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An inquiry into how organizational members break, demand, make and give sense to cope with change
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Summary

This thesis aims at creating an understanding of how organizational members in the volunteer organization Save the Children Youth Denmark (SCY) make sense of a change in their organization. Thus I have worked towards answering the research questions: 1) how do organizational members make sense of the organizational change in SCY? And 2) how is this sensemaking influenced and facilitated by the management groups in the organization? Two assumptions lie behind these formulations. Firstly, that organizational members make sense in different ways because sensemaking is based on individual knowledge, and secondly, that management and particularly middle managers play a crucial role in giving sense to and influencing the sensemaking processes of others.

Since the goal is to create an understanding of the case organization, the scientific paradigm of the thesis is social constructivism, which favours qualitative methods. Through a triangulation of interviewing, observing and analyzing organizational documents I conducted a three-part analysis showing in detail how the board, the middle managers and the volunteers went through their sensemaking processes by breaking, demanding, making and giving sense.

The answer to the first research question is that organizational members made sense of the change in their organization, with different conclusions. The board who initiated the change found that it corresponded well with their objectives for the organization. Both middle managers and regular volunteers however found that this change and the strategy it was a part of was misplaced and that there was a more pressing need for dealing with the values of the organization and through that to improve the coherency, transparency and spirit of the organization. The answer to the second research questions is that management groups in the organization were indispensible in influencing and facilitating the sensemaking of others. But seeing as the groups in the organization reached different understandings of the sensemaking object, these management groups had clearly failed in aiding other organizational members with their sensemaking efforts. The analysis showed that the reason for this was that there was no clear strategy from the board on how to break sense for others and when confronted with sensedemanding from others, both board members and middle managers were unable to give sufficient sense. The discussion of these results led to some recommendations for the board of the organization, for example to start up different initiatives to accommodate the members’ wishes for a more coherent organization.
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1. Introduction

1.1. How to make sense of change

In 2011 the board in the volunteer organization Save the Children Youth Denmark (henceforth referred to as SCY) initiated a change process which was at first not welcomed by the organizational volunteer members. The investigation takes a point of departure in the event of SCY’s annual congress in November 2011. Here the major focus was on the board’s proposal to change the structure of the board, taking it from 14 to 9 members and at the same time changing the tasks and responsibilities of the board and its individual members. The consequences of this last point was by many members of the organization perceived as the board removing itself from the members, making it more difficult for the individual groups and members across the country to be heard in the top of the organization. For the board the initiative was considered necessary to increase the efficiency of its decision-making processes and free up time for focusing on strategy. This clash in sensemaking was the main discussion topic at the congress. Eventually the vote resulted in the approval of the board’s proposal.

The special circumstance of a volunteer organization, as opposed to a profit oriented organization, is its dependency on democracy. All initiatives taken to change processes in the organization must be elected by a majority at the annual congress and in this situation it was the board’s responsibility to promote their agenda and convince the organizational members that this change was a right step to take for the organization at the time.

My interest lies in why some members were against the proposal, why they eventually accepted it, and how the board, or those who had an interest in the acceptance of the proposal, changed the climate in their favour.
1.2. Purpose

This thesis has as its goal to reach a complex understanding of the sensemaking processes that occur in an organization during times of change and how the stakeholders involved affect the sensemaking processes of each other. The complexity of the understanding is created through a combination of theories of sensemaking and theories of management. Sensemaking is done in an environment where the person looking for meaning cannot know in advance if there is any higher truth to be discovered, has to look for unifying order without any reassurance that there is a pre-existing order and has to search indefinitely, never knowing whether the unifying order has been discovered (Weick, 2001). It revolves around the person’s ability to structure a framework of the world he is acting in and by placing stimuli in this framework meaning can be created. Thus, sensemaking is fundamental for any person to create meaning and act upon that meaning when it comes to unknown and unforeseen signals relating to a change in an organization.

In times of organizational change, the key to success is to alter the current way of understanding, thinking and acting by the organizational members (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991). Change is an inevitable factor for the organization, but strategies to change processes in organizations fail up to 70% of the time (Herzig, 2006). If organizational members are to change their understandings of the organization and how it usually operates, in a successful manner, they need to understand it in a way that “makes sense” to them. In situations where change is initiated by management, it falls to this very group to aid the organizational members in making sense of their situation in order to make the change a success.

Where it is top management’s prerogative to create the plans and strategies for change, it is often the managers further down in the hierarchy of the organization who are obligated with creating the link between the higher intentions and the low-practical actions for the organizational members (Nonaka, 1988). Thus, this middle management group plays an important role in getting the organizational members to understand the advantages of a change, to accept it and adapt to it. Since regular organizational members are not typically in close daily contact with the top management, it is paramount that their immediate daily leader can create this sense for them. Otherwise the big plans to set a new direction for the organization may fail.

1.3. Research Questions

Related to the consequences of restructuring the board in Save the Children Youth Denmark, I
ask the following two questions:

**RQ1: How do organizational members make sense of the organizational change in SCY?**

**RQ2: How is this sensemaking influenced and facilitated by the management groups in the organization?**

These research questions serve several purposes. They have been formulated with the intention of reaching a discovery of how organizational members make sense of the same situation, what differences in experience has of influence on this, how this says something about the communication that travels through an organization’s hierarchy and how managers can have positive as well as negative influence on the sensemaking of others. The research objectives are thus important as they can result in practical implications for the organization and in valuable knowledge for managers on how they can affect organizational members’ sensemaking processes and improve processes of organizational change. It is important from a management perspective to know how the members make sense of things because they have to be the drive behind the change and if organizational members are not able to make sense for themselves then the change cannot succeed.

1.4. **Analysis strategy**

This analysis strategy serves as a short introduction to the theories, methods and data that are the foundation of this thesis. All of these aspects will be elaborated following the introduction.

**Literature**

To answer the research questions I build on the theories by mainly Weick (1995) and Vlaar et al (2008). Weick (1995) presents sensemaking as a process where the sensemaker attempts to create sense or order in a flux of chaotic and ongoing impressions. According to Vlaar et al. (2008) this is done through breaking, demanding and giving sense. Sense breaking, demanding and giving are basically all natural parts of the process of sensemaking, but by making use of these authors’ specific distinctions, the analysis can become more complex and detailed.

According to Vlaar et al (2008) sense is created based on previous experience and knowledge. Thus it is the underlying assumption throughout the thesis that different members in the organization depending on hierarchical status and experience in the organization will hold different knowledge and thus make different sense of the same situation. The consequences of this may be that they are in need of different sensegiving efforts.
In order to explain the linkages between the different parts of the sensemaking process I turn to theories of management, where for example Nonaka (1988) presents Middle-Up-Down Management as a beneficial method to reach a higher level of consensus in the organization.

**Methodology**

The possibilities that an organizational member has for performing these sense creating actions and thus reaching an acceptable level of understanding is decided by the knowledge and experience this person holds (ibid.). Thus each individual makes sense in a unique manner but I assume that there is a (relatively clear) distinction in the sensemaking efforts between the organization’s groups as divided by the hierarchy of the organization due to the different frames of experience they hold.

For this reason and because Nonaka argues that middle managers play a specific and important role in creating sense for other organizational members my analysis is divided into three chapters, each dealing with a specific hierarchical group of the organization, starting with the board followed by the project leaders / middle managers and ending with the regular project volunteers who are defined by having no management responsibility. For each chapter I will analyse and interpret how these specific stakeholders break, demand, make and give sense and also how they each influence the sensemaking processes of the other groups.

The analysis will be concluded by a summary of the results, clearly showing how the groups influence each other, and how sense has been made. Following this I will discuss the topics that were engaged with in the sensemaking process and - in some instances more importantly - which topics were not touched upon.

This thesis is based on the paradigm of social constructivism because my goal is to create an understanding regarding the organizational members for myself and for the reader. A focus on creating understanding thus means that I am not endeavoursing to try to give any definitive explanation or decide what is right or wrong in the given situation. I will elaborate on this in the next chapter on “Constructivism”.

**Empirical data**

The thesis is based on qualitative data from interviews, observations and documents from the organization. I have conducted seven semi-structured interviews with nine organizational members in different parts of the organization, some of them volunteers (board, local board and local project) and some of them employees (consultants/administrative staff). The observations
are mainly from the congress in November 2011, but also from two board meetings and a project leader meeting. The organizational documents are in the form of material concerning the change proposal and a value report produced by members of the organization. I am also making use of the organization’s public webpage and intranet for basic background information on the organization, e.g. values, rules, and meeting agendas/minutes.

1.5. Delimitations

As I have explained my focus will be on the organizational members of SCY and an analysis of their negotiation of sense within the organization only relating to the restructuring of the board. The analysis is limited in some regards as will be presented here. The list is not exhaustive but draws a line which along with the scope of the research questions and the analysis strategy clearly states the boundaries of this research.

Firstly, Weick’s theories concerning sensemaking are extensive and for the sake of analytical simplicity and overview I have been very strict in which aspects of his theories I have chosen to include in my theoretical framework. This is also done because I want to make space for including contributions from Vlaar et al., Nonaka and others in analyzing sensemaking processes. Thus, this cannot be considered a classic Weick analysis of sensemaking but rather an attempt to show some nuances of the process that stand out clearer with the help of these additional theories with their focus on sensebreaking, demanding and giving.

Secondly, even though the starting point of this investigation is a proposal to change structures in the organization, my focus is not on the concept of “change management” and thus I am not making use of theories concerning this. The reason that a change in the organization is the centre of this analysis is that the sensemaking process is activated when the stakeholder experiences a “shock”, which can be in the form of any sort of change to the organizational members’ everyday life (Weick, 1995). Sensemaking is not necessarily activated by an organizational change, it just happens to be the case for this thesis and this is why focus is not on “change management” but on reaching an understanding of the sensemaking organizational members go through and what influence management can have on this.

Thirdly, I interview relatively few organizational members. In the constructivist perspective this is not necessarily a problem since it is based on the premise that all is relative, there is no final objective truth, and thus each new interview would only add to the individual stories that were
told, not necessarily making it easier to generalize. At the same time it is important to remember that not all interpretations are equally good, only that they can be discussed against each other. Some will be more justifiable and qualified and have greater internal and external coherency. On the other hand it is a large complex organization and the possibility exists that the voices in this research are not completely representative of the organization.

I am aware that these limitations may reduce the generalizability of the results due to the relatively restricted scope of the research object, but I find that it still illustrates nicely the workings of sensemaking processes as well as give insights into responses and reactions to organizational change and that this might in the end serve as interesting contributions to different theories, e.g. of change management.

1.6. Relevance of the thesis

The purpose of the thesis is to interpret the processes of sensemaking by applying it to the NGO SCY and in addition to increase the complexity of this understanding by combining management theories with the theories of sensemaking. My aspiration is to gain knowledge that may improve my and the reader’s understanding of the organizational interactions as well as creating understanding and a tool for the management of the organization for improved future sensegiving.

1.7. Structure of the thesis

The structure of this thesis is built up in a way that firstly lays the ground for understanding the results, secondly a presentation of the results and lastly a discussion of the results. The research questions form the basis for the thesis and guide the use of paradigm, methodology and theoretical framework. These are tightly linked and are thus presented right after each other. Then, before the analysis commences, is a short presentation of the organization and its background. The analysis is divided into three chapters, each focusing on a level in the organization’s hierarchy. The results from these three analyses are summed up before they are discussed and reflected upon, along with a discussion of the data and methodology. Finally the thesis ends with a conclusion. The structure can be seen in the figure on next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>Research Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Philosophical Approach</td>
<td>Constructivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Methodology</td>
<td>The Pragmatic Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Managing Sensemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Introducing the Organization</td>
<td>Save the Children Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Analysis</td>
<td>The Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion of results, method and data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conclusion</td>
<td>Conclusion and Reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Social Constructivism

In this chapter I present the paradigm of social constructivism that lies behind this thesis, since it is decisive for the further choices that are made concerning the link between research question, method and theory. I present the most important concepts behind this and discuss their meanings for this paper as it leads us directly into the next chapter, being the thesis’ methodology.

2.1. Paradigm

According to Kuhn (Jordansen and Madsen (PIP, p. 42), p. 44) a paradigm is characterized by being 1) a set of values and believes, which guides our actions, 2) a set of basic assumptions which are characteristic for a discipline and which are assumed to be guiding for the choice of e.g. problem statement, theory, concepts, method and ethic and 3) an expression of a period’s perception of “reality”. Thus, in the context of producing a thesis, a paradigm frames my thinking and choices of methods.

The philosophical paradigm of this thesis is decided by the purpose of the research questions, which aim to create an understanding of organizational members’ processes of interpretation or sensemaking efforts after having been presented with the “shock” of a proposal to restructure parts of the organization. The moment we attempt to understand something as relative as other people’s thoughts and reasoning for action, we move within the constructivist paradigm.

2.2. Social constructivism

This thesis is based on theories about sensemaking and therefore follows a social constructivist paradigm. Social constructivism and sensemaking have in common that they are both based on the worldview that our reality is shaped by our recognition of it (Rasborg, 2004). In social constructivism this means that societal phenomena are not eternal and unchangeable, but rather
that they are created through historic and social processes and as such are subject to change (ibid.).

Actors in society create reality through their knowledge and actions. This means that e.g. a volunteer organization cannot be described as a volunteer organization unless the participating actors can agree that it is just that (ibid., p. 354). This need for communication makes verbal language an essential part of social constructivism. According to Rasborg (2004) reality has an independent existence outside of language, and in its own it is just an indefinable “something” that cannot be reached by human recognition unless the reality is forced into concepts and in that way given a verbal format (ibid., p. 358). Weick formulates this in his famous saying concerning sensemaking when he asks “How can I know what I think until I see what I say?” (Weick, 1995). Truths start to exist when people reach consensus about them or introduce words or concepts that can express these truths (Rasborg, 2004, p. 352).

According to Rasborg, in a social constructivist view the world is perceived as ambiguous, dynamic and chaotic and it is through social practice that we construct a (relatively) limited form of unambiguous, solid order (ibid., p. 379). Here Weick has a direct link between social constructivism and sensemaking because he states that sensemaking (what Rasborg calls social practice in constructivism above)\(^1\) is what carves out cues in the ongoing flux of life and create order from that.

As Nietzsche wrote there is no objective or final truth, only myriads of interpretations (Rasborg, 2004, p. 357). Investigating an organization can lead to several discoveries, but according to social constructivism, these discoveries are never the whole truth. Rather they are interpretations of the practices in one organization, which might prove to be valuable information for several organizations but they can never be proclaimed to be true since they are based on biased, value-laden, subjective analysis (Jordansen, 2010, p. 275). This leads back to the introduction of the thesis, where I mentioned that I focus on creating an understanding for organizational members’ thoughts and actions.

The process of creating meaning and understanding is a never-ending process, but at some point there must be an end to the collection of data. According to Bowen this happens at the point of saturation and he writes that *saturation is reached when the researcher gathers data to the point ____________*\(^1\)

\(^1\) In either case we are dealing with a situation – a social situation of construction – where people are interacting in order to create meaning
of diminishing returns, when nothing new is being added (2008, p. 140).

2.3. Implications of paradigm

Working with a social constructivist perspective means accepting to be subjective in my work and accepting that we all continuously affect each other but it does not mean to be uncritical of these processes or to accept bias or, indeed, manipulation. Though we are not neutral observers, we must treat our research objects, cases and source material with respect and try to minimize and confront bias and prejudice. For the researcher to obtain an image of the workings of the research object (e.g. the organization) that is as unbiased as possible, the researcher must stand in the middle of it and be a part of it. Interacting with the players makes me as a researcher a co-creator of the discoveries that are made.

Being a constructivist demands a lot from the research methods used since the researcher must pay careful attention to whether outcomes of observations and interactions are real or a product of interference. These aspects will all be further elaborated upon in the chapter of discussion.
3. Methodology

In this chapter I present my methods for generating and analyzing data. The thesis builds on the constructivist paradigm and this has consequences for the methods and techniques used for generating and analyzing data for the analysis.

3.1. Methodology and Social Constructivism

Working within the paradigm of social constructivism the point of departure is that it is not possible to develop generic theories because the research object is unique. The social constructions that are analyzed in the constructivist paradigm are differently formed in different places and they also change over time. This makes them unstable and underlines how such an analysis is almost a snapshot of a specific situation at a specific point in time. The goal is to achieve firsthand knowledge of organizational members that can help answer the research question. For this purpose qualitative methods are used (Jordansen & Madsen, PIP, p. 62). These can be defined as methods that aid the researcher in describing and understanding meaning (as opposed to quantitative methods, which in general deal with frequency) (Jordansen, PIP, p. 205). Seeing as this research is focused on the construction of recognition, the knowledge which is sought after is related to the individual and thus can only be understood from that person’s perspective, making concepts such as reality and objectivity less important. For this reason knowledge and data is created (constructed) between the researcher and the research object (Jordansen & Madsen, 2010, p. 59).

3.2. The Research Design – Case Study

This thesis attempts through the use of theories of sensemaking to understand how sense develops in a real life case organization, which means that the research design used is a case
study. The purpose of a case study is to reach a deeper understanding of a specific phenomenon in a specific context and to find out how meaning is ascribed in that context (Georg, 2010, p. 145). This also means that the research is inductive since the conclusions drawn will be generalized based on observations from a single case (Jordansen & Madsen, 2010, p. 47). A case study as a research design prescribes which methods are best for producing data. These methods will be presented below.

3.3. Data Collection Methods

This case study is based on both first hand and second hand data of the qualitative. Qualitative data is the most common kind of data in the socially constructed world, where there is a focus on human interactions above quantitative statistics (Jordansen, 2010, p. 205).

The data I have collected is derived from first hand observations of board meetings and the annual congress 2011, from informal conversations with fellow volunteers and from interviews with members in the organization. The second hand data is in the form of internally and externally directed documents from the organization and the organization’s web page, and is for example board meeting minutes and a report on the use of values written by three organizational members, named the RBA report (this can be seen in the appendix on the enclosed CD). This method triangulation interviews, observations and documents are combined brings a complexity to my analysis that can increase the validity of my findings (Mik-Meyer, 2010, p. 327). Table 1 on the next page gives an overview of the data collection.

Interviews

I initially conducted an explorative unstructured interview as an early inspiration to learn which topics could be relevant to investigate in the organization, with a volunteer in the organization, who was both a high-level coordinator and who was also sitting in the board at the time.

My primary empirical data is based on seven interviews with nine persons in the organization, and represents many “types” of organizational members; volunteers and employees, leaders and followers, those close to the core of the organization and those further away in the loosely coupled structure. I made it a point to have such diverse voices heard, because I consider it to be representing the organization in the most optimal manner. These key persons are: the president of the organization (interview C), the manager of the secretariat (interview A), an employee in the secretariat (interview B), two board members (interview D + interview E), two volunteers
from a local youth project in Copenhagen (interview F) and two volunteers from a local board in Aarhus (interview G).

These interviews were all semi-structured in-depth interviews (Madsen & Darmer, 2010, p. 213ff) because the semi-structured interview gave me the possibility of interviewing with a loosely planned interview guide where I had a few questions prepared in advance but also had the option of pursuing interesting unplanned topics that emerged during the interview (ibid., p. 220). Also, by doing an in-depth interview I took advantage of the information I held about the organization already (from own experience and from initial inspirational interview) and could go in-depth and learn more on the topic (ibid., p. 217).

Adhering to the constructivist paradigm, the objective of this type of interview is also to let me as the interviewer ask into other people’s subjective perception of their own situation and attempt to understand what the interviewee thinks and believes and how he perceives his “life world”. Wanting to understand people’s perceptions limited my choices of interview type as it was paramount that I allowed the interviewee to go down any (within the limits of my interest) road of topic. The interview guide can be seen in Appendix 2. The interviews were all recorded
and transcribed in Danish, where after they were coded in an Excel ark and translated into English for the analysis. An example of the coding in Excel can be seen further down below and the coding can be seen in full in Appendix 3.

Some of the organizational members, whom I interviewed and observed in meetings, already knew me. This meant that some might have chosen to open more up to me and be more forward than they would have been to a stranger. On the other hand it was my clear impression that some worked very hard throughout the interview to maintain and present a facade of themselves and the organization that they wished to convey, and thus where less willing to open up or go into stories or explanations which they felt reflected poorly on them or the organization. The further away I got from the core of the organization in this loosely coupled structure the less I experienced this particular phenomenon.

**Observations**

The volunteer organization is created and formed by its members and thus a supreme example of the social constructivist position that the organization does not exist as such, but rather it is a result of how people create meaning and construct stable social structures that affect and are affected by their actions (Jordansen, 2010, p. 275). Thus it has proved valuable for me to observe the organizational members interacting, where I could witness the experienced organizational reality, the individual’s perception of own and other’s identity and how the always present power balance is constructed (ibid.). I was not searching for one specific true answer, but rather an answer that could increase the complexity of my understanding of the organization and its attitude to this particular situation of change.

The majority of my interviews were conducted during the weekend of the organization’s annual congress in 2011. I also made many observations of the participants’ reactions to the many meetings, discussions and votes during this weekend. The intense atmosphere that the congress created creates a special context for the data that I have obtained, which is taken into consideration, when I use this data in my analysis.

My observations were written out in note-form after the meetings and elaborated for the use of the appendix, where they can be seen (Appendix 4-7).

**Documents**

In a constructivist perspective all kinds of documents can aid in acquiring knowledge of a certain topic (Mik-Meyer & Justesen, 2010, p. 285ff). Thus a document can never present the complete...
“truth”, but is rather a representation of the organization’s negotiated self-perception. Smith (as cited by Mik-Meyer & Justesen, ibid.) claims that the document cannot be taken out of its socially constructed context where it has been produced and consumed, it will only be meaningful when taken into a social situation. Therefore it is also never ”dead”. The knowledge it is portraying is constructed in a specific manner, which could have been done differently. It is the construction of this reality which is interesting for the researcher because what is communicated in this document gives a certain, constructed impression of a reality, which the sender could have chosen to construct differently (ibid., p. 289).

An example of some organizational documents, which I will be using in a supporting manner in my analysis, is a document that is referred to repeatedly by the board members. This is the RBA report, which was produced by volunteers in the organization and which aims to inform the board and the volunteers of the benefits of working with a rights based approach. The report acts as an advocate for paying much more attention to values and how they are practiced. It has been submitted on the enclosed CD as an appendix.

3.4. Data Analysis

This is an empirical analysis, where the interaction between theory and data is the starting point and centre of the analysis (Darmer & Madsen, 2010, p. 345). The purpose of the analysis is to discover connections through finding and sorting the themes in the interviews and other data. Understanding develops through interpreting the connections discovered in the analysis when these are explained. The purpose of interpretation is to discover the meaning and significance of the statements in the interviews and it is two-fold. Firstly, it looks at what people say and what it means in its own. Secondly, the connections, discoveries and phenomena from the analysis are generalized. These interpretations are subjective (ibid.).

To commence the analysis, I carefully read the transcribed interviews several times. I coded the material by highlighting phrases, words and sentences that were repeated by multiple sources and/or which related to my guiding research question. Thus I tried to both keep a focus on where I wanted to go but also take into consideration where the interviewees wanted to take me.

The coding of my data followed the research objectives and was thus focused on pointing out instances where sense was broken, demanded, made or given. Thus, the text or quotes taken from the interviews are relatively long because I found that the context of what was said was
important for understanding the use of the quote in a specific context. This is in accordance with the constructivist perspective where coding is less important because focus is on ambiguity and identifying variations as well as contradictions (Georg, 2010).

This is an example of what my excel spreadsheet came to look like. It can be seen in its full extend in Appendix 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensemaking</th>
<th>Top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Topic:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D line 3</td>
<td>hvorfor er jeg frivillig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D line 5</td>
<td>RBU ikke vigtigt i forhold til projektet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D line 7</td>
<td>the importance of values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.5. Practical and ethical considerations of working with own organization**

My interest in the organization and the reason for it becoming the focus of this thesis stems from me being an active (organizational) volunteer in the organization since early 2010. I recognize that my experience and relations in the organization give me some prior knowledge and thus perhaps (subconscious) bias. I am aware that it can prove difficult for me to question the practice of the organization since I am already acquainted with it and my pre-understanding can make it difficult not to be limited by my assumptions and prejudice.

The assumptions I hold are thus coloured by my pre-understanding of the organization, and this can both be an advantage and a disadvantage for the research. I strive to avoid bias through thorough use of theories and by discussing my considerations throughout the paper. It is my intention that the analysis and conclusions become credible through explicit reflecting on the consequences of my own experience, emotions and opinions about the research question, method, analysis and conclusions.

According to Kalckar (2010) there are both pros and cons to being a researcher in a familiar organization. First of all it benefits because I have a great knowledge of the organization,
relatively easy access to data, and knowledge of how to behave in the organization and how to talk about certain issues. On the other hand it can be difficult to create a distance between me and the organization and thus see other or new perspectives because one can have ”blind spots”. The danger is that I confirm myself and what I already know because of my prejudice and pre-understandings, instead of challenging it.

In order to challenge my own presumptions and pre-understandings I have conducted some of the interviews with organizational members with whom I have not had prior relationships with and this did give some insights that I had not encountered earlier. According to Jordansen (2010, p. 277) the researcher possesses a great power in being in a position to take over other’s stories and define their reality. I have tried to avoid this by being open to the stories I heard and letting them take me in directions I had not previously contemplated.

3.6. Summary of chapter

This chapter has presented how the research is build up on the conditions of the constructivist paradigm that was presented in the previous chapter. The conditions are that all interpretations derived from the data analysis are subjective and this demands a high level of credibility, consistency, transparency and reflection to ensure a high research quality. The research is conducted as an inductive case study based on qualitative methods. These methods produce the empirical data for the analysis and are in the form of semi-structured in-depth interviews, observations and document analysis. In my chapter of discussion I will give an evaluation and critique of my choice of methods.
4. Theoretical framework

In this chapter I present the theoretical framework of this paper. In a social constructivist perspective a model for analysis can only be inspirational and never copied, since it would go against the constructivist paradigm if there was only one interpretation of how a theory could and should be used in an analysis (Darmer & Madsen, 2010, p. 341ff). In accordance with this, this chapter shows how I make use of sensemaking to understand what happens amongst the members of an organization.

