up the informants post-BaL 3. I then moved on to ask if they had attended any more leadership courses, to see if one of the intentions behind BaL 3, namely enhancing self-development; increased their wish to learn more about themselves. I also asked about four topics which were not directly part of BaL 3, but to me seemed relevant in such a program. Having read Statoil’s corporate web page and the Statoil book, I was left wondering as to why sustainable development, ethnicity, gender and ethics were not part of their leadership course. The company stated that they were an international company operating in 30 countries, which naturally involved working with new and different cultures. The question around ethics naturally arose, since some of these countries were not democratic. Moreover, they referred to their sustainable perspective which was interesting, given that they were fundamentally an oil and gas company. To my way of thinking these topics were central to the leader role, since at first glance they may seem to pose a challenge for an individual becoming a future Statoil leader. In other words, what I wanted to target was Statoil’s CSR with regards to these themes. Did the participants view the themes, given their highlight on the company webpage, as authentic or as merely window-dressing? Moreover, were they seen as relevant in the program BaL 3?

4.3.1 Development plan

Only three of the participants had used the development plan after their BaL 3 attendance. Dina started off by saying that she had not used it, but when looking at it now she had done so on an unconscious level. As for Statoil following up the plan, she saw it as the small groups own responsibility. For her the intention was to summon a post- BaL 3 gathering of the small working group and that this gathering was to be viewed as the follow up. Their facilitator would be present, but they themselves would initiate when and where the gathering would take place. The reason why they had failed to summon a gathering she adhered to the merger between Statoil and Hydro which took place in the fall of 2007. In other words, Statoil was not to blame as she saw it as their responsibility of summoning a gathering. Yngve had the development plan at home and had used it randomly as a memo. He remembered that they discussed how they would implement BaL 3, when returning to a hectic work day. The answer was to have a memo to look at now and then, to refresh one’s
memory of what one needed to work on. Summing-up he used the plan as a note for reflection. But, also in his case, Statoil had not followed up the plan. Laila had used it now and then for ideas, so it did not lie on a shelf collecting dust. She used it as a reference to see if there were any ideas on which she could elaborate. She saw BaL 3 as a time given to philosophize, sit down and think long thoughts. Thus, it was useful to go back and see if there was something in the plan that could be meaningful. Statoil had not followed up the plan, but she put this down to themselves integrating the plan into the People@Statoil appraisal interview. She had added some points from the plan into the appraisal interview and felt that she received very good support and backing from her leaders. She saw it as up to herself if she wanted to prioritize it on her agenda. She had not been asked about the plan by her superiors, but this was due to the merger and being given a new superior after BaL 3. The new superior was very engaged in leadership development, and she had been actively followed up. She made the point that this was due to her leader’s personal engagement and not something organized by Statoil.

The majority had not used the development plan, nor had Statoil followed up the plan after course attendance. For the remaining three who had, it was used randomly or unconsciously. The development plan was used for ideas and reflection. They viewed it as a tool in incorporating BaL 3 into a hectic work day post attendance. Both Dina and Laila placed the responsibility of the development plan usage post BaL 3, on themselves. However, they did see this post usage of the plan in different ways. Dina understands it to be an explicit gathering of the small working group where their BaL 3 facilitator would be present. In other words, the plan would be utilized at this gathering, which they themselves summoned. Laila saw it as up to herself if she wanted to integrate points from the development plan into her appraisal interview. Here there is a divide in the participant’s answers, as to it being Statoil’s task to follow up the use of the development plan or it being the individual’s responsibility. Thus, the facilitators are unclear in communicating the usage of the plan post course attendance. It’s also a bit alarming that only two of the participants have actively used the development plan. This is the only BaL 3 exercise where they write down what they find rewarding through course attendance and would like to implement post BaL 3. It indicates that the future leader’s work day is very demanding and that a follow up of the plan left to the individual, is unlikely to happen. This being said, Laila’s understanding of the appraisal interview where the plan can be integrated, is a cost effective solution of incorporating BaL 3 into their work life.
4.3.2 Appraisal interview

I also asked if their attendance at BaL 3 was addressed in their appraisal interview. The majority had been asked about BaL 3 in their appraisal interview. Dina confirmed that she had a follow-up conversation with her leader right before the merger. However, this conversation she saw as a signing out on his part more than a continuation of the development of Dina. That being said, she had received very positive feedback for her BaL 3 initiative. Yngve mentioned that he put some of the development plan goals into the People@Statoil conversation as measurements on behavioural goals in order to follow-up BaL 3. Unni’s BaL 3 participation was also mentioned in her appraisal interview. She added that the way Statoil arranges courses for competence training, signaled a purposeful and structured system around employee development. Here she highlights the existence of a system within Statoil, where one’s leader appoints their employees to relevant leadership courses. The system provides the courses, but attendance is not a fully structured process.

4.3.3 New leadership courses?

The next section dealt with whether they had taken new leadership courses. Only three out of eight had taken new leadership courses. In this section, nearly all of them elaborated and anticipated my final question; if there were changes they would like to propose when it came to the design and content of BaL 3. Due to their lengthy answers, which I find belong more to the final question, they will be presented there.

The majority had not taken any new courses, but some of them would have wanted to. Per was one of them. He saw it as being useful since he learned something new every time he participated in a course. He believed that it was an everlasting process that never stopped. This kind of substance needed to be repeated and rehearsed as other things in life, they were skills which can always be improved. He summed it up with leadership being a challenge in its own right, where one needed to be taken out of one’s daily work in order to train and reflect. Ulrik had taken a new course dealing with feedback and some other internal courses because he had encountered some challenging situations. It had therefore been good to receive professional advice at regular intervals. Laila said that she had not taken any new courses, however she had been recommended to take some courses due to the merger. To me, she revealed and highlighted a distinction between choosing herself as to being appointed by the system. These courses were held by external actors. She found them to be artificial and
did not learn anything from them. To put it mildly she did not care for them. She finalized by saying that she would rather have wanted to take new leadership courses. She found it useful to be taken out of one’s daily work routine and given time to focus on leadership, meeting others in the same situation and receiving specialist knowledge. For Laila even if one did not learn a lot of new knowledge it was inspiration in one’s workday. Unni had also taken a new leadership course, for which she was nominated. She wondered why as it was similar to BaL 3, although BaL 3 was better and more professional. This course was intended for project managers and she later sent her project managers to attend this specific course. It was very useful that she herself had attended the course, in order to know what they learnt. The project manager course was not as defined as BaL 3 and left it more up to the participants as to how the course developed. BaL 3 was more concrete with training sessions and exercises. For Unni it was much more demanding to attend BaL 3 and quite exhausting since it required more from oneself.

Only three had taken new leadership courses, but some of those who had not; pointed out that they would have wanted to. Despite having taken new courses or not, both sides have interesting views on leadership courses. They mention that leadership courses are useful and inspirational since one learns something new every time, leadership is an everlasting process, a skill which needs to be repeated and rehearsed, something which can always be developed. Summa summarum, what they are actually saying is that they view leadership to be dynamic – an active skill which can be taught and trained to everyone.

Moreover, they maintain that the nature of leadership requires that one is taken out of one’s daily work in order to train and reflect. Those who have taken new courses, mention the benefits of getting a course targeted at challenging situations which they encounter – in other words, receiving professional advice at regular intervals. Laila, was recommended courses due to the merger and she highlights a distinction between choosing herself as to being recommended. She found the merger courses to be less than satisfactory. I do not interpret it due to her being recommended, but more to do with the fact that they were solely held by externals, thus the lack of quality and understanding of how the Statoil system works. Unni refers to another leadership course within Statoil, a project manager course. This differed from BaL 3, as course development was more in the hands of the participants as to how the course developed. To me this signals, that a course dealing with soft subjects such as leadership, needs to be developed and facilitated by academically trained personal. Moreover,
that these courses are best executed by internal personal in order to provide a structured learning platform and are therefore tailor-made, since they know the system from within.

4.3.4 CSR – authentic or merely window-dressing?

In my interview I also addressed topics that were not explicitly expressed in the program: sustainable development, ethnicity, gender and ethics, because I found them relevant aspects when becoming a future Statoil leader. The company’s web page highlights sustainability, being a global player, ethics and values. Gender is interesting based on sociological theory and debates around leadership positions and women. All of the informants give lengthy and interesting answers.

When asked about sustainable development, six of the informants were negative as to this being addressed in BaL 3. Ola stated rather clearly that he saw it as a paradox that at an oil company made this statement. Statoil was a company that produced a non-renewable resource which greatly polluted the environment. To him it was hypocrisy, Statoil had to take stock of the situation and call themselves an oil company, because that was what they were. When I confronted him with Statoil’s web page and that it was explicitly expressed that they were targeting sustainable development, he modified his answer and said that they should contribute and search for optimal energy solutions and have focus on renewable energy. He found this to be correct and something they aimed for. Dina was on the same page as Ola. With regards to her business unit that focused on the extraction of oil and gas, sustainable development was not of high priority. It was not high on her priority list when at work, but something she tried to address at home. She saw Statoil’s focus on sustainable development due to the company’s size. Per acknowledged sustainable development to be an element that leaders should have conscious awareness of. He deemed it a very important theme for the company, but he was unsure whether it should be a part of BaL 3. Rather, he saw it as being part of a discussion in many other contexts. Heidi found it to be a fundamental element, like the Statoil’s values which should be ingrained in the employee. However, she saw it as a more natural part of BaL 1 and 2 since these courses dealt with the employer role, aka Statoil. To her, BaL 3 was targeting the leader role and individual development. Unni felt that sustainable development was addressed in many other forums and should perhaps be a course in its own right. She acknowledged that it could be a theme in BaL 3, but then again, so could many other things. She made the same point as Heidi, viewing BaL 3 as a course dealing with
personal development. Laila was the only informant who was positive to incorporating sustainable development into BaL 3. She saw it as necessary to understand sustainable development from a 360 degrees angle and also its annual report, which few have heard of – yet alone understand. In reference to this report she felt that there was a lack of understanding of its importance. On this note, Laila would have wanted a discussion about sustainable development in BaL 3. It is worth mentioning, that Laila’s unit deals solely with CSR.

The topic sustainable development, is by most of the participants viewed as a theme which does not belong at BaL3. Their perspective shifts according to which business unit they work in. To simplify, one could say that the more hands-on one is with Statoil’s product, as defined in oil; the more disproportionally the informants view on sustainable development’s importance as a relevant topic in the program BaL 3 is. They give different reasons for this, varying from seeing it as a paradox given that Statoil is an oil company, to it being a program for leaders and individual development. However, three of them do acknowledge sustainable development to be an important topic, seeing it as part of a discussion in other contexts i.e. BaL 1 and 2 which deals with the employer role or maybe a course in its own right.

The second issue which I wondered why was not addressed explicitly in BaL 3, was ethnicity. Here the informants where equally divided as to it being or not being addressed in BaL 3. Dina said she has worked very little with non-Norwegians and thus did not see this as a relevant topic. Per, however, thought that it could be an idea, to make internalization a theme in its own right. The topic was partially addressed in other courses, but in BaL 3 one had participation from other parts of the world, thus he saw the relevance of it being addressed. Ulrik agreed with Per, especially since he himself worked abroad. He had encountered many new challenges since being stationed abroad. His experience was that as a leader working internationally, one was left much more to oneself. Yngve felt that it was an implicit topic at BaL 3, although not a topic in its own right. Heidi saw it as an important subject, but she wondered if the subject was too big for BaL 3. If it was to be incorporated she saw it as a natural extension of the JTI personality test. One could broaden it to incorporate culture, not only individual differences. She emphasized its importance for units working internationally; for these it should be mandatory. Her suggestion was that as a topic it should be addressed in a course of its own. Unni acknowledged that ethnicity was not a topic in its own right at BaL 3, but stated that there exists specific courses which deals with the theme. In other words, this was addressed elsewhere. She wondered what one of the international participants gained from the program, reflecting that BaL 3 was very
Norwegian. Moreover, she wondered how easy it was to make such a course international and meaningful for everybody. She admitted that they learnt how Statoil wanted their leaders to be – literally meaning in every corner of the world, but not how to adjust accordingly when facing new cultures. She felt this was addressed more at the PLE (Project Leader) course she attended. Unni made the suggestion that there should perhaps be an international BaL 3 course. Laila was the only informant positive to addressing ethnicity at BaL 3. She saw that they could perhaps have had a session exclusively dealing with cultural differences. She herself had attended lectures on the subject and found it very interesting to try to understand cultural differences. She saw the importance of being aware of differences in culture, especially in Statoil’s priority areas.

Ethnicity as a theme and its relevance in BaL 3, divides the course participants equally. The ones who view it as not being a relevant theme, contributes this to lack of work experience with international colleagues and to it being an implicit topic in the program. Moreover, that the subject is too big for BaL 3 and thus, should be a course in its own right. Lastly, the topic is addressed in specific courses elsewhere and although they learn how Statoil wants their leaders to lead in every corner of the world, the course does not focus on how to adjust when facing new cultures. The other half of the participants who view it as a relevant theme, see this in light of the international course participation at BaL3, experience working abroad and the importance in understanding cultural differences, especially in Statoil’s priority areas.

The third topic I wondered about was gender. Gender was not addressed in BaL 3 and I wondered if, especially from the women’s standpoint, it was a valid issue that should be addressed. All of the informants stated that gender was not a topic that needed to be addressed, since they deemed it of no importance. Ola was quite blunt and said that for him it was important what sits between someone ears and not legs. He had never had any problem with a leader due to gender and never would. Dina did not want to pay attention to something which was not an issue. This could stir the pot, when there was no need. Her experience with leaders no matter what gender, had always been positive, so to her it was not a relevant subject. Based on his experience, Per did not see it as an important theme. He saw everyone as individuals, not in terms of gender. Moreover, he saw affirmative action as valuable in terms of having representation which portrays the demographic of society. Ulrik also did not see it as relevant. He felt that Statoil as an employer was good at helping individuals forward regardless of gender. Laila agreed with Dina when it came to gender being addressed specifically at BaL 3, feeling that stirring the pot could bring attention to something that did
not need to be highlighted. She did not consider it relevant. To her, participating in BaL 3 where genders were mixed, was a strong enough signal in itself that this was a non-relevant topic. Moreover, she shared Per’s view that Statoil was very conscious on wanting to recruit female leaders. However, she did make the point that perhaps gender should be in a discussion due to international participation, since female leaders in other cultures may be a newer concept, in other words, making everyone aware of Statoil’s attitude on the subject. Unni experienced affirmative action at the end of the 90’s when she was employed. Then one could hear the casual remark referring to one being selected based on gender. But nowadays this was something of the past, so there had been a tremendous positive shift in the last ten years. She also made the interesting remark that she saw BaL 3 as promoting a feminine leadership style versus an authoritative leadership style. To her BaL 3 taught one to find the causes behind a problem, which she adhered to being a more feminine leadership approach.

The last topic that I addressed, had to do with ethics. The reason was Statoil’s past history with the Iran corruption scandal in 2003, leading to CEO Olav Fjell’s resignation. The current hot potato; Statoil’s tar sand project in Canada (2007), confirmed the relevance of this topic. The conflict between being an environmental conscious oil company on their web page and the actions they sometimes took, was interesting when it came to discussing the development of future Statoil leaders. I therefore wondered if ethics might be a relevant subject in its own right, since a leader was bound to stumble across ethical dilemmas to varying degrees.

Ola jumped the gun by stating there was one subject he would have liked to discuss at BaL 3, namely ethics – especially direct corruption. He deemed it so important that it should perhaps be a seminar for leaders in its own right. He wondered about the company working in a country such as Nigeria, but also the shift that had occurred in Norway over the past decades. He exemplified by Statoil building infrastructure when they discovered blocks along the Norwegian coastline. Today it was referred to as social responsibility, but to him it seemed as if the state transferred responsibility to the private sector. He wondered if it was okay for a municipality with bad economy to let the private sector build its infrastructure. Statoil thought that it was okay, but he found such a discussion suitable. He finalized by saying that when push came to shove, he had to defend Statoil’s view due to his position, but that did not mean that he agreed with their standpoint. Ulrik also agreed with Ola that ethics as a subject should be addressed in BaL 3, saying that he faced ethical challenges on a daily basis. Moreover, he found the ethical challenges rather difficult in spite of the company’s values serving as guidelines. Legislating the values and executing them, boiled down to his
responsibility as a leader and for him it would have been nice with such a discussion amongst fellow leaders. Others felt that ethics were ingrained in the Statoil values and referred to their unit’s leader meetings where ethics were quite often on the agenda. Moreover, to ethics being addressed elsewhere, exemplified by the one day obligatory ethical workshop. Yngve made the same point as the others, but added interestingly enough that he saw it as relevant, but wondered whether if it was natural as part of BaL 3’s context where one focused on developing leader skills and self-development. However, the others acknowledged that ethics was important in relation to the leader role. In this light they suggested that there should perhaps be a discussion on the subject and some form of group work in relation to ethics and being a leader, and if so it should be in relation to the ethic work shop. Laila also referred to an ethics course which all the leaders in her unit were summoned to attend. In the aftermath of this course, a good common platform was established for dealing with issues regarding ethics.

The participants are equally divided when it comes to ethics. They see BaL 3 as a course focusing on developing leader skills and self-development. I would like to emphasize that although they do not find the topic relevant as part of the program, this does not mean that they view it as unimportant, rather on the contrary they see it as very important, just not as part of BaL 3. Those who are in favor of the topic being part of BaL 3, go even further and want it to be a seminar in its own right. This is due to the experience of finding oneself in the middle, as to defending Statoil’s views on the one hand, but privately not agreeing with their standpoint. Furthermore, when working abroad one is faced with ethical challenges daily and that this is rather hard in spite of the company’s values serving as guidelines. The experience of finding oneself in the middle, refers to a process which Sørhaug (1996, 2004) uses religious vocabulary to describe. He speaks of leaders embodying the organization and its values, they are literally ”values made flesh”. Moreover, that the representative and the performative collide, that there becomes an identity between “is” and “does”. This does not seem to be taking place in the leader development program BaL 3, since there is still experienced a distinction between ones private values as a person and the company values one represents as a leader.

All in all, I will argue that the four different topics are interesting and useful since the answers shed light on how Statoil’s placement on the themes, is viewed by their own future leaders. Three of the themes, sustainable development, ethnicity and ethics can be said to divide them, in the question of whether these are relevant to a leader course such as BaL 3.
The one they are unanimous as to not being relevant, is gender. The topic which causes most negative feedback, and coming closest to being viewed as merely window-dressing, is sustainable development. As for being viewed as most authentic, ethics is seen as most valid, since Statoil pays such attention to it.

In today’s society CSR is often addressed through a company’s value based leadership. Brooker (2005), defines leadership as: “Leadership aims to persuade, renegotiate, being an advocate for the organization’s ideology, creating consensus, being a conflict solver, being an ambassador etc.” There can be said to be a discrepancy between Statoil’s CSR as it is written down and how it is experienced by their leaders, especially in the case of sustainable development. This discrepancy might become more difficult when given the definition that leadership entails being an advocate of the organization’s ideology and an ambassador. Being a leader and an advocate of the organization’s ideology, can become challenging if the company’s CSR policy is seen as unattainable or detached from everyday work life.

4.3.5 Improving content and design

The final question was if the informants have suggestions for improving BaL 3 when it comes to content and design. My trail of thought was, whether the informants reflections when looking back at BaL 3, had given them some ideas as to what had been and what had not been useful, when it came to everyday work. All eight informants had suggestions regarding improvement of BaL 3, as to things they themselves had missed post attendance.

Ola started by saying that some parts of BaL 3 were very good, others were not (“terrible”). He exemplified by referring to the module called “Ambition to Action” which was very good and to the lecture on “the Statoil-Hydro book” as not good (“terrible”). The reason he found the former good, was due to the person giving the session being very engaging and the topic useful. The latter was not good, because the lecturer seemed unprepared and he reckoned he could have done a better job himself. All in all, BaL 3 was a positive experience and he gave praise to the facilitators giving the course. Dina explicitly stated that she would have wanted more follow-up. She said that once a year, a one to two day seminar would have been good. Moreover, she would have liked the module addressing the appraisal interview to have been more extensive. She elaborated that training on giving feedback in appraisal interviews would be useful, also learning more about “what feedback to which person”, how to incorporate it
into the individuals development plan and seeing an area in need of improvement for an individual. Per would also have liked a follow-up. He saw the small BaL 3 group as relevant in coming together after some time had passed, but also all the participants at BaL 3 meeting up a year later in order to hear what the status was for the different individuals, “where are they now?, where do they want to go? what could they do to improve individually, but also as a group?” Per believed that discussing challenges and reflecting on what they learnt at BaL 3 over a couple of days, would have been useful. There did not exist this kind of systematic follow-up at that point in time. To sum up he would have wanted a structured BaL3 follow-up and also a deeper pre-conversation with the participants about the intention and what one was trying to achieve with BaL 3. In order to prevent it from being a compulsory exercise on the competence plan, it was important to target the individual’s motivation for wanting to participate.

Ulrik appreciated the modules targeting personal development and consciousness-raising. Thus, he would have wanted more focus on these subjects and less of Statoil’s specific management systems (People@Statoil, Ambition to Action etc.). He argued that Statoil’s management system was addressed quite well elsewhere and also covered in BaL 1 and 2. Moreover, he would have liked to have seen the course highlight the more negative aspects of being a leader. He referred to the challenges and conflicts which were part of the work as a leader. Yngve saw a follow-up definitely as a natural part of BaL 3 and would have wanted this. It could occur after half a year or up to one year after BaL 3 and last for one day. Natural content could be addressing the status after BaL 3; how they had followed up their development plan, some skill exercises, repetition and consciousness-raising.

Heidi was cautious when it came to making suggestions as to adding, improving or taking something away from BaL 3’s content. Phrased differently, she was wary as to biting over more than one could chew. She saw a follow-up as being useful, because the teachings at BaL 3 needed to be worked on post BaL 3, if not they were easily forgotten. Some were good at incorporating what they learnt into their everyday work, but this she believed was rare. For most leaders their work day was rather hectic, and therefore a follow up to refresh certain themes would create a greater learning effect. This could take place once or twice yearly as a two day seminar. In the evening one could be given an exercise to complete, allowing for reflection. In this way, one could incorporate some learning in a leader’s hectic work day. Furthermore, it was a suggestion that leadership could become a topic in its own right at the annual appraisal interview, where Statoil could have a list of different themes one could work
on and deepen one’s understanding in order to structure leadership development for their leaders. They would be ticking off a subject box, working on it the coming year and receiving feedback at their next appraisal interview. For example, if they chose “communication” as a topic they would do some reading on this topic and attend a seminar and if they completed this, they delivered and if not - they did not deliver. In this way one could measure and address leadership development through the appraisal interview.

Laila would have wanted to learn more about how to conduct difficult conversations. More examples as to when it was done and not done correctly, and more of a discussion as to why this happened. She would have liked to have seen videos and had discussions prior to the simulation exercise. She felt she lacked preparation before being thrown into the exercise and this created a lack of mastering on her behalf. In other words, she missed better preparation before the actual exercise took place. She would also have wanted a follow-up focusing on more in-depth learning of certain themes such as coaching, techniques and tools. She mentioned that she had a leader colleague who had a coach and found it very rewarding. These offers were not easily accessible within Statoil. When it came to a follow-up as in teaming up with the BaL 3 group, she did not have a need for this. She contributed this to her leader, who had focus on this within the leader group which she was a member of. She saw it as more valuable getting a follow-up through one’s leader group, building these groups since one already was a member and this group being more connected to her everyday work. She also addressed that BaL 3 could have focused more on Health, Safety and Environment (HSE), especially the connection between health and people, because she viewed BaL 1 and 2 to be more practical courses where safety and environment would be more natural topics. BaL 3 could address the total risk assessment more in regards to how one’s work unit was run internally and delivered to the rest of the organization. Another topic was how one’s leadership style affected one’s unit. She concluded by stating that she preferred part 2 of the BaL 3 course, since it had more practical exercises, such as working together through a maze.

Also, second time around one had the advantage of knowing each other better.

Unni found BaL 3 to be very thorough. She found the facilitators and hired actors to be very professional. However, she emphasized that in such a course it was important that those who gave lectures, referring to an internal leader employee; had to be motivating and engaging. She would also have liked a follow-up. She referred to the PLE course she attended after BaL 3, where they had a mentor arrangement after the course finished. She saw this as a good idea for BaL 3, that the small group after half a year met up with the facilitator to check status and
the development plan. Again, she referred to the PLE course, the reason why it was held in such high esteem, was that one had a full year with follow up. Mentor meetings were held monthly, where the course delegates and the mentors met up. In other words, there was a much more systematically follow up. Thus, Unni saw this as lacking in BaL 3. Moreover, she wanted to see that every line leader was given the course straight away, and not having to wait five years or maybe not getting a place, as the case was now. She wanted to see that a leader after six months was given a place at BaL 3, since she saw it as being very valuable and useful for new leaders. All the participants had suggestions as to improving BaL 3, and everyone addressed things they missed post attendance. To sum up Ola’s points, it boiled down to two requirements; firstly the lecturer had to be very engaging and motivating, secondly the topic had to be useful. He praised the professionalism of the facilitators and found BaL 3 to be a positive experience. I interpret the positive outcome to rest heavily on the professionalism of the facilitator’s in their design and content of BaL 3.

There is one major element that all the participant’s addressed as missing post attendance, namely a systematic/structured follow-up. It was an underlying theme throughout the interviews, but now it is explicitly mentioned. Their suggestions vary as to a follow – up taking place after 6 months to annually, as a one or two day seminar; summoning the small group or all the course participants with the facilitator present.

So, why would they find a follow-up necessary? They mention to check status, in the form of the goals of the development plan; to discuss challenges and reflect on their new position with fellow course members. Moreover, the teachings in BaL 3 need to be worked on post course attendance, if not they are easily forgotten in a hectic work day. Thus, a follow-up is pivotal in order to refresh themes which would yield a greater learning effect of the course material.

When it boils down to what they would have liked to be addressed in a follow-up, their answers vary, but most importantly it is in-depth learning and repetition of skills and exercises, such as coaching, the art of feedback and more practice when it comes to difficult conversations. Moreover, they want discussions which highlight the challenges, stress and conflicts they encounter as leaders. Also, topics revolving around clarification, awareness, the handling of expectations and demands when it comes to the leader role are sought after. In other words, they want modules which address personal development as a leader. The
governance part of leadership, as in Statoil’s specific management systems is addressed elsewhere and therefore not asked for in a follow-up.

One of the participants refer to the PLE course, which has a one year mentor follow-up arrangement. The mentor meetings occur monthly, where course delegates and mentors attend. Again, BaL 3 lacks a systematic follow-up which apparently is doable and already taking place within another course. Another suggestion mentioned before, is incorporating leadership as a topic in the annual appraisal interview. Here, Statoil could provide a list of different themes one can work on and deepen one’s understanding in order to structure leadership development throughout the year for their leaders. They can attend a seminar about chosen topics and also be given literature to read. This will address and measure leadership development through the appraisal interview.

I see this as a very good suggestion for several reasons, firstly it is cost effective when it comes to time and money. The appraisal interview as a system, already exists and is something which every employee has to attend annually. So, one does not need to use time and money to develop something new – the appraisal interview is already part of the system. All Statoil has to do; is elaborate and incorporate some new elements. Secondly, it is cost effective, since one does not need to take employees out of their work environment and send them to a seminar. The learning is now placed in the hands of the individual throughout the year. In other words, the system makes the individual accountable for his or her own leadership development.

In this light, BaL 3 is easily seen as a confidence builder for the future leader. In BaL 3, through its varying exercises and meeting with others who are in the same situation, Statoil establishes a safe environment for development of the leader role and personal growth. The program successfully balances personal development without invading one’s self. That being said, the informants want more focus on personal growth and less focus on Statoil lectures regarding governance.
5 Conclusion

This master thesis research question was: "How does Statoil equip their leaders for the future through the leadership program, Become a Leader (BaL) - Level 3?". I wanted to see how my perspective on this internally developed program played out with the course participants becoming leaders. This was new and unfamiliar content for the engineers, and I was intrigued to see if they learnt anything from the course. To me this would best be showcased, if they were able to implement what they learnt from the course into their everyday work. Simply put, is there an outcome, and if so, what is it? I looked at the program from two angles, the actors, Statoil’s future leaders - the course participants and the system, Statoil. Why does Statoil deem an internally developed leadership program to be of importance? Why such focus? In this last chapter I will discuss and conclude my findings.

Starting with the actors, although the course content being new and unfamiliar to the engineers, all in all, it went down very well. I refer to that they all say that they learnt something from participating in BaL 3. It was not a waste of time, they all took away something to a larger or lesser extent. Stating this, I want to point out that pivotal to this conclusion is the fact that it was internally designed, where some of the facilitators were former engineers having switched over to the social sciences. In other words, the facilitators understood both the engineer terminology and also the nature of Statoil’s culture as an organization. I doubt if my findings had been the same, had it been an external consultancy firm carrying out the seminar. What leads me to say this, is that some of the course participants referred to experiences with external courses, and did not find them nearly as satisfactory in terms of learning, as the internally developed BaL 3. The internal facilitators knew which skills were useful to develop and what tools were important to learn when becoming a Statoil leader.

Another factor which adheres to a positive outcome, is that they actually implemented coaching and other tools, into their everyday work. Even more interesting, they sorely for learning more about coaching and wanted to be followed up by Statoil when it came to coaching and tools related to this subject. Having taken BaL 1 and 2, nearly all the course participants were adamant that BaL 3 should focus only on leadership and leave out the governance focus. Furthermore, not only dedicate the program to leadership, but also being followed up by Statoil after having taken the course, was something they were unanimous in wanting. A follow-up did not take place at that point in time. This is a limitation with the
master thesis, that I was not able to follow the unit and the program to see what alterations took place with regards to the development of the program.

This leads me to discuss another important perspective of the course, namely the two parameters governance and leadership. The question of how Statoil organizes being an oil company is answered by the term governance; which gives order. Simply phrased, how does Statoil do oil? Where do they want to go as an oil company, is answered by the term leadership which gives them direction. Their direction is being a sustainable, international, value-based and ethical oil company.

Firstly, I want to address the lack of a follow-up post course attendance. This addresses Statoil’s governance and reveals a serious flaw. Why is it serious? Because, it is noticed and highly requested by the course participants. Moreover, looking at the program as an external, it makes one wonder why Statoil, who lists every detail of what they are, do and want to be as a company in the Statoil book, can simply miss such an important subject. Also the monetary cost that goes into the training of their future leaders, both with the time away from work for the participants and also having a unit solely dedicated to developing programs for the employees, shows an organization that is serious about learning and development. The lack of a follow-up, could boil down to Statoil when designing the program not realizing the importance of a structured follow-up after BaL 3. In other words, that the mandate given to the unit should have been to develop both a program and a follow-up. If I were to make another assumption, it could be that it comes down to the economic factor. There is not enough money put aside for a follow-up of BaL 3. If it is hindrance due to costs, I would recommend that Statoil reminds themselves of the detailed and well-functioning system of governance that already exists within their organization. Therefore, it would be a cost effective solution to review the already existing systems of governance, such as the people@statoil, and revise and incorporate a follow-up for those who have taken a leadership course. One of the participants had a very good idea as to making available a few leadership topics which the employee could choose from. Then one topic could be selected and worked on through the year by the individual. When it was time for the annual people@statoil conversation, a dialogue between the leader and the employee concerning the chosen topic could take place. This solution would meet the participants need for much sought after follow-up.
When it comes to the subjects of being a sustainable, international, value-based and ethical company, I saw that these themes were emphasized on Statoil’s web page, but that these topics were not a part of BaL 3. Therefore, they were addressed in the interviews with the BaL 3 course participants. I wanted to see if the topics were missed by the participants as part of their leadership training in becoming future leaders in Statoil.

Those who worked closely with the company’s core product, oil, did not find sustainable development to be a necessary and important topic in the program. On the other hand, one participant found it very relevant, but it needs to be pointed out that this participant’s unit worked solely with CSR. Remembering that these interviews were given in 2008/2009 and being able to review them in 2017, sheds new light on the topic. Since the interviews were given, Statoil’s strong emphasize on sustainability has earned them international recognition when setting environmental records, which is traditionally uncommon for the oil and gas industry. In 2014, they were ranked as the fourth most sustainable energy company, according to the corporate Knights Global 100 list of the world’s most sustainable organizations. For 2015 they received a disclosure score of 100 and a performance score of 80 from the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). In 2016, they were recognised by CDP as the most sustainable oil and gas producer in the world. What does this tell us? That although being in an anti-environmental industry, Statoil is the best company within this field. Their focus on sustainability can therefore not be dismissed as merely window dressing, since clear results show that Statoil’s long term focus on sustainability has yielded international acclaim. The topic, sustainability, yields results in the way of external acclaim, regardless of being addressed in the program. This is also in line with the course participant’s answers, that the majority did not want the topic to be part of the program, because they actually viewed sustainability as merely window dressing. The topic is therefore not missed or wanted by the course participants and stands strong enough on its own without being part of the program. I can therefore conclude that this topic does not need to be addressed in the program BaL 3.

Statoil has moved on from being a purely national governed oil company focusing on the Norwegian continental shelf to becoming an international oil and gas company. They conduct business in more than 30 countries. However, since 2011 one can see that Statoil’s international business is not making a profit, it’s actually losing money. Nationally, is where they are making a profit. With regards to promoting being an international company where the corporate language is English, I wondered why the international focus was left out in the BaL 3 program. Out of the 17 course delegates, only two were international employees and
one was a Norwegian stationed abroad. Half of the course participants I interviewed, did not see the relevance of incorporating an international focus in the program. I do believe that had course delegates consisted of more international employees, my findings would have been different. It seems to me that the participants view Statoil as a Norwegian company and thus consider themselves working for a Norwegian employer versus an international employer. In this perspective, since the majority of the course participants are Norwegians it seems realistic to leave out the international focus in the program. In other words, Statoil could not be said to have succeeded in becoming an international company - internally or externally. Internally, I look to the employees and the Statoil culture which seems to remain unequivocally Norwegian. Externally, the results show that going global has not been a success in terms of profit.

The Statoil values were not directly targeted in the program, but the participants felt that the values were almost ingrained in their backbone. This signals that the values are clearly a part of both the actors and Statoil’s organizational culture per se. However, there is a flip side. How one carries out the company’s values, translates as to how one conducts business ethically. This is the real testimony which showcases if a company practices what it preaches. The course participants strongly advocate the importance of ethics as a topic, although being divided as to incorporating it into the program. Statoil has faced scandals (Mongstad 1987-88), corruption scandals (Statoil/ Horton case 2006, Trial against Statoil consultant and two accomplices 2011) and controversies (Rotvoll 1991, Corrib Gas Project 2005, Management of art collection 2010, North Sea 2011, Charges of unethical practices in Athabascan 2012, Artic 2012). Therefore, as a system, Statoil could be said to fail when it comes to following their own leadership direction in terms of ethics. It therefore seems that, Statoil does not on an overall level practice what they preach, in terms of ethics.

The perspective that has been overriding when analysing the data has been governance and leadership. As Ola clearly stated “Statoil was a company that produced a non-renewable resource which greatly polluted the environment”. Given that the identity of Statoil is clear cut to their employees; Statoil is fundamentally seen as an oil company, one can conclude that governance is solidified internally. The company as a system knows its order and the actors know who and what they are working for, namely Statoil an oil producing company. In this perspective, it becomes very apparent why leadership becomes what they need and want in the program BaL 3. Leadership is not something they automatically know how to execute as employees, it’s just words on piece of paper. Therefore, when learning leadership in the
BaL 3 program, there is a unanimous demand for this to be the single focus on BaL level 3. This is the first time they experience that Statoil’s view on leadership becomes alive, as in learning how to do leadership through exercises and training of skills in order to become future leaders in Statoil.

I will end by saying that three things stand out as paramount. Firstly, that designing a program to develop and train leaders on leadership development, should be designed internally due to the understanding and knowledge that can only come from one’s own employees. Secondly, that a program dealing with leadership development should focus solely on leadership and leave out the governance focus, this should be taken care of elsewhere. Lastly, that a system that executes leadership development for their employees through a program, should also understand that this opens up a processual content that does not stop on the program’s last day. Processual content, by the very nature of its name, instigates to be followed-up, there is no expiration date on learning leadership.
6 Reference list


Appendix 1: Interview guide

1. Bakgrunn

1.1. Personalia:
- Sivilstand
- Barn
- Alder

1.2. Utdanning
- Hvilken utdanning
- Lengde på utdanning
- Hvorfor denne utdannelsen?

1.3.1. Yrkeskarriere
- Arbeid etter endt utdanning

1.3.2. Karriere i Statoil
- Hvorfor Statoil?
- Karriere i Statoil.
  - I hvilken enhet arbeider du nå?
  - Har du arbeidet i andre enheter tidligere? Hvilke?
  - Hva er ditt geografiske arbeidssted nå?
  - Har du hatt andre geografiske arbeidssteder tidligere? Hvilke?
- Hadde du et ønske om lederstilling i organisasjonen når du begynte?
  - Hvorfor?
  - Innenfor hvilket område – faglig/administratív?
  - Hvorfor er du valgt som leder foran andre i organisasjonen?
  - Har andre bidratt til at du er valgt som leder? Hvordan?
- Hva var din stilling da du gjennomførte BaL 3?
- Har du tidligere kurs i ledelse?
  - Hvis ja, hvilke?
  - Hvordan var disse kursene sammenlignet med BaL3?
- Har du fortsatt lederansvar?
  - Hvis nei, hvorfor ikke?
  - Har BaL3 bidratt til valget?
2. Becoming a Leader 3 (BaL3)

- Hva synes du at du lærte av kurset?
- Hva synes du om kurset nå i ettertid?
  - Har det vært nyttig for deg som leder/generelt?
  - Hva var særlig nyttig?
- Hvordan har BaL 3 hatt betydning for deg i utvikling av din ledersel/rolle/karriere?
  - Gi konkrete eksempler.
- Valgte du selv å ta kurset, eller var dette et ønske fra overordnede?
  - Hvis selvvalgt:
    - Hva var din motivasjon for å ta kurset?
    - Hvordan fremmet du ønske om å få kurset?
    - Føler du at kurset var nødvendig for en videre karriere i Statoil?
  - Hvis det var et ønske fra overordnede:
    - Hvorfor ville Statoil at du tok kurset?
    - Er kurset et pliktluop i regi av Statoil?
    - Følte du at det å bli valgt til kurset var en bekreftelse på at Statoil satser på deg?
    - Følte du deg beæret over å bli valgt til kurset?
    - Hvordan påvirket dette din motivasjon for videre karriere i Statoil?
- Husker du noe fra oppstartssamtaalen?
- Tok du selv initiativ til, eller kalte overordnede deg inn til dette møte?
- Et av målene med samtaalen var å konkretisere dine utfordringer som leder
  - Var de utfordringene som kom frem kjent eller ukjent for deg fra tidligere?
  - Synes du din leders beskrivelse av dine utfordringer var legitim?
- Endret denne samtaalen din motivasjon for kurset?
- Kurset har to hovedfokus. Det ene er utvikling av deg som leder, og det andre er å lære deg Statoils syn på ledelse.
  - Hvordan oppfatter du denne påstanden?
  - Hvis enig, hvordan oppfatter du vektingen av de to fokusene?

Når jeg ser på BaL 3, så oppfatter jeg dette som kurs for inginører som skal lære seg ledelse: De kan fag, men skal lære seg ledelse……(det relasjonelle).

Det tolker jeg utfra:

Lag modell av "bollene":

1. Ved siden av å formidle Statoil’s kultur/ledelsesfilosofi er det..
2. Deg som leder, egenanalyse vha; JTI, mellomperiodeoppgaven, refl. team
3. Trening i lederferdigheter; simulering, øving, coaching

(Respons)

Har jeg glemt noe viktig?

Nå: Snakke litt om disse:
4. Statoil og ledelse.

"Lære seg Statoil" / Kultur-Ledelse (rolle):

- Statoil utdanner egne ledere i et internt program. Hvilke tanker gjør du deg om dette?
  - Fordeler: Ta vare på egne folk, gir utdannelse, utfordringer, veileder, gir kurs
  - Ulemper?
- Statoil har en uttalt ledelsesfilosofi.
  - Hva synes du om den og utviklingen av den? (da-nå)
  - Sammenfaller den med ditt eget syn på ledelse?
- Ved kursets start var Statoils ledelsesfilosofi basert på verdiene; caring, truthful, professional, imaginary, hands-on.
  - Hva synes du om de?
  - Hva legger du i disse?
- Etter fusjonen til StatoilHydro, er verdiene endret til; Hands-on, open, courages, caring?
  - Hva synes du om de nye verdiene?

5. BaL 3; Design(person):

- Hvordan var sammensetningen av deltakere med tanke på;
  - De ulike enhetene som var representert
  - Internasjonal deltakelse/etnisitet.
  - Kjønn
  - Alder
- Tror du at det lå en spesiell tanke bak denne sammensetningen?
- Synes du at sammensetningen var fruktbar?

6. Nettverkseffekt (rolle):

- Hadde du møtt noen av kursdeltakerne forut?
- Ble du godt kjent med de andre deltakerne på kurset?
- Har du hatt kontakt med noen av de andre deltakerne etter kurset?
  - Hvis ja, hvordan?
- Hvilken type kontakt har dette vært?
  - Refleksjoner angående kurset?
  - Tematikk rundt lederrollen?
  - Faglige utfordringer?
  - Ikke-faglig karakter?

7. "Indre"(rolle):

- Testresultatet fra Den Jungianske Type Index (JTI) ble gjennomgått, hva synes du om dens relevans?
- Hvordan opplevde du øvelsen, refleksierende team? Hva ga den deg?
- Har det du lærte på kurset vært nyttig på andre arenaer i livet ditt?
  - Hvilke?
  - Hvordan?
8. Trening/ Simulering/Øving (rolle):

- Kurset gjennomgikk ulike simuleringer av vanskelige situasjoner som leder, var de relevante i forhold til din arbeidshverdag? (Oppsigelse, sykdom)
- Mellom de to seminarene i kurset, fikk dere en praktisk oppgave i egen organisasjon; Oppgaven ga at man skulle velge til sammen 4-6 personer fra arbeid og privat, og skrive ned hvilke forventninger man trodde at disse hadde til en selv. Etter dette skulle man så intervjuje de for å kartlegge de faktiske forventningene. Til sist skulle man så strukturere data, og reflektere over likheter/ulikheter.
  - Hvordan gikk det å løse denne oppgaven?
  - Hva syntes du om denne oppgaven?
  - Var resultatet av denne oppgaven nyttig for deg som leder?
- Kurset inneholdt et foredrag om coaching. Har du hatt nytte av dette i rollen som leder?

9. Post BaL 3/ Oppfølging:

- Dere ble på slutten av kurset bedt om å skrive hver deres utviklingsplan.
  - Har du brutt den i etterkant?
  - Hvis ja, hvordan og i hvilken kontekst?
  - Har StatOil fulgt deg opp med tanke på denne?
- Har din overordnede i etterkant av kurset, spurt deg angående dette?
  - Hvis ja, i hvilken kontekst?
- Ble din deltagelse på BaL 3 nevnt i medarbeidersamtalen?
- Har du tatt nye lederutviklingskurs?
  - Hvis ja, hvilke og hvorfor?
  - Hvis nei, er dette noe du har ønsket, og i så fall hvorfor?
- Er det viktige tema som du synes burde vært tatt opp, eller som er mangelfullt utdypet i seminaret?
  - Bærekraftig utvikling
  - Etnisitet
  - Kjønn
  - Etikk
- I etterkant, vil du foreslå endringer i form og/eller innhold (design) av BaL 3?
  - Hvis ja, hvilke?
## Appendix 2: Overview of the program Become a Leader - Level 3

### Become a Leader – Script – Class 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day/time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:15 – 09:45</td>
<td>Setting the scene</td>
<td><strong>Ellen</strong> /Ellen Welcome, HSE, staff presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utenfor plenumsrom (restauranten)</td>
<td><strong>Helle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mingling: (2-3 minutes each question: write question on flipover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. What energises you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. What do I do when I succeed as a leader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Something exiting about yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. show what you do when you are caring, truthful, professional, imaginary, hands on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viktig å holde tiden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:45 – 10:15</td>
<td>Present the Program</td>
<td><strong>Ellen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of program,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Husk å minne om Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronicle 2 from group 1 and 2 from group 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program 1st session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Show groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Husk å minne om at tilretteleggere sitter ofte ved eget bord til lunsj og</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>middag dag 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explain the objective and process round the tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:15</td>
<td>Contracting the program</td>
<td>4 tables – 15 minutes per table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bord 1: Beate /Erik</td>
<td><strong>1. Mutual Expectations (Øyvind)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bord 2: Ellen/Ellen</td>
<td>Facilitator discuss Statoil expectation to the participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bord 3: Atle/Atle</td>
<td>- be on time to every session,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bord 4: Henning/Helle</td>
<td>- you are the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- contribute with own experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- be open and give constructive feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- put cell phone away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Statoil invests in your training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What do you want out of this program, what are you learning expectations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitator writes down the participants expectations for the program on a flipover. He presents this in plenary.

2. **Leadership in Statoil (Ellen)**
   - Briefly go thru the presentation LiS, give out folders and facilitate a discussion about LiS.

3. **My Challenges as a new leader (Atle)** (NB: contracting of prework)
   - Facilitator discuss with participants their own challenges, prework
   - Facilitator write down the notes from the discussion

   - Go briefly thru the peer feedback notes scheme and explain the objective of this activity and use of the notes book, Facilitator give out the scheme and book.
   - Experiences with feedback Husk – Her og nå
   - **Eli styrer tiden og musikk**
   - **Ellen tar med musikk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:15 – 11:30</td>
<td>Summarizing in plenary</td>
<td><strong>Ellen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 12:15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Facilitator sits on separate table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   - **Jens R. Jenssen** “Leadership in Statoil” (confirmed)
   - Ellen presents Jens R. Jenssen Executive Vice President HR
   - He will present Leadership in Statoil
   - Brief introduction
   - Processing KL’s message
   - What did you hear?
   - What stands out as important for you?
   - Did you miss anything?
| 13:45 – 15:00 | Start up in Group                             | Review of pre work, Leadership challenge, not Business challenge,
   - See facilitator notes
   - Prepare for Leadership Chronicles?
   - Emphasize focus on reflection and learning, not a summary of the day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:00 – 15:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15 – 16:45</td>
<td>Participants read JTI profile</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45 – 17:45</td>
<td>JTI in group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45 – 18:00</td>
<td>Break with snacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00 – 19:30</td>
<td>The CEO perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>Dinner at Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre course work (for a detailed description, see Leadership Network):**

1. Conversation with Your Leader
2. Completion of the JTI Survey
3. Management and Control in Statoil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day/time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2</strong> 08:30-08:55</td>
<td>The Leadership Chronicle</td>
<td>Two members of Group 1 and two members of Group 4 to host. <strong>Helle</strong> reviews agenda for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 10:45 Plenary</td>
<td>Effective communication and feedback</td>
<td><strong>Ellen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relate to Statoil context</td>
<td>1. Addresss the 4 qualities and discuss communication approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knyttes til de 4 Personal Qualities</td>
<td>2. Present ladder of inference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Present the six step model and discuss JTI types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Here and Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Explain - what is a simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – 11:00 Break</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draw a picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-</td>
<td>Simulation 1</td>
<td>10 min to read and discuss first case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inform the actor before he/she enters which participant he/she will meet, and what they specifically should train on. Remember to take timeout and reflect with the group (ref. Hennings way of doing it) Ref. facilitator notes, (this part is updated.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Simulation 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Simulation 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>Break with snacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>Peer feedback notes</td>
<td>Individual walk/talk/etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>Dinner in separate room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day/time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1</strong></td>
<td>Welcome in plenary</td>
<td><strong>Ellen/Ellen</strong>&lt;br&gt;Introduce this week’s agenda. Log where people are, and how interim assignments have been. Encourage participants to bring up what is important to them in their focus times (not what they believe we want as topics). Teach and learn: You are the program! -we are here to help you get the best out of it. Present the connection to Leadership in Statoil: The Statoil book 4D – personal qualities – teach and learn Delivery versus behaviour Performance Mngt. Learning model Remember to mention clothing for tomorrow afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>Back in groups</td>
<td>Informal dialog&lt;br&gt;Flips on the wall – spilleregler, forventninger, JT1, statusmatrisen&lt;br&gt;Quick check to see if there are pressing issues that the facilitator or fellow group members need to be aware of before embarking on focus times&lt;br&gt;Reset learning principles in learning group&lt;br&gt;The goal with role analysis is to get focused on 2-3 leadership development areas that are important for each participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>Role analysis</td>
<td>In groups, 15 min per participant&lt;br&gt;- Present to the group the most significant findings and put forward 2 leadership challenges areas:&lt;br&gt;  - Why these areas?&lt;br&gt;  - Why is this important for you?&lt;br&gt;  - Open ended reflection and feedback from the group (get the group working)&lt;br&gt;  - Decide on 2 topics to bring to coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day/time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;08:30-08:55</td>
<td>The Leadership Chronicle</td>
<td>Two members from Group 2 and Two members from Group 3. ... reviews today's activities Who need taxi at 15:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 11:30</td>
<td>Ergo Ego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 11:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 12:00</td>
<td>Lunch - sandwich to bring into group room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 14:20</td>
<td>Groups&lt;br&gt;Peer feedback&lt;br&gt;My Leadership Challenge Closure</td>
<td>Process Status Scheme from Ergo Ego with Personal Qualities <strong>Peer Feedback</strong>&lt;br&gt;Group Session is a training session – facilitators be helpful by providing your feedback in PFN format. Format: First impression followed by SBI feedback.&lt;br&gt;(See facilitator notes)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Revisit My Leadership challenge and closure group</strong>&lt;br&gt;How did you describe your challenges, and what new perspectives do you have now&lt;br&gt;Any open topics.&lt;br&gt;(See facilitator notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20 – 14:45</td>
<td>Interim Assignment&lt;br&gt;Leadership Role</td>
<td>In plenary&lt;br&gt;Remember to start early with the assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45 – 15:00</td>
<td>Evaluation and close</td>
<td>Link to introduction Day 1.&lt;br&gt;Complete Evaluation forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interim Assignment (see Leadership Network for detailed instructions):** *mellompericde*

1. My Role as a Leader/Role clarification<br>   Conversations with stakeholders<br>   Reflect over typology/JTI
2. Prepare for individual focus time
3. Read Promod & Team documents

In between session administrator send out mail to participants and remind interim assignment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13:30 - 14:30 | Coaching introduction  | **Ellen/Ellen**  Coaching is one of many leadership competences  
Review the status model, & communication styles,  
**Basic skills:**  
Active listening  
Open questions  
Quiet  
Acknowledgment  
GROW |
| 14:30 - 14:45 | Break                     |                              |
| 14:45 - 16:45 | Coaching in plenary       | **Ellen**  3 in each group  
1 coach – 1 coachee – 1 observer  
20 min. for each coaching – 10 min feedback from observer  
2 rounds |
<p>| 16:45 - 17:00 | Break                     |                              |
| 17:00 - 17:30 | Walk and talk              |                              |
| 20:00 | Dinner                     |                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day/time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Henning/ Helle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30-08:45</td>
<td></td>
<td>What did you learn from yesterday?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What frustrated you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What was fun?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What would you have more of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:45-11:00</td>
<td>Performance Mangt.</td>
<td>Bjarte Bognes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From Ambition to Action</td>
<td>45 min presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min discussion – own A to A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 min group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 min presentation/discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00–11.10</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10-12.30</td>
<td>P@S</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour goals</td>
<td>10 min presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 min group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 min presentation/discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-17:00</td>
<td>Action – process – reflection</td>
<td>Beate/Atle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work on individual strengths and development areas</td>
<td>Short introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Management – how to cope with change</td>
<td>Three activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stamme x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sump x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Botte x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endringsinnspill på stamme: lederbytte + rotere de to første bakers – de to siste fremst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endringsinnspill på sump: En blir gjort stum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endringsinnspill på botte: lederbytte, sabotør</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>Snack at Villa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>Aperitif</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00- 19.00</td>
<td>Transition to becoming a leader</td>
<td>Bjørg Aalstad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>Dinner in separate room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day/time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>08:30-09.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ellen, Helle, Atle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What was important in coping with change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What was important working as a team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What worked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What was challenging?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00-09.15</td>
<td>Reflective team in groups</td>
<td>Contracting reflective team -15min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.15-10.25</td>
<td>Reflective team in groups</td>
<td>10 min presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 min reflective team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 persons a 35 min pr. person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.25-10.35</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.35-11.45</td>
<td>Reflective team in groups</td>
<td>10 min presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 min reflective team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 persons a 35 min pr. person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45-12.00</td>
<td>Development plan</td>
<td>Write the development plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-13.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-14.10</td>
<td>Reflective team and closure</td>
<td>10 min presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 min reflective team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 persons a 35 min pr. person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.10-14.20</td>
<td>Development plan</td>
<td>Write the development plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20-15.00</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; closure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Bus leaves for Flesland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fokus i de forskjellige oppgavene:

1. stemme - Endring
Bytte leder - veiledde i mål når de ikke klarer øvelsen/målet
Endring - kommunikasjon - fører og lederstiler - sortering og prioriteringer av informasjon -risiko-
trygghet

3. Sump - HMS
- Leder på benk - vise start/mål - vise materiale -
HMS -Kreative prosesser og analytisk - planlegging først og underveis - organisering - hva styrer valg

4. Beholder 1 og 2 (Bøtte)
Mest aktive blir sykemeldt, bytte leder
Vise forurenset område
Kreative - planlegging - organisering -gjennomføring - følge opp - bruk av alle i laget - 1 ert utfør bøtta
er ok, hvis de må starte på nytt trenger de ikke knytte opp tau.

Felles for alle oppgavene:
Hvor gikk det særleg bra?
Hva er dine styrker?
Forberedelse
- Følelsesmessige / umiddelbar reaksjon
- tekniske/sak
samle laget
- Tema
1) leder 2)laget 3) observatør 4) tilrettelegger
Oversetting/make meaning
5 min. refleksjonsboken
Appendix 3: Examples of Interview transcripts

INTERVJUER:
Hva med dette med etikk og samfunnsansvar, er det et viktig tema som bør opp i dagen på... på kurset?

- Det er et viktig tema å berøre, men det har vært veldig mange kurs, og det har vært obligatoriske kurs i selskapene med etikk. Så det er veldig godt dekket på det området, så jeg føler ikke at det er et ekstroordinært behov for å de... få det inn i dette. Men etikk som en del av lederskapsrollen, det er jo viktig. Men jeg tror kurs... kursene i StatoilHydro på det området har vært relativt omfattende den siste tiden. Sånn sett så tror jeg... jeg føler meg rimelig godt dekket på det området.

INTERVJUER:
I etterkant, er det... vil du foreslå noen endringer i form eller innhold i forhold til BaL3?

- Nei, jeg har i utgangspunktet ikke det. Det eneste er oppfølging i ettetid, altså den... at den kunne vært mer struktureret. Da ville folk tatt BaL3 som et kursopplegg som et isolert evenement, eller isolert hendelse, jeg tror jeg er ganske... virker ganske bra for meg. Så den... oppfølging i ettetid tror jeg en kunne sett på om en kunne gjort noe mer, hatt noen andre prosesser på det. Om en kunne fått en annen struktur, sånn at en hadde sikret seg en viss grad av oppfølging. Og så er det vel kanskje det som jeg nevnte innledningsvis, i forhold til motivasjon av den enkelte før en begynner. En kunne kanskje tenkt seg at en hadde en samtal med den enkelte i forhold til formål med kurs og egen motivasjon, den type ting, som kunne kanskje være... vært en sånn, kall det oppvarmingsøvelse i forkant.

INTERVJUER:
Mm. Som er litt bredere, litt dypere da, enn oppstartssamtalen?

- Ja, litt... ja, litt dypere enn oppstartssamtalen, som jeg tror kan være sånn tilfeldig og stor variasjon fra enhet til enhet.

INTERVJUER:
For å kanskje luke ut dem da, som

- Luke ut dem, og kanskje du kan også... ikke bare luke ut, men kanskje motivere dem, at de ser her virkelig en forståelse av hva en ønsker å oppnå. Hva er målet for dette. Og ikke... at det ikke blir en sånn pliktøvelse fordi at det står... har stått som et sånt tiltak på medar... kompetanseplanen.

INTERVJUER:
Kjempebra... mm. Jeg blir så fornøyd.

- Synes du det, ja?

INTERVJUER:
Ja.

- Jeg vet ikke, [jeg har ikke helt]... svarene er alltid, noe gjennomtenkt og ikke gjennomtenkt. Da må bare du...

INTERVJUER:
Nei, men det er jo... jeg har jo mine hypoteser når jeg har sett på det, og ting som jeg synes... som jeg gjør meg tanker rundt. Og så er det jo utrolig interessant å snakke med de ulike informantene og få bekreftet og... og at det er andre perspektiver på det, altså... å hente ut den informasjonen. Så jeg glider meg veldig til å skrive dette og levere tilbake til... til den gjengen.
positivt at jeg selv tok initiativet til kurs og sånt. Det har jeg fått tilbakemelding på.

**INTERVJUER:**
Skal vi se... PC av og til, altså... *[forståelig]* Har du tatt nye lederutviklingskurs?

- Nei. Det har jeg ikke gjort siden. Det... og forsåvidt så kunne jeg tenkt meg det, men jeg vet... jeg tror faktisk det var sann at da vi var på dette kurset så fikk vi vite at da var jo vi det siste... siste runden på BaL3. Så skulle det lages noe nytt i StatOilHydro...

**INTERVJUER:**
DYL.

- Og så vet jeg ik... hva heter det?

**INTERVJUER:**
DYL. Developing Your Leadership.

- OK, ja... mm. Så det... jeg vet egentlig ikke hva som er... finnes det noe etter nummer 3-nivået?

**INTERVJUER:**
Nei, det... da lurer jeg på om det går på...

- Jeg tror det finnes der også, men da... det er liksom litt...

**INTERVJUER:**
Ja... da er det liksom litt høyere opp igjen, tror jeg, på denne...

- Det har jeg også oppfattet, at det... mm, at det finnes noe lenger oppe.

**INTERVJUER:**
Men du hadde ønsket at det hadde vært...?

- Ja, jeg kunne godt tenkt meg noe mer oppfølging, det kunne jeg jo godt tenkt meg. Sånn... men nå har jeg jo forsåvidt hatt det veldig travelt nå etter fusjonen. Så som... jeg har ikke vært på et kurs siden i fjor høst, eller siden desember i fjor. Så det er liksom... så... men nå var det liksom... neste år da skal jeg gjennomføre noen flere kurs da, for å få litt påfyll. Som jeg sa... mm.

**INTERVJUER:**
Men det hadde vært interessant med et oppfølgingskurs?

- Mm... mm. Det hadde absolutt det.

**INTERVJUER:**
Tenker du noe på... ja, en gang i året, på varighet...?

- Ja, kanskje en gang i året, én til to dager. Det... det hadde det. Altså, det som vi har... vi har jo en ledergruppe i... altså, den ledergruppa som jeg sitter i nå, det er Finans og Kontroll.
INTERVJUER:
Ja. Men forstår jeg deg dithen at det hadde vært ønskelig med mer oppfølging i etterkant av BaL3?

- Jeg tror vi ville hatt bedre nytte av det med... altså, det er noe med den læringen du får, hvis du ikke jobber litt med det i etterkant så forsvinner det fort. Og noen er flinke til å ta det videre ut i hverdagen, men det tror jeg er de aller færreste. For vi har det veldig travelt. Men hvis du hadde hatt noen oppfølging, hvor du krysset opp for at du skulle snakke om det eller diskutere det, eller hadde et tema som du skulle... ja, en dag, så tror jeg at effekten av læringen hadde vært større.

INTERVJUER:
Hvor ofte ser du for deg et sånt oppfrisknings... ?

- Nei, det er litt vanskeligere å si. Kanske, hvis vi hadde hatt noen sånn fordypning på... på noen av disse emnene, så...

INTERVJUER:
En gang i året, eller to ganger i året?

- Ja, én til to...

INTERVJUER:
En til to... to dager?

- To... ja, hvis du hadde hatt... hatt én gang hvert halvår, hvor du da hadde det... men det er kanskje... kanskje en skulle hatt noe sånt at du... en gikk [én og én], og så hadde du noe du skulle jobbe med i løpet av kvelden, sant? Litt lesering i forhold til og reflekisjoner rundt det... så hadde du jo fått inn litt læring i hverdagen [uforståelig]

INTERVJUER:
Skulle det vært implementert i medarbeidersamtalen?

- Ja, kanskje ledelse er en del... altså, bør egentlig være en fast del på medarbeidersamtalen. At du har en utvikling som leder som du kan [uforståelig]. Og så har du tema, og der kunne selskapet godt ha en liste over ting som du skal jobbe og fordype deg innenfor, og så, for ledelsen, for at de ikke skal gjøre det så komplisert og vanskelig. For disse lederen som sitter og... har det også travelt, ikke sant. Da er du kommet dit, og til neste... det neste trinnet, ikke sant. En tilbakemelding.

INTERVJUER:
Nettopp, fordi at jeg tenker du måles [generelt] på ikke bare at man leverer, men også hvordan man leverer. Og jeg tenker at man må jo... og så har jeg også forstått det sånn at man... noen føler at man mangler, på en måte, anerkjennelse hvis man gjør noe ekstra utad i selskapet. Sånn som jeg... ja, snappet opp, sanné ting... så jeg tenker at hvis man hadde fått... altså, anerkjennelse er viktig uansett, i forhold til det å være... ja, medarbeider, leder. Og å vite at det man jobber med blir sett, selv om det ikke bare er på... på prosjekter der man [uforståelig]. Hvis det skal være en virkelig rød tråd på det som går på verdiene, og...

- Ja, at det bør gis anerkjennelse i forhold til... ?

INTERVJUER:
Til dem...

- Det som gjøres eller det som blir mer utøvd eller lært, eller... ?
INTERVJUER:
Ja, nei, det skal jeg være veldig enig i.

- Så jeg er egentlig litt sånn imponert over at alle klarer å... man får jo alle, egentlig, til å – stort sett, da – til å handle innenfor lovene eller reglene som er.

INTERVJUER:
Mm. I etterkant, er det noen endringer du vil foreslå i forhold til form eller innhold, altså designet på BaL3? Det er jo lagt opp nå med to dager, og så en måned mellom, og så tre dager?

- Kanskje en eller annen oppfølging i etterkant, da.

INTERVJUER:
Mm. Hva ser du for deg? En gang årlig, to ganger... ?

- Nei, altså, det som de hadde på det PLE... det andre kurset jeg var på, som var veldig bra... de hadde en mentorordning etterpå.

INTERVJUER:
De har det... OK.

- Det kunne jo vært noe som var bra for BaL3. Eventuelt at... at det var i kurset, at selve gruppa hadde en gruppeleder, kanskje skulle treffes et halvt år etterpå og så signere hvordan det gikk, eksempel... at du blir litt sånn minnet på det moduset igjen. Sånn som utviklingsplan og sånt, det har jeg... det har jeg helt glemt.

INTERVJUER:
Ja. Og det er jo det... det blir jo en rød tråd i de funnene jeg har fått også. Og det nettopp det som da blir [et] litt viktig poeng for meg. At når man setter av såpass mye tid og penger og ressurser som går med til gjennomføringen, så er... anser jeg det som viktig med oppfølging i etterkant. Vil jeg tro. Og det er jo noe jeg egentlig har fått bekreftet fra samtlige nå.

- Ja, og det er jo det de sier de som har det PLE-kurset. At noe av det som er så bra med det er at du har ett år med oppfølging etterpå. Da har du mentormøter hver måned, og så samles liksom kurslederne og mentorene og de som går på kurset. Og det er liksom mye mer sånn systematisk oppfølging etterpå. Og det er jo det de sier er veldig bra med det. Altså, du går jo gjerne på et kurs, og så er du inne i det der og da, og så glemer du det. Men mange av de tingene jeg har lært i BaL3 har jeg jo ikke glemt, så... det er kanskje litt bedre systematisk oppfølging. Og så burde jo alle som var linjeleder bare få kurset med én gang. Da har jo jeg vært linjeleder i flere år etterpå og prøvd å få inn nye linjeledere. Men det finnes jo ikke noen sånne kurs, det har jo vært helt... så det er veldig viktig at...

INTERVJUER:
Så du synes at man skal få det kjapt, BaL3?

- Ja, absolutt.

INTERVJUER:
Kan det komme foran BaL1 og BaL2, eller... ? For hensikten er jo først BaL1, BaL2 og så BaL3.

- Ja, altså, BaL1 og 2 er jo på en måte management-biten. Der må du jo liksom bare lære det. Og BaL3... i hvert fall når folk liksom ikke kommer inn på det i det hele tatt, eller må vente fem år...
Mm... er det viktige tema som du synes burde vært tatt opp i forbindelse med seminaret, eller som er mangelfullt utviklet?

- Jeg må jo si nei, men det kan være i mangel av bedre vitende, holdt jeg på å si.

* Da spør jeg deg: Bærekraftig utvikling?

- Nei. Synes jeg ikke er et naturlig tema der.

* Krysskulturell?

- Det var vel sånn implisitt et tema under noen av dem, men ikke som et eget tema da. Men det ble jo diskutert, synes jeg å huske. Ikke noe jeg har savnet da; men det er fordi at jeg har ikke jobbet... vi har... vi har en italiener i avdelingen. Men han snakker svensk og er relativt godt tilpasset, så det er ikke et stort problem. Og de vi møter sånn eksternt også, det har ikke vært et savn for meg.

* Nei... kjønn? Og da tenker jeg på kvotering i forhold til kvinner i lederstillinger?

- Om det burde vært et tema? Nei...

* Etikk, samfunnsansvar?

- Det... der har vi jo vært både på kurs og workshop og seminarer utenom, holdt jeg på å si. Og det synes jeg jo er relevant, men jeg vet ikke om det er naturlig i den settingen, hvor vi trener på lederferdigheter og selvinnsikt.

* I etterkant, når du ser tilbake og tenker tilbake på det, ville du foreslått noen endringer i forhold til innholdet i BaL3 på pluss- og minussiden?

- Det kan godt være, men jeg må si at jeg... jeg vet ikke om jeg klarer å ta det her og nå, altså. Hva jeg ville... jeg var egentlig veldig fornøyd, da, det må jeg si. Så noen... det er nok noen ting jeg ville sagt mer eller mindre av, men jeg var egentlig veldig fornøyd og har ikke noen sårne voldsomt gode forslag til... til ting som burde vært endret her og nå, altså.

* Men da [spør] jeg ut fra det du har sagt og det jeg har hørt, at sånn som jeg ser det eller oppfatter det så virker det som kanskje mer oppfølging i etterkant og mer ferdighetstrening i etterkant?

- Ja... ja. Altså, den oppfølgingen i etterkant, den... mener jeg, hvis man skulle ha endret noe utenom selve innholdet i seminaret, så kunne det definitivt vært mer oppfølging i etterkant, ja. Det er jeg enig i.

* Ja. Ja, men da... da er vi ferdige?

- Var det alle spørsmålene?