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Shared macro-industry context and generic firm commonalities would suggest that organizations would have similar approaches to change, but is that really the case? This assignment goes out to investigate change cultures within two firms from the creative industries. The aim is to identify the factors that shape how they deal with change and to understand what it is that makes them deal with change so differently. No change management model are perfectly predictive, and this assignment applies two complementary theories that differs in seeing organizational inertia as either central or peripheral, which accordingly deems change as either a necessary evil or naturally continuous. The analysis incorporates internal organizational factors and external environmental elements in order to provide a rich explanation of the determinants of change culture.

Studying the music venue Jazz House and the publishing house The Danish Architectural Press provides insight into two small firms operating in niche fields within the creative industries. Despite their obvious similarities, i.e. small in absolute size, established macro-industry context, operating at minimum scale of efficiency and facing two-sided markets, they have significantly different change cultures. This study suggests that it is the micro-industry specificities that impacts firm size and structure the most, i.e. nature of the product, product life cycles and workflow, which indicates high levels of isomorphism. This is primarily due to both levels of micro-industries building on traditional structures that are proven successful, and thus provide the template actors will model after, i.e. live music and magazine publishing respectively.

Size and structure are seen as the central differentiating factors between the two cases and are regarded as highly determinant of change culture. Disregarding micro-industry differences the relative and discrete variances in size (4 at Jazz House versus 15 The Danish Architectural Press) cause the firms to be structured inversely. The larger firm generate a hierarchical firm with departmental structure relies more greatly on executive management and planned change, while the smaller firm produce a flat hierarchical firm with constant interaction among staff members, high transparency and shared commitments. The larger firm is seen as relatively more inertial than the smaller firm due to increased social and structural rigidities.
INTRODUCTION

*Change never starts because it never stops.* (Weick & Quinn, 1999)

Just as time is inseparable from our existence so is constant change an inextricable part of our lives. Central to this constant motion is trying to come up with concepts, theories and models with some predictive power to deal with the ambiguity that an inherently uncertain future entails. Even though it is firmly established that humans are comfort seeking habitual beings who tend to prefer permanence to disorder, we still systematically work to reduce the uncertainty that comes with change. In academia change is an essential element illustrated by sociologists wanting to know how groups change, economists who wants to know how markets change and engineers wanting to know how processes change. Within corporate businesses an entire field has been dedicated to the search for optimal solutions for change processes, although none seem to be universally applicable. This underlines the challenge of perfectly predicting complex human behavioral processes and this social complexity is evident in all organizations and tends to increase with firm size (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

But how do these intricate legal entities deal with change on their own? And what is it that determines how firms deal with change? This project is referring to the firms that do not make use of large-scale consultancy firms to assist in high-risk assessment, but develop their own designs and customs of how to deal with ambiguity. In doing so it was interesting to find firms where the impact of change is frequently confronted. The innate uncertainty that is associated with innovation and novelty directed attention towards the creative industries, where no one knows what success looks like before having tried out a set of ideas. This acceptance of risk causes firms within the creative industries to be explorative and often creating experiential products. Scholars of organizational change have previously focused on large corporations facing big risks where assisted decisions have been necessary. Thus, literature has had a limited focus on small firms. Being a relatively newly acknowledge economic system the creative industries have still not paired up with change management, which leaves room for exploration for the researcher.

Creative industries present several interesting features in that there is a tendency of firms being relatively small in size, highly network-based, and view
uncertainty and turbulence as an attractive challenge in their work field. The research objects Jazz House and the Danish Architectural Press have successfully endured many of the same change processes, though have dealt with them in dissimilar ways. Investigating change cultures within two cases the researcher sets out to identify the factors that can help explain what it is that makes them deal with change differently. The research question is formulated as follows:

"What are the determinants of change culture within a firm and how can they be explained in relation to organizational structure and industry context? Two relatively small cases from the creative industries."

**Research Design**

This is a qualitative study where the organization is the principal level of analysis within the macro-industry context of the creative industries. Though, when dealing with issues of organizational behavior, i.e. teamwork, social diversity or impact of executive management, elements of individual emphasis will come into play. Inductive reasoning has been applied to both make sense of the choice of comparative case study, and the choice of theory building and theory guided coding. This is a retrospective project investigating past performance where the primary objective is to understand prior events, not to predict future events. Data is treated with a critical realist philosophical approach balancing systematic data via theory and anecdotal data through interviews. The aim of this research is to treat the cases not as universally generalizable but indicative of firms facing similar relative, not absolute, conditions. Throughout the assignment Jazz House will be referred to as JH, The Danish Architectural Press as DAP, Punctuated Equilibrium as PE and Emergent Change as EC.

**Structure**

Firstly, a review of literature on change, organizational structure and behavior and the creative industries will be presented. This will offer an overview of scholarly contributions to the respective fields and provide a vocabulary to guide the reader through the analysis. Secondly, the research method will be described, philosophical approach will be explained and the two cases will be presented providing insights as
to how data has been dealt with. Thirdly, the preliminary findings will be analyzed, dealing mostly with separate factors that have an impact on the change culture in the respective firms. Fourthly, a discussion of the themes provided by the theoretical framework and the empirical findings will be presented to go deeper into the underlying factors of change culture. Lastly, contributions will be summarized and synthesized in a final conclusion (for summary see Figure 1).

**LITITRATURE REVIEW**

This section will introduce topics from literature that are relevant for the research question and the case selection. The purpose of this passage is to illustrate the identified research gap by funnelling different scholarly fields and end up with a synthesized research aim for the project. It is sectioned in three parts, firstly dealing with the notion of change, then looking at organizations and how they deal with change and lastly illustrating what is meant by creative industries. The section on change will provide a philosophical and scientific introduction to change from different perspectives to provide a backdrop for the project. The section on organizations will deal with structure and different features of organizational change, such as type, scale and pace. Additionally, effects of change will be introduced as inertia and isomorphism, while duality theory, niche theory and ambidexterity will attempt to explain how firms are structured differently. Furthermore, the field of change management will be reviewed in order to illustrate how change processes are facilitated differently from a traditionalist or complexity theorist perspective. Finally, a presentation of what creative industries entails will be offered in order to give a macro-industry specific context for the case studies.
Change
From a logical point of view, change is primarily a phenomenon of time. It is the way we talk about an event where something (A) has become something else (B), where this “something-else” (B) is the outcome of the change process through time (Horn, 1983; Smith, 1984). This definition includes two interrelated elements. Firstly it deals with identity, the idea of what that something is. This idea is derived from Aristotle’s system of reasoning and thinking (Wilden, 1980). Central to this thought is the notion of separateness, which is established when an observer isolates the entity from its background or surroundings, and this separateness is attained through boundaries that are not objects themselves, but is a tool that resides in the observer and helps make an object distinguishable from a background or an environment (Maturana & Vareka, 1987). A second element of identity is the persistence, stability or permanence of the object, which in formal logic is a fixed permanent position (Ichazo, 1976). Continuity refers to the unchanging essence of an object and is evidenced in the practice of defining, understanding and recognizing individual objects in terms of their relatively fixed patterns or characteristics (Ford & Ford, 1994). Secondly change is defined as process as the movement of that something from one condition in time and space to another condition in time and space (Ford & Ford, 1994).

Evolutionary change
From the Darwinian school of thought change is the inherent characteristics of biological populations over successive generations that give rise to the diversity of biological organizations. The argument about natural selection is explained by the notion of a population that will vary in the extent to which they are adaptable to their environment whereby the more adaptive members of a population will outperform the less adaptive, and ultimately cause extinction for the second and survival for the first. In the evolution of Homo sapiens the way we live has affected our appearances, i.e. how our bone structures have slowly adjusted to accommodate significantly new lifestyles, as supported by the French naturalist Jean-Baptiste Lamarck and his idea of adaptation. Here, change is the critical mechanism that drives growth, development and ultimately survival (Lewontin, 1970; Futuyma, 1999).

Individual Change
Our deeply ingrained habits of thought serendipitously work to elevate notions of order, stability, discreteness, identity and permanence over disorder, flux, dispersal, difference and change. However, our understanding of the social world is necessarily
and conveniently conceptualized through dominant static categories, accepting their inherent limitations as typologies, taxonomies and classification schemas that are essentially reductionist methods for abstracting and systemizing a complex social world (Chia, 2001). People that show disproportional resistance to change, which are conceptualized as a stable personality trait, are less likely to voluntarily incorporate changes in their lives. When change is imposed on them they are more likely to experience negative emotional reactions such as anxiety, anger and fear (Oreg, 2006).

**Cognitive Dissonance**

A way of explaining the discomfort associated with change is cognitive dissonance. Social psychologist Leon Festinger published in 1957 his theory of cognitive dissonance, where he explained the distressing mental state that arises when people find that their beliefs are inconsistent with their actions, while holding two or more conflicting cognitions (ideas, beliefs, values or emotional reactions). This conflict translates into disequilibrium with much emotional tension, such as frustration, dread, guilt, anger, anxiety, etc. (Festinger, 1985). Examples of this are the agnostic priest or the story about the fox and the grapes. In the story the fox has the desire to eat some high hanging grapes, but when he is unable to find a way of reaching them he rationalizes that they are probably not ripe thereby conditioning and reducing his experience of dissonance by criticizing it in the name of self-justification (Elster, 1983).

**Organizational Structure**

One explanation for why firms organize in a certain way is borrowed from institutional theorists in the discussion of the impact of institutional context. In order to survive firms must accommodate exogenous institutional expectations even though they may have little to do with technical notions of performance and accomplishment (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). One example used to illustrate this point is the accounting firm that is organized as a professional partnership. The choice of structure was not based on an investigation to evaluate other options that would lead to professional partnership as a seemingly optimal, but is rather determined by similar firms under similar conditions organizing in a similar way. This exemplifies a mimetic convergence toward the norm, which leaves out the critical, complex and in some cases practically impossible process to evaluate other options. The institutional
context provides templates for organizing that create obvious patterns in how organizations are structured. It seeks to provide an explanation of the similarity and stability of organizational arrangements in a given population or field of organizations (Greenwood & Hinings, 1996). The variables involved in determining organizational structure are centralization and decentralization, differentiation, integration, specialization, formalization, span of control and bureaucracy (Brooks, 2009). This goes to show how firms organize according not only to market pressures but also institutional pressures, e.g. governmental legislation, regulatory agencies, the actions of leading agencies within a field (Greenwood and Hinings, 1996). Burns and Stalker (1961) identified three dimensions to characterize an organization’s structure as either mechanistic or organic: (1) the number of hierarchical levels, (2) the extent to which knowledge and control are concentrated at the top of the organization (centralization), and (3) the degree of adherence to rules and policies (formalization).

**Isomorphism**
The term for the previously illustrated situation is isomorphism and it seeks to explain organizational behavior with emphasis on the natural gravitation toward conformity in order to maximize legitimacy of that shift (Zucker, 1988; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991). DiMaggio and Powell (1991) suggest that organizations conform to contextual expectations of appropriate organizational forms to gain legitimacy and improve their competitiveness and increase their probability of survival based on external encouragement of reliability and accountability (Ginsberg & Buchholtz, 1990). Strong institutions have a clearly articulate organizational culture that serves as a tool for legitimation. Institutional theorists believe that it is the institutional context that dictates organizational behavior grounded in shared ideas, values and beliefs. Drawing further on the concept of mimetic convergence (imitation) institutional norms that encourage innovation and change will foster an organizational behavior that tends to reflect flexibility and responsiveness (Zucker, 1987)

**Duality Theory**
Duality theory proposes an explanation of why it is becoming more important to carefully determine how a firm is organized based on the increasingly complex work environments, whereas traditional and bureaucratic structures are becoming too rigid to foster innovation and tackle the issues that come with globalization and rapid market fluctuations (Reeves & Deimler, 2011). This is point of view accept the risk of
operating in a world where technology is growing exponentially and influencing most areas of business life in the modern age, thus predicting adaptability as the greatest competitive advantage a firm can have (Reeves & Deimler, 2011). Organizations that have not responded to environmental turbulence by surrendering traditional structures to new and better-adjusted structures have a significant competitive disadvantage, shedding some light on the negative aspects of mindless isomorphism. Key coordinating and control features of bureaucracy continue to play an important role, but new structures can better maintain competitive and organizational capabilities that are tailored to the specific needs of the work environment (Graetz & Smith, 2009).

Focus on the tradeoffs between flexibility and control, and freedom and accountability are essential in this discussion. By looking at duality characteristics across structures, processes, boundaries and frameworks the theory presents dualities as a part of a conceptual explanation for the presence of contradictory organizing forms that is proposed to be advantageous for change managers (Graetz & Smith, 2009). These thoughts are aligned with contingency theorists who suggest that there is no best way to organize, manage or structure a firm, and thus deeming the intutionalist view on isomorphism as exclusively negative in that no one template can be right for all firms within a field (Mintzberg, 1979; Chandler, 1962).

**Niche Theory & Ambidexterity**

Niche theory distinguishes between two types of organizations: the generalist and the specialist. The specialist maximizes their explorative capabilities and accepts risk in a changing environment, while the generalist accepts a lower level of exploitation in return for greater security (Hannan & Freeman, 1977). Niche theory attempts to explain variations in structure in different industries and how relevant environments shape them. This is supported by the notion of ambidexterity that predicts the superior performance of a firm that is capable of simultaneously exploiting existing competencies and exploring new opportunities (Tushman & O’Reilly (2004); Birkinshaw et al. (2009). The elements that need balancing are differentiation vs. integration (varying with firm size and task at hand), individual vs. organization (managing conflicting goals, time orientations, cross-disciplinary work vs. individual work), static vs. dynamic (sequential ambidexterity), internal vs. external (solving the paradoxical requirements of ambidexterity through outsourcing or in-house R&D) (Birkinshaw et al., 2009). The aforementioned ideas from duality theory further
substantiate the focus on this balancing act between intuitively contradicting elements.

**Organizational Change**

**Types**
Strategic change deals with adjusting top-down directional tools such as mission statements or vision declarations in response to external environment. It can also include reevaluating alliances and partners, market structures, product selection – all from an overall strategic point of view in answering the question of “why we do the things we do”. Structural change includes redesigning an organization, e.g. hierarchy of authority, goals, administrative procedures or management systems. These changes are technical, two-dimensional (cause and effect) and can be both practical (e.g. smoking ban) and organizational (reorganization). Processual change strives to maximize efficiency by reengineering processes to increase productivity. This type of change is often related to production in dealing with supply chain management in manufacturing, but can also be used to enhance efficiency in the service industry (e.g. by changing customer service processes to increase the number of interactions). People-oriented change seeks to alter behavior, attitudes, skills and performance of employees often addressed with emphasis on communication, learning activities, motivation and coaching. Problems related to these changes are self-reflexivity, how problems are solved, how groups interact and understanding how these areas can be improved. (Smith, 2002; Nadler, 1995)

**Scale**
First order change deals with the adjustments, fine-tunings and modifications to processes, systems or structures in an organization. The change is incremental and does not challenge the operational fundament of the work place, but develops existing practices in continuity with the ongoing business processes, leaving the firm recognizable. Second order change goes more deeply into the organization and alters, shifts or reforms the core of a firm. This type of change is radical and transformational in that it will create a significant imprint on the organization with its revolutionary impact and discontinuous interruption (Bates, 1994). Initiatives such as downsizing, restructuring and reengineering are typically related to second order transformational change (Palmer, Dunford & Akin, 2009).
Using organizational theory as a starting point Greenwood and Hinings (1996) proposes two dimensions of change, namely the scope (convergent versus radical) and pace (evolutionary versus revolutionary). They propose radical change as “busting loose from an existing orientation” (Johnson, 1987). This is what happens when an organization moves from one template-in-use to another. This is contrary to convergent change that deals with fine-tuning the existing orientation that occurs within the parameters on an existing archetypal template. While evolutionary change happens slowly and gradually, revolutionary change happens swiftly and affects all parts of the organization simultaneously. This highlights the impact of radical change as it embodies the entire organization in its reflexes.

**Pace**

When writing about revolutionary and episodic change, Weick and Quinn (1999) suggests that grand alterations are a response to growing inertia that most often takes the form of planned replacement wherein an old structure is replaced by a new structure. This is contrasted by the notion of continuous change that is an ongoing flow of small adaptations, which accumulate from improvisation and learning to provide the organization with stability. Greenwood and Hinings suggests the notion of change tracks to describe the pace of change, where the tracks constitute the varying paths an organization follows when moving, intentionally or not, from one design to another. The firm that completes a program for radical change uses the reorientation track, while the firm that starts but fails to complete such a transition is on a non-reorientation track (Greenwood & Hinings, 1988). This notion is a part of the discussion about how to implement radical change, where there is evidence to support that radical change must be implemented quickly in order to be successful (Warren, 1984, Hackman, 1984, Romanelli and Tushman, 1994). However, this conceptualization of pace concludes that the speed at which change takes place is seen as integral to the change track followed (Amis, Slack and Hinings, 2004).

Change has no meaning unless it is juxtaposed against constancy, and needs to be managed with a profound appreciation of stability (Huy & Mintzberg, 2003). Change and constancy are relative concepts; group life is never without change, they are merely differences in the amount and type of change, termed the quasi-stationary equilibrium (Lewin, 1947; Burnes, 2003). A collection of terms relating to intensity of change can be summarized in the following table (Table 1) of juxtaposed terms:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change processes</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incremental</td>
<td>Radical change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First order</td>
<td>Second order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent</td>
<td>Reorientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>Programmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

**Effects of Change**

Huy (1999) investigates the effects of radical change in relation to the emotional dynamics of an organization. He claims that second-order change refers to a fundamental, qualitative change in the firm’s philosophy or core identity, which is the distinctive characteristic of the group that fosters a sense of community and belonging. Acceptance of a corporate culture and organizational identity are important determinants of behavior in a firm, and these represent a point of behavioral reference for employees. Adhering to these prescriptions creates an emotional investment due to the self-reflexive process of identification. Corporate cultures provide emotional and cognitive stability and are important structures for sense making in a firm. Radical change will challenge the basic assumptions of a company and potentially cause a paradigm shift, which is an unsettling experience for the emotionally invested employee that uses corporate culture as a tool to deal with ambiguous and uncontrollable events (Schein, 1992). Altering the ground pillars of a firm will cause strong emotional responses and could trigger resistance such as anxiety and defensiveness (Schein, 1992; Huy, 1999). The ability of an organization to understand and accommodate its inherent emotional dynamics defines its level of emotional capability, and thus the likelihood of successfully executing radical change.

Typical barriers to change are grounded in a sensation of dislike, discomfort of uncertainty, perceived breach of psychological contract, lack of conviction that a change is needed, lack of clarity as to what is expected, or the belief that a change is inappropriate, excessive and/or poorly timed (Palmer, Dunford & Akin, 2009).
**Inertia**
Organizational Inertia is the tendency for mature organizations to uncritically continue on its current trajectory based on path dependency. Resource rigidity (unwillingness to invest) and routine rigidity (inability to change patterns) are some plausible explanations for organizational inertia, in its passive state of acceptance and mindless operation (Gilbert, 2005). Inertia is often the unintended consequence of successful performance because organizations are prone to repeat processes that have led to prior success instead of accounting for new contingencies (Miller, 1993, 1994). Lewin’s idea remains central especially to episodic change in that he assumes that inertia in the form of a quasi-stationary equilibrium is the main impediment to change (Schein, 1996). Pfeffer (1997) proposes that inertia is the inability for organizations to change as rapidly as the environment, which aligns him with the duality theorists who focus on adaptability as the greatest competitive advantage (Reeves & Deimler, 2011). The term is derived from one of the fundamental principles from classical physics (inertia means *iners* in Latin meaning idle or lazy), whereby a physical object resists change to its state of motion, and is used to describe how the object is affected by applied forces (Ragep, 2001). Similarly, a firm that experiences a passive equilibrium that restrains productivity, innovation and efficiency can be said to be inertial. Miller and Friesen (1980) suggests an explanation of internal inertia as stemming from organizational culture that reinforces past behavior and cause its future amplification, operating procedures and strategies being continued past their point of usefulness because they have enjoyed success in the past, or the asymmetric power relation in firms that causes some key members with elevated social status to be more likely to have goals aligned with the corporate culture (Miller & Friesen, 1980; Ginsberg & Buchholtz, 1990).

**Absorptive capacity**
The term is borrowed from the field of business administration and relates to a firm’s ability to recognize the value of new information, assimilate it and apply it to commercial ends. It is predicted that a firm with high absorptive capacity will reflect positively on that firm’s performance, innovation, aspiration level and organizational learning, which is associated with Weick’s sense making process (Cohen & Levintal, 1990). The model deals with how knowledge is encapsulated in an organization through cumulative experience, depending greatly on prior knowledge and diversity of backgrounds. They suggest that a firm that continually (rather than punctually)
nurture its ability to recognize new opportunities will accumulate valuable experience and become increasingly equipped to make good business decisions (Cohen & Levintal, 1990).

**Change Management**

In trying to understand, deal with and master change processes a growing body of work on change management is by now firmly established as a focus areas for both managers and academics. This growing interest was triggered by the dissatisfaction of implementing change in a strictly top-down manner in the 1980s, when the first books on change management were published. Consultants typically specialize in change management to facilitate change projects in particularly large organizations dealing with big risks and significant opportunity costs (Anderson & Anderson, 2001). The academic research on change management often cumulates in a model that is intended to serve as a management tool to reduce the discomfort related to change and to obtain optimal results from a change process.

**Traditionalists and Complexity Theorists**

The dominant view in Western management academics is the construction that organizational change is a problem that needs to be managed (Chia, 2001). Two lines of medication for this condition are divided between traditional and complexity theories, where the first is linear and prescriptive while the second is emergent and organic. Examples of traditional concepts are Kotter’s 8-step change model, which gives a thick description of how to successfully lead change through eight prepared initiatives and is primarily a tool for empowered top-managers in a hierarchical structure. Another widely acknowledged change theorist is the German-American psychologist Kurt Lewin with his 3-step model of “unfreeze (overcoming inertia) – change (confusion and transition) – refreeze (returning to initial comfort level)”. Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) suggest that rational views had the upper hand on non-rational views of organizations in their extensive review of organizational culture. However, a significant, and also contemporary, contribution to the discussion is the complexity theorists who view organizations as complex, adaptive and open systems that are in constant dynamic equilibrium (or disequilibrium) where change processes are messy and inherently unpredictable (Shaw, 1997; Stacey, 2004). Complexity models embody more elements of the organizations, such as change drivers, levers,
change context, feedback loops and the iterative process of driving change (Shaw, 1997). Stacey suggests that dynamic patterns of behavior are naturally paradoxical and that it is impossible to eliminate in the quest for control, predictability and planned change. Complexity theorists propose that numerous interacting agents act on the basis of local knowledge and adapt to others behavior without explicit coordination, but rather through emergent self-organization. In complex adaptive systems people and groups simultaneously adapt, and the collection of adaptations builds complexity from which “perpetual novelty” emerges (Anderson, 1999; Chiles et al., 2004).

So far it has been established that the many notions of change only makes sense when juxtaposed, and may be motivated by inertial forces that build up in an organization over time, e.g. in the form of organizational culture, mimetic isomorphism or failure to adapt. Organizations can structure against the risk that comes with turbulence by having an awareness of the dualities or ambidextrous, qualities organizations entails that can be measured by a firms absorptive capacity and emotional capability. Change management attempts to medicate the discomfort associated especially with radical change processes.

**Creative Industries**

Hesmondalhg (2002) offers a definition of the creative industries as a range of economic activities that are concerned with generation and exploitation of knowledge and information. Howkins (2001) emphasizes the copyright and IPR protected works in his definition of the creative economy, where advertising, architecture, arts, crafts, design, fashion, music, performing arts, R&D, software, toys, games, TV and radio is included. UNCTAD define creative industries as: *the cycles of creation, production and distribution of goods and services that use intellectual capital and creativity as primary inputs in knowledge-based activities*, which is fairly similar to the UK Government Department for Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS) who describe creative industries as those having their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent; and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual properties. This assignment will be mostly inspired by Howkins’ definition due to its general nature and acceptance of economic value.
Creative Individuals and Organizations

Organizations within the creative industries show a clear tendency of small business formation. A recent survey showed that around 20% of individuals employed in creative industries in Scotland were self-employed, which is more than double the average for all industries in Scotland (Carr, 2009). High levels of self-employment are associated with freelance work, which provides the flexibility to be engaged in several projects with short life cycles simultaneously. These projects are often complex and experiential, and include cross-disciplinary collaborations. This complexity is frequently referred to as *The Mötley Crue* effect exemplified by movies where the list of credits are seemingly never-ending. This work form indicates the entrepreneurial spirit that is common among creative workers where the tendency is low risk avoidance, which comes from the attraction of creating something original and the need to be flexible enough to respond to opportunities (Carr, 2009). This illustrates an embrace of uncertainty and ambiguity that the creative industries regarded as an intrinsic motivation in itself (Bilton, 2010; Hesmondhalgh, 2007). Richard Florida defines the creative class in relation to three factors: talent, technology and tolerance, which describe the ‘qualified’ individuals as technologically aware, meritocratic and talent-driven (Florida, 2002). Small, specialized firms contribute to the heightened interdependencies that exist among them and the need for connectivity in order for information to be exchanged rapidly and effectively (Hesmondhalgh, 2007; Caves, 2000). This explains an increased focus on networks within creative industries, where specialist firms will depend on other firms with other skill sets to facilitate specific projects. For example is the concept of Strength of Weak Ties especially relevant for the creative industries, in that it is in the periphery, not the inner circle, where information flows most freely and effectively (Granovetter, 1973). Hesmondhalgh (2007) emphasizes that in small organizations there is a strong tendency of functional integration, meaning that one person executes several of the tasks necessary for the organization.

In summary, creative industries are characterized by small, dynamic businesses, self-employment, presenting socially complex products, project-based work with networks playing a key role in working relationships.

The aim for this thesis is to investigate what impact organizational constructs and industry structures have on how firms deal with change and the creative industry
holds some interesting specificities that have so far been unexplored, which is the motivation of this research.

**METHOD**
This section presents the scientific approach to the research, the process of data collection and analysis, and the specificities of the chosen case objects. This will provide the reader with insight to how analytical strategy and scientific approach has affected the research design and the chosen perspective to investigate data. Essentially, this section will communicate how the researcher has dealt with data and thus provide direction on how to interpret the assignment.

**Case Selection**
Case study as a research strategy focuses on understanding the dynamics present within single settings. Data collection is typically a combination of archives, interviews and observations in either qualitative (e.g. words) or quantitative (e.g. numbers) measures. Case studies can be used to accomplish various aims, namely to either provide description, test theory, or generate theory (Eisenhardt, 1989). The research question follows the same rationale as in hypothesis testing, namely to provide a research focus in order to avoid becoming overwhelmed by data when attempting to collect specific information systematically (Mintzberg, 1979). However, the research question may change during the process, a process that was exemplified by Gersick (1988) in converting theory testing to theory-building research by taking advantage of the serendipitous findings where the research focus emerged after the data collection had begun. This is reflective of the iterative research process of this project. Theory-building research is executed as close as possible to the ideal of no theory under consideration and no hypothesis to test in order to maximize objectivity and avoid skewed findings, from which grounded theory lies at the most conservative end. Mintzberg (1979) explains that systematic data creates the foundation for our theories while anecdotal data is what enable us to do the building and provide the richness to explain relationships between variables when illustrating the synergies between quantitative and qualitative data collection.
Comparative case study and theory building
Where hypothesis testing is mostly based on statistical sampling, case studies apply theoretical sampling of cases are chosen to either replicate previous cases or extend emergent theory or to fill theoretical categories and provide examples of polar types (Eisenhardt, 1989). When working with small numbers of cases it makes sense to choose cases such as extreme situations and polar types where the process of interest is transparently observable under the assumption that the selected cases are likely to replicate or extend emergent theory (Pettigrew, 1988). The reasoning behind cross-case analysis is that people, here referring to the role of the researcher, are notoriously bad processors of information, especially at the convenience of rapid decision making at the cost of e.g. limited data, where premature or even false conclusions are the result of information-processing biases. One way to medicate this tendency is to look at data in many divergent ways, as is made possible through a cross-case analysis (Kahneman & Tversky, 1973).

The investigated categories or dimensions can be suggested by the research problem or by existing literature or defined by the researcher himself, and will seek out to identify similarities and/or differences. A combination of literature specific and intuitive categories will be applied in this project. One approach is to select pairs of cases and list similarities and differences between them to allow for subtle nuances to emerge from the seemingly similar cases only when juxtaposed, which is the method applied in this thesis. This technique may lead to new categories and concepts that the investigator did not anticipate (Eisenhardt, 1989). The motivation for such an approach is that it allows the researcher to go beyond initial impressions through the use of structured and diverse lenses, and through that improve accuracy, reliability and the likelihood of novel findings. This provides the reasoning on which a dual case study analysis has been based on. Case studies have predominantly been focused on large firms contrary to the two relatively small sized cases in this specific research where industry specific features are taken into account, which gives some justification of the application of inductive, explorative and theory-building research strategy.

Philosophical Approach
This research is a qualitative investigation of the relation between organizational studies and cultural and creative industries in order to study how organizational
variables act as determinants of change processes within the two respective firms. Examining the empirical world and developing theory based on observations coupled with existing knowledge allows for the researcher to have an explorative and iterative research process. Observations of the research objects were recorded in real time and were continuously aligned with the research objective. This method can only be validated with a realist philosophical approach, believing that the observed world is true in its visible nature. Still, the realist epistemology of pure objectivity and independence of a research object disregards a lot of the complexities and ambiguities especially prevalent in the cultural and creative industries facing uncertain markets and taking extensive risks (Caves, 2000). However, it is accepted that the world is imperfect and in continuous development, but if there are no categories or systems to organize our observations about our environment, as the conservative constructivist would claim, then creating an understanding, and further a functioning society, will be practically impossible. Hence, a scientific approach of critical realism will be applied in this study in order to give rise to the practical and generally applicable validity of the research while attempting to correct for subjective imperfections and biases. This scientific method brings us closer to reality that many people can relate to, but not to a universally acceptable and applicable reality (Eisenhardt, 1989).

**Research Design**
A case study is one or more samples out of a large mass of organizations facing similar conditions. Creating validity for only investigating two samples is supported by the choice of research method being induction over deduction, coupled with a theory building strategy. Data has been gathered from two cases due to scale advantages that allows for detailed comparison and investigation of the discrete differences in the cases. The way the data has been treated is through analytical induction where casual explanations of the phenomena that result from investigating the fields of research will be provided. A conservative constructivist would give no validity whatsoever to empirical observations due to ontology of the world existing only of social constructs, which is biased due to high degree of personal interpretation and ambiguity. Thus, a constructivist approach would not allow for a case study to contribute with any insights other than an isolated example of individual truth based on inter-subjectivity. However, the aim of this research is to treat the cases not as
universally generalizable but indicative of firms facing similar relative, not absolute, conditions.

Ever since the preliminary research question and research aim was defined this has been a guiding factor and point of reference in preparing questions for interviews, active participation in keeping the conversation on relevant subjects and going through the transcripts. In other words, the researcher and her aim have been present in the decision-making processes of gathering and analyzing data. This inability to separate the researcher from the research process may be claimed to reduce objectivity, which describes this process as constructivist. However, since the scope of this research is limited both in size and time this strong alignment between research aim and information seeking has been necessary in order to identify the most compelling and relevant indicators of determinants of change in cultural and creative organizations (Tenkasi & Hay, 2004; Urquhart, 2001)

**Data Collection**

**Primary Data**

**Observations**

The qualitative nature of the research implies a triangulation of data collection through interviews, documents and observations. Primary data was gathered through interviews and observations. Observations were collected out through meetings in the respective office areas with no explicit agenda related to this research and with casual interaction with the staff members in both organizations. These observations have been collected regularly since April 2013 and have taken the form of observant as participant due to the fact that the specificities of this research were not spoken openly about at this stage. The observation notes taken from these meetings are mainly descriptive as it records immediate reflections of the issues discussed, but also bridges analytical notes to capture ideas for further research.

**Interviews**

9 interviews were held between April 15\textsuperscript{th} and May 1\textsuperscript{st} 2013. The research aim is mainly explorative, thus the prepared questions were fairly open and encouraging the interview objects to reflect both on their personal role in the organization and on the organization itself. Interviews were held in the mother tongue of the interview objects, namely Danish, in order to for them speak outmost freely. The interviews
were transcribed and translated into English and notes were taken during the interview with the same character as notes from observations. Transcripts can be found in Appendix A. Interview objects were also triangulated in hierarchy and seniority. Interviews were semi-structured in order for the conversation to highlight relevant topics for the research providing guidance and direction with the prepared questions while allowing for them to improvise on the raised topics. Interviewees were informed about the purpose of the research and it was a highly active conversation, which includes dynamic involvement from the interviewer. This way of disrupting objectivity is generally more accepted in constructivism, whereas a realist would prefer a structured interview in order to limit skewness. However, applying a critical realist approach would account for context, subjectivity and interviewer influence in a way that does not reduce the objectivity and validity in the conversation. Table 2 and 3 illustrates the interview objects, position, tenure and age of the respective firms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bjarke Svendsen</td>
<td>Daily Manager</td>
<td>1 1/5 years</td>
<td>34 years old</td>
<td>April 14th/April 24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus Hedegaard Nielsen</td>
<td>Production Manager</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>34 years old</td>
<td>April 19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmus Hjorthøj Steffensen</td>
<td>PR Manager</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>34 year old</td>
<td>April 23rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanne Wall-Gremstrup</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>47 years old</td>
<td>May 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Arpe</td>
<td>Manager of Finance</td>
<td>4 1/5 years</td>
<td>62 years old</td>
<td>April 23rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie Bjerring</td>
<td>Editor Assistant</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>33 years old</td>
<td>April 30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Kieding</td>
<td>Editor of Arkitekten</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>55 years old</td>
<td>April 30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Navalda</td>
<td>Editor Assistant</td>
<td>27 years</td>
<td>65 years old</td>
<td>April 30th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Secondary Data
Documents investigated can be categorized in two groups: 1) documents produced by the business itself and 2) documents produced by others. Examples of data gathered from the first group are the organizations web sites where promotional bias is accounted for. These documents are products of how the organization wants to be perceived and indicate the level of self-reflexivity in a marketing situation. The second group of documents consists primarily of media products such as news articles. Here the issue of journalistic agenda must be treated with caution, which is especially a constructivist consideration. A journalist’s job is to angle a case interestingly in order to strike a balance between treating an event or a case with justice and simultaneously attracting readers. This creates potential ambiguity based on the distinct subjective constructivism of this document, which is accounted for in the review of news articles. Documents are not seen as mirror images of an objective reality but rather texts as valid examples of an illustration shedding light on gaps of discourse in the field of investigation (Tenkasi & Hay, 2004).

Coding
Coding is used under all circumstances in research, either deliberately or casually. The most deliberate and conservative approach to coding is grounded theory where a precondition is no prior knowledge to the area of research and total objectivity, which would allow a researcher to identify patterns that exists in its own natural form. The fact that there exists extensive literature on organizational theory and cultural and creative industries together with the fact that creating theory through grounded theory is highly time consuming, gives reasons for why this approach was not applicable in these case studies.

At the other extreme is theory determined coding where predetermined categories are constructed before analyzing a text in order to fit the data in these boxes. A limitation with this approach is the rigidity that does not allow for much interpretation or subjectivity to the point where valuable information might get lost if it does not fit any of the predetermined classifications. Thus, the selected approach for this research has been theory guided coding. This method allows for the application of categories not directly derived from theory, but drawing on the ideas of the theoretical approach of the study (Urquhart, 2001). Theory becomes a tool for guidance, which is seen as less constraining than when theory is determining, and thus excludes improvisation and creativity in the research process.
Theory guided coding allows for greater freedom for the researcher, which has been an important aspect in this assignment due to the unexplored area of the intersection between organizational change theory and creative industries. Thus, categories were established as an iterative process going back and forth between the research aim and the transcripts in order to identify relevant expressions of change determinants. The next step was to search for patterns and commonalities in the transcripts. The final step was to align these findings with the existing theory and create categories based on the synthesis of these two bases of information.

Case Study Presentation
The presentation of JH and DAP will be based on available public data and the information that was collected from the interviews. There is no one-person sender and a collective summary and accumulation of the reflections made of the respective firms will be presented unless otherwise specified. The relevant time frame investigated is from the point when the new top management was instilled, respectively one and seven years ago for JH and DAP.

Jazz House
Ever since it’s opening in 1991 JH has been an important music venue hosting international and national musicians and artists within the jazz world. JH suffered detrimental water damage in July 2011 and reopened June 1st 2012 after extensive restoration, both of the internal structure of the organization and the physical facilities. The current CEO, Karsten, is also the CEO of Copenhagen Jazz Festival and overtook the position as Signe Lodrup left the position during the fall of 2012. JH is highly publicly and commercially subsidized, which somewhat reduces its pressure on profit seeking activities and allows for JH to be a genre specific niche-venue. Organizational structure is illustrated in Figure 2, and shows how the daily manager, PR manager, production manager and accountant work together. The major challenge has been to reinvent JH both with regards to the organizational structure and culture, but also the branding of the house, i.e. eliminating the popular nightclub activity as a drastic artistic transformation of its cultural profile. During Bjarke’s first year he fired five people from the old organization who were unable to adapt to the new and more professionally driven JH. The team today consists of four members a bookkeeper, PR manager, production manager and production manager assistant, who are all
employed under Svendsen’s management. Svendsen took over an organization with 1.8 million DKK in losses and there is still a constant focus on cost cutting. Previously the booking had been the responsibility of Ginman, a passionate jazz musician with a broad network. Today Bjarke is in charge of booking but regularly utilizes the insights of his staff when researching for new artists. The office is an open space where the level of interaction is high and the atmosphere is informal.

The Danish Architectural Press

DAP was founded in 1949 as a commercial foundation to promote the Danish architecture profession’s standing through publications of books and magazines. DAP publishes four magazines (Arkitekten, Arkitektur DK, Landskab and Nordic), the last of which is a collaborative effort with the Nordic architecture schools. However, the interview objects from the editorial team at DAP were associated with Arkitekten, which is the dominant magazine out of the four and will serve as the primary point of reference. Point of sale is through subscriptions via the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Schools of Architecture, and Design and Conservation and sales via their online shop. The firm consists of an administrative department with 5 members and an editorial department with 10 members, making 15 in total. Power is distributed with the CEO on the top, and the management group
consisting of her, two editors and the Financial Manager. Under the editors are the editorial teams consisting of writers, graphic designers, assistants and interns, etc. The office at Pasteursvej in Vesterbro is designed to separate the administration in individual offices while the editorial teams are grouped in two semi-open spaces. DAP is dependent on advertisers to finance their operations. Organizational structure is illustrated in Figure 3. Sanne Wal-Gremstrup started in 2007 as the first CEO without an architectural background. During her two first years at DAP Wal-Gremstrup let go of 10 persons of the staff, leaving 15 employees and privileges such as an hour breakfast at the office, soda machines has been eliminated and arbitrary relation to vacation have been thoroughly tightened together with biannual instead of annual salary negotiations. The previous manager was forced to leave due to a harmful alcohol habit that made him incapable to continue as the CEO. This left the organization in a chaotic state where a defensive, paranoid and anxious culture had developed among the staff. Additionally, the financial state of DAP showed severely negative numbers, losing money on each issue. DAP has gone from publishing 10-12 books a year to 1-2 books a year.

**Case similarities**
Both firms keep core business processes in-house as much as possible, seeing that excessive activity would quickly become redundant and expensive for two organizations based on the principle of minimum efficiency scale (MES). This implies that a low average cost is minimized to ensure sustainable financial operations with the smallest possible amount of in-house resources (Carlton, 2005). This causes both firms to outsource peripheral activities making them highly network based and inflatable organizations that increase in size during events or intensified periods of
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production via volunteers or external contributors. JH and DAP both operate within niche markets and provide experiential products that activates the senses. JH and DAP are two-sided markets in that they are facilitators and thus need to establish attractiveness both to artists, i.e. musicians and architects respectively, and for the consumer, i.e. the advertisers and writers and the subscribers. Organizations with two-sided markets create value by enabling direct interactions between two or more types of affiliated customers, e.g. credit cards (merchant and card holder) and HMOs (patients and doctors), and exist due to the need for an intermediary that matches demand effectively and make possible an exchange that will create value for both sides that would not be possible otherwise (Haigu & Wright, 2011). Additionally, JH and DAP are situated in Copenhagen, which minimizes cultural discrepancies.

**Case dissimilarities**

There is a discrete differences in relative size, where JH have 4 permanent employees while DAP has 15. JH consists of one department situated in an open and intimate office space, which motivates a flat hierarchal structure. DAP has a triangular hierarchal structure and separates administration and editorial teams in two departments situated at their respective ends of the office space, where the administration have individual offices and the editorial teams work in semi-open spaces. JH have had one year with new top management, while DAP has had 7 years with new top management. Disparities in product life cycles are evident in that JH facilitate three concerts per week, while DAP publish one magazine per month. The firms vary in education, where the staff at DAP is dominantly specifically educated within architecture, while the staff at JH have a broad range of educational backgrounds. JH is an integrated part of Copenhagen Jazz Festival and adheres to a CEO who