My theoretical framework is first of all anchored in Karl E. Weick’s (1995) theory of sensemaking but is further build up and strengthened by supporting theories relating to the cognitive mechanisms of understanding ones surroundings. Specifically this consists of Vlaar et al’s (2008) theories relating to sensebreaking and sensedemanding, Gioia & Chittipeddi’s (1991) theory of sensegiving, Smircich & Morgan’s (1982) theory of how leaders give sense through “management of meaning” as well as Nonaka’s focus on the middle managers. Following this introduction I will explain each of these theories in more detail and show how I consider them to be linked.

My studies have given me a solid background in leadership and organizational studies and I see a clear link between the two areas. Sensemaking theories can in their essence be used as a constructive management tool, because immersion into what organizational members think, what makes them think what they think and what can be done to change what they think, should be considerations that any leader with an aspiration to creating a productive working environment have in mind. The factors affecting these thoughts can be found in and outside the organization in the form of stakeholders, the environment and other influencing factors. Thus I have found it relevant to draw on such theories in explaining the boundaries as well as links between the four different sensemaking mechanisms. These will also be introduced.
Ending this chapter, I will present a figure for visualizing how I see the links between breaking, demanding, making and giving sense and how theories of management fit with them. The figure will here be presented as a simplified theoretical model which should be seen as a theoretical contribution to the research of sensemaking and management literature in its ability to show how all stakeholders of the organization are responsible for and play their own part in creating congruency and shared sense.

4.1. The Sensemaking Process

According to Vlaar et al (2008) organizational members engage with actions of sensegiving, sensedemanding and sensebreaking when they encounter asymmetries in knowledge and experience or find that requirements or task characteristics are complex, unstable, ambiguous or novel. Engaging with breaking, demanding and giving sense allows them to make sense of their tasks and environment and it increases the likelihood that congruent and actionable understandings emerge. Furthermore, it assists them in cocreating novel understandings, especially when acts of sensegiving and sensedemanding are complemented with instances of sensebreaking (Vlaar et al., 2008, p. 227). Breaking, demanding and giving sense is thus something that is done to create an understanding.

Sensemaking

I use the phrase sensemaking to cover two different aspects. Firstly, sensemaking is the umbrella term used when dealing with the processes of creating meaning. This means that all four sense-related mechanisms – breaking, demanding, giving and making – are part of the overall sensemaking process. Breaking the analysis of this process into these four stages enriches the analysis as it opens up for the possibility of making it deeper and more detailed. The phrase sensemaking is also used when dealing with the specific part of this chain that is sensemaking – the moment when the stakeholder attaches a cue to a frame and attempts to make sense of something in her surroundings.

In its essence, sensemaking is a cognitive mechanism for the individual to cope with uncertainty. Making sense of our surroundings is something we all do, at all times. In the ongoing flux of life, people are continuously bombarded with information and this information is swiftly categorized and compartmentalized (Weick et. al. 2005). The “shock” (Weick, 1995) that this uncertainty and ongoing information creates is what activates the sensemaking process.
However, sometimes the action that has precipitated this sensemaking is too disruptive for the frames of understanding we hold and thus it results in change (reframing). I work out from the assumption that sensemaking is a constant ongoing activity and therefore not necessarily an action that always creates change or is started by change. However, the focus of this paper is on an instance where sensemaking happens in response to change-bringing “shock”. This also underlines that the focus of the thesis is on a change to what the stakeholder has previously been accustomed to and not on the widely spread concept of “organizational change”.

The properties of sensemaking

Karl E. Weick began his work with sensemaking in the 1960s (Weick, 1964, as cited by Weick, 2001, p. 6) when he observed how people in a study rationalized their understanding of a situation until it made sense for them. Weick identified seven properties (Weick, 1995, p. 17) of sensemaking based on this, namely that sensemaking is a cognitive activity, which is:

- **Social**: we cannot make sense of things on our own, firstly because what we make sense of is information coming from others and secondly because we interact with others to make sense - organizational members share assumptions, knowledge, and expectations with others with whom they have close (working) relationships (Orlikowski, 1994, p. 177).

- **Retrospective**: sense is made of past experiences when we pay attention to them and thereby modify the perception of an experience to fit in with the given present situation. Thus, sensemaking is influenced by what people notice in elapsed events, how far back they look, and how well they remember the past (Weick, 2007). Weick also calls this “adaptive sensemaking” because there are truths of the moment that change, develop and take shape through time. It is these changes through time that progressively reveal that a seemingly correct action “back then” is becoming an incorrect action “now” (Weick, 2005). Vlaar et al (2008), however, also sees a future oriented perspective in sensemaking because acts of sensemaking include observing, reasoning, analyzing, contemplating, anticipating and imagining (Vlaar et. al., 2008, p. 240).

- **Identity related**: when making sense we refer to what we know and who we perceive ourselves to be. Weick formulates it as a person’s (or group’s) sense of who they are in a certain situation, what threats to this sense of self the situation contains, and what is available to enhance, continue and render successful that sense of self as being the
elements which provide the explanatory frame the person needs (Weick, 2007).

- **Ongoing**: as mentioned above sensemaking happens constantly and pertaining to a specific situation sense can be altered continuously as it fits the given situation. This makes sensemaking an ongoing, negotiated process (Clarkson, 2006).

- **Enactive of its environment**: the sensemaker engages her environment or surroundings by asking questions, notice reactions and infer meanings. These actions at the same time shape and enact the surroundings. In this way what one is making sense of will always be a partial reflection of oneself (Weick, 2007). It means that the sensemaker takes part in creating a reality, which at the same time restricts the options for action (Darmer & Nygaard, 2006).

- **Focused on cues**: sense is created within our frames of reference (what we know and understand), and we constantly receive cues from our surroundings that either do or do not fit with that frame. The act of sensemaking is focused on the cues that help us make sense of a situation, i.e. the cues that are given from management.

- **Plausible rather than accurate**: when making sense of something, it is more important for the sensemaker that it is possible or plausible than actually accurate, since what is basically needed from the sensemaking mechanisms is to reach a workable level of uncertainty (Vlaar et. al., 2008) and thus be able to move forward with other pressing tasks (Weick, 2007).

These seven properties combined are activated in a sensemaking process when observations and expectations diverge from each other, or when there is no obvious way to engage in activities (Vlaar et. al., 2008) and this continues until the sensemaker has reached an acceptable level of understanding. In this way sensemaking informs and constrains action (Vlaar et. al., 2008, p. 240) from the sensemaker because we act according to what makes sense for us. According to Clarkson (2006) the properties have an effect on the willingness of people to disengage from their initial story and adopt a newer story that is more sensitive to the particulars of the present context (Clarkson, 2006).

The properties of sensemaking are not evenly represented in the analysis because some of the aspects are more significant or telling than others. This means that the aspect of identity in particular takes up a great deal of space in the analysis.
Frames

Individual sensemaking takes place within a person’s frame of reference. A frame can be defined as a person’s definition of reality and it is built up by that person’s assumptions, knowledge, and expectations (Orlikowski, 1994, p. 176). This premise makes a frame individual and thus different individuals in a group may have different frames as well as different groups in an organization may have different frames. Frames are expressed symbolically through language, visual images, metaphors, and stories and they are flexible in structure and content, having variable dimensions that shift in salience and content by context and over time (Ibid.).

According to Orlikowski (1994) frames help us structure the organizational experience and they allow us to make sense of ambiguous situations, to minimize uncertainty during complex or changing conditions, and our frames provide us with the basis we need for taking action. The problem with frames, which will also be presented below along with the concept of sensebreaking, is that they become restraining when they reinforce unreflective reliance on established assumptions and knowledge, distort information to make it fit existing cognitive structures, and inhibit creative problem solving (Orlikowski, 1994, p. 176-177). To avoid this we need to break the frame – to break with the sense we have thus far held of the issue in question. In the example of this thesis it is the need to break with the previously held understanding of what the purpose is of the board in a volunteer organization.

All in all, sensemaking is a cognitive process, which starts with a shock or chaos and organizes flux. First the sensemaker notices a cue and brackets it in a frame – once bracketing occurs, the world is simplified (Chia 2000, as cited by Weick et. al., 2005, p 134). In order to stabilize the chaos of information, we use sensemaking to label and categorize. A label can for example be in the form of a concern, a bad sign, a mistake, or an opportunity (Weick et. al., 2005, p. 133).

Sensemaking is the result of a cue being related to a frame in a manner that creates new understanding. Thus sensemaking will happen successfully when the sensemaker can adapt his frame of understanding to a new situation through receiving a cue from a stakeholder or sensegiver which makes sense for him and which can be related to the frame that is needed for making sense.

Sensebreaking, sensedemanding and sensegiving

In 2008 Vlaar et al conducted a study of how geographically dispersed organizational members could co-create understanding and thus value for the organization (Vlaar et. al., 2008). Taking a
point of departure in sensemaking the researchers were able to identify specific actions that more precisely could explain the cognitive mechanisms going on amongst the organizational members. Besides sensemaking (Weick, 1964) and sensegiving (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991) they pointed out sensebreaking and sensedemanding as crucial co-mechanisms.

**Sensebreaking**

Sensemaking, sensebreaking and sensedemanding are mechanisms that create meaning for the individual. For this new meaning creation to be necessary in the first place, sensebreaking acts as a mechanism for individuals to disrupt a previously held understanding. This disruption in effect acts as, what Weick has labelled a “shock”, an instance, which makes the individual question existing understandings, and to experience their views of reality as incoherent, insensible, and untenable (Vlaar et. al., 2008). Sensebreaking happens when one stakeholder presents another stakeholder with reasons for the invalidity of the existing frame.

Thus sensebreaking entails that previously held understandings or conceptions are reframed and that individuals direct their attention towards searching for solutions to the disruption. Sensebreaking can take the form of presenting alternative practices or openly questioning assumptions and it happens when a focal person believes that others hold incongruent or undesirable views of reality, and when he or she believes that other lines of thinking lead to adverse and disjointed action (Vlaar et. al., 2008, p. 241).

Sensebreaking is a necessary mechanism for people to break with an understanding of how things have been, to be open to new aspects of tasks and environments and to avoid that people continually attempt to incorporate new knowledge into existing understandings and frames. Instead, people can fundamentally challenge the validity of pre-existing understandings that are preventing them from achieving more congruent understandings (Vlaar et. al., 2008).

**Sensedemanding**

According to Vlaar et al (2008), people experiencing a disruption in their understandings are not likely to wait for others to clarify their situation (Vlaar et. al., 2008, p. 240). Instead, they “demand” sense, either through information search, inquiries, or through asking questions so that they can acquire and process information and create a workable level of uncertainty (ibid.).

The need to acquire information and thus having to demand sense can happen to any organizational member. In this sense there is always a certain level of disequilibrium of
information amongst the different organizational members. Someone will always know more than others or for example have an interest in moving the organization in a different direction. Sense can thus be demanded from leaders, superiors, peers, equals or external stakeholders as well as other organizational members or experts who hold important information that can help in the sensemaking process.

It is at this stage that sensemaking begins, when the person starts to receive new cues for forming a new frame of references for his understanding.

**Sensegiving**

Whereas sensebreaking disrupts people’s definition and understandings of organizational reality, when this definition is deemed incorrect, sensegiving on the other hand is focused on influencing the sensemaking and meaning construction of others toward a preferred redefinition of this organizational reality (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991, p. 442). Sensegiving is partly the sensegiver’s attempt to make sense for herself and partly her attempt to bring this sense forward to others.

Through the use of sensegiving mechanisms, individuals endeavour to modify and influence how other individuals think and act (Vlaar et. al., 2008, p. 240). According to Smircich and Morgan this is especially a task for the leaders in the organizational setting, because the actions and utterances of leaders frame and shape the context of action in such a way that the members of that context are able to use the meaning thus created as a point of reference for their own action and understanding of the situation (Smircich & Morgan, 1982, p. 261). In this way leadership involves a process of defining reality in ways that are sensible to the led (ibid., p. 259).

However, other organizational members than leaders, can give sense as well. It is just as feasible that sense could be given by equals or external stakeholders or that leaders could be influenced in their sensemaking by information coming from organizational members further down in the hierarchy.

Vlaar et al (2008) formulates it as the stakeholders framing and disseminating visions and beliefs to others in order to increase their understanding and support. Thus, sensegiving is actions that offer descriptions and explanations, provide signals, construct credible and consistent narratives and project images through stories, slogans, metaphors, and artefacts (Vlaar et. al., 2008, p. 240). This is also what is named “cues” in the above description of the properties of sensemaking.

Whether it is called understanding, meaning or sense, it is created in the processes of sensemaking when an oscillation between sensebreaking, sensedemanding, sensegiving and
sensemaking occurs and according to Vlaar et al (2008, p. 232) “people will generally understand, interpret, and attend to situations differently because of structural differences in prior experience, bounded rationality and discrepancies in interests and objectives”.

4.2. Making Sense in the Organization

In this section I will attempt to lift the aspects of the sensemaking processes from an individual level to an organizational level, in order to show how the entire organization is affected by the organizational members’ sensemaking.

Even though sensemaking is an individual cognitive process, it is still conditioned by the sensemaker’s surroundings because it is social and thus happens in interactions with other sensemaking individuals (e.g. when enacting the environment or receiving cues). Each individual has its own memories, perceptions and attitudes of what has happened earlier (they hold different frames of understanding), which means that they will also have different understandings of what is happening in the present time because sensemaking is retrospective.

The decisions that individuals make based on the sensemaking process they have gone through, affect their actions and each decision will influence individual, team, department, and organizational performance and productivity (Clarkson, 2006). Thus, their understanding of their surroundings affects their actions but their actions will in turn affect and shape their environment. Nonaka (1994) formulates it in the way that these actions create organizational mind as individuals interact and trigger behaviour patterns in others (Nonaka, 1994, p. 23).

Vlaar et al. (2008) argues that sensemaking permits parties with different views and expectations to achieve congruency and to construct accounts of reality that allow them to comprehend the world and act collectively. I agree with this, but will emphasize how crucial the process of sensegiving is in this context. This is because having a management group which is capable of presenting organizational members with the specific cues they need for creating the desired sense is decisive for the success of reaching consensus. Since individuals have different frames they can also be in need of different cues to reach the same sense. Smircich and Morgan (1982) formulate it as different organizational members may make sense of situations with the aid of different interpretive schemes (what I relate to as frames), establishing “counter-realities”, a source of tension in the group that may set the basis for change of an innovative or disintegrative kind (ibid, p. 262).
4.3. The context of the organizational setting

In this section I would like to create a picture of how I perceive the context of the organization, because I consider it to be important for the understanding of organizational theories and it has a great impact on the success of the organization’s sensemaking.

Time and space

According to Kant (1781) we use time and space as a systematic framework to structure our experience. Thus I also underline the importance of the concepts “time” and “space” to structure some ideas concerning the context of the organizational setting. The time perspective has as such already been presented as a part of sensemaking, namely that we make sense of the present by referring to events of the past as well as imagining the future. Thus, the sensemaker can also create new sense as time passes because new experiences and the receiving of new cues change the setting for the sensemaking. This aspect makes the concept of time important to keep in mind.

Concerning the space perspective of organizing, I define it in a “vertical” and “horizontal” manner. The vertical space perspective illustrates the hierarchy of the organization, with some thoughts and theory by Nonaka (1988) on the links between the levels of the organization. The horizontal space perspective illustrates the extent of the organization being comprised of all the different groups that branch out on the different levels in the organization and some thoughts and theory by Orton & Weick (1990) on the conditions of the coupling of organizations, whether the coupling is loose, tight or nonexistent, because this acts as a condition for the success of sensegiving.

The vertical link between the organizational levels

To help describe the link between the levels in the organizational hierarchy I use the theory by Nonaka from 1988. Much management literature focuses on top-down processes where there is an emphasis on the process of implementing and refining decisions made by top management as they are transmitted down in the organization or bottom-up processes where there is an emphasis on the influence of information from lower levels in the organization on management decision making (Nonaka, 1988, p. 9).

Nonaka (1988) combines the two in a third combination, namely middle-up-down management. The core of this theory is that top management concerns themselves with creating
the vision or dream for the organization and then let the middle managers – those in close, daily contact with the regular organizational members – create and implement the concrete concepts needed to solve and exceed *the contradictions arising from gaps between what exists at the moment and what management hopes to create* (Nonaka, 1988, p. 9).

These gaps between the abstract and reality is what sensemaking theory sees as a point of need for sensemaking (Weick et. al., 2005, p. 133). It is at this moment that the sensemaker is breaking with a previously held frame of reference because the abstract of what is visualized by top management does no longer comply with the known reality of the organizational member. Thus the middle manager, according to Nonaka, becomes an important link for the regular organizational member to start making sense of the cues coming from above and thus create the new frames of understanding for embracing the visions of top management. Adhering to the theory of middle-up-down management I will thus make a separate analysis of SCY’s middle managers, namely the project leaders.

*The horizontal link between the groups constituting the organization*

Another premise for the case organization of this thesis is that it is loosely coupled. I base this on a statement from one of the interviewed board members, who said that “*it has to be a strategic prioritization that we try to coordinate the different areas in the organization because earlier we were this satellite organization...*” (Quote, Interview E, line 18) in the sense that the groups were scattered. According to Orton & Weick’s definition of a “*loosely coupled system*” a system (the organization) is loosely coupled when there is distinctiveness between the units of the organization and when these units are responsive to each other while at the same time remaining their separateness and identity (Orton & Weick, 1990 page 203-204). It means that any level in the organization’s hierarchy (top, middle, or bottom) has interdependent elements that may vary in number and strength. The loose coupling can exist among individuals, subunits, hierarchical levels and also among ideas, activities, intentions and actions (Orton & Weick, 1990). An advantage concerning loose coupling can be that it functions as a “buffer” so that problems in one unit are not (necessarily) spread to other units (ibid, p. 213).

This is what the case organization SCY looks like, because it is constituted by a myriad of project groups, communication groups, local boards and so on. These groups are only sporadically linked through different “management groups”\(^2\) and their commitment to

\(^2\) “Styregrupper”
communication with the rest of the organization differs enormously as this secretariat employee can tell: "...it is so difficult to motivate the volunteers [to communicate] and make them understand why it is important [...] they don’t feel a need but somehow we have to make them understand that there is a need..." (Quote, Interview B, line 46).

The consequences of being a loosely coupled system for the case organization SCY is that it inherently presents difficulties for communication to go out to all groups because these will feel more or less related to the sender of this communication. For example this means that the management group would have to diversify their communication to the different groups in order to reach the best outcome. This has a great impact on the sensegiving efforts that are needed to have all organizational members embrace the change.

4.4. Organizational sensemaking figure

I have created this figure to illustrate the connections between the mechanisms in sensemaking and the hierarchy in the organization. For reader-friendly versions see Appendix 9.

The circles in the figure represent the levels in the organization’s hierarchy. In this example there are three stakeholders – levels – because that is what I am working with in my analysis. The number of circles could of course be endless. The arrows represent the sensemaking mechanisms that go on in the organization between the different stakeholder groups.

The four parts of the overall sensemaking process are linked in a distinct order because there cannot be one without the other. This is indicated with red numbers in figure 2. Thus sensebreaking is the first part of the process. Following this come sensedemanding and sensegiving if they are needed to be able to make sense. Sense is after all only demanded if the sensemaker lacks information and then sense is given in response to this. Sense, however, can
also be given independently of sensedemanding if for example management is offering cues to make the sensemaker reach an understanding that management wishes.

In figure 2 the process described above has been illustrated only at one level with black arrows. The same process is of course happening simultaneously at the other levels. Sensedemanding, sensegiving and sensemaking can reoccur repeatedly until the sensemaker has reached a workable level of understanding. This is indicated with black arrows in figure 2. This can in theory mean that sense is demanded and given several times until sensemaking has become plausible enough to work from. Thus I imagine that in the occurrence of one period of sensemaking, the sensemaker experiences sensebreaking as the initiator of the sensemaking process, then jump between sensedemanding, sensereceiving and sensemaking until understanding has reached an acceptable – plausible - level.

Thus, the stakeholders are demanding and giving sense to and from each other in order to reach consensus. These acts of sensegiving, sensemaking, sensedemanding and sensebreaking constitute ongoing and dynamic processes with a fundamentally social character. Jointly, they enable individuals to change, synchronize, and deepen their understandings (Vlaar et. al., 2008, p. 241).

I will use this figure to introduce each part of the analysis, to illustrate the progress in the paper and discuss its contributions further in my final chapter of discussion.

4.5. Implications of chosen theories

I have selected parts of these researchers’ theories which it made sense for me to use and combine. They have been chosen and used in a manner that hopefully supports but also expands on each theory’s scope. Thus making this a unique collection of management, organization and sensemaking theories to build upon. I am aware that I have not exhausted the realm of these theories but this is the scope that I have chosen because I find it to be thorough and sufficient in bringing me through my analysis and at the same time having a clear boundary for the analysis.

I am aware of Corvellec and Risberg’s (2007) refusal of the theories of sensemaking that sees sense as a something for someone to hold and be able to give to others. They prefer to work with the concept of “mise-en-sens”, which more describes a process of influencing others through

---

3 The sensemaker receiving the sense (cue) that is given from a sensegiver
contextualisation, ontologising and neutralising (Corvellec & Risberg, 2007, p. 313), thereby creating the sense you wish the stakeholders to. I find the sensemaking theories to be very capable of describing and demonstrating the organizational processes whereby management groups can influence as well as aid the organizational members in finding some sense in their surroundings, as pertains to their role, job description, task, hierarchy and so on. For that reason I do not agree with Corvellec and Risberg that the sensemaking theories prescribe that the sensegiver can “hold” sense. I argue that stakeholders through giving cues can affect the sensemaking of other stakeholders. In that sense no one is ever “holding” the truth, but we negotiate meaning in our social context. For that reason I base my thesis on these theories and disregard Corvellec and Risberg’s concerns.

4.6. Summary of chapter

This chapter has presented the theoretical framework for the paper. The base of it all is Weick’s theory of sensemaking, with the added support from Vlaar et al, Nonaka, Gioia & Chittipeddi, Smircich & Morgan and others, who help to further deepen the understanding of sensemaking through expanding on the micro processes that happen within the overall process. These are sensebreaking, sensedemanding, and sensegiving. Bringing in these concepts adds an extra dimension to the analysis and discussion and these concepts might be helpful in taking the understanding of what is happening further, where mere sensemaking is not sufficient.

Furthermore I have introduced the concept of middle-up-down management to underline the importance of management theories in general and middle managers in particular as aids in the sensemaking process.

I have also presented the concept of loosely coupled systems to create an understanding of how sensemaking across loosely coupled groups in an organization can hinder the progression of effective sensegiving.

Finally I have created a figure, which should be considered a theoretical contribution, in showing the relations between the processes in sensemaking and the hierarchies in the organization as well as an illustrative tool for this analysis.
5. The case organization

Save the Children Youth Denmark

In this chapter I present the case organization, which is the focus of the analysis along with some definitions of particular concepts that pertain to this organization.

5.1. Background

A volunteer organization, such as SCY, can be defined as a volunteer not-for-profit oriented organization that is created by voluntary forces, is organized and managed by volunteers, is independent of the state and has a benevolent character (Berndtson, 1995, p. 27-28). In this thesis I use NGO and volunteer organization interchangeably, both referring back to this definition.

The volunteer organization, Save the Children Youth Denmark (SCY), was established in 2003 as a, in its own words, young and flexible alternative to the more traditional charities and NGOs. The organization is linked to Save the Children Denmark and through that to an international alliance of Save the Children and Save the Children Youth organizations around the globe, but other than that it is politically and financially independent.

The work of SCY takes a political point of departure in the UN convention on children’s rights and primarily works towards informing children and youngsters of their rights and on improving children’s conditions in Denmark and the rest of the world. The organization now comprises more than 1000 members between the ages 15-30, divided across 10 local branches and about 40 different projects in Denmark, Lebanon, Egypt, Ghana and the other Scandinavian countries.

These 1000 members are either categorized as project volunteers if they are active in the different projects that constitute SCY, e.g. homework cafés or children’s clubs or they are organizational volunteers if they are engaged with tasks pertaining to the management of the
organization, e.g. the board\textsuperscript{4}, HR group, communication group and finance group. These definitions are adopted from the interviews I have conducted and thus taken directly from the organizational members’ vocabulary. I use the phrase \textit{organizational member} to describe every single member, volunteer or employed, of the organization.

The intention with the organization is to give volunteers the support necessary for taking initiatives and for investing their time and skills in a project rather than the traditional way of donating money.\textsuperscript{5} The values that lie behind this attitude are: commitment to a cause, being able to encompass different people, taking responsibility for ones actions and projects and showing ingenuity in coming up with alternative ways of doing things \textsuperscript{6} and are summed up as involvement, responsibility, appreciation and commitment.

The operational goals for the organization until the end of 2012 is to double the amount of projects and ongoing activities; that all projects in SCY develop annual strategies for how to involve children and youngsters; and in 2012 to have the organization in the media on a monthly basis presenting its opinion on issues in the society pertaining to the organization’s work for children’s rights.\textsuperscript{7}

5.2. \textbf{Organizational structure}

The organizational structure of SCY has an annual congress as its highest authority. On a daily basis it is the board, selected at the congress, which is in charge of the organization’s activities. The structure of the board was changed at the annual congress in 2011. Before, the board consisted of 14 members representing each of the political and organizational groups of which SCY consists\textsuperscript{8}. In relation to the board is an executive committee which consisted of the

\textsuperscript{4} Even though board members are referred to as organizational volunteers on a daily basis in the organization, I will refer to them separately as “the board” or “management group” to keep a distinction between the leaders and followers in the organization.

\textsuperscript{5}SCY intranet \url{http://intra.redbarnetungdom.dk/haandbog/om-red-barnet-ungdom/historie}

\textsuperscript{6}SCY intranet \url{http://intra.redbarnetungdom.dk/haandbog/om-red-barnet-ungdom/vaerdigrundlag}

\textsuperscript{7}SCY intranet \url{http://intra.redbarnetungdom.dk/haandbog/om-red-barnet-ungdom/operationelle-mal-2012}

\textsuperscript{8} I president, 1 political vice president, 1 organizational vice president, 1 treasurer, 1 communication foreman, 1 HR foreman, 1 region foreman, 1 political leader for the anti-bullying area, 1 political leader for the asylum area, 1 political leader for the integration area, 1 political leader for the international area, the secretariat manager (only employee on the board), and 2 ordinary members – source: SCY homepage 
\url{http://www.redbarnetungdom.dk/Red_Barnet_Ungdom/Hvem_er_vi/Bestyrelsen/Formand.aspx}
president, the two vice presidents, the treasurer and the manager of the secretariat (employed). Now, after the congress, the board consists of 9 members who are not responsible for individual areas of the organization, but rather act as contact persons for these areas. The executive committee consist of the same people as before, the difference being that there is now only one vice-president. This group prepares the agenda for each board meeting. The organizational chart can be seen in more detail in Appendix 1.
6. Analysis 1/3 - The Board

This chapter attempts to analyze some of the elements that affect the sensemaking processes of the board members in SCY and thus to reach an understanding of these organizational members’ sensemaking. There is a focus on data derived from interviews, but observations of board meetings, as well as communicative material from the board is brought in as support.

The two board members interviewed were both board members without a specific area of responsibility, which in their own words made them more distanced to the different areas of the organization (compared to their fellow board members who could e.g. be responsible for the communication area) and they found that this allowed them to have a greater overview (Interview D, line 20). For this reason I have found it sufficient to limit my interviews with board members to these two persons, as the attitudes of the other board members is clearly stated in the board meeting observations, which will also be presented during the analysis.

As explained in the theoretical framework, sensemaking is a process of breaking with an old understanding, demanding sense to form a new understanding, creating this new understanding in cooperation with others and perhaps even aid others by giving them sense as well. It is an interlinked, iterative process, where no parts can stand alone. For the sake of the analytical overview, I divide this chapter into four, each representing a part of the sensemaking process. But because the actions are so interlinked it cannot be avoided that some parts will be brought into the analysis of other parts for the sake of the reading flow and the understanding that emerges.

6.1. Sensebreaking

Sensebreaking happens between two parties who hold different perceptions of the state of their constructed reality, and where the one stakeholder has an interest in getting the other stakeholder
to take part in a new negotiation of this constructed reality. In the board of SCY the members have gone through a period of sensemaking that has led them to the point where they decided to propose a new structure for their work to the rest of the organization.

I will begin this analysis by attempting to pinpoint some of the reasons that led to this renegotiation. According to the interviewed board members, there have been several occasions that have led them to question their perception of the constructed reality in the first place. Such occasions can be summed up in the negotiations of:

- What is the purpose of SCY and our mission? (Ideological)
- What is the purpose of the board, what are our duties, tasks and responsibilities? (Practical)

Thus, board members have had practical as well as ideological considerations leading to a change.

**Ideological reasons**

The first issue is exemplified by this quote from one of the board members:

"This last year, year and a half, we have been working in a very self critical manner because we realized that we work with a foundation in the children’s convention and at the same time we have a rhetoric saying that we work for exposed children or children with needs but in the children’s convention it says all children and it doesn’t say anything about needs, it says that all children have the right and we had to start working actively with that" (Quote, Interview D, line 9).

For these dedicated, politically interested, organizational members it is very important to “get it right”, that they act according to their mission. It falls back on the perception of their identity, which was one of the properties of sensemaking. Their efforts at sensemaking were being hindered because their perception of their identity could not be aligned with the actual circumstances of the situation. Their identity had been expressed through their mission statement, and realizing that they were actually not acting according to the mission, led to a break with the sense they had thus far held. Thus this revelation was an initial eye-opener to start looking inwards, in a self critical manner, and these reflections initiated a change process because the board around the same time had a workshop with an external consultant\(^\text{10}\), who aided

---

\(^\text{10}\) Appendix: At the observation of the board meeting 29/5/11 a board member referred to this as a "Kompetence Udviklingsdag"
the board members in formulating their ambitions for their work.

Another property of sensemaking which shines through clearly here is that of sensemaking being a social action. The sensebreaking that has been under way has been nurtured in the group of the board members and has evolved in negotiations in between these members over some time, because they have been sharing their assumptions and knowledge with those whom they have had close relationships with (Orlikowski, 1994).

**Practical reasons**

On the practical side, a break with the understanding they have had concerning the board’s work, arose when they came to a point where they could agree that the board was not working as efficient as could be wished. This can be seen in the observations from a board meeting (Appendix 5) where there was a discussion of the issues relating to the workload exemplified by the problem of having a double role, which resulted in: unfair work pressure, increased the possibility of lobby work\(^ \text{11} \), made it “legitimate” for those not responsible for an area that was up for discussion to not participate in that discussion, presented issues with transparency, and resulted in difficulties of having a balanced work / life relationship. Furthermore, it made the board meetings ineffective because too much time went with discussing issues that were too practically oriented and thus below the level of a strategic discussion and consequently taking time from the board to have a more strategic focus.

The issue of “lobbyism” was also pointed out by one of the board members during an interview:

“... it [the board’s work] has been so rigid this year because people have had lobby interests, they have in part had a responsibility for, but also a defence of an area, which has made it difficult for us to make strategic decisions, because we all have to think about everyone’s’ areas and people haven’t done that, they have had their lobby and [said] “what about me” [...] instead of saying “what about us?”” (Quote, Interview D, line 18).

Thus, the board members have had to break with their understanding of what their purpose has been, e.g. that there should no longer be a certain area of interest to defend. This is in sensemaking terms again related to their perception of their identity, and this situation forces them to renegotiate their identity. This has naturally happened some time before the issue was presented to the rest of the organization, which has given the board more time to work with the

---

\(^ {11} \) In this context ”lobby work” is used to describe situations, where board members advocate for their own areas of responsibility and is thus not a reference to stakeholders outside the organization.
changes than the rest of the organizational members have had.

The board was finally forced to break with their sense/understanding because what had been could no longer be aligned with what was needed in an ideological as well as a practical perspective.

6.2. Sense-demanding from peers

Sense-demanding happens when a stakeholder, who has had to break with a previously held understanding, finds himself to be at a loss and try to redeem this by demanding sense from other stakeholders who may hold information that can aid him in making sense of the new uncertain situation (Vlaar et al, 2008).

This happened for the board members in the forum of the board meetings, especially at one board meeting which I observed (Appendix 5). At this meeting there were heated arguments, accusations and even tears. The board members were taking the responsibility of changing the organization for the better very seriously (because it is tied to their perception of their identity).

As can be seen in Appendix 5, these emotions were anchored in concerns over: losing the identity one knew, the prospects of losing influence on behalf of one’s area if the area was no longer represented on the board, how the role as a board member could be fulfilled satisfyingly, how the organization could remain coherent and no parts of the organization or volunteers would be “lost”, how the board could help and support the volunteers optimally and a fear of the organization becoming increasingly hierarchical, if the area representatives were not in the board. This board member is referring to her reaction at the mentioned board meeting in this quote:

"At first I was actually very critical because this represents a tendency that can also be seen in other organizations, that the board is made smaller, other places you are even elected for two years and then the board becomes this small exclusive group and in my mind a board should represent the volunteers, you know, reflect the diversity of the volunteers in that group” (Quote, Interview E, line 20).

Board members who very clearly felt uncomfortable with the discussion of changes demanded sense from their fellow board members. This happened in smaller group discussions as well as a discussion in the whole board. This sense was demanded in the form of explanations and reasoning for the need of the change and reassurances of the betterment of the organization.

In this situation the president of the organization gave sense in terms of encouraging a sense of
responsibility and autonomy in the board members through formulations such as “51/49” – that everyone in the board should have a 51% focus on where the organization should go and a 49% focus on where they wanted to take it personally, because more than 49% focus from anyone on where they personally wanted it to go (e.g. too much focus on one’s own area) would hinder the organization in moving jointly forward. Another catchphrase she presented was that of the “arms length principle”, that the groups in the organization should have a certain amount of autonomy and freedom to work with their projects without having unnecessary interferences from the board. In this sense she was encouraging the development towards a board that could be more strategic in its work rather than the almost managerial role it had had thus far (See Appendix 5).

6.3. Sensemaking

When the board members make sense for themselves, regarding the board’s role and future, their responses can be divided into concerns over the importance of values (having values), the implementation of values (using the values) and the board’s responsibilities, which could also be seen above where the board members were concerned with how their tasks could be performed in the best possible manner.

Importance of values

The organizational members, who are in the board, hold a different knowledge and experience than organizational members elsewhere in the organization (Vlaar et al., 2008). This affects their frames for creating as well as negotiating sense. The experiences of this board member show how the sense/understanding, she holds of the organization and its values, has been created over time and thus show the retrospective aspect of sensemaking:

“...after some time I realized that these projects develop from a set of values, these projects are not just something coincidental, it’s because there are some fundamental values behind, but it took me years to realize this and before it got under my skin why I am in SCY and especially this last year where I have been on the board it has really moved something for me, where I have begun to be proud of it…” (Quote, Interview D, line 7, my emphasis).

“...you are there for the project but you are not conscious of why you are in save the children youth and not everyone stays in the organization like many of us who are in the board now. I’ve been here for about 4 years and the president has been here for 5, and it is a problem if it has to take that long to realize why SCY is different from the others...” (Quote, Interview D, line 12, my emphasis).

This progression in the board member’s understanding of her surroundings clearly shows the ongoing sensemaking that has happened for her, where she over time has been adapting aspects
of the organization to her identity and thus finally to reach a point where she felt “proud”. At the same time she raises an important issue concerning the values of the organization, namely that she experiences that volunteers prioritize their projects above the actual organization behind the projects, in that the values are not important. This other board member on the other hand has a lot of experience with projects and she sees a clear link between them and the values:

”... we all want what is best for the children and that is reflected in the projects, at least the projects I choose to get involved with, [...] you dive into the projects and then you realize that they matter and have value...” (Quote, Interview E, line 10).

Furthermore, she understands and accepts the volunteer tendency to give low priority to things outside their projects and points out the middle managers of the organization as central for the understanding that a new volunteer in the organization will attach to e.g. the annual congress:

”...when you enter an organization, then the annual congress is not the first thing you throw yourself at, personally I think it takes a very good project leader to make you think that you will get a positive way into the organization through that and then I think that the projects are so great in themselves that people don’t feel the need, I know that, I talked to some of the participants yesterday and they don’t have a need to get involved on an organizational level, [...] it is not the primary reason for why they are in SCY, that’s some of our special projects and where they want to take those, so for that reason I think it demands some good project leaders and it demands that we [the board] are good faces to put on the organization and that it becomes an organization where you feel that you can relate to the ones at the top, that they are visible and that there is transparency...” (Quote, Interview E, line 14).

That she points to the project leaders as central for the volunteers to make sense of the organization, underlines the importance Nonaka (1988) presents in having these middle managers translating the information that comes from the board and make it tangible and present for the regular volunteers. In this way they help the regular volunteers with giving sense so that they can make sense and create an understanding of the organization and its values.

Lastly, the same board member\(^{12}\) points to what it means to actively make use of the organization’s values and points to the problems that occur if a poor leader/project manager is not able to lift this task:

“... I think a lot about RBA [see footnote 12] to me it is the solution to a lot of problems or an idea of how to solve a lot of things and the appreciative approach is exactly an appreciation of every single volunteer, that she is not seen as just another volunteer I think is very important in an organization, that

\(^{12}\) This board member has also been responsible for writing a report to the organization concerning RBA – Rights Based Approach – and is thus a warm advocate of using values actively in the approach to all stakeholders of the organization.
is how I like to feel concerning my commitment in these organizations […] you find an inclusiveness and a recognition of every single volunteer, and I like that, that you do something for the individual volunteer as well […] and I would like to get this attitude out in the entire organization, also when you think about a project leader, there are some leaders out there that are not optimal, that don’t get the volunteers to feel this […] it just gives a different kind of belonging when you know that you are appreciated so what the board needs to do is to express the sentiment that it is the individual volunteer who makes a difference, it is the individual relation between the individual child and volunteer that makes a difference…” (Quote, Interview E, line 41).

This to a very high degree points to how making actively use of the organization’s values such as being appreciative of and including the volunteers is something that stimulates the perception the volunteers hold of their identity, in that the person is “not just another volunteer”, “you know that you are appreciated”, and “you make the difference”. This board member shows how she sees a solution to engaging the volunteers and keeping them satisfied, through nurturing a sense of a social encompassing environment.

**Acting on values**

One thing is to be aware of the “value of values”. Another thing is to know how to use them in practice. This can also have a big importance for the success of the board’s sensegiving efforts since the values of SCY are very tangible and thus could be easy to practice. The values encourage the volunteers to **appreciate** each other’s forces and the children they interact with, that both volunteers and children are **involved** in decision making that affects them, that the volunteers are **committed** and share their ideas to create a better world and lastly that volunteers act **responsibly** when interacting with each other, the children and the world around them so that the organization can appear reliable through the actions of its volunteers. The last quote in the paragraph above refers to the value of appreciating the volunteers with the clear sentiment that this is not being done well enough. When asked if the board members make use of the values, the answers differ:

”Yes, I think so, I’m not saying that we have done it optimally, but it has been based on these values that we have figured out how to do these things, it has meant a lot that we have read this report, it has meant a lot for me in my understanding of how to approach other people, so we have begun to do it but it is a long term process…” (Quote, Interview D, line 16).

”It is not happening now, but we are in the process of starting it up…” (Quote, Interview E, line 16).

---

13 Anerkendelse, inddragelse, engagement, ansvarlighed - Source: SCY’s Intranet

14 The RBA report which can be found on the enclosed CD
The difference in the answers clearly shows that the values are not being practiced across all the aspects of the board’s work, but at the same time it shows a determinacy to get to a point where they are actively used. One way that the board is implementing the values in a practical manner happens through an evaluation of their board meetings:

”...the board is working on it [implementing the values], the board has a point on the agenda called RBA after each meeting [...] where we ourselves reflect on how we work with this approach and how we could be more involving, more open, and more transparent and [...] small steps have been taken, like for example to share the meeting minutes with the rest of the organization [for transparency], that is completely new, and then [...] the communication around our annual congress has changed a bit with the use of videos and the communication... my sense is that the organization is at least starting to gather around this, that there is a focus on us using each other and that we do something together ...” (Quote, Interview E, line 16).

The values have been implemented in the actions of organizational members through the use of “RBA”; at least, it is what RBA is intended to be able to do:

”...for volunteers this [RBA] is a hands-on way to involve children and fellow volunteers in the different phases of the projects so to say, and to be involved in both the what questions, why and how, with what and evaluation and stuff like that, and to be a part of all of these phases - at the organizational level it isn’t any different, it just takes something else because we don’t have this contact with the volunteers and children as much as we should, so in that case it is other key words, for example transparency and openness and also involvement [...] to be a rights based organization doesn’t mean that it’s the volunteers and the projects that do these things, it’s about the entire organization all the way through, so in that way we have to be role models in showing this openness and appreciative approach ...” (Quote, Interview E, line 28).

Thus, this board member shows an understanding of how the values could and should be made tangible and result in specific actions for the organizational members and that this should be done in a differentiated manner as corresponds to their role in the organization.

The focus of this research is indirectly on the differences of opinion that were evident at the annual congress and which are also exemplified by the quote below. The issue in this case might be that the board has had problems with getting their message across to all volunteers (issues with sensegiving) or maybe they are hindered by fractions in the organization that cannot see eye to eye with the board because of a power struggle:

”...it is so odd, those who have been the most critical of the board’s work [...] they have the opinion that the board is this "small exclusive group”, they haven’t been able to embrace RBA as a possibility for involvement and appreciation because they per definition are against everything that comes from the board, so it also demands that the rest of the organization is open towards this as well, that they can say "well well, it hasn’t been there before but because it is there now it doesn’t mean that it is an expression
of false [...] intentions” that you really want to do this, in this situation everyone has to be appreciative in the approach as a volunteer and say “okay, fine, I’m open to it, I’ll see what it is before I judge it” (Quote, Interview E, line 26).

This is an example of what Smircich & Morgan see as organizational members having established “counter-realities” which in this case has developed into a situation where change is difficult to integrate in the group that is not agreeing with the board. Even though the board member wants for these volunteers to be more open to change and suggestions, their reaction may be the result of prior and/or present poor sensegiving efforts from the board. In this case, as stated in the theoretical framework, there might be a need for differentiated sensegiving; that the board does more or something new to reach this group, influence them, and succeed in giving them sense. This same board members is one of the authors of the RBA report, in which it is stated that:

“An appreciative approach has as its starting point the conviction that others act meaningfully. If the meaning is not clear to us, it is not because it is not there; it is because we have not seen it yet. Appreciation is to meet others as competent persons, who both want to and can contribute constructively.” (Quote, Et Rettighedsbaseret RBU, 2010, p. 8, my translation).

This is almost repeated by the board member (and co-author of the RBA report) in the interview:

”... we have to choose to try and look for the meaning, the intention, that lies behind people’s actions, because all people are full of good intentions, but it is the manner in which they act that make us doubtful and we have to see through that, so it is about seeing Emil of Lönneberga in all our children and in all our fellow volunteers and also on the organizational level, to have this appreciative approach to other people because it makes a huge difference...” (Quote, Interview E, line 5).

This shows how the board member on one level is making sense of a situation based on what she knows, her convictions and her experiences with producing the RBA report. However, on another level she can still be baffled by opposing voices in the organization and not understand how they cannot be open-minded to suggestions from the board. This suggests that the ideology of the RBA report is still at an abstract level for the organizational members and not integrated in their communication and actions yet.

The responsibilities of the board

Besides the reasons for having values and knowing how these values can be transformed into actions, the board members are also concerned about and make sense of their responsibilities. Both because the scope of the responsibilities is changing now that they are restructuring the board and because they in general are met with misunderstandings as to what their role is. To
look into this I start with a clarification of the board’s responsibilities as defined by one of the board members:

”…with the steps we have taken now I find it important that the board does not feel like the central organ in the organization [...] we are nothing else or more than the projects, so it [our tasks] is something about relating to the strategic level, the values, where do we want to go, what should SCY be known for, what do we want to work with, this prioritization of the values, that it is this level we work at and then we leave the responsibility [for practical things] to those who know something about that…” (Quote, Interview E, line 35).

In discussing the new format and responsibilities of the board this board member has gone through a sensemaking process (as defined by the seven properties of sensemaking) where she has been looking back at what was, compared it to what is going to be (the retrospective and future perspective of sensemaking), developed this attitude in ongoing interactions with her fellow board members (social) and especially she has been attaching the cues of the organization’s values to the frames of understanding she already held (identity) and been enacting them in the environment of the board to reach the plausible conclusion that the future might not look so dire after all:

”... I really like – I have learned to appreciate the value of – that the people who are on the board, are people with a general interest in SCY, now it’s all the volunteers who are represented, it’s no longer about having a strong face representing your area of interest, it’s not about that anymore, now everyone has a responsibility for everyone, and that is going to create a completely different energy in the board meetings, positive energy, because now you’re not competing about money and specifics like that for your constituency, that is no longer your primary area of responsibility and then you have the responsibility for everyone...” (Quote, Interview E, line 20, my emphasis).

The new structure is important to the board members because it can allow them to improve the quality of their work in regards to taking new initiatives and being freed up for dealing with strategic work:

”...now that the board is smaller, it has created room for initiatives [...] like having a children’s counsel ...” (Quote, Interview E, line 20).

”... we can streamline things like RBA in all areas because now it is not dependent on whether or not the area representative thinks that it is important or not, because it is a prioritization in all areas, so that gives the possibility to affect the rest of the organization...” (Quote, Interview E, line 22).

Despite this there are some limits to the board’s possibilities for action:

”...we have these consultants employed who have been putting out fires so the problems that have been out there [in the organization] have not reached the board so you [the volunteer] get a feeling that the
"...our concept is that all these practical challenges are something the secretariat deals with, we have these consultants who are specialists in the area [...] they solve the problems and then obviously, when do you then get to talk to the board if they are not participating in this..." (Quote, Interview E, line 33).

And these limits sometimes result in inconsistencies between what the board can do and what is expected of them, between what the board members expect of themselves versus what others expect of them:

"...it depends on what you expect of the board [...] we are in the process of clarifying these issues with the strategic and the tactical and the executing level, so it is simply about [...] clarification of expectations relating to what you expect of the board (Quote, Interview E, line 33).

Such inconsistencies should be addressed (for example through greater transparency and communication) in order to avoid disappointments and to develop into counter-realities (Smircich & Morgan, 1982) that could prove difficult to align with the organization’s identity.

6.4. Sensegiving

Sensegiving has in the board happened in both an internal and an external manner. Internally where board members and the president have helped each other finding meaning and externally where they have had to communicate this meaning to other organizational members to help them reach an understanding of the change as well.

**Internal Sensegiving**

The analysis of the sensegiving that happens inside the board was begun under the paragraph of sensedemanding, where it was explained how board members who had embraced the idea of change, aided other board members in doing the same.

Here the president played a big role in directing the discussion and giving the board members cues to attach their sensemaking to. The president has in general a great possibility for affecting the outcome of situations, as also Smircich & Morgan (1982) were cited for in the theoretical framework, stating that leaders have a unique possibility for influencing and managing meaning making of the fellow organizational members. I here shortly present the sensegiving actions of the president on a more general level as it is not related to her sensegiving efforts in relations to changing the structure of the board, but more relates to her general sensemaking efforts as a political leader and it can be seen in this quote showing the president’s thoughts on her internal
sensegiving as a leader:

"... I have had a focus on how I can do what to influence that we have a great team as a board and that we also more or less agree on the direction of the board [...] already before you run for the position [as a board member], you have to know a little about what are the actual expectations I have to live up to if I am to sit in this board and I think my role in giving that information is important...” (Quote, Interview C, line 12).

Thus, the president has an interest in giving a general sense of direction to the work within the board, but as this next quote shows, she is more limited in giving sense outside of the board. This is an example of how something can be feasible in theory but would be destructive in reality, so even though the sensegiving theory states that especially managers are in a unique situation to give sense, this organization has found its own balance:

"... if I go out and contact some group under the HR group, who are responsible for planning our education days, if I go to them and have a close dialogue and mark my expectations about this and that without having our HR secretary who is the logical link in between, her with whom I have a natural contact with through the board and who is the manager of the HR group, if I go around her in contacting this group and start having all sorts of communication, then you could imagine that they would be a bit puzzled and think they had done something wrong or that this is out of the ordinary because now it’s the president who is contacting us...” (Quote, Interview C, line 16).

In order not to rattle the system and thus confuse people’s sensemaking by suddenly giving them sense in a new context – that it is another person and even the president, who is now the sensegiver – the president has to walk a certain balance between sensegiving inside and outside the board:

"...it’s important for me to mark my expectations to those closest to me and show that I expect them to pass it on [...] it is important to pay attention to showing the board members that they also have a leadership responsibility, they are the middle managers, so they are responsible for passing some things on, what we decide on the board, so that it can also make sense further out in the organization to be a volunteer in SCY and understand the decisions that are implemented and that they can engage themselves in implementing them [...], so it is leadership in relation to passing something on but also being clued-in in relation to is there something going on in the periphery of the organization that is relevant in relation to the board’s work...” (Quote, Interview C, line 17).

Again, middle managers are referred to as an indispensable link between management and volunteers in giving and translating sense. I concur with the president that the board members at this time when they also had areas of responsibility beside their board member role acted as middle managers, but for the sake of analytical simplicity I only use the project leaders in my analysis of middle managers’ role in organizational sensemaking. Another reason for this is that
the new structure of the board has eliminated the link that gave the board members a middle manager role and thus this focus in the analysis can give a clearer picture of how the sensemaking efforts will function in the organization following the structural change in the board.

*External Sensegiving*

After sense had been given to the board members, the need arose for the board to give sense externally, namely to the rest of the organization’s members, as this board member points to:

"There have been so many critical questions [...] and the reason it is critical might be because of ignorance, they simply lack an understanding of where this is coming from, why, how it is put together, it’s because people don’t know so much about it and that is what we have to meet…" (Quote, Interview E, line 29).

At the same time she is also pointing to the issue, which was presented in the introduction to this thesis, namely that volunteers came to the annual congress with an animosity towards the proposal. Looking further above at what the president said about the middle managers’ role in creating this understanding for the volunteers, it would appear that some middle managers have not managed to meet their task of giving sense.

In relation to the annual congress, the board attempted to encourage and create an understanding among the volunteers of attending the annual congress and of the change proposal. This was done with the use of four short video clips on the web page showing different volunteers at different organizational levels, telling their story about why attending the congress is so important. Here there was made great use of the organization’s values as the “buzz-words”.

These buzz-words acted as the red thread in all the material sent to volunteers, e.g. the invitation, which can be seen in Appendix 8, where the values are spelled out across the page, demanding the reader’s attention and where the volunteer is highly encouraged to come and participate in the democracy as the responsible, engaged, involved and appreciative person, they should be as a volunteer in SCY.

The board members are aware of the importance of communicating to the volunteers and think a lot about how to do this as these two final quotes illustrate:

"...at the moment you have to be a member of the board in order to understand what is happening in the board and we want to change that, we have some ideas for communication and personally I am glad to get out with RBA and meet people [...] and we would like both in theory, on an abstract level, that you know what it is about, who we are, why we do these things but also in practical terms, that we get out and
meet people and that they feel welcome …” (Quote, Interview E, line 31).

”… we have tried to involve people more and give them more information, to break with the image of the board as this small closed group that boards can appear as, we have sent out information on mail, tried to prepare what should happen, made something in writing about why it is important that you attend the congress, how it has influence and kind of tried to illustrate the link, so I think that has meant a lot, I also think it has been important that [two of the board members] have visited the local boards and met people, that you have a face on the invitation, that it is not just an email...” (Quote, Interview D, line 14).

In conclusion to this it can be said that the board has had a focus on communication and tried to give sense to the volunteers through heavy use of the organization’s values as cues or “buzz-words”. With this they on the one hand succeeded in having one of the highest attending rates in the history of SCY’s annual congresses. On the other hand there was a big opposition to the proposal.

6.5. Chapter summary

This part of the analysis has dealt with the sensemaking processes of the board in SCY and showed how the individual members are affected by their experiences, their knowledge, their fellow board members and their fellow volunteers in their sensemaking processes. The analysis showed that the board members initiated a change because they both had ideological and practical considerations concerning the board structure and this discrepancy between, what they wanted, and what they had, made them break with their understanding of their purpose as a board. In this process the board members demanded sense from their peers and the president in order to negotiate a new understanding of the board and their roles in it. What they focused on when relaying their concerns over the restructuring was the values of the organization, how these were being practiced and what the role of the board was and should be. Finally, the analysis showed that the members of the board gave sense both within the board to their fellow board members as well as outside the board to the rest of the organizational members and that this was done through a multitude of channels including communication in person, in meetings, on the webpage, and through videos. The board members also had a focus on the middle managers as mediators to the rest of the organization.
7. Analysis 2/3 - The Middle Managers

Nonaka (1988) focuses on the middle managers in the organization as the link between the board and the rest of the organization. According to him they have the important role of translating the visionary directions from the board into tangible assignments for the regular organizational members. In the previous analysis which focused on the board members and their sensemaking, there were many references to the role of the middle managers. Here I give an analysis of the sensemaking processes which this group engages with, in the same order as the previous analysis and with the same focus on influences from other groups on their sensemaking process.

7.1. Sensebreaking

The middle managers have also been forced to break with their understanding of how the board should be structured and they have had to consider the consequences this would have for their own work. As this quote shows, their concerns have been directed at the more practical aspects such as communication lines that would change with a restructuring:

"... one of the things we have talked a lot about is this issue with the new coordinators, so it is actually not the change in the board, but a consequence of the change in the board, and I think it has been difficult, because we have received so many misleading – well, not misleading – but we have simply received different information from the board on what they actually wanted with these coordinators, and that has been problematic [...] I think we have come to terms with it along the way [they laugh] because in the beginning we were very concerned with how this was all going to play out...” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 1, line 33, my emphasis).

This quote shows the sensemaking process they have undergone, where they firstly have had to break with their understanding of the role of the board and these new coordinators, and how they have gone directly to the next step of demanding sense concerning these changes and what the role of the coordinator would be. At the congress I observed these two middle managers being very active with their group in questioning and challenging the board, continuously to be
demanding information that could help them make sense, and also try to put their own change proposal forward, a proposal which made more sense for them than the board’s proposal.

The last comment, that in the beginning they were concerned, but now they have come to terms with the change, shows how their sensemaking process has developed. At first they felt insecure with the prospect of change, but through a process of demanding more sense, even as the information they received was inconsistent, their process of constructing a new understanding of this change could land on a level where it was plausible (Weick, 1995) and thus “good enough” to work from or at least good enough to “come to terms with”.

That the middle managers find that they have received misguided or different information when they have demanded sense indicates that the board has been inconsistent in their sensegiving efforts and that perhaps there has not been a clear strategy for breaking the sense for the organizational members.

7.2. Sensedemanding

Above I showed how the middle managers demanded sense to alleviate their insecurities. In this quote they go in to more detail of that event when asked how they first received information that there would be a change:

G2: “...you have sought after knowledge yourself, so you got knowledge directly from [the president]”
G1: “Well I kept emailing and then finally I got a draft paper” G2: “I have heard all sorts of things from you [...] and I didn’t attend the education day and I was told that she [the president] gave a small presentation of it there [...]” G1: “[Then] we received the preliminary summoning and agenda” G2: “Yes and that wasn’t very informative, it was very long but it didn’t say much, so I have that, your stories and then what they [the board] have send out officially” G1: “I have kept myself up to date on rbu.dk/landsmode, and have seen when they put up new stuff [...]” G2: “[...] I am not really sure, have we gone looking for information ourselves? [...] we knew about it before we were told about it [...] I just think we have had our antennas out” (Quote, Interview G, Respondents 1 & 2, lines 68-80, my emphasis).

As this quote shows, the middle managers have sought information to make sense from, from a multitude of sources, for example focusing on direct information from the president of the organization. What is also interesting is that they have clearly been motivated to demand information to make the situation clearer because they started searching for information on their own initiative before the proposal was even official.

Besides how they sought information, they also tell what kind of information they found relevant:
“...now the board has had time to find itself, after they have had a consultant and have a plan, a strategy for where they are going and stuff like that, but the rest of the organization has not fallen into place, there are a lot of things that are still up in the air, and they [the board] do not have an eye on it all, so how can they expect that they can get everyone on board for an event like this when there are no clear guidelines, the communication lines are not in place, people’s roles and responsibilities and demands and stuff like that [...] it is not something that has just fallen into place, that everyone knows, so that makes you wonder, what can they expect...” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 38, my emphasis).

The frustrations that come across in this quote also create a picture of a situation where the middle managers have not been satisfied with the level or quality of information they have received from the board. This is an aspect that is expanded in the analysis of the middle managers’ efforts at sensegiving in the end of this chapter.

As this final quote shows the middle managers also experience both for themselves and for their volunteers, that communication has a tendency of going only one way:

”... I find that we have had the experience that all movements move upwards [...] in the organization, that if you want to accomplish something then you have to go to the level above you or further up or go to the board [...] it’s not like any contact comes down from above [...] I think you hear a lot of stories about if you want to do something, then you have to go to the source, you have to as a volunteer go and look for it yourself, no one will come down and make sure that you are involved or asked or informed, you simply have to do it yourself... I think there has been too much of a tendency in that direction...” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 36).

In theoretical terms this middle manager finds it problematic that the organizational members have to work this hard to demand sense and would prefer that more was done to give sense from the top of the organization and downwards.

7.3. Sensemaking

Even though the focus of this analysis is to identify instances of middle managers trying to make sense for themselves regarding the restructuring of the organization, the interview with them about this topic invariably led to other topics as well, since their commitment to the organization results in them linking these present issues of the restructuring to previous or more general and underlying issues in the organization. Therefore this part of the analysis will commence with a focus on the middle managers’ perception of the restructuring but is followed up with a linkage to a more general issue being how the middle managers link their concerns to their role as middle managers or in other words their perception of what these conflicts mean for their identity as middle managers.
This part of the analysis follows the same principles as presented in the theoretical framework and as was shown in the previous analysis of the board member’s sensemaking actions. This means that the topics and quotes have been chosen because I find them illustrative of the process the sensemaker has undergone in that the seven properties of sensemaking have been activated in the sensemaker’s thought activity.

Restructuring the Organization

In general, the middle managers present scepticism towards the board’s proposal to the change and this tendency appears repeatedly as can be seen in this collection of quotes:

”...we [this middle management group] have had a really long discussion or dialogue about it [the restructuring], in the beginning I at least was very sceptical, I felt like, are they now going to be further away from the volunteers [...] all the stuff about securing co-decision making and who decides what and stuff, that is where I have been in doubt...” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 32).

”...we questioned this thing about [...] the board being very focused on strategy, that we have to be big and we have to get far and we have to have a lot of long term goals and more money and stuff like that...” (Quote, interview G, Respondent 2, lines 130-132).

”...I think that a lot of the things we want to change are a result of some frustrations that have build up, different things, experiences in the organization, but I have reached a point where I just have to trust that the people in these positions will take care of it, because I actually think you give up on it...” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 97).

When it comes to the proposal to restructure the board the middle managers have a tendency to draw the discussion into more latent issues in the organization. As the quotes show, the middle managers have based their attitude towards the change proposal on previous experiences in the organization. They have over a long period experienced that they were not heard or involved by the board and thus this change proposal has them worried that a change at this point will remove the focus from more, as I wrote, latent issues in the organization. This shows how the sense they create around the change proposal is retrospective in that it is based on previous experiences of interactions with the board. It is also done in a social context because their sensemaking efforts have developed in their group and with their volunteers, interacting with and enacting their environment and as a forthcoming point will show, they also relate these issues to their identity as middle managers to a very high degree.

In order to deal with what I call “latent issues”, that there are some old problems that are not being dealt with, this middle manager calls for a different solution than a restructuring to the problems in the organization concerning the coherency of the organization, namely to focus on
nurturing a “SCY-spirit”:

“...what you really ought to do was to hold on a bit to the status quo and look inwards and say now we try to work a bit with this and make that better and then we can grow afterwards because you might grow bigger and have double the amount of projects but then it is also double the work and having to gather that around one, like, “SCY-spirit”, and I don’t necessarily think that it is easier to do it that way - to me it seems easier if there is one unanimous voice, we don’t really have that “SCY-spirit” yet, a “why is it that you are a volunteer in SCY”, I don’t think many people will say “well it’s because it’s SCY”, there is always some story [...] it’s usually the project and the personal interest in helping a child, the personal and the near [...] it’s because we are who we are...” (Quote, interview G, Respondent 2, lines 130-132, my emphasis).

The fact that these organizational members are pulling other concerns into the discussion of a restructuring of the board shows that their leaders have not been able to present them with a sense of urgency for why it is important to take exactly these actions at exactly this point in time. Thus it is not unnatural that the middle managers’ attitude towards the change proposal has been relatively negative. They have seen other issues and thought of other forms of solutions than what they have been presented with by their leaders.

This quote shows how the middle managers see the link between ”a responsible change” and being able to rally the organizational members to the cause with the clear conclusion that they do not find that the board has been able to do this:

”... there are always some who, either because they don’t understand it or they don’t like change - it can be change for the better, but it is an irresponsible change if you don’t – you have a responsibility as a leader to take people with you and you can’t go faster than people are ready for [...] I wouldn’t call them [the board] elitists [...] but there is this tendency that when you get high up in the organization then it is difficult [...] to look all the way down and see the perspective that exists at the lowest level [...]of the hierarchy, I don’t think they have managed to do that ... ” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 105).

Once again this is an example of the board not being able to create the burning platform or the sense of urgency for the organizational members and thus to make them understand that there is a need to break with the understanding there has thus far existed and then instead of calling people opponents to change (those who “don’t understand or don’t like change”), to make them understand the need for change.

Identity as middle manager

The middle managers clearly have frustrations regarding the restructuring of the organization and these frustrations are often based on the middle managers’ sense of living up to the responsibilities they believe they have as middle managers. This sensemaking process is rooted
in their perception of their identity as middle managers as these quotes illustrate:

”...I have talked to so many people where I have tried to say that this is important, you have to come [...] but they choose not to go, because it gets down prioritized [...] it really has to feel important for you to go and somehow I think you have to have a post as a project leader [...] before you think it is worth getting involved with it...” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 24).

”...as a project leader you are schooled, it is often also the project leaders who continue to other posts in the organization [...] it's a tendency that isn't there if you are a regular member of a group, then there isn’t this natural transition ...” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 26).

The quotes also show that the middle managers have an understanding of why the organizational members they are there to lead do not partake in the organizational life. It clearly shows a division between “them” and “us”. “We” are schooled and it does not feel important if you do not understand what this entails, if you do not have the same experience as “us” who have been here for a longer time and have a bigger responsibility. How the middle managers attempt to close this gap for their organizational members is the topic for the last part of this analysis, concerning the aspects of “sensegiving”.

The middle managers also take upon them a responsibility to try and make those they can influence identify with the rest of the organization as this quote shows:

G1: ”I feel that we have chosen to be influenced by the board’s work [...] I don’t know if we have the right to be a local branch in SCY, if we just run our own course, we have our own regulations, we could have done whatever we wanted, but I have found it important that we were a local branch of SCY and that is why I have been interested in what was going on [...]” G2: “We have taken the responsibility ourselves to contact the board [...] to ensure that this communication is there, because we could easily have said that okay, we’ll just do whatever we want, but we haven’t done that” (Quote, Interview G, Respondents 1 and 2, lines 111-116).

These middle managers have felt so decoupled from the rest of the organization that they at one point asked themselves: are we on our own or should we choose to get involved with the rest of the organization. They actively chose the latter option, they “found it important” that they were a part of something bigger and they actively try to communicate this attitude to the organizational members below them. Not once do they mention that the organization came to them and tried to tie them tighter to the rest of the organization.

A last comment on the sensemaking of middle managers is not specific to their role as middle managers but shows an interesting picture of the communication that has happened in the organization:
"... now it has just become a habit to say involvement\textsuperscript{15} because I think [...]there has been so much here lately with the board and the congress that involvement is in capital letters, and on all flyers and on every page on the homepage it says involvement, but not even in their [...] strategy program does it say involvement of the volunteers in the organization, it only says involvement of children and it is things like that, that gets my attention, because I think it is a tendency that you forget to involve the volunteers in the decisions, when you only focus on involving the children, we just incorporated this philosophy that [...] the strategies must be rights based but we only focus on our target group which are the children and not on ourselves...” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 101).

As shown in the previous chapter the board has actively tried to use the organization’s values as the cues or buzz-words to rally the organizational members. But as this quote shows, the communication – or sensegiving – has clearly not been greeted in the manner it was intended. Instead this middle manager has the experience that it is empty words because she has not found that the words the board has decided to put in the strategy program live up to what has been said or done.

7.4. Sensegiving

According to Nonaka the middle managers are the managerial and communicative link between the top and the bottom of the organization. In the process of giving sense the middle managers have an important role because they are responsible for the board’s plans to be presented to the regular volunteers in a manner that will hopefully make them accept the proposal. In this section of the analysis I will show how these middle managers are aware of exactly that role and also a specific example where the middle manager acted as a mediator between a board member and the middle manager’s volunteer group in a situation where the communication went wrong. One comment that should be tied to this is that it invariably complicates the sensegiving situation for the middle managers that they themselves never reached a satisfactory understanding of the need for change due to the board’s inability to break and give sense through creating a burning platform for the middle managers.

As a part of the board’s communication strategy they asked the local boards to host preparation meetings where interested volunteers could attend and discuss and have explained what the congress and the change proposal was about.

"...it is about how much the board actually does to give information... now it has been put on our

\textsuperscript{15} ‘Inddragelse’
shoulders, we have been encouraged to be the ones who help to host some preparation meetings (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 22).

“...we have made a big effort [...] to make sure that more people know about what it is, the congress and stuff, than what would have happened otherwise (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 17).

"Seeing as I knew about it, I hope – that is how I would like to see myself – that I have contributed to communicating this out, more than it is about me being told about it [...] because we were encouraged to do preparation meetings, where we could prep the others in our community to know about these things, and there I have a huge advantage with [respondent 2] who is the only other in a local board group of eight who have tried to be at a congress before” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 1, line 14).

This collection of quotes shows how this local board has been aware of their responsibility to give sense to the organizational members in their part of the country. As the last quote shows they have at least been able give information (sense) about what the congress was about because they possessed previous knowledge of and experience with this event. As this next and final quote will show, however, it was more difficult to create understanding and give information (sense) about the proposal to restructure the board, even with the presence of a board member.

At one point board members visited volunteer groups to inform about the change proposal. An observation of such a situation is described in Appendix 7. This middle manager tells about another example:

"...I had an experience where one of the board members came to tell about some of the changes they had planned and where there were some heated reactions from the listeners [...] because this board member couldn’t really - I tried to talk a little afterwards because I too was a bit curious about some of the things he mentioned, but it was as if there wasn’t really an openness to, or [...] sympathy for saying “I can understand why they are nervous that these changes will bring something bad,[...] that when you go in and make a radical change like that in your organization then the volunteers will wonder why and wonder if it will be for the better or for the worse”, that that is a natural reaction, I didn’t meet that understanding at all ...” (Quote, Interview G, Respondent 2, line 103-107).

It seems as if this board member has been focused on informing and not attentive or able to give sense concerning that information. This experience is in accordance with what I observed at the before mentioned project leader meeting (see Appendix 7). In the situation described in this quote the middle manager attempted to act as a mediator between the board member and the project group, and tried to demand sense from the board member so she could translate this and be able to give sense to the organizational members, who were experiencing a “shock” and demanding sense that the board member was not giving or could not give them.

That board members have not been better at or more aware of the importance of giving sense
explains why the change proposal was up against the wind at the annual congress. Even though it was attempted, the board members did not succeed in giving the sense that was needed to lay the ground for an acceptance of the change.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter has given an analysis of the sensemaking processes that the middle managers of the organization have gone through. It showed that this organizational group, when breaking their sense of how the board should be structured, have been much more concerned with the practical ramifications of this regarding the communication with the board than with the strategic and efficiency optimization that has been the purpose of the change proposal. It is also the communicational links as well as the hierarchy of decision making privileges that have been questioned when it came to demanding sense and information from the board. These middle managers have made use of many types of sources for demanding sense, using among other both direct contact with the president as well as the organization’s webpage.

When it came to making sense and creating an understanding of the change proposal the middle managers were focused on their own situation and the consequences there would be for them. Furthermore they did not perceive the problem and its solution in the same manner as the board and actively made use of their political and democratic options for changing this by presenting an alternative to the change proposal. Nevertheless, when this did not succeed they were still supportive of the board.

Additionally they were very attentive of their identity as middle managers and the responsibility in guiding organizational members that this entailed. This matter of identity is also their reason for being conscious of and taking actively part in the organization’s and the board’s work. This even though they have experienced that they have to be the most active part in that relationship seeing as communication in their perspective has had a tendency of going more upwards than downwards. Relating to this they also see the cues from management regarding the use of values as empty talk rather than the motivator it is intended to be.

As a consequence of their sense of identity and responsibility they have been very active through sensegiving in helping organizational members understand, what is happening even though board members put in the same situation were not able to do this.
8. Analysis 3/3 - The Volunteers

In this chapter I show how regular volunteers of the organization have been breaking, demanding, making and giving sense. Firstly, though, I find it relevant to show the distinction that organizational members experience between the different types of volunteers because it is a condition for the sensegiving efforts from managers that they should be aware of.

Two types of volunteers

Amongst the volunteers of SCY there are two dominating types of volunteers. Those engaged with organizational tasks and those engaged with projects, such as children’s clubs. This quote from a secretariat employed consultant shows the difference in attitude towards the rest of the organization between the types of volunteers:

"...the project volunteers don’t prioritize the organizational work at all, and the organizational volunteers think that the project volunteers should prioritize the community spirit much more and that is where they clash, because there is a really big difference in how they experience what volunteer work is..." (Quote: Interview B, line 48).

In this research I have only interviewed volunteers involved with children’s projects (project volunteers) and thus the following analysis is based on their attitude. What the differences in attitude have of consequences for the organization will be further dealt with in the chapter of discussion.

8.1. Sensebreaking

Since the volunteers have different backgrounds, experience and knowledge as well as different reasons for volunteering as was just shown it does not come as a surprise that there exist competing discourses among them concerning not how but if to have to break sense of anything.
**Competing discourses**

The purpose of sensebreaking is for people to fundamentally challenge the validity of pre-existing understandings (Vlaar et. al., 2008). When looking into the reactions of regular volunteers in SCY, two different discourses have emerged, exemplified by this quote:

”... it felt like accusations, "now you are just going to decide everything”, that sentiment was there, that tendency, but others were like "what has this got to do with me?...” (Quote: Interview G, Respondent 2, line 107).

The two discourses, which have been dominant, have thus been: “you are taking away our chance for influence” versus “why should I care what you do?”. The first discourse comes closest to actual sensebreaking because organizational members have the reaction that something, for example influence or control or simply structure, is being taken away from them. They are being put in a situation where they have to break with the understanding they previously held of how the organization functioned and what this meant for them. This break – shock – with practice as usual is what causes the frustrations in the form of, as the quote puts it, accusations.

The other discourse – why should I care what you do – is actually not showing signs of sensebreaking as such, because the volunteer basically is the type of volunteer who is involved with the organization because of a specific children’s program and is only feeling responsible for this program and not for the rest of the organization. It is this type of volunteer who is indifferent to being a part of SCY; he might as well be a member of one of the other similar organizations if they ran the same program. The following collection of quotes exemplifies this type of volunteer:

“When I began it could have been any organization. The reason I began was that a project appealed to me.” (Quote: Interview D, line 5).

”SCY doesn’t mean that much in this because it is all about the project.” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 1, line 6).

”It wasn’t SCY that appealed to me as such, it was because I had heard about the project and I thought it sounded exciting and now that I’ve been here for about a year I still don’t feel that it would make any difference if it was URK or SCY that was behind the children’s club, I couldn’t say that SCY has put its mark on our club or anything, it isn’t really related to my everyday life” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 2, line 20, my emphasis).

Perceiving the organization and what is important in one way or another is related to the

\[16\] A similar volunteer organization called Red Cross Youth
organizational member’s sense of what it means for his or her identity. This relates to that person’s previous experiences and knowledge and thus will differ between individuals. Because of this these competing attitudes towards what is important and how closely an organizational member feels related to the organization outside the project can both easily be present within one project group and thus present a difficult situation for the volunteer who is challenged on her attitude towards the organization as this quote exemplifies:

“...we kind of tried to involve the other volunteers in our group and the reaction was actually quite funny, almost like “why should I? What do I get out of that? I don’t feel like being a part of all that” and there was a very negative atmosphere around it and that is pretty strange, when you are a part of a project in the organization, that you don’t feel like engaging with it, not that you have to want it, but there ought to be some kind of interest in influencing the organization, it is pretty strange, I was shocked by the reaction that some volunteers had” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 1, line 48).

In this situation the organizational member has been presented with an attitude from peers that she cannot relate to and the clear opposition it shows against her own attitude acts as sensemaking cues she can explain and justify her own commitment with.

Among the volunteers there has existed a specific frame of understanding of what the board represented and which function it held in relation to be of aid for the volunteers. In the instance where a restructuring of the board and its functions has been announced the volunteers have experienced what Weick (1995) labels a “shock” which has instigated their need for sensemaking.

If a volunteer is not engaged in the organization then changes in that organization will not affect the volunteer and thus no sensemaking processes will ever be activated concerning the change proposal.

8.2. Sensedemanding

Sensedemanding happens when individuals actively seek out assistance from others when experiencing a problematic situation (Vlaar et. al., 2008). When first presented with the plans to restructure the board in the organization, this volunteer found that she did not understand how things were linked in the organization, and more importantly, was met with great difficulties in attempting to alleviate this lack of knowledge as this quote shows:

“In my opinion, how am I to run for a position when I don’t even know what it contains? That I find a little odd, and the reason that I haven’t asked about it is that I became full of doubt, is it because I can’t
find it on my own? I thought, did something go wrong for me since everyone else haven’t asked the same question, then I wonder if there is some information available out there, as if I have missed something” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 1, line 42-44).

Following this she demanded information from her surroundings to help make sense of this. This happened through the internet as the volunteer tells:

“I was checking it out on the webpage to find the information I needed, [...] and then I tried to find out how many hours it would take? What can I contribute with? Anyway, I couldn’t find anything about it there and again, if it is there, it should be something that it was possible to go and find” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 1, line 42-44).

Information was also sought after from a middle manager, whom the volunteer, in theoretical terms, demanded sense from, as this quote shows:

“There is this political leader [...] who has written to me wanting to know if I was interested in becoming this new coordinator or board member and that is a bit difficult to answer when I don’t know what it entails and I wrote back and she tried to answer as much as possible...” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 1, line 42-44).

In general, the sense that has been demanded from volunteers of their middle managers and the information on the webpage, has been in the form of low practical information, pertaining to their insecurities of “what does this change mean for me” and they have not shown great interest in the strategies or strategic decisions of the organization such as the board did.

8.3. Sensemaking

The sensemaking processes of these volunteers are retrospective because they are being asked to formulate their thoughts concerning the changes in the board after they have been introduced to the issue earlier and they make use of what they already know as well. It is ongoing because they continue to work on reaching an acceptable level of uncertainty (plausible rather than accurate) and their understanding continues to evolve as they receive new information. These volunteers react to the organization’s values as cues and this can be divided into two categories as it was with the board. One category concerns the importance of values, the other the use of these values. Seeing as the restructuring is not something that fundamentally initiates sense making processes for this group of volunteers, what they actually relate to are things that are more present to them, i.e. the values.

At the annual congress the board facilitated a value-workshop, where all participants engaged
with matrix group discussions about the meaning of the organization’s values, being engagement, involvement, responsibility and appreciation. As the forthcoming analysis shows, it is walking this talk, which is sought after.

**The importance of values**
The project volunteers do not have a lot to say about the restructuring of the board other than they hope it will increase transparency and improve communication lines (Interview F). Instead they are more focused on the importance of values and the purpose of the organization.

“I don’t think I would be able to tell a difference, why is SCY an organization, what is the purpose of that organization – even with the values that we just worked with [in the workshop] - it means a lot that you have something concrete to follow and that they are different from other organizations” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 1, line 8).

In this quote, the volunteer is underlining the importance of values as the foundation of the reason for existing as an organization and at the same time criticizing the organization for not doing it well enough. It clearly demonstrates some frustrations from the volunteer.

“...the whole purpose of the organization, the focus areas, and what are the goals, why are we doing the things we do? I think there are so many basic things that are not in place yet, which is such a shame and I think we are losing a lot of volunteers over it because people don’t understand, they don’t feel involved in our values, they don’t feel like they are a part of it...” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 2, line 16).

This is supported by the manager of the secretariat who during the interview said that at the present time there was no clarification or unanimity concerning what the purpose of the organization was and how things were done in the organization, even to the extent where there had been disagreements over what the right name for the organization was (Interview A, line 2-4).

Seen in this light, it is not strange that interviewed organizational members at all levels of the organization have called for something to gather around and in general have agreed that the values could be used more actively.

**Acting on values**
When these volunteers try to make sense for themselves regarding the organization’s values in a more practical perspective, they are focused on the transparency of the organization. They call

---

17 See Appendix 4 under "RBA workshop"
for a way to make involvement and engagement easier and they request a higher level of involvement both from their fellow volunteers and their leaders. They want to be involved in decision making by their leaders which is also the purpose of the value “involvement”.

These quotes illustrate how volunteers experience the extent of value-based action in the organization:

“...you have to go in and listen to the volunteers and hear what they have to say, I have tried myself at a project leader meeting to propose suggestions and I don’t feel like there is any - well yes they are heard, but there is no action behind it, so that you can take up the volunteers’ proposals…” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 2, line 18).

"It is almost strange that there doesn’t exist this expectation of the volunteer that if you are a member of SCY then of course you attend the annual congress because you are a part of it, it concerns you, it is your organization – I feel that [...] they should do more to make the volunteers like feel a part of it and that they have this sense of ownership, that it all depends on our involvement” (Quote, Interview F, Respondent 1, line 22).

Clearly the volunteers do not find that the values are being used actively in the organization and this to an extent where it is destructive for their work.

These quotes from volunteers describe the importance of involving everyone, as one value prescribes, and the result of not living up to it:

"I think we lose a lot of volunteers because people don’t understand, they don’t feel engaged in our values, they don’t feel like a part of it, and I think that is a shame” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 2, line 16).

"Now I am back as a regular volunteer and I don’t feel like I have anything to do with the organization anymore” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 2, line 18).

“I don’t feel that we are appreciated, sure it is good that you are a volunteer, but it’s not like it is expected that you are a part of it all - you know, like, have influence on where we are going, this vision, when they are talking about strategy, it is as if they don’t expect that us volunteers who actually do all the work, all us volunteers, should be a part of it and I find that somewhat ironic [...]you don’t have the feeling that we are equal – it’s fine that there is a board – but it shouldn’t mean that [...] there is this sort of hierarchy, that there are them and then there are us, I don’t feel like that should be there in a democratic organization such as SCY” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 1, line 22).

"There isn’t this feeling that I belong or feel any sort of ownership and that makes it easy to back out, especially when it gets difficult, you know, these projects are hard work and when things don’t go well and you don’t have the feeling that we are in it together then it is so easy to say “I am not a part of this”, whereas if we had a stronger bond then [...] you have this feeling that you won’t be missed because no one is asking in to where you went, there isn’t any contact in that sense” (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 2, line 30).
"it’s not like we’re paid to do it, we are volunteers, so for that reason there ought to be some centre force, you should at least try to do more for the volunteers to want to get involved with the organization, I don’t feel it, but that is just the best way to make sure that people stay on, it creates a sense of loyalty I think, then you are a part of it and you stay a part of it" (Quote: Interview F, Respondent 1, lines 48-52).

Volunteers latch on to the use of the language surrounding values because they hear things that they can recognize in their own work but it becomes difficult for them to accept (and it doesn’t help them feel closer to the organization) when what they hear being said is not what they see or experience happen.

8.4. Sensegiving

If sensegiving has happened in this group it has as a maximum been in the form of discussions between the volunteers of the information they possessed, in an oscillation between giving and demanding sense where they could try to help each other’s sensemaking process underway.

8.5. Chapter Summary

The analysis showed that there were two major competing discourses when it came to sensebreaking; those who found that sense was being broken for them and those who actively distanced themselves from this and never engaged in a sensebreaking process.

The volunteer who engaged in a sensebreaking process also attempted to demand sense from the organization’s webpage and a middle manager but the process stranded because she never received information to the extent that she felt she needed in order to make sense of the situation.

When it came to the proposal to restructure the organization this group never received the information they needed and demanded in order to be able to make sense. Giving up on making sense of this, they instead became more active in discussing the role of values in the organization. Here they followed the tendency that have emerged throughout analysis namely that the values are not being practiced and that practicing the values could solve some big issues for these organizational members and perhaps even ignite a sense of belonging, a sense of ownership – a SCY-spirit as one middle manager named it.

Sensegiving has only happened amongst the group members and has thus not transcended the hierarchy of the organization as the sensegiving efforts of the two management groups did.
**9. Summary of Analysis**

This chapter shortly sums up the results of the previous three-part analysis in the below table. The key words in the table relate to the topics, which the organizational groups focused on in their sensemaking processes. Below the table I highlight the most important aspects that were found in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Analysis</th>
<th>The Board</th>
<th>The Project Leaders</th>
<th>The Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense Breaking</strong></td>
<td>Practical - Increase efficiency - Minimize lobbyism - Diminish workload Ideological - Focus on values - Not acting according to mission</td>
<td>- Focus on the practical aspects of restructuring such as questioning the role of the new coordinators</td>
<td>Two discourses: - Not interested in organization and not engaging in sensemaking processes - Interested in organization and breaking sense with the understanding of the board’s role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense Demanding</strong></td>
<td>- From peers - From stakeholders holding relevant information</td>
<td>- From peers, the board and other sources</td>
<td>- From peers, middle managers and other sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense Making</strong></td>
<td>A focus on: - The importance of values, - The implementation of values, - The responsibilities of the board, in the light of restructuring the organization. - We need to promote a “SCY-spirit”</td>
<td>- Restructuring the organization - Identity as middle manager resulting in choosing actively to be a part of the organization - Lack of a “SCY-spirit”</td>
<td>- The importance of values - The implementation of values - Lack of coherency in and a sense of ownership of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense Giving</strong></td>
<td>Internal - In board meetings - Special role of the president External: - At project leader meetings = to middle managers - At the congress to all members - Through documents and videos to all members</td>
<td>- To peers and organizational volunteers in their area</td>
<td>- At the most occurring amongst the regular volunteers as discussions of the sense they have made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first step in the sensemaking process, **sensebreaking** presents the biggest disagreement amongst the organizational members. The purpose was to see how volunteers break with their understanding of the board’s need to be restructured. The board is the only group that relates clearly to this and presents practical and ideological reasons for the need of the change. The middle managers do not contemplate these overall strategic aspects but are hoping for something as low-practical as clearer communication lines after a restructuring. The most interesting group in this perspective is also the largest, namely the regular volunteers. Here many sources, including the volunteers themselves, explain that there is a big part of the volunteers in the organization, who do not find that the organization is relevant enough for them, to be in a situation where their sense of it can be broken. The volunteers, e.g. the ones that were interviewed, who are interested in the organization behind their project, agree with the middle managers that a change would be good if it brought with it more transparency and improved communication lines. They also accept the statement that board members’ need a lighter work load.

The organizational members all follow the same pattern when **demanding sense**. They go to peers, the managers above them or use the organization’s webpage. The board seems to be the only group that has benefitted satisfyingly from this step in the sensemaking process. Both middle managers and regular volunteers express that they gave up on demanding sense after some time. If they were supposed to make sense of the new change based on new information then it follows logically that they never accomplished this because this step or link in the sensemaking process was not fulfilled. The consequence is that they cannot make sense of the change.

For this reason the object of organizational members’ **sensemaking** is diversified. The board members are focused on the benefits of the change and what it means for their responsibilities as board members. They link this to the values of the organization, which particularly one board member, who has also produced a report (the RBA report) on the same subject for the board, finds to be the solution to all problems in the organization. This is however a point that both middle managers as well as regular volunteers agree on. This would suggest that there in general is satisfaction with the values that the organization has proclaimed to be based on. However, there is in general great dissatisfaction with the implementation of these values and the use of them in practice. This also leads to a different point being how the organizational members make sense of the change proposal. As we saw with the sensedemanding the middle managers and
regular volunteers have not received the information they needed to make sense from. Instead the middle managers fell back on what they could relate to and make sense of. Based on this and their attitude to the values they came up with an alternative to the board’s change proposal. The middle managers did not find that it was the right time for focusing on strategy and growing bigger as long as fundamentals, such as nursing a “SCY-spirit”, were not in place. The regular volunteers agreed that it would strengthen the volunteers’ motivation if there was a greater sense of belonging to and ownership of the organization.

Concerning sensegiving board members were active in both giving sense to their fellow board members and afterwards to other organizational members. They managed to do this on several fronts, e.g. at project leader (middle managers) meetings, on the webpage, in emails and sending material home to organizational members. Despite of this, as the sensedemanding efforts from middle managers and regular volunteers showed, this external sensegiving was not successful. That middle managers did not receive enough information to make sense from was also problematic for their possibilities of passing sense on to their volunteers. Regular volunteers attempted to give sense to each other through discussion but this was also limited by the sense/understanding they had reached through their sensedemanding and sensemaking processes.
10. Discussion

In this chapter I will discuss the results of my analysis, and evaluate my choice of methods and theories. The discussion will begin with an example of how the organizational sensemaking figure presented in chapter 4 has developed based on the findings of the analysis. The following discussion of results is two-fold. Firstly, I will discuss the value of the results relating to the case organization SCY and secondly, I will discuss the generalizability of the results exemplified by looking at the value of the results for other organizations.

10.1. Organizational Sensemaking Figure

This figure roughly illustrates the relationships between the hierarchies in the organization and the sensemaking process as it looks based on the results of the analysis. Managers at both upper levels were not able to give sense to the groups below them and make them understand what to break sense with and neither volunteers nor middle managers were able to demand enough sense from the board. Thus there was not congruency between the sense/understanding that was created at the different levels.

10.2. Discussion of results

Making Sense in SCY

My analysis of the sensemaking processes in SCY resulted in an impression of an organization
where volunteers could not see the purpose of the board’s change proposal and therefore found that other issues might be more important and in need of discussion/critical re-evaluation.

The board seems to be the only group that fully grasped the scope and purpose of the change proposal which is only natural since they were responsible for it. However, they still had to motivate the rest of the organizational members in this change process. This failed because the board was not able to break the organizational members’ frames of understanding and give sense in response to the sensedemanding from volunteers, as is illustrated in the organizational sensemaking figure, nor were they able to create a sense of urgency in the volunteers and an idea of what the burning platform was.

Seeing as people’s sense was not broken, they continuously strived to incorporate new knowledge (we need a change) into existing understandings (we are not enacting our values). The organizational members could not make sense of the board’s change proposal, and as sensemaking strives to be plausible, they never reached a plausible level of understanding because they did not receive correct/enough information. Instead they fell back on what they already knew and made sense of that. This explains why both middle managers and regular volunteers related more to creating a sense of coherency, ownership and a SCY-spirit through acting on the organization’s values than they related to the change proposal.

**Loosely coupled organization**

SCY is a *loosely coupled* organization with multiple groups and local boards. This means that even though the board is focused on using the middle managers as a communicational link to the bottom of the organization, even though the change proposal was passed by a majority of the voters, and even though they want all volunteers in SCY to support and actively use the values of SCY, there can still be hundreds of volunteers in the organization who do not feel related to the rest of the organization and to whom these messages have not gotten through. Due to the absence of tighter couplings (e.g. more attentive or competent middle managers) these volunteers can “get away with” not taking actively part in the organization. Based on the definition of the different types of volunteers that emerged in the analysis and their commitment to the organization it would seem that some groups are even *decoupled* from the rest of the organization and this would certainly make it difficult to give sense to them. In such a situation leaders would have to be aware of the extra effort that would be needed to reach such a group. In terms of having a successfully joined and streamlined organization, a group that is decoupled.
from and thus not receptive to inputs from the board, makes reaching congruency very difficult and in the long run it creates counter-realities and results in an organization that appears scattered. In order to avoid this, the board must figure out how to create **tighter couplings** in the organization where needed.

**Leadership in a loosely coupled organization and the role of middle managers**

If the couplings in the organization are not tight enough, members may feel *that they are “disorganized” because they do not share a common way of making sense or their experience* (Smircich & Morgan, 1982, p. 258). “Feeling disorganized” was what happened for organizational members at the annual congress, when volunteers defined the organizational issues and solutions to be different from those of the board. It demands a special effort from the leaders and managers in the organization to step in and define reality for these volunteers.

The sensemaking process of the regular volunteers could have been facilitated by the middle managers. Analysis 3 showed how one volunteer gave up on demanding sense because the middle manager was not able to give enough information. Analysis 2 showed that middle managers engaged in demanding sense on behalf of their volunteers but that the result of this was limited by the ability or will of the board member in the situation to give sense back. Thus, the sensemaking process in SCY was worsened by the fact that middle managers were not able to fulfil their role.

**Recommendations for the leaders and managers in SCY**

Based on the above discussion I have the following recommendations for the leaders in SCY:

- Develop a **strategy for breaking the sense** of organizational members
- Be aware that **different organizational members might need different explanations** and information in order to be able to make sense of the same topic and come to the same conclusion
- Start up initiatives to make the volunteers more open to ideas coming from the board
- Start up initiatives to better train the middle managers in making them understand their important role as the communication and management link between the board and the volunteers, e.g. involve them in strategy-making to improve their understanding of this
- Start up initiatives to make the values of the organization visible in the actions of the board so that others will follow the example
Generalizability of results
In general the premises of sensemaking indicate that sensemaking outcomes will vary from one organization to another because the organizational members in different companies hold different understandings and because the sensemaking changes over time because people develop new understandings. This being said, general results of the thesis can be applied to other organizations. The obvious parallels are to other volunteer organizations, to other loosely coupled organization or to traditional organizations.

The major characteristic separating SCY and other volunteer organizations from traditional organizations is that it due to being a voluntary organization is based on democracy. This means that the board/top management cannot make any strategic, structural or other changes without the support of a majority of the organization. In more traditional profit-oriented organizations, the top management is more at liberty to make changes which they find necessary for the sake of the profit or performance of the organization. That being said, this thesis has shown that management will have it easier if their organizational members understand and are for the directions set by management. This aspect underlines the importance of reaching consensus through sensemaking/communicational processes.

This thesis has shown some important general principles for all these types of organizations being the importance of successfully communicating with the organizational members, the big role and responsibility of middle managers and understanding the importance of breaking and giving sense. All else equal, these are important points that should be valid for tightly coupled, loosely coupled, voluntary and non-voluntary organizations.

Closing remarks
This thesis has shown a snapshot of an organization in constant development. In a year’s time it will undoubtedly look different. Organizational members will have negotiated and created new meaning among each other and together they will have moved the organization. This will happen successfully if the organizational members can break sense for and give sense to each other.

One final comment regarding sensemaking is that even though the purpose of it is to create congruency in the organization, it must be an explicit discussion, whether the organization even finds that complete consensus is possible or desirable. People are different and thus there will always be different discourses and sense. Despite the extra communicational effort this demands, it is also from these diverse attitudes that innovation and development originates from.
Sensemaking is in general directed at negotiating agreement and as such it is in the interest of the organization that these negotiations do not become so full of conflict that they prevent realizing the goals of the organization. Sensebreaking or reframing is necessary to avoid that organizational members get stuck in old patterns and beliefs that are not convenient for the development of the organization and which inhibits creativity and change.

10.3. Discussion of method

Validity
According to Jordansen & Madsen (2010) “high quality” in constructivist research is defined by:

1) Credibility of the presented interpretations based on
2) Consistency between research question, choice of data collection methods and the overall scientific paradigm and
3) Openness, transparency and reflection concerning the choices of producing and subsequently analyzing data (Jordansen & Madsen, 2010, p. 61).

I have tried to secure this standard of high quality by proceeding methodically throughout the thesis and substantiating arguments with data. Thus every part of the process has been made transparent for the reader to be able to follow it. The thesis was introduced by a thorough explanation of the format of the research questions (aimed at reaching understanding), how this decided the scientific paradigm of social constructivism and how this paradigm in turn was decisive for the choice of qualitative methods. I have employed data and methods in a triangulation of interviewing organizational members, attending organizational events and through careful reading, listening, asking, comparison of and focus on emerging common topics. This thesis also shows full openness and transparency of the data produced with both coding, transcripts and sound files from the interviews enclosed in the appendices. These conditions make it possible to examine the credibility and validity of the results, and disregarding context specific premises of this case study (such as the organization being based on democracy) the results also contribute on a more general organizational level.

Challenges
During the data collecting process, I experienced that I found it difficult to reach a point of saturation in my data collecting efforts. As presented in Chapter 2 a point of saturation is reached when one experiences diminishing returns of new data. This point was difficult for me to
reach since each new interview I performed brought with it new aspects and I found that it would be impossible for me alone to perform enough interviews to reach that point of saturation. On the other hand, I later in the process realized that my data material was not sufficient for my research aspirations. My research question and theoretical framework had over time (after the interviews had been gathered) naturally developed and subsequently improved, but unfortunately growing out of the limits of my interview material. I attempted to solve this issue by contacting the organization for a supplementary interview, but the organization did not find that they had the resources to accommodate my wish at the time. Consequently I solved the problem by supplementing my interview material where it was insufficient with data from observations, my own experiences in the organization and internally produced material to organizational members.

**Alternative methods**

An alternative to the way I chose to construct this research could have been to perform a more broad reaching investigation; interviewing a larger member base and reaching a more elaborated picture of the multiple distinctions of volunteers and thus perceptions and understandings of the organization that really exist within it. The danger of this, however, could be to lose the overview and make it more difficult to point out the characteristics of the sensemaking processes. The distinction between board, middle manager and regular volunteer in this research has been simplified for the analytical overview and scope of this research objective. A broader investigation taking into account the relatively big differences that exist among the groups and hierarchical levels of the organization, could create a richer understanding of the complexity of the organization, and could show the extent of different attitudes towards the organization and pinpoint where the communicational dissonance resulting in poor sensegiving and sensemaking exists to make it more easy to go into the organization and solve these problems. This could aid the organization in performing an effective communication to the entire organization, and hopefully make it clearer for the sceptical organizational members why SCY is so special and important both to them and to their projects. Reaching this broader member base could be done through carefully planned questionnaires and focus group meetings with groups of volunteers in several different parts of the organization, both geographically and hierarchically.

10.4. **Discussion of theory**

**Analytical distinctions**

In the Theoretical Framework, I repeatedly underlined how interlinked the four different parts of
the sensemaking theory were. That the sensemaking process could not begin without the sensemaker breaking with an old understanding of the sensemaking object, that he or she would have to demand additional sense and information from a more knowable stakeholder, that after this sensemaking, as based on the seven properties, could start and that finally the sensemaker might even be able to give sense to others.

Despite this strong coherency between the mechanisms I chose to divide my analyses in a highly categorized manner. This was done in order to improve the understanding of the sensemaking process and be able to go into detail with what sense was broken, demanded, made and given.

Not only was there thus sharp analytical distinctions between the theoretical concepts, but the complexity of the analysis was further increased through three categorizations of the organizational members as well. This was a very conscious choice. I could have settled on just the board and the rest of the volunteers, or as contemplated in the paragraph of “Alternatives” above there could have been numerous distinctive groups. The latter option was not feasible since I found it unrealistic that I alone should be able to gather such an extensive data pool. Concerning the first option, I did not find that it gave an acceptable nuanced impression of the organization and through my management studies at CBS I had become interested in the middle managers as the binding glue of organizations and I wanted to investigate their role further.

**Alternative and supplementing theories**

At an early stage of the research process I had noted that the organizational members in SCY were not focusing on the same issues or telling the same story of the organization. I found this conundrum to be very interesting and explored the possibilities of uncovering this issue through applying theories of knowledge sharing, organizational learning (Argyris 1996, Levitt & March 1988), organizational identity (Ravasi & Schultz 2006), organizational culture (Schein 1992), motivation (Ellermers et al, 2004), or competing discourses, but with each attempt I found that the results the theory could lead me to were too simple compared to the more complex ideas I had of what could be the fundamental problem in the organization. The thesis has already demonstrated thoroughly how this complexity was finally achieved through a combination of sensemaking and management theories. Another alternative could have been to look at the organization through theories of change implementation/change management.
11. Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis has been to reach a complex understanding of the sensemaking processes that occur in the volunteer organization SCY during times of insecurity brought on by the prospect of change. The research questions aimed at discovering how the voluntary organizational members across the organization made sense of the change and furthermore to discover how the different groups depending on hierarchical status in the organization, influenced and facilitated each others’ sensemaking processes. The assumptions behind this was that organizational members make sense differently based on previous knowledge and that actors in management positions hold a special responsibility and possibility for guiding the sensemaking processes of other actors.

The analysis showed that the different groups made sense in different ways and of different subjects because the board had a fundamental problem with instilling in them a sense of urgency and breaking the understanding people held of the organization and a need for change in the first place. When organizational members came to the board and demanded sense, it was with a different perspective because their understanding had not been broken. The board however did not comply with this and kept giving sense with a wrong perspective compared to what the organizational members were demanding. Thus, the organizational members and the board never began a compatible sensemaking process.

The discussion of these results showed how the loosely coupled structure of the organization can complicate the sensemaking process and underlined the importance of visible and competent management. Based on the discussion recommendations were given to the board for future improved sensemaking facilitation.
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13. Appendices
13.1. **Appendix 1 Organizational Chart**

The official chart as passed by the annual congress:

A more detailed version, which more correctly illustrates the links in hierarchy, decision making and communication lines, created by a volunteer in the organization:
13.2. **Appendix 2 Interview Guide**

- Where do you volunteer?
- Why do you volunteer?
- Why SCY and not a different NGO?
- Why is it, do you think, that there are not more volunteers present at the congress? (80/2000)
- What do you know about the plans to restructure the board?
- What do you think about it?
- How have you heard about it?
- Are you here alone or as part of a group?
- How have you/the group prepared for the congress?
- Have you discussed the proposal to restructure the board in your group?
- How do the board’s decisions and work affect you now?
- How do you think it will affect your work if the change is made?
13.3. **Appendix 3 Data Coding in Excel**

### Sensebreaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview:</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
<th>Quote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1. 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>what is the purpose of scy?</strong></td>
<td>Her det sidste 1,5-1 år har vi arbejder meget selvkritisk fordi det gik op for os at vi arbejder med fundament i børnekonventionen og samtidigt har vi en retorik der hedder at vi arbejder for alle udsatte børn eller alle børn med behov, men i børnekonventionen står der alle børn, og der står ikke noget om behov, der står at alle børn har ret, [3:25] og da vi så ligesom begyndte aktivt, hvordan skal vi begynde at arbejde med det her? – det er faktisk alle børn vi er til for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **3.1. 18** | **what do we need this change for?** | det har været ekstremt rigtig det første halve år af bestyrelsesåret, at folk har siddet med lobby interesser, man har siddet dels med et ansvar og dels med et forsvar for et område, på den måde som man har gjort, når vi har skullet træffe strategiske beslutninger, hvorvi vi sammen har skullet tænke hinandens områder ind i det [9:00]. Det har folk ikke gjort, der har man simpelthen siddet med sin lobby hat og sagt "hvad med mig, jeg ved det her, hvad med mig" i stedet for at sige, hvad med os? Så jeg har været meget fortaler for den her ændring, dermed ikke sagt at bestyrelsen for evigt skal bestå af 9 medlemmer, men jeg har været meget fortaler for at man ikke har skullet have, den her kasket på der har heddet politisk leder, samtidig er der også en risiko at man måske bliver for distanceret i forhold til ude i felten, det har vi så prøvet at imødekomme ved at sige at man skal have en kontakt persons funktion, så man har ansvaret for at orientere sig på alle områder, men især på et område skal man kunne referere alt fra, så ligesom den her skulle være en måde for at det skulle kunne give ansvar, uden at det skulle blive forsvar, og det har været en rigtig svær støjrelse at balancere med |

| **4.1. 20** | **the board's responsibilities + isomorphism (doing what other organizations are doing) + sensebreaking med en ny forståelse for bestyrelsens rolle + forsvar for den nye struktur** | Altså først var jeg faktisk meget kritisk [refererer til min bestyrelsesmødeobservation, hvor hun var meget emotionelt påvirket af ikke at kunne overskue konsekvenserne af disse ændringer], fordi at er en tendens som også er i andre organisationer, det er med at gøre bestyrelsen mindre, andre steder bliver man endda valgt for to år, og så bliver det sådan en lille eksklusiv skare, og i mit hoved er en bestyrelse også noget der repræsenterer de frivillige, altså gerne skal afspejle de frivillige i den gruppe der er der, så jeg synes det er en kæmpe stor værdi at man også bliver udskiftet, ja, man kommer ikke så dybt ind i budgettet, som man kunne og man får ikke gennemført alle de ting man vil, men du får de her løbende inputs nedfra, så synes jeg også man har et pligt til så at skride når man har siddet der nogle år, for så er der sgu brug for nye blod og nye tendenser, men samtidig med at bestyrelsen er blevet mindre, så er der også blevet plads til, for eksempel sådan nogen initiativer som det børneråd vi har snakket om, fordi argumentet tidligere har været at vi har været 13 og det er ret meget at sidde om et bord, og så oven i det måske skulle have et børneråd, måske en per mand, så er vi 26 til et møde, det er fuldstændigt urealistisk, hvor man jo nu ville være under 20 og man ville måske endda også være mindre, hvor der er plads til de her ekstra aktører og hvor der også er plads til at inddrage de mennesker som det her punkt måske lige handler om, fordi vi ikke er så mange, og så kan jeg rigtig godt lide – har jeg lært at forstå værdien i – at det er folk der sidder der med en generel interesse for RBU, det er alle de frivillige nu der er repræsenteret, det handler ikke om at man har en stærk, et stærkt ansigt på et andet område, det handler det ikke om nu, nu har alle ansvaret for alle, og det kommer til at give en helt anden energi i bestyrelsesmøderne også, positiv energi, fordi man sidder ikke og konkurrerer om penge og noget sådan specifikt til ens eget bagland, det er ikke det der er ens primære ansvaret, og så sidder man med ansvaret for alle, så det er alle de frivillige, |

### Mellem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview:</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
<th>Quote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.1. 83</strong></td>
<td><strong>hvad går landsmødet ud på</strong></td>
<td>der var sådan en generel stemming for at tingene blev lagt frem og så stemte man for, okay fint, næste, det var ikke sådan – jeg tror at jeg kom med en forestilling om at okay, på landsmødet så tager vi så – så diskuterer man nogen ting og så har man en eller anden form for indflydelse, men det gik ret hurtigt op for mig, og det tror jeg var for en del af os, at hvis du vil have noget indflydelse på landsmødet, så er du nødt til at være rigtig godt forberedt, og have alting klart på forhånd, du kan ikke bare møde op uvidende, og så gør noget, angivet end at du kan stemme blankt, fordi at alle andre stemmer for, så du har ikke nogen indflydelse på den måde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jamen altså der var meget det der med, sådan, lidt, det føltes som beskyldninger, nu vil i bare bestemme det hele agtigt, den var der lidt, en tendens, men der var også nogen der bare sådan siger, jamen hvad har det der med mig at gøre, jeg tror også at denne person måske også lige selv var med til at skabe denne her lidt defensive, der var sådan lidt forsvars agtig stemming, at det er bare, når folk, jeg tror at når folk er engagerede i det og de er frivillige, så kommer følelserne mere i spil, og når tingene bliver lige pludselige personlige, at der sidder en person her, så bliver det, nå men jeg har selvfølgelig at det vi skal indføre så derfor så står jeg inde for det, man bliver stillet op som om det er to personer overfor hinanden.

Bund

Interview: Topic: Quote:

F1 l. 36

the volunteers are actually not focused on sensebreaking because it has been so difficult for them to gather information (sensedemanding) that they have been more focused on the transparency and walking the talk of values in the organization

Jeg syntes at det var svært at være med i den diskussion, i forhold til hvordan det egentligt hænger sammen, hvad deres konkrete arbejdsspogaver er, og egentligt lyder det bare på mig som om de vil prøve på at få løftet arbejdssbyrden, sådan så de ikke havde så meget at sidde med selv, så de i stedet ville have noget koordinator på i stedet for, så igen, jeg er ikke blevet klogere på hvad deres arbejde er og om det er bedre at omstrukturer det syntes jeg ikke jeg fik ret meget ud at, og der var ikke ret meget plads til at stille spørgsmål og folk var meget engagerede hvilket var godt, men der var ikke nok tid til det,

F1 l. 48

sensebreaking not relevant

vi prøvede ligesom at inddrage [17:03] de andre frivillige og reaktionen var faktisk ret sjov, nærmest: ”hvorfor skulle jeg det? Hvad får jeg ud af det her? Jeg har da slet ikke lyst til at være en del af det” og der var en meget negativ stemming omkring det, og det er da ret underligt når man er en del af et projekt under organisationen, at man ikke har lyst til at engagnere sig, ikke fordi man behøver sådan at vende sig til, men der bør da være en eller anden interesse i at præge organisationen, det er jo ret underligt, jeg blev chokeret over den reaktion som nogle af de frivillige kom med.

Sensedemanding

Top

Interview: Topic: Quote:

E l. 20

the board's responsibilities + isomorphism (doing what other organizations are doing) + sensebreaking med en ny forståelse for bestyrelsens rolle + forsvar for den nye struktur

Altså først var jeg faktisk meget kritisk, fordi at det er en tendens som også er i andre organisationer, det her med at gøre bestyrelsen mindre, andre steder bliver man endda valgt for to år, og så bliver det sådan en lille eksklusiv skare, og i mit hoved er en bestyrelse også noget der repræsenterer de frivillige, altså gerne skal afspejlde de frivillige i den gruppe der er der, så jeg synes det er en kæmpet stor værdi at man også bliver udskiftet, ja, man kommer ikke så dybt ind i budgettet, som man kunne og man får ikke gennemført alle de ting man vil, men du får de her løbende inputs nedafra, så synes jeg også man har en pligt til så at skride når man har siddet der nogle år, for så er der sgu brug for nye blod og nye tendenser, men samtidig med at bestyrelsen er blevet mindre, så er der også blevet plads til, for eksempel sådan nogen initiativer som det børneråd vi har snakket om, fordi argumentet tidligere har været at vi har været 13 og det er ret meget at sidde om et bord, og så oven i det måske skulle have et børneråd, måske en per mand, så er vi 26 til et møde, det er fuldstændig urealistisk, hvordan man jo nu ville være under 20 og man ville måske endda også være mindre, hvor der er plads til de her ekstra aktører og hvor der også er plads til at inddrage de mennesker som det her punkt måske lige handler om, fordi vi ikke er så mange, og så kan jeg rigtig godt lide – har jeg lært at forstå værdien i – at det er folk der sidder der med en generel interesse for RBU, det er alle de frivillige nu der er repræsenteret, det handler ikke om at man har en stærk, et stærkt ansigt på ens indsatsområde, det handler det ikke om nu, nu har alle ansvar for alle, og det kommer til at give en helt anden energi i bestyrelsesmøderne også, positiv energi, fordi man sidder ikke og konkurrerer om penge og noget sådan specifikt til ens eget bagland, det er ikke det der er ens primære ansvar, og så sidder man med ansvaret for alle, så det er alle de frivillige.

Mellem

Interview: Topic: Quote:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G1 l. 33</th>
<th>omstrukturerings</th>
<th>nu har bestyrelsen fået lidt styr på sig selv, nu har de haft nogen konsulenter, og har en plan, en strategi for hvor de skal hen og sådan noget, men resten af organisationen, er ikke faldet på plads, der er mange ting der ikke er kommet styr på endnu, og de har ikke blik for det hele, så derfor så hvordan kan du få alle med til sådan en begivenhed når der ikke er klare linier, der ikke er kommunikationslinier der er afklaret og folks roller og ansvar og krav og sådan nogen ting, der er ikke, er ikke sådan noget der bare ligger fast, som alle ved, så der tænker man på, hvad kan man så forvente</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G2 l. 38</td>
<td>kommunikation mellem top og bund</td>
<td>SPM [23:40] hvad har bestyrelsen så gjort for at informere jer om det? Hvad har I så fået, har I fået fyldestgørende materiale om det for eksempel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: altså vi er ikke blevet taget hensyn til, vi er blevet informeret lige så vel som alle andre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: vi har selv – du har opsøgt viden, så du har fået viden direkte fra Henriette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: altså jeg blev ved med at maile og så til sidst fik jeg et konceptpapir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: altså jeg har fået alt muligt at vide fra 1, så det er ret svært – og jeg var ikke med på uddannelsesdagen og fik at vide at der holdt de også, der holdt hun lige en lille præsentation af det, så det kan jeg ikke udtale mig om, så jeg kan kun udtale mig om det de lagde ud forud for første oplysningsmøde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: ja for der fik vi jo den der foreløbige indkaldelse og dagsorden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: ja og den sagde ikke så meget, den var meget lang og sagde ikke så meget, så den har jeg, dine beretninger og så det de har sendt ud officielt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: og så har jeg holdt mig meget opdateret på den der rbu.dk/landsmøde, og har sådan lige set, er der dukket noget nyt op, om der er blevet lagt – det var også det jeg fortalte dig at nu var der kommet billeder og beskrivelser af de enkelte kandidater, så den har jeg været rimelig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: det har jeg selvfølgelig også været inde at pigge på, så jeg synes det er svært at udtale mig for så har jeg ikke – jeg har kun 1s vurdering af det hun sagde på uddannelsesdagen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: det er faktisk lidt paradokssalt at vi – har vi så selv opsøgt det, jeg ved det ikke – vi har vidst det før vi blev fortalt det</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: så det er faktisk svært for os at være sikre på det</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: men vi har også – det er noget der har interesseret os fordi vi har allerede da vi sad i toget hjem fra landsmødet – kongressen sidste år – der havde mig og 2 lige lært hinanden og kende fordi vi delvis læser på samme studie – og der sagde vi, det her, det gør vi bedre til næste år</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: det var simpelthen afslagen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: så jeg tror simpelthen at antennerne har været ude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| G1 and G2, l. 68-80 | sensedemanding: this information so we pushed until we got it | jeg har oplevet sådan en situation hvor der var en ude fra bestyrelsen og fortælle nogen om de forandringer de havde planlagt, hvor der kom nogen, også lidt ophedede reaktioner, fra dem der sad og lyttede, det var sådan på international dag, men den her bestyrelsesmedlem kunne ikke rigtig – jeg forsøgte ligesom at tage og snakke lidt bagefter fordi jeg også var lidt nysgerrig om nogen af de her ting som han sagde, men det var som om at der ikke rigtig var øje for eller hvad skal man sige, sympati for at sige, nå men jeg kan godt forstå hvorfor det er der er nervøse for at de her ændringer medfører noget dårligere, at de... jeg kan godt forstå at når man går ind og laver sådan en radikal forandring i en organisation, så vil de frivillige selvfølgelig undre sig over hvorfor og undre sig over om det fører til det bedre eller dårligere, at det er en naturlig |
| G2 l. 103 | som mellemleder lade ved at | jeg har oplevet sådan en situation hvor der var en ude fra bestyrelsen og fortælle nogen om de forandringer de havde planlagt, hvor der kom nogen, også lidt ophedede reaktioner, fra dem der sad og lyttede, det var sådan på international dag, men den her bestyrelsesmedlem kunne ikke rigtig – jeg forsøgte ligesom at tage og snakke lidt bagefter fordi jeg også var lidt nysgerrig om nogen af de her ting som han sagde, men det var som om at der ikke rigtig var øje for eller hvad skal man sige, sympati for at sige, nå men jeg kan godt forstå hvorfor det er der er nervøse for at de her ændringer medfører noget dårligere, at de... jeg kan godt forstå at når man går ind og laver sådan en radikal forandring i en organisation, så vil de frivillige selvfølgelig undre sig over hvorfor og undre sig over om det fører til det bedre eller dårligere, at det er en naturlig |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G2 L. 105</th>
<th>as a middlemanager I need the board to have greater understanding for the importance of sensegiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>der er altid nogen som, enten fordi man ikke forstår det eller ikke kan lide forandringer eller sådan noget, det kan godt være forandringer for det bedre, men det er en uansvarlig forandring hvis ikke du ligesom, altså man har jo et ansvar som leder, til at tage folk med, og du kan jo ikke gå hurtigere end folk er parat til, (så det... jeg synes lidt at der er sådan en - jeg vil ikke kalde det elitært for det synes jeg heller ikke de er, jeg kender flere af dem i bestyrelsen, og jeg kan godt lidte dem og sådan, men) der er sådan en tendens til at når man kommer langt nok op, så er det svært, også når man samtidig har det der overblik, så at nå helt ned og se det perspektiv der er helt nede på nederste niveau hvis man kan sige det, i hierarkiet, at det synes jeg ikke helt de har formået, at man er nødt til at tage snakken også, man er nødt til at tage omsorg omkring de her mennesker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview:</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quote:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2 L. 42-44</th>
<th>don't understand how things are linked and after having been presented with the new changes still can't find the needed info - demanded sense from a middlemanage r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ja helt klart, og så også fordi den sidste runde hvor bestyrelsesmedlemmerne skulle rundt og forklare, hvor mange timer bruger du egentligt på det her? Og hvad er det for nogle arbejde opgaver er det du har? Jeg har det sådan at, hvordan skal jeg kunne stille op til en post når jeg ikke engang ved hvad det går ud på? Det synes jeg bare sådan at lidt sæt, og grunden til at man ikke har spurgt ind til det er fordi jeg blev lige sådan lidt i tvivl, er det fordi jeg ikke selv kan finde det? Jeg tænkte, er der noget der er gået galt for mig siden alle andre ikke har stillet sammen spørgsmål, så andre jeg mig over om der er nogle oplysninger der ligger der uto, om der er tilgængelige, som om der er noget jeg er gået glip af, at men det virker på folk som om de ikke rigtigt ved hvad det indebærer, både generelt men også hvad det egentligt laver konkret men ikke bare de overordnede rammer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2 L. 57</th>
<th>hopes for the new strucutre -- lav praktiske forhåbninger om at kunne finde rundt i sin organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Den måde der er opbygget op, bare strukturen, så man ved hvem man skal henvende sig til, hvis man som projektleder, hvem man kan gå videre til koordinatoren, så man kan se det perspektiv der er helt nede på nederste niveau hvis man kan sige det, i hierarkiet, at det synes jeg ikke helt de har formået, at man er nødt til at tage snakken også, man er nødt til at tage omsorg omkring de her mennesker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Sensemaking

#### Top

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview:</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quote:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D I 3</th>
<th>hvorfor er jeg frivillig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>det er lave frivilligt arbejde er som smilet man giver på gaden, altså, det forplanter sig bare videre, og hvis du smiler til er person på gaden så smiler de igen og smilet bliver på deres ansigt indtil en ny smilet tilløbe. Det er lidt det samme med frivilligt arbejde, bare det det med at gøre noget der føles godt, og det er frivilligt tit, det føles rart og det, jeg laver det sammen med lader til at det også føles rart, så det er meget sådan en &quot;great life&quot; følelse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D I 5</th>
<th>rbu ikke vigtigt i forhold til projektet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Da jeg startede kunne det have været en hvilken som helst organisation. Grunden til at jeg startede var et projektet taltalte mig. Det var et lektiehjælps projekt hvor man skulle hjælpe, jeg skulle hjælpe til en pige, og lære hendes familie at kende og lave lektier med hende</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D I 7</th>
<th>the importance of values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jeg følte virkelig at vi kunne nå til månen og hjem igen efter det, så jeg blev meget nysgerrig på RBU, så i takt med at jeg var ved hende åbnede jeg også op på alle mulige andre projekter i RBU og endte med at være i nærmest det hele, i lidt forskellige omgange [2:23]. Og så lige så stille fandt jeg ud at de her projekter kommer af nogle værdier, de her projekter er ikke bare tilfældige, det er fordi der er et værdigrundlag bag ved, men det tog alligevel en del år før at jeg fandt ud af det, også før det virkeligt kom ind under huden på mig hvorfor jeg var i RBU, og især det sidst år hvor jeg har siddet i bestyrelsen har det virkelig rykket noget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for mig hvor jeg er begyndt at være stolt over det
der kunne jeg virkeligt se igen, det er der altså ikke andre organisationer der siger. Vores såkaldte moder organisation Red barnet er til for udsatte børn, URK er til for udsatte børn, DFUNK er til for udsatte flytnings børn, Red barnet undgår er til for alle børn, fordi det har ret at vi er til for dem, og lige præcis der, derfor er jeg her, fordi det at man siger at et barn har et behov, eller et barn er udsat, det er selvfølgelig en opmærksomhed der kan sikre en hjælpende hånd, men det er også stigmatiserende på samme tid [4:18] fordi man siger ”Nå Brian, du bor i det og det område, dine forældre har den og den indkomst: du er udsat!”, og så kan det godt være at han får ekstra lektie hjælp men han får også lige den der kasket på: du har ikke det samme som de andre har. Og for at hjælpe positivt syntes jeg ikke nødvendigvis at der også skal være noget negativt, hvorfor kan det ikke udelukkende være en positiv effekt man bidrager med, det tror jeg faktisk på at kan lykkes og det syntes jeg det gør ved at vi har været så orienterede om og så kritiske om, at det er alle børn, og det er fordi de har ret og ikke fordi de har en eller anden etnicitet, mangler penge eller forældre kontakt, det er fordi de har ret til det, så derfor

| Dl. 9    | why scy
|----------|--------------------------------------------------|
|          | the importance of values - why scy - the link between an ordinary volunteer and the board
|          | man er der for projektet, men man ikke er bevidst for hvorfor man er i red barnet undgået, og det er ikke alle der bliver i en organisation som mange af os der er endt i bestyrelsen er, nu har jeg været med i omkring 4 år og formanden har været med i 5, [5:43], det er et problem hvis det skal tage så lang tid at finde ud af hvorfor RBU skiller sig ud, så det tror jeg har en stor væsentlig betydning, at man ikke kan se linket i at sidde her og træffe de her beslutninger til at det man sidder i en lektie cafe til dagligt. Og heldigvis har vi været meget bevidst om det og snakket meget om det i det sidste halve år, og vil rigtigt gerne gøre noget ved det, så det er heldigvis en begyndelse og der var også 82 tilmeldte til landsmødet, hvor det de andre år har været omkring 50

| Dl. 12   | implementing the values - brugen af værdier
|          | (har i brugt værdierne) Ja det synes jeg, dermed ikke sagt at vi har gjort det optimale, det har helt klart været ud fra de værdier at vi har fundet ud af at vi har skullet gøre de her ting, det har betydet rigtigt meget at vi har læst den her rapport som -----har lavet for 1 eller jeg tror at de startede på det for 2 år siden, det har betyder rigtigt meget for mig i min forståelse for hvordan man skal gå til andre, så vi er startet på det, men det er en langvarig proces,

| Dl. 20   | my role in the board versus the others in the board
|          | jeg har haft lov til at syntes det. Det er jo ikke givet at man kan det, man sidder jo som politisk leder, så kan det være utroligt svært at give sig selv lov til at syntes det, altså fordi man har det der ansvar som til fordre et Forsvar, man det har været meget nemmere for mig at se jeg har heller ikke et bagland, men jeg ved ikke om man måske har følt at man har svigted dem, der har måske været flere relationer det har skullet tænkes ind, i den proces, jeg har været mere fri

| Dl. 3    | hvorfor er jeg frivillig
|          | Det er fordi jeg gerne selv vil være den forandring som jeg ønsker at andre også bidrager til, så det er vel en ansvarsfølelse for at gøre den forskel som man også efterlyser at andre skulle tage at gøre, og fordi at når man så starter så bliver man sgu lidt sulen, og så finder man ud af hvor fedt det er og hvor meget man får ud af det og hvor meget man kan give andre og så rører det sgu bare ekspennonent deraf, det gør det, altså, men det giver så meget mening, og så meget mere mening for det er jo studiet i praksis kan man sige, det er det her jeg gerne vil, så derfor betyder det også at jeg har udsat både speciale og alle mulige andre opgaver har jeg faktisk også nedprioriteret så det er ikke karaktererne jeg har arbejdet på på min uddannelse, til gengæld har jeg fået så mange gode relationer og lært rigtigt meget om mig selv og om værdier, RBA selvfølgelig

| Dl. 5    | the importance of values
|          | at vi vælger at forsøge at finde den mening, den intention, der ligger bag de handlinger de gør, fordi alle mennesker er fulde af gode intentioner, men det er formen på handlingerne, som får os til at tvele på det og det skal vi bare se igennem, så det handler om at kunne se Emil fra Lønneberg i alle vores børn og i alle vores medfrivillige og også på det organisatoriske plan, have denne her sådan anerkendende tilgang til andre mennesker og det gør en kæmpe forskel

| E l. 3   | scy not important
|          | jeg går efter sagen, jeg går efter hvad det er projektene kan, så jeg faldt over et opslag omkring Barnets Ven og denne her 1 til 1 relation, hvor jeg skulle give mere af mig selv, men hvor jeg også ved at jeg får mere ud af det, selve relationen man kan dyrke der og få noget ud af den på sådan en længerevarende basis og ikke bare at jeg kommer i en lektiecafe to timer hver anden uge eller et eller andet, det her det er virkelig noget socialt der forpligter og jeg har en relation og jeg er en del af hendes familie også, så det er... det er noget der kræver mere, men det er også noget der giver mere og det projekt har jeg sgu ikke set noget lignende til andre steder, så det faldt jeg rimelig hurtigt for, ligesom ferielejren med ungdommens røde kors, det er virkelig virkelig en god sag også [... ] så det er projektene, indholdet, hvad de kan, hvad de kan skabe, mellem mennesker og relationer
| E. L. 10 | the importance of values | den der med anerkendende tilgang, altså hvis... ungdommens røde kors bruger ikke deres værdier lige så meget som vi gør, de dyrker ikke så meget det værdibaserede som vi gør lige nu, men værdierne er der, vi vil jo alle sammen det bedste for ungerne og det afspejler projekterne altså også rigtig rigtigt meget, i hvert fald dem jeg engagerer mig i, men jo, så dyrker man jo ned i projekterne og så finder man ud af hvad er der det betyder noget, og så var jeg jo i Bangladesh og lavede det her felterbøjde og oplevede hvordan børn virkelig kan give den gas hvis de får muligheden for det og hvor meget de kan vokse, så det her med når man så også får ambitioner på deres vegne og tænker: Red Barnet Ungdom skal være en platform for deres sociale udvikling ligesom det er for os frivillige, børn de skal vokse igennem vores projekter, de skal ikke bare have lavet deres lektier, det skal de også, men vores ambitioner synes jeg godt må være på nogle andre områder, på de sociale områder, for de får rigtig meget ud af at møde os, som gider dem og som har tid til dem og som der set det gode i dem |
| E. L. 14 | udskiftning af frivillige som besværliggøre nde præmis for sensegiving | udskiftning af frivillige er et stort problem, jeg har jo været med i 4 år nu og jeg kender måske 15% af dem der er dukket op, fordi der kommer nye hele heden, du så også, jeg vid jeg ikke om du der jo da vi rakte hånden i vejret, der var nogen der spurgte hvor mange der var her for første gang, næsten alle er her for første gang, der er enorm udskiftning i frivilligt arbejde, det er i hvert fald en gang om året der er det nok 50% af de frivillige der bliver skiftet ud, og det er ret meget |
| E. L. 16 | the importance of values, transparency and goodwillom the board - volunteers not interested in organizational work - the importance of middlemanagers | så når man allerede kommer ind i en organisation, så er landsmødet ikke det første man kaster sig over, det tror jeg i hvert fald personligt at det kan godt kræve at man har en god projektleder, så man tænker at man får en god positiv oplevelse den vej ind i organisationen og så tror jeg også bare som sagt at projekterne er så fede i sig selv så folk har ikke et behov, det ved jeg også, jeg har også snakket med nogle af deltagerne igår, og de har ikke et behov for at engagerer sig på det organisatoriske plan, det er meget rart at se hvem vi er og hvor vi holder til, og hvad vi tænker om alle de her ting, men det er ikke derfor primært at de er med i Red Barnet Ungdom, det er så nogle af vores særlige projekter, Ik, og hvad det er de gerne vil med dem, så jeg tror at det kræver nogle gode projektlederede og det kræver at vi også er nogle gode ansigter på organisationen, at det bliver en organisation hvor man føler at man kan relaterer til dem der sidder på toppen også og at de er synlige og at der er gennemsigtighed |
| E. L. 18 | the board’s responsibilities | Det sker ikke nu, men vi er i gang med at starte det, bestyrelsen arbejder jo også på, har sådan et punkt der hedder RBA fast efter deres møder som vi introducerede for et halvt år, ja, et par måneder siden, hvor vi selv reflekterer over hvordan vi selv arbejder med denne her tilgang og om vi kunne være mere inddragende, mere åbne og mere gennemsigtige, og det er stadigvæk, der er taget små skridt, som for eksempel at dele referater med resten af organisationen, det er helt nyt, og så har vi jo også, kommunikationen af vores landsmøde i hvert fald har jo også ændret sig lidt med videoer og kommunikationen, altså, min fornemmelse af organisationen er i hvert fald at den er ved at samles om, at der er fokus på at vi bruger hinanden og at vi gør noget sammen, at vi har de kompetencer der skal til rundt omkring i organisationen |
| E. L. 20 | the board’s responsibilities + isomorphism (doing what other organizations are doing) + sensebreaking with en ny forståelse for bestyrelens rolle + forsvaret for den nye struktur | Det synes jeg, det synes jeg det må være en strategisk prioritering at man forsøger netop at koordinere de forskellige områder i organisationen fordi vi har været meget en satellit organisation tidligere, altså det var... og så har vi haft de her ansatte som integrationskonsulent som har været brandslukkere, så de her problemer der har været derude, og det har jeg selv oplevet, jeg har selv løbet panden i mod en mur rigtig mange gange faktisk altså for fire år siden, så, så slukker de brande og så får man ikke fornemmelsen af bestyrelsen, altså det er som om der er nogle strømninger der ikke mødes og det er vi ved at arbejde med, der er rigtig mange tiltag på vej, så vi har taget nogle små skridt, men det er også et giant leap for RBU altså, det er det |
[Man risikerer ikke at folk stadig favorisere et område?] Nej, fordi de mennesker er der ikke mere, og det er ikke alle områder heller der er repræsenteret, og vi har jo også, altså rent vedtægtsmæssigt har vi jo vedtaget et kommisarie, vi forholder os til, og det er af natur meget overordnet, og holder sig meget tæt til arbejdsprogrammet, så man får reelt ikke rigtig nogen indflydelse, den ligger ude på selve områderne, der hvor folk er, der hvor folk de ved noget om det her område, det er dem der skal vurdere: hvad har vi lyst til, hvor hurtigt skal det gå og alle de her ting, ik, så nej, for der bliver ikke noget at konkurrere om, alle har lige indflydelse, det er ret fedt, faktisk, for det betyder også at vi kan strøml. sådan nogen ting som RBA for eksempel, på alle områder, så det er ikke bare afhængigt af om det ansigt indenfor det område synes det er vigtigt eller ej, for det er jo vigtigt, på åbning på alle områder, så, man har også mulighed for at påvirke resten af organisationen ud over de enkelte ansigter, og det synes jeg er en stor værdi, og så medfølger også det her ansvar med at vi har pligt til at indråde, der kommer også et vedtægtsforslag i dag om det skal stå i vedtætterne hvordan vi inddrager, og det synes jeg faktisk, jeg vid jeg ikke om det skal stå i vedtætterne, men jeg er ret glad for at folk er så kritiske og kræver deres ret, altså kræver at de bliver inddraget, så det bliver også en tur, altå, når nu man ikke er så mange, og vi har - mange af os der stiller op – har også en erfaring forskellige steder i organisationen eller i udvalg, som jo også er en generel interesse, så jeg tror ikke at det bliver et problem, tværtimod, jeg tror det kommer til at skabe en rigit konstruktiv værdi og nogen ambitioner på alles vegne

E L. 22 the new structure

min egen oplevelse er jo at jeg ikke har haft nogen relation til bestyrelsen før man bliver en del af den, men jeg er jo kommet ind i bestyrelsen med RBA, med mine to års erfaring og videnssamling omkring RBA, så for mig – det kommer jeg også til at sige noget om i dag i min salvale for mig - er det, altå, jeg har tænkt mig at sælge mig på at være anerkendende og inddragende og det er det jeg forventer at folk tænker om mig og forventer af mig også, så jeg er ikke den eneste der skal leve op til det, men at folk også kræver det af mig, ja som sagt, der er, RBA er kommet ind i bestyrelsen, og folk er interesserede i det og folk er virkelig ambitiøse på det her område også, på bestyrelsesplan, for sig selv og for andre, så der er taget små skridt, men det er virkelig vigtige skridt, for det sidste år har vi virkelig taget store diskussioner omkring det her, om det er vigtigt, hvorfor det er vigtigt, det er meget pudsigt, fordi selv dem der har været allermest kritiske overfor bestyrelsen – vi sidder i bestyrelsen – de sidder og tænker bestyrelsen er det bare sådan en lille eksklusiv skare, de har ikke engang kunnet omfavne RBA som en mulighed for at inddrage og anerkende fordi de bare partout er imod alt hvad der kommer fra bestyrelsen, så det handler også om en åbenhed overfor resten – til resten af organisationen, til ligesom at sige ja ja, det har ikke været der før men fordi det er der nu behøver det ikke være et skalkeskjul eller hvad hedder sådan noget, det behøver ikke bare være falske intentioner om at man rent faktisk vil det, der må man også være anerkendende i sin tilgang som frivillige sige, ok fint nok, jeg er åben, jeg vil gerne se hvad det er får jeg dømmet det

E L. 26 the importance of values + the board versus the others

Konkret for frivillige er det jo en måde og inddrage børn og medfrivillige i de forskellige projektfaser kan man sige, og blive inddraget, i både i forhold til hvad-spørgsmål, hvorfor og hvordan, med hvad og evaluering, og sådan nogen ting, ik, og være en del af alle de her faser, på organisatorisk plan er det jo ikke noget andet, der kræver det lidt noget andet for vi har jo ikke det her direkte kontakt til frivillige og børn så meget som vi burde, så der er nogle andre ting, nogle andre nøgleord, for eksempel gennemskitghed og åbenhed og også der kræver det lidt noget andet, for vi har jo ikke det her direkte kontakt til frivillige og børn så meget som vi burde, så der er nogle andre ting, nogle andre nøgleord, for eksempel gennemskitghed og åbenhed og også der kræver det lidt noget andet, de sidste år har vi virkelig taget store diskussioner omkring det her, om det er vigtigt, hvorfor det er vigtigt, det er meget pudsigt, fordi selv dem der har været allermest kritiske overfor bestyrelsen – vi sidder i bestyrelsen – de sidder og tænker bestyrelsen er det bare sådan en lille eksklusiv skare, de har ikke engang kunnet omfavne RBA som en mulighed for at inddrage og anerkende fordi de bare partout er imod alt hvad der kommer fra bestyrelsen, så det handler også om en åbenhed overfor resten af organisationen, der skal lave de her strategier, det har jeg stået fast på og det kommer jeg også til at stå fast på overfor vores RBA konsulent og vores gruppe, at det har været ambitionen hele tiden, fordi at være en rettighedsbaseret organisation betyder ikke at det er de frivillige og projekterne der gør de her ting, det handler om hele organisationen, hele vejen igennem, så vi skal også være rollemodeller i forhold til netop at vise denne her åbenhed og anerkendende tilgang uden at det bare er ros og sådan fedt, tak fordi i er med, men at man ved at der kommer nogen fede ideer, vi får ikke de fedeste ideer, det får vi jo fordi vi har indstigt i de områder og fordi mange af os har været frivillige før, så jeg tror at, jamen helt konkret indtil videre har det jo så været at vi har sat, jeg har foreslået, mere eller mindre krævet at bestyrelsen går foran og satte 15-20 minutter af til hvert møde hvor der ikke er noget på programmet, hvor vi sidder og reflekterer over det her, hvad har vi gjort i dag, og hvad kunne vi gøre til næste gang, for at være mere gennemgående og åbne og anerkendende og så videre, og det er så kun noget vi har gjort i et par måneder, eller måske 4-5 måneder, ik, så det er nyt, men ambitionerne er der, og vi er jo flere nu, mange af dem faktisk som stiller op til bestyrelsen, som jo tror rigtigt meget på det her, så små skridt, men vi er på vej, så det handler også om at få lavet nogle, ja, nogle spændende strategier

E L. 28 RBA + the importance of values

volunteers lacking knowledge = negative energy

der har jo været så mange kritiske spørgsmål og det er jo det der er så fedt, det er jo det det er så fedt at folk de er der jo med en energi, ik, og grunden til at den er så kritisk det er jo måske også pga uvidenhed, de mangler simpelthen en forståelse for hvor kommer det fra, hvorfor, hvordan er det lige skruet sammen og sådan, det er simpelthen fordi folk ikke ved så meget om det og det er jo det vi skal møde
Det kræver at du er der – lige nu kræver det at du er en del af bestyrelsen for at forstå hvad det er, og det har vi også tænkt os at lave om på, der er også både nogle kommunikationsideer og personligt for mit vedkommende er jeg ret glad for at jeg kommer ud med RBA og møder folk og jeg har været en del af projektet i fire år nu, både lektiecåfe og barnets ven og sådan og det skal de også vide at det er der rigtig mange frivillige der har, formanden har været organisatorisk i 5 år nu men før det har hun også selv været engageret i børneprojekter og sådan noget, så vi kunne også godt tænke os, ja både teorien, sådan på ideplan at man ved hvad det handler om, hvem vi er, hvorfor det er at vi gør de her ting, men også uddadtil, at vi kommer ud og møder folk og at de føler sig velkomne, altså at vi har lyst til at snakke med dem, for det har vi jo, elers sad vi jo ikke her i bestyrelsen, hvis vi ikke havde lyst til de frivillige og det frivillige arbejde

Det kommer an på hvad man forventer af bestyrelsen jo, altså, vi er jo bygget op omkring at alle de her praktiske udfordringer er jo noget sekretariatet tager sig af, vi har jo de konsulenter som er uddannet på området og også igen det her jeg talte om før, det er meget brændslukning, så den stopper meget derude ved dem, de læser de problemer, og det er jo klart, hvor nár er det så lige man snakker med bestyrelsen hvis ikke de er inde over her, vi er jo også ved at afklare det her med det strategiske og det taktiske og det udførende plan eller det praktiske plan, ja så det handler simpelthen om forventninger, forventningsafklaring i forhold til hvad det er man forventer af bestyrelsen, det kunne måske være meget spændende at høre hvad folk havde af billeder på hvad en bestyrelse kan, og hvad de bør og ja, hvad de skal udgøre for en rolle,

Det er et rigtig godt spørgsmål, det er et stort spørgsmål, men jeg – de skridt der er blevet taget nu synes jeg det er vigtigt at bestyrelsen netop ikke føler sig som hovedorganet i en organisation og det ved jeg i hvert fald at formanden ikke tænker, formanden er meget – vi er i intet andet eller mere end projekterne, så det er noget med at forholde sig til det strategiske plan, det værdimæssige, hvor er det vi vil hen, hvad er det Red Barnet Ungdom skal være kendt for, hvad er det vi gerne vil arbejde med, altså, denne her prioritering af det værdibaserede også, ik, at det er på det niveau at vi forholder os og så overlader vi det her ansvar til dem som ved noget om det, så udover det, nu håber jeg - det kunne være fedt hvis man fik lidt mere tid for vi har jo klarer rigtig mange småting i løbet af året, og vi har brugt rigtig meget tid på at udarbejde strategi og sådan noget også, så det kommer jo til at frigive noget tid – det kunne være lidt fedt hvis man kunne tage den op og så sige nå, nu er vi i København eller nu er vi i Århus, lad os bruge de næste par timer på at besøge det her projekt eller et eller andet, øhm ja men elers, det går begge veje, vi har pligt til at inddrage og som frivillig har man også pligt til at deltage, så det handler også om at invitere os ud og altså deltage her hvor vi er jo på landsmøde eller på uddannelsesdagene er vi jo også altid repræsenteret sådan set, så det går lidt begge veje, så det er et vigtigt ansvar fra begge sider

Nej, for vi er den stærkeste part, altså jo længere du kommer op i en relation, vil folk have mere indflydelse og være mere trænede i den organisatoriske tilgang, så derfor er det nemmere for dem og løfte knoglen og høre hvordan det går, og det kan man ikke forvente af en ny frivillig, det kan man ikke, men man kan måske godt forvente at når man så er bevidst omkring at man er en del af en organisation at man så også har lyst til at opleve hvad det er, jo, altså lade være med at afvise at blive en del af det værdibaserede og uddannelsesdagene, før man ved det er, så give det en chance og kom med, for det er jo en positiv oplevelse og det er der vi er og vi nyder det jo, det er jo for fedt at møde nye frivillige og deres nye inputs og sådan nogen ting, ik, megafedt, deres perspektiv er også tit noget man ikke har hørt før, jo flere man møder jo større billede får du jo så, nej, det primære ansvar ligger ja i forhold til de frivillige hos projektlederen, i forhold til projektlederen hos indsatsoverlædeleren, så du ved, den vej op, og så ligger ansvaret hos den størkeste part i relationen, det gør den, og man har også tænker jeg, du kan ikke gå i et projekt og så være sur over at bestyrelsen ikke besøger dit projekt, der synes jeg i hvert fald der er en eller anden form for misforståelse i forhold til det, det har jeg i al fald som projektleder aldrig forventet, at jeg skulle møde en bestyrelse i mit projekt, altså den forventning har jeg sgu ikke haft, der må man også møde organisationen hvor den er, så gå lidt på kompromis og så sige, nå men okay, der er 70 projekter og ja
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview:</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
<th>Quote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1 l. 12</strong></td>
<td>identity</td>
<td>jeg ved i hvert fald sidste år, der var jeg med fordi jeg følte selv at jeg havde pligt til at tage med for der var jeg lige blevet projektleder og så tænkte jeg at det er sådan noget projektledere gør, de tager med til landsmøde og efter det fandt jeg jo så ud af hvor vigtigt landsmødet var, det var der ikke nogen der havde fortalt mig før, der havde det bare været sådan en diffus begivenhed, og ikke et mandat, eller hvad skal man sige, en myndigheds – et myndighedsorgan i Red Barnet Ungdom, der var det bare, altså et event,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2 l. 17</strong></td>
<td>sensemaking as leader having to give sense</td>
<td>hvor vi dukkede op stort set uforberedte, altså vi anede ikke hvad der skulle ske, altså jeg tog med af nysgerrighed, jeg var også projektleder og jeg havde hørt om det før, og jeg har fået at vide at det var godt at komme men jeg vidste ikke rigtig hvorfor, det var først da du [1.] sagde til at af de her forberedelsesmøder, jeg tror det var dig der sagde det da mener jeg det er såvigt med myndighed i organisationen, det var først der jeg sådan tænkte – nåh ja, og så i lyset af valget og så begyndte jeg ligesom at sætte det ind i sådan et større perspektiv, jeg tror egentlig ikke engang jeg gjorde det sidste år selvom vi var der og alle de ting her, af alle mulige forskellige grunde, vi var noget utilfredsmed nogle ting, jeg tror at det fyldte mere end at jeg egentlig kunne se det store bilde i det, det er først nu jeg gør det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2 l. 24</strong></td>
<td>sensemaking as leader having to give sense</td>
<td>altså jeg har også snakket med flere, hvor jeg sådan har forsøgt at sige det her er vigtigt, I skal komme, til adskillige mennesker, men så vælger de det fra, fordi det bliver nedprioriteret i forhold til at muligt andet, øhm… når jeg sådan… det er som om… du skal virkelig synes det er vigtigt før du kommer, og det tror jeg måske et eller andet sted man er nødt til at have en post som projektleder eller et eller andet for at kunne – eller have været her og arrangeret det før du ligesom synes det er værd at engageres i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2 l. 26</strong></td>
<td>sensemaking as leader having to give sense</td>
<td>som projektleder bliver du lidt skolet i, det er jo tit også projektlederne, der går videre i organisationen, nu er du, jeg er jo også videre i lokalforeningen, det gjorde du også, så kan man sige, det næste for dig ville være at gå i bestyrelsen, det er du jo også blevet spurgt om, så altså, den tendens er der ikke hvis du er menigt medlem i en gruppe, så er der ikke en naturlig overgang til, nå men så går du dale – så springer du lige til skridt eller hvad, fordi der er ikke den den stemning for at nu skal vi til landsmøde og så stiller vi op og så skal vi stemme om det og så skal vi diskutere hvad der skal ske med denne her organisation, det er ikke sådan noget de almindelige frivillige tænker på,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2 l. 32</strong></td>
<td>omstrukturering</td>
<td>Vi har haft sådan en rigtig rigtig lang diskussion eller dialog om det, i starten var jeg i hvert fald meget skeptisk, jeg havde det sådan, skal de nu være længere fra de frivillige, men efter at have snakket med de interne som er i området, snakket med de internationale udvalg om hvad deres syn er på det sådan hører deres erfaringer om at de faktisk har lidt for mange arbejdsopgaver, i forhold til hvad der er, hvad man kunne forvente af dem, også fra det internationale… som politisk leder for det internationale område, har hun haft for meget at se til fordi hun både skulle sidde i bestyrelsen og hun skulle have en masse ting at se til i det internationale udvalg og det var faktisk for meget for hende, så det gav god mening og dele det i to personer, men alt det andet sådan med og sikre sig medbestemmelse og hvem bestemmer hvad og sådan, det er sådan der hvor jeg har været meget i tvivl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1 l. 33</strong></td>
<td>omstrukturering</td>
<td>noget af det vi har snakket meget om, det er blandt andet de der nye koordinatorer, så det er jo faktisk ikke den der ændring i bestyrelsen, men en følge af en ændring i bestyrelsen, og det synes jeg har været svært, fordi vi har fået så misvisende, eller ikke misvisende, vi har simpelthen fået forskellige informationer fra bestyrelsen om hvad det egentlig var de ville, med de der koordinatorer og det har været problematisk, men jeg tror det sætter helt vildt skub i processen, at vi får gjort både deres forbeholdser og koordinatorændringen sådan helhjertet samtidig, også selv om det måske ikke er helt klart endnu for det havde jo været noget… altså en virkelig mærkelig situation, for der sidder jo ikke en politisk leder for international i en bestyrelsesstruktur, hvor der kun skal være, hvad er det, i alt, så det tror jeg måske vi har affundet os med undervejs (der grines) for i starten var vi meget bekymrede for hvordan det nu lige skulle gå det her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

frivillige, det kan jeg godt lide, at der bliver gjort noget for den enkelte frivillige også, det er ikke sådan noget med at du er bare frivillig, bed lige din projektleder om at ringe, eller, ja, og det kunne jeg godt tænke mig at få helt ud til den enkelte frivillige også i forhold til en projektleder, der sidder jo også nogle ledere som ikke er optimale, som netop ikke får de frivillige til også at føle denne her, lige læfter knoglen en gang, det gør vi meget i Barnets Ven men nu er Barnets Ven også et lidt særligt projekt i forhold til at vi udformer de her ligeværdige relationer, det værdibaserede er også ret latent i de projekter, og der løfter vi knoglen en gang om måneden til projektet og lige høre hvordan det går, hvordan har de det, og det giver en lidt anden samhørighed, når man ved at man er værdsat, så det bestyrelsen skal gøre, det bestyrelsen skal give udtryk for, det er at det er den enkelte frivillige der gør en forskel, det er den enkelte relation mellem det enkelte barn og frivillige som gør en forskel |
hvis jeg lige må supplere til det du sagde lige inden vi fik den der opbakning, for den har vi selvfølgelig fået, men jeg synes vi har haft en oplevelse af at der har været en tendens til at alle bevægelser går op af i bestyrelsen, nej hvad hedder det, i organisationen, at hvis du vil opnå noget, så skal du opsøge ledet over dig eller videre op til bestyrelsen, så skal du henvende dig til bestyrelsen, det er ikke sådan at der kommer kontakt nedad, det er ikke sådan, nu er det selvfølgelig lidt vildt med regionsudvalgets... sekretæren hedder det, vores situation har været meget usikker, så det er et lidt ekstremt tilfælde, jeg synes man hører mange historier om at hvis du vil noget, så er du nødt til at gå til kilden, du er nødt til selv som frivillig at opsøge det, der kommer ikke nogen ned og sørger for at du bliver involveret, at du bliver spurt eller du bliver oplyst, du er simpelthen selv nødt til at gøre det... jeg synes der har været for meget en tendens til det og det synes jeg også med landsmødet sidste år, at det for eksempel - det er ret svært som ny frivillig at vide - hov, hvis du faktisk vil ændre på noget af det der bliver foreslået, så er du nødt til så og så mange uger før og give besked om det eller du skal læse de her ting igennem inden så du faktisk er ordentligt forberedt, for der er ikke tid til det på landsmødet, at du kan sætte dig ned og lave et nyt, lave et ændringsforslag, der er et stratm program, der er mange ting, der ikke bliver sagt, synes jeg, det giver os sådan et billede af en tendens som jeg har ...

så var der også sådan en eller anden mærkelig stemning, det er selvfølgelig en subjektiv oplevelse, af at fordi der er de her offentlige stemmer – du sidder med et rødt kort eller grønt kort eller et gult kort, at hvis du løfter det røde kort, så melder du dig imod, og hvis alle andre stemmer grøn, så kan de jo se at du er den eneste der ikke gider det her, så du er faktisk sådan lidt jeg gider ikke denne her gruppe agtig, der var sådan en eller anden mærkelig stemning omkring det, det snakkede vi i hvert fald om, så det var nogen af de ting der ligesom gjorde at vi sagde okay, det her det skal ikke ske igen, vi skal bare være bedre forberedt

så foreslår man det og fremlægger det og så bliver det måske ikke ført igennem, jeg tænker også lidt at du har ikke vildt meget indflydelse med mindre du går ind i bestyrelsen

så tror jeg at jeg gider mig ind at det gør det nemmere for mig hvis jeg kan få ændret de her ting, og så håber jeg jo så på at der sidder nogen og ved noget helt andet der så gør noget der gør det nemmere for dem, fordi det er noget af det vi har oplevet, at det er utrolig svært at forsøge at gøre sig til talsperson på tværs af projekter som vi jo reelt set bør være som lokaforeningsbestyrelsesmedlemmer, for det er så forskelligt hvordan man arbejder på tværs af de forskellige områder, så man må sådan forsøge at snakke sammen, men man kan ikke hjælpe hinanden når det sådan kommer til udformning af en paragraf, så tæt på hinanden kan vi ikke komme med mindre vi skal bruge ekstremt meget tid på at sætte os ind i hinandens

jeg tror egentlig også at mange af de der ting vi gerne vil have ændret, det kommer altså af nogen frustrationer der bygges op, nogle forskellige ting, oplevelser i organisationen, men jeg er kommet til det punkt at nu er jeg nødt til bare at have tillid til at dem der sidder på posterne, de skal nok ordne det, for jeg tror egentlig at man giver lidt op på det, altså nu har vi gjort rigtig meget for – nu må vi se hvordan det går i morgen, men jeg tror at hvis det ikke bliver vedtaget, altså bliver gennemført, så ved jeg ikke om jeg gider bruge så meget energi på det næste år

nu siger jeg det næsten bare sådan af vane, at så siger jeg inddragelse, fordi jeg synes meget at os der har været utrolig meget her på det sidste med bestyrelsen og landsmødet at inddragelse det sådan står med stort, og på alle deres flyers og hvad ved jeg og på hver eneste side inde på hjemmesiden der står der inddragelse, men ikke engang i deres arbejdsplan, eller hvad hedder det, arbejdsprogram, der står jo ikke engang inddragelse af de frivillige i organisationen, der står kun inddragelse af børn, og det er sådan, noget der ligesom vækker min opmærksomhed, for jeg synes det er sådan en tendens til at man glemmer at inddrage de frivillige i sine beslutninger, når man kun fokuserer på at inndrage børnene for det er som om at nu har vi lige indførte denne her filosofi om, eller, hvad det nu hedder om at strategierne skal være rettighedsbaserede, men vi fokuserer kun på vores målgruppe som er børnene og ikke på os selv, man kigger ikke rigtig indad, så ja helt sikkert, det er den der inddragelse

SPM: men er det ikke også meningen?

G2 l. 36 omstrukturering

G2 l. 83 hvad går landsmødet ud på

G2 l. 89 bestyrelsens rolle

G1 l. 96 svært at være mellemleder + vigtigheden af landsmødet

G2 l. 97 eget engagement + imødekommenhed = kommende engagement - frustrationer som sensebreaking mekanismer

G2 l. 101 frustration over keyword indragelse

G1 and G2 l.111-116 sensemaking: vi som mellemledere har et ansvar for at

1.: jeg føler at vi har valgt at lade os påvirke at bestyrelsens arbejde
alle identificerer sig med og er linkede til hovedgruppen / sensedemanding; vi kunne godt være ligeglade med hvad der sker men vi vælger selv at engagerer os og kræve svar og opretholde kommunikationen

1.: fordi at – jo, men så ved jeg ikke om vi har ret til at være en lokalforening i Red Barnet Ungdom, hvis vi bare kører fuldstændig af os selv, altså vi har jo vores egne vedtægter, vi kunne også bare have kørt som vi ville, men jeg har synes at det var vigtigt at vi var en lokalforening i red barnet ungdom og derfor har jeg interesseret mig for hvad der foregik og ligesom forsøgt at sige, hvis I implementerer en ny frivilligpolitis, jamen så skal vi da se om vi ikke kan hjælpe med at få den kommunikeret ud og husket folk på at hov, det kan godt være du har været projektleder i et år men lige nu der har vi faktisk vedtaget at den her skal vises frem når du rekrutterer nye medlemmer og sådan at vi ligesom har valgt at sige, jamen det er vigtigt at vi er med i red barnet ungdom, vi er ikke bare en forening for os selv

2.: vi har jo taget ansvar for selv at tage kontakt til bestyrelsen og have en – der mener jeg selvfølgelig mest dig, fordi det er dig der har haft, du har snakket rigtigt meget sammen med[formanden og] regionsssekretæren, det er os der meget har taget ansvar for at nu sætter vi for at denne her kommunikation den er der, synes jeg, for vi kunne sagtens bare have sagt, okay vi kører bare vores eget liv, det har vi ikke gjort

1.: ja, det tror jeg også vi kunne, og vi har snakket lidt om, hvornår bliver vi stoppet, altså hvornår har vi gjort noget der er forkert

2.: ja, vi har lavet rigtigt mange jokes omkring det, men selvfølgelig tager vi det alvorligt, at vi kunne sagtens have lavet alt mulig sjov med vores penge

G2 l. 130 værdiernes rolle

vi stillede lidt spørgsmålstegn ved det her med at organisationen, nej hvad hedder det, bestyrelsen er meget fokuserede på det her med strategi med at vi skal være store og vi skal nå langt og vi skal have en masse langsigtede mål og flere penge og sådan noget, og at man måske i virkeligheden skulle sørge for at holde lidt fast i status quo og så kigge indad og sige nu prøver vi lige at arbejde lidt med det vi har og gøre det bedre og så kan vi vores bagefter, fordi det kan godt være at du bliver større og har dobbelt så mange projektar men så er det da også dobbelt så meget arbejde og skulle samle det omkring én, sådan, RBU ånd, og det tror jeg ikke nødvendigvis det er nemmere bare sådan... jeg ser i hvert fald at det er nemmere hvis der er sådan en samlet stemme, vi har ikke rigtig sådan en RBU ånd endnu, sådan en hvorfor er du frivillig i Red Barnet Ungdom, det tror jeg ikke der er særlig mange der vil sige jamen det er fordi det er red barnet ungdom, det er altid en eller anden historie

frustration over omstrukturering (outward) versus værdier (inward)

G2 l. 132 hvorfor frivillig

det er som regel projektet og den personlige interesse i at sidde og lige hjælpe et barn, det personlige og det nære, så jeg tror ikke det er noget man ... det er fordi vi er dem vi er
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Interview: Topic: Quote:

F1 l. 3 hvorfor er jeg frivillig

det er sådan noget jeg altid gerne har vilde gøre, jeg føler lidt at når man er i stand til det, syntes jeg at man skal prøve at man skal hjælpe nogle af de mindrebemidlede i samfundet, og der er så egentligt derfor at jeg er frivillig, for at ligesom kunne hjælpe folk måske der har brug for det

F2 l. 4 hvorfor er jeg frivillig

fordi jeg synes at det er rigtigt spændende at lave noget andet end det jeg beskæftiger mig med til daglig og så også for at være med til at ændre ting, og fordi man har været med i de forskellige tilbud der ligesom har været da man har været yngre, så jeg føler ligesom at jeg giver igen nu hvor jeg er blevet ældre

F1 l. 6 the importance of values

For mit vedkommende betyder RBU ikke så meget i det her, det er jo mere projektet. Jeg startede inde hos URK til at starte med, så det er ikke så meget [1:29] jeg sidder egentligt stadigt at tivité over hvad forskellen egentligt er mellem RBU og URK,

F1 l. 8 the importance of values

Jamen jeg tror slet ikke at jeg ville kunne se forskellen, hvorfor er rbu egentligt en organisation, hvad er formålet med hele organisationen, også med værdierne som vi også lige har fået på plads nu, det betyder rigtigt meget at man har noget konkrekt at gå efter, og at de adskiller sig fra de andre organisationer,

F1 l. 9-10 the importance of values

Men føler du at du har fået en bedre forståelse for hvad RBU er og værdierne?

F1 l. 9-10 the importance of values

Nej jeg kan ikke se forskellen som sådan, det er ikke fordi det har ændret sig på det plan, men det håber jeg det til foråret med strategi mødet at så sker der noget, også fordi det er en ny organisation så det er forståeligt nok,
Jamen det er bl.a. hele formålet med organisationen [der ikke går som det skal], indsatsområderne og hvad er målene, hvorfor gør vi det vi gør? Jeg syntes at der er mange af de basale ting der ikke er på plads endnu, som er rigtigt ærgerligt og jeg tror også at vi mister rigtigt mange frivillige fordi folk ikke rigtigt forstår, føler sig inddraget i vores værdier fælser sig ikke en del af det og det syntes jeg er ærgerligt, og det er nogle af de ting som ikke går særligt godt,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2 l. 16</th>
<th>the importance of values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg tror at man skal gå ind og lytte til de frivillige, til hvad de har og sige, jeg har selv prøvet at, at projektedræmmerne, at stille forslag, og jeg føler ikke at der kommer jo de bliver hørt, men der kommer ikke rigtigt nogen handling, det sker ikke noget bag, så man ligesom kan tage de frivilliges forslag, op, der sker ikke rigtigt noget, også fordi nu er jeg tilbage som frivillig igen, [3:53] så jeg føler ikke at jeg er en del af organisationen overhoved nu, hvorimod jeg havde mere en følelse af at være den del af noget da jeg kom til de er projektedræmmer møde, og jeg har også prøvet at stille det her forslag at man burde kunne invitere de frivillige med til projektedræmmer mødet, det var flertallet, går jeg ud fra, af dem der var med til det her projektedræmme ikke enige i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2 l. 18</th>
<th>inddragelse af frivillige</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>det var ikke RBU som sådan der tiltrak mig, det var fordi jeg havde hørt om projektet, jeg syntes at det lød spændende, og nu har jeg været der i et års tid, og jeg føler ikke at det her nogen betydning om det havde været URK eller RBU der havde drevet børnekulubben, jeg vil ikke kunne sige at RBU har sat sig prægt på vores klub eller noget, det har ikke rigtigt noget med min hverdag at gøre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F1 l. 20</th>
<th>the importance of values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>det er nærmest underligt at det ikke er forventningen altså hvis du er medlem af RBU så kommer du da til landsmødet, du er jo en del af det, det har noget med dig at gøre, det er din organisation, altså jeg føler det er mange [...] vi var ved at snakke om forventningerne til dem der kommer her, jeg føler ligesom, for at gøre det til mere end en af de mange organisations ting der er, altså de mange undsom tilbud der er altså hvis du gerne vil være frivillig, og hvis det lige som lige kunne have en skarpsere profil, så syntes jeg at de bør gøre mere for at de frivillige ligesom føler sig som en del det, og ligesom har den her ejer formennelse af altså det hele ligesom står og faldet med vores engagement, og jeg føler ikke at man bliver værsdast, ja at det er godt man er frivillig, men det er ikke som om man forventer at vi skal være en del af hele ... altså træge hvor vi vil hen, altså den her vision når de snakker om strategi, det er som om at de ikke forventer at os der egentligt laver arbejdet altså alle os frivillige vi ikke skal være en del af det, og jeg syntes at det er lidt ironisk [7:11] at de snakke om at玫瑰knedefestivalen, det var en top down organisation, men det er det jo egentligt også her, der er jo ikke den der hvor vi føler at vi er ligeværdige, men det er jo fint nok at der er en bestyrelse, men det skal ikke betyde at vi ikke, at der er et sådan et herakii, at der er dem og så er det os, det føler jeg ikke rigtigt at der bør være, i en demokratiskt organisation som red barnet unddom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F1 l. 22</th>
<th>acting on values - mere inddragelse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>der ikke er den følelse af at jeg hører til, eller har nogle ejerforrnennelser over det, og så er det nemt at droppe de især når de bliver svært, altås de her projekter er hårdt arbejde og når det ikke går godt, så og der ikke er den her følelse af at vi er sammen i det, så er det jo også nemt at sige, det her er jeg ikke en del af, hvorimod hvis vi havde et stærkere sammen hold, ... Ja så er det jo... kan jeg ikke lige huske hvad det var jeg sagde lige før, ja så føler jeg at når der ikke er den her følelse af at vi på en eller anden måde hærde sammen i organisationen, [11:11] så er det jo også nemt bare sådan at falde fra og sige det her er ikke noget for mig, der har man jo også den der med at jeg bliver jo nok ikke savnet, der er jo ikke nogen der spørger til hvor blev du af? Der er jo ikke noget kontakt på den måde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2 l. 30</th>
<th>acting on values - mere inddragelse og kommunikation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg syntes at det var svært at være med i den diskussion, i forhold til hvordan det egentligt hærde sammen, hvad deres konkrete arbejdsopgaver er og, egentligt lyder det bare på mig som om dem vil prøve på at få løftet arbejdsbyrden, sådan så de ikke havde så meget at sidde med selv, så de i stedet ville have noget koordinator på i stedet for, så igen, jeg er ikke blevet klogere på hvad deres arbejde er og om det er bedre at omstrukturerere det syntes jeg ikke jeg fik ret meget ud af, og der var ikke ret meget plads til at stille spørgsmål og folk var meget engagerede hvilket var godt, men der var ikke nok tid til det</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2 l. 36</th>
<th>omstrukturering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeg syntes at det var svært at være med i den diskussion, i forhold til hvordan det egentligt hærde sammen, hvad deres konkrete arbejdsopgaver er og, egentligt lyder det bare på mig som om dem vil prøve på at få løftet arbejdsbyrden, sådan så de ikke havde så meget at sidde med selv, så de i stedet ville have noget koordinator på i stedet for, så igen, jeg er ikke blevet klogere på hvad deres arbejde er og om det er bedre at omstrukturerere det syntes jeg ikke jeg fik ret meget ud af, og der var ikke ret meget plads til at stille spørgsmål og folk var meget engagerede hvilket var godt, men der var ikke nok tid til det</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F1 and F2 l. 48-52</th>
<th>my identity as a volunteer is not linked to the organization, on the contrary + transparency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (ang. forberedelse til landsmødet) Altså jeg vil sige at i den tid vi har arbejdet sammen har vi snakket om de forskellige ting, men altså desideret op til et måde har der ikke været sådan at vi har gjort noget ekstra ud af det, men vi har da haft samtaler om klubben, men jeg syntes også at der er ærgerligt at det skal være så hård arbejde, når man tænker på at RBU sagtens kan finde frivillige der kan og gerne vil være engagerede og det er jo lidt ærgerligt at de ikke uddyber de ressurser der er til rådighed, altså så svært som det egentligt har været så er vi her stadigt, det har jo også været svært, når vi har snakket lidt om det, omkring landsmødet, fordi vi prøvede ligesom at inddrage [17:03] de andre frivillige og reaktionen var faktisk ret sjov, nærmest: ”hvorfor skulle jeg det? Hvad får jeg ud af det her? Jeg har da slet ikke lyst til at være en del af det” og der var en meget negativ stemning omkring det, og det er da ret underligt når man er en del at et projekt under organisationen, at man ikke har lyst til at engagnere sig, ikke fordi man behøver sådan at vidte det, men der bør der være en eller anden interesse i at prage organisationen, det er jo ret underligt, jeg blev chokeret over den reaktion som nogle af de frivillige kom med

99
Hvad sagde de?

Jamen det var mere sådan ”hvorfor skulle jeg det?”, og det er ikke nødvendigvis ikke fordi de ikke har lyst til at præge organisationen, men jeg tror mere bare det er måden RBU er bygget op på at man tænker bare hvor skal man starte henne? Jeg tror virkelig at det er der den ligger, det har vi haft rigtigt mange diskussioner om altså i vores klub altså med de frivillige løbende

altå det er jo ikke fordi vi bliver betalt for det, vi er jo frivillige, så derfor burde der være en eller anden koncentreret kraft, man bør i hver fald prøve at gøre lidt mere for de frivillige har lyst til at engageres i organisationen, altså det fører jeg ikke, altså det er bare den bedste måde at sikre sig på at folk bliver her, det skaber en loyalitets fornemmelse, tænker jeg , så er man en del af det og det bliver man så ved med at være.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensegiving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C17 MUD    | så jeg gør meget ud af at markere forventninger til dem der er nærmest under mig, og markere forventningerne også, at de tager det videre og modsat også altså, hvis jeg – jeg kan godt – hvis der er noget, altså i nogen særlige tilfælde kan jeg godt, hvis jeg, altså jeg kan jo for eksempel også bare informere [regionsekreteren] om at jeg snakker lige med dem der nu er ansvarlige for at planlægge uddannelsesdags om det og det og det, så er hun i hvert fald ligesom med, på sidelinjen, så på den måde er det ikke, altså, hvis der er noget hvor jeg tænker, hvis jeg skal være ansvarlig for at vi i bestyrelsen træffer den rigtige beslutning, kan jeg jo godt have brug for at samle noget information længere nede fra, så det kan jeg vælge at gøre via dem der sidder i bestyrelsen, eller også nogen gange at gå direkte, men det – altså for mig er det meget vigtigt at være opmærksom på også at markere over for de bestyrelsesmedlemmer der sidder der, at de også har et ledelsesansvar, de er jo mellemledere, så de er ansvarlige for at bære nogle ting videre, det vi
beslutter i bestyrelsen, så det også kan give mening længere ude i organisationen, at være frivillig i Red Barnet Ungdom, og forstå de beslutninger som bliver implementeret, og at de kan være med til at implementere dem og sige nej det er altså ikke godt nok, det må vi lige genoverveje i bestyrelsen, så det er lederskab i forhold til at bære noget videre men også hele tiden have fingeren på pulsen i forhold til jamen er der noget der foregår lidt mere perifert i organisationen som er relevant i forhold til at tage ind og forhold sig til som bestyrelse,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview:</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
<th>Quote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1 line 14</td>
<td>sensegiving from middlemanager</td>
<td>nu vidste jeg det jo, så jeg håber – det er sådan jeg gerne vil se mig selv – at jeg har været med til at kommunikere det ud, mere end at det er mig der har fået det at vide, blandt andet i kraft af at vi var blevet opfordret til nogle forberedelsesmøder, hvor vi ligesom kunne preppe de andre i vores nærmiljø til at blive klar over de her ting, og der har jeg en kanonfordel sammen med Maren som er den eneste anden ud af en otte mand stor lokalforeningsbestyrelse, der havde prøvet at være med til landsmødet før,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 line 17</td>
<td>sensegiving from middlemanager</td>
<td>jeg tror vi har haft en stor indsats, i hvert fald fra Århus' side at der er nogen der har fået mere kendskab til hvad det er, landsmødet og sådan noget, end hvad der ellers ville være sket,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 line 22</td>
<td>sensemaking as leader having to give sense</td>
<td>det er det der med hvor meget bestyrelsen gør for ligesom at oplyse – nu er det så blevet lagt ud på vores hænder, det er blevet opfordret til at det er os der ligesom hjælper med at afholde forberedelsesmøder, men altså,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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13.4. **Appendix 4 Observations of the annual congress in SCY 5th-6th/11 2011**

Bestyrelsens fremlæggelse/evaluering af deres arbejde det sidste år:

- Dette er en ung organisation i modsætning til en gammel fast organisation med deres faste måde at gøre tingene på → vi har plads til at være kritiske overfor os selv
- Bestyrelse evaluering: selv overraskede over hvor meget de har forandret
- Observation: organisatorisk forandring med meget positivstemning
- Observation: godkendelse af forretningsorden: to modstridende diskurser:
  - det er demokratisk at have fredsvælg (minus mistillidsstemme) og det er ikke rart at skulle lave dårlig stemning (jeg fik en dårlig følelse ) ved at stemme imod nogen
  - Modstridende diskurs: demokratisk ikke at have fredsvælg og usagligt at argumentere med at det skaber dårlig stemning
- Kasserer: 1740 medlemmer under 30 – når vi 2000 stiger vi i tilskud fra DUF – 600 aktive frivillige
- Observation: bestyrelsens fremlæggelse af strukturerendringer foreslår organisatorisk forandring primært for bestyrelse og udvalg, foreslår du kan kun være bestyrelsesmedlem eller udvalgsformand
  - Hvorfor gør vi det?
    - At ruste et samlet RBU til at kunne arbejde mere målrettet for indfrielse af visionen om en børnevenlig verden
  - Hvordan når vi der til?
    - Ny bestyrelse i form og forståelse frigiver tid og fokus til at arbejde strategisk
      - (samme fremlægger som sad ved et projektledermøde og sagde ”det her vil ikke påvirke jer”)
- Bestyrelsens nye kerneområder: strategi, økonomi, kommisiorium, dialog, inddragelse
- ”Vi håber I har tillid til os og så vil vi vise jer tillid”
- Landsmødet er et forum for produktion af tekster, men hvis en beslutning tages bliver det vel i effekt diskursen? Eller er det modstridende diskurser der bliver til en institution når valget tages?
- Sensegiving+sensemaking:
Bestyrelsen forsøger at give mening sker i direkte ”tekst” udveksling i debat om vedtægtsændringer.

De frivillige forsøger at skaber mening i deres eget verdensbillede ved at stille spørgsmål/kritisere bestyrelsens forslag og argumenter.

- Projektrfrivillig: indsatsonråder arbejder specifikt på et indsatsonråde, udvalg arbejder på tværs af hele organisationen.
- Bestyrelsesmedlem: områderne skal ligestilles, skal strømlines, uanset hvad der arbejdes med så arbejder vi alle for det samme.
- Bestyrelsesmedlem: en organisation er i konstant udvikling så man skal passe på ikke at gøre vedtægterne for bindende/constraining – vedtægter skal sige *nogen* ting men for resten gælder der frihed under ansvar.
- Bestyrelsesmedlem retrospective: siden marts: we were scared that someday the board would consist of 25 people, long term solution, to cut it to 6 now, would we have to add a board member each time we added an area as the org. grew?
- ”Onde tunger” har sagt at hvis forslag ikke var klart kunne det måske vente til næste år.
- Bestyrelsesmedlem: tegn på at folk kræver at de bliver hørt.

Discussion of organizational changes:

- Forandringer:
  - Planlagte vs. spontane
  - Frivillig vs. ufrivillig
  - Positiv vs. negativ
  - Nødvendig vs. unødvendig
- Alle forandringer har konsekvenser, hvad der ikke kan forklares kan ikke forsvares.

Gæsteforedrag af Roskilde repræsentant:

- Roskilde ændret struktur stort set årligt – giver et hovedløst indtryk at man ændrer sit værktøj (som struktur er) konstant – hvad har man opnået med det, hvad skal der til for at man føler man har opnået det man ville med strukturarnderingerne → i det mindste har Roskilde gjort et forsøg på at få structuren til at afspjæle best practice – RBU lader nærmest bare stå til hvad angår strukturiagram hvilket resulterer i uigennemsigtighed og
usikkerhed ang. beslutningsgange.

- Roskilde arbejder lidt ud fra Maslows behovspyramide i deres tilgang til at tiltrække frivillige og gøre det det værd

**RBA** [18] **workshop: matrix groups discussing the values of the organization**

- Engagement: hvorfor er du engageret? Egoistisk, ser godt ud på cv’et, gøre noget konkret i den virkelige verden ved siden af / i stedet for at sidde med næsen i en skolebog, brugt

  **RBU som aktions forsknings sted – hvordan gør man det umulige muligt**

- Ansvarlighed: Når jeg tager ansvar for noget, føler jeg også i højere grad for at involvere mig i det

- Anerkendelse: Man kan ikke have en relation uden at man anerkender hinanden

- Inddragelse: Føle ejerskab

- Workshop acted as a plenum storytelling forum where all members were making sense for themselves regarding the four values through telling stories

**Præsentation af arbejdspogram:**

- Formand: de her mål har måske ikke været realistiske og vi må tage ansvar for at rette op på det


- Aktiviteter:

  1. **RBU understøtter børns rettigheder blandt flere børn via flere aktiviteter og flere frivillige**

  2. **RBU udfolder RBU arbejdsmetoden**

  3. **RBU råber omverdenen op**
     - Asyl udvider

---

[18] Rights Based Approach
- Antimobning udvider hvis økonomisk støtte opnås
- International fastholder aktivitetsniveau, særskilt afklaring
- Integration udvider hvis økonomisk støtte opnås

- Vi kommer måske ikke i mål med de kvantitative mål – vi vil gerne bevare intentionen – reviderer det kvantitative for at være realistiske
- Diskussion af fremlæggelse af arbejdsprogram
- En frygt for den modsatte ekstremitet: at bestyrelsesmedlemmer uden touch vs bestyrelsesmedlemmer med for meget touch og ingen tid til at være bestyrelsesmedlem
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Agenda: Drøftelse af sammensætning af bestyrelsen.

Bestyrelsen drøfter hvilke gevinster der er ved at fortsætte med uændret bestyrelsessammensætning for det enkelte bestyrelsesmedlem og for RBU, samt hvilke gevinster der kunne være ved at ændre bestyrelsessammensætningen for det enkelte bestyrelsesmedlem og for RBU.

Diskussion af overgang til en bestyrelse, der ikke nødvendigvis er sammensat af områdevalgte repræsentanter.

Alternativer:
1. uændret, med håndslag om strategisk ledelse
2. uændret, men med udvalgsformænd til "aflastning" af bestyrelsesmedlemmerne
3. valg til strategisk bestyrelse

Er det FU eller bestyrelsen der ønsker at ændre sammensætningen?

FU mener der er fordele ved at ændre bestyrelsessammensætning

"ikke noget vi sidder og finder på men resultat af de drøftelser der har været"

Der har været frustrationer – samarbejdet bestyrelse og FU imellem?

Nuærendes bestyrelsessammensætning er ikke langtidsudholdbar – passede fint i starten men dur ikke for den voksende organisation

Der har været en "Kompetence udviklingsdag” 20. marts

Nogle bestyrelsesmedlemmer er medlemmer af forretningsudvalget – bl.a. formanden

Hvad lægger den formelle struktur op til at opgavefordelingen er imellem bestyrelsen,
Issues for bestyrelsesmedlemmer:

- dobbeltrolle
- arbejdspres: Der skal lægges mange timers arbejde fordi man sidder med sit eget indsatsområde plus skal til bestyrelsesmøder hver 6. uge – formanden: ”et personligt problem”
- Gennemsigtighed: ønskes for at afklare hvor organisationen skal hen frem for fokus på struktur og retningslinjer
- Skabe en balance imellem det personlige og organisatoriske
- 51/49 – alle skal helst have et 51 % fokus på hvor organisationen skal hen frem for hvor vedkommende selv vil hen med det. Hvis alle har et 51 % fokus på dem selv kan organisationen ikke rykke samlet fremad
- Kvalificerede beslutninger – der er en stor viden i bestyrelsen, brug den kompetent
- Mindre skel / balance mellem FU og resten af bestyrelsen
- Lobby arbejde vs. fælles front - Ønske om neutrale samarbejde da FU ofte kan føle at hvis de har diskuteret noget så træder de, de områdeansvarlige over tæerne med deres beslutninger
- Bestyrelse: ”armslængdeprincip” – give områderne frihed til at gøre det de skal gøre – vedkommende skal ikke nødvendigvis sidde i bestyrelsen
- Bestyrelsesmedlem: hvor stort et problem er dobbeltrollerne?
  - Frygt for at organisationen bliver endnu mere hierarkisk hvis ikke område formændene naturligt har en plads i bestyrelsen
- Bekymring at nogle bestyrelsesmedlemmer kan ”melde sig ud” af en diskussion hvis det drejer sig om et andet område end deres egen fordi de ved nogen andre tager sig af det
  - Kan give mere samlet bestyrelse
- Kommunikation i bestyrelse skal blive bedre – der er ”forskellige sprog”
  - Der skal kommunikeres på tværs af områderne – at de forskellige formænd bruger hinanden
- Møder ineffektive pga. detaljeorientering
- Problematik: hvem har legitimitet og/eller ret til at tage for eksempel strategiske
beslutninger – de der bliver taget i FU kunne måske tages i bestyrelsen – man tager opgaver fra bestyrelsen som ligger under deres ansvarsområde

- Struktur: FU skal diskutere alt – alt skal igennem FU
- Bestyrelsen – ineffektivitet: mange drøftelser men få beslutninger
- Kommentar fra sekretariatsleder (fastansat): understreger overfor bestyrelsen at de er arbejdsgivere
- Diskussion af kommunikationsgange – hvordan er organisationen struktureret (dette skulle vist omstruktureres sammen med en omstrukturering af bestyrelsen) – hvad har det af betydning for hvem der skal kommunikere med hvem?

- Næste møde i august, landsmøde og bestyrelsensvalg i november

Opdelte diskussioner i små grupper:

- Identitets usikkerhed – hvad er min rolle hvis jeg ikke længere må sidde i bestyrelsen – mister indflydelse
- Medlemmer bruger ordet ”lobby” når de snakker om at hvem som helst i organisationen kan gå til hvem som helst og spørge til eller advokere for deres sag
- Mulighed for sammenlægning af FU og bestyrelse fordi bestyrelse har været proforma (har bare skulle sige god for ting på papiret som FU allerede havde beslutet)
- Pointe fra bestyrelsensmedlem: bestyrelsen er ikke en bestyrelse, den er snarere en direktion

Tilbage i plenum:

- Stort besvær med at beslutte hvordan de 3 forslag skal diskuteres
- Stort besvær ved at beslutte hvordan det skal stemmes om
- Folk er meget følelsesladede, der eksisterer en bekymring for hvordan man kan varetage sin bestyrelsesrolle tilfredsstillende og sørge for en sammenhængende organisation, hvor man ikke taber nogen dele af organisationen eller frivillige på gulvet
- Nogen har et stort fokus på at strømline organisationen (typisk dem der sidder i FU) og gøre bestyrelsen overordnet strategisk, andre har en meget større bekymring for hvordan bestyrelsen kan hjælpe de frivillige med deres arbejde bedst muligt
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- Mødet foregår som en velkomst af de nye bestyrelsesmedlemmer og en overordnet indføring i hvad bestyrelsesarbejdet består i, hvad deres opgaver og ansvar bliver og praktiske foranstaltninger omkring mødeafholdelse og kommunikation.

- Hvordan skaber meningsgiverne mening for sig selv? De må jo skulle finde fælles fodslag i deres retningsgivende aktiviteter og tekster overfor organisationen. Hvordan opnås dette?

- Fokus på rammer – material mechanisms – trækker på institutioner – DUF lederuddannelse
  - Et par stykker har i forvejen erfaringer derfra (hvilket yderligere legitimerer den)

- Er sprog en material mechanism? Meget professionelt sprog med brug af meget officielle betegnelser (kommisiorium, stille ændringsforslag, arbejdsopgaver horizontalt og vertikalt, ensretning, effektivisering)

- ”Jeg synes det er en rigtig god ide for så er de inddraget med det samme” → skaber mening for sig selv og forsøger at skabe mening for andre ved at trække på deres cues and frames i form af henvisninger til værdierne som er diskurser der er blevet trukket meget på under landsmødet

- Kan præmisserne og teorierne der forklarer sensemaking+giving som jeg bruger det på en demokratisk org. Bruges på samme vis i en bureaucratiske org.?
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- Bestyrelsesmedlem (og medlem af FU) på besøg ved projektledermøde
- Disse projektledere har intet organisatorisk virke, de er fokuserede på deres diverse projekter = børneklubber
- Et bestyrelsesmedlem er til stede og fremlægger bestyrelsesændringerne som er til valg på landsmødet.
- Bestyrelsesmedlemmet fremlægger strukturrendringerne og understreger at disse ikke vil have nogen effekt/indvirkning på projektledernes arbejde
- Hertil får han spørgsmålet: Hvorfor skulle vi så interessere os for det?
- Modstridende diskurser: den organisatorisk frivillige er fokuseret på at informere om og skabe opbakning til bestyrelsens ønske om strukturrendring. Projekt frivillige forstår ikke relevansen og engagerer sig ikke i en diskussion om sagen
- Til stede er også projektlederen for de projektfrivillige, der bliver interviewet på landsmødet (på landsmødet er projektlederen ikke selv til stede)
- Der var mindst 20 til stede - 0 af dem var sikre på at komme til landsmødet, 4 af dem overvejede at komme til mødet.
- Afsæt tid til og hjælp med at facilitere netværkning på tværs af organisationen og hjælp de forskellige klubber og projekter med at dele viden og erfaringer med fokus på noget de kan gå hjem og bruge konkret i deres RBU hverdag
- Bestyrelsesmedlemmet fik præsenteret bestyrelsesændringen som noget "der ikke kommer til at påvirke jer og jeres projekter" hvortil han fik spørgsmålet "hvorfor skulle jeg så interessere mig for det?". Det er mit indtryk at frivillige som er i RBU for at drive børneklubber ikke kunne være mere ligeglade med den organisatoriske og bestyrelsesmæssige del af RBU. En af de frivillige efterlyste mere viden om hvem bestyrelsesmedlemmerne er. Han har været i RBU i 1,5 år og havde aldrig hørt eller set noget til bestyrelsen og havde ergo ikke noget forhold til dem.
- Kommunikér/fortæl de frivillige på et helt lavpraktisk niveau hvorfor det er interessant for dem at komme - sørg for at der er noget indhold på landsmødet som taler direkte til dem - de er ligeglade med det organisatoriske, de tænker kun på deres børn
Red Barnet Ungdom i børnevenlig forandring

ER DU EN AF DE FORANDRINGSAGENTER, DER GÅR FORREST, NÅR RED BARNET UNGDOM SKÅBER BØRNEVENLIG FORANDRING I STORT OGSÅ SMÅT? ELLER VIL DU GERNE VÆRE DET – SAMMEN MED DINE MEDFRIVILLIGE? SÅ TAG MED, NÅR RED BARNET UNGDOM STÅR I FORANDRINGENS TEGN TIL LANDSMØDE 2011 5. – 6. NOVEMBER I KØBENHAVN!

OM LANDSMØDET
Landsmødet er det demokratiske fælles-skab, som alle medlemmer en gang årligt har mulighed for at være en del af, og som møder de store beslutninger for Red Barnet Ungdom. Du og dine medfrivillige kan derfor ved at deltage på landsmødet være med til at forme organisationens fremtid: Hvordan og hvornår Red Barnet Ungdom skal forandre sig, og med hvem i spidsen?

Nedenfor under FORSLAG TIL FORANDRING kan du se, hvad landsmødet i år mere spetsigt har på dagsordenen.

Du vil i løbet af weekenden:
> få øget indsigt i organisationen og det værdigrundlag, vi arbejder ud fra
> opleve hyggeligt og festligt samvær med dine medfrivillige
> få rig mulighed for at dele dine forandringssperspektiver med andre
> være med til at træffe de store beslutninger, der får betydning for din frivillighed
> være med til at vælge den bestyrelse, der skal lede RBUs videre mod visionen om en børnevenlig verden, hvor børn og unges rettigheder blir taget alvorligt!
> blive inspireret til, hvordan du kan være en del af forandringen efter landsmødet

Kom og gør din stemme gjældende! Alle, der har været medlem af Red Barnet Ungdom i mere end en måned, har stemmeret.

TID OG STED
Landsmødet afholdes i Red Barnets hus på Rosenørns Alle 12, 1634 København V fra lørdag d. 5. november kl. 10.00 til søndag d. 6. november kl. 14.00.
13.9. Appendix 9 Organizational Sensemaking figure

Figure 1: Basic Organizational Sensemaking figure
Figure 2: Organizational Sensemaking figure showing the sensemaking mechanisms in action.
13.10. **Appendix X: Full interview transcripts only available to supervisor and censor**

The full interview transcripts in Danish are only available in the two thesis copies that are handed to Copenhagen Business School for grading purposes, i.e. the copies for supervisor and censor.

Any other public/distributed copy, including the electronic copy of the thesis handed in to Copenhagen Business School, is without the full interview transcripts.

Selected and relevant quotes are available in Appendix 3. Interviewees have been promised to remain anonymous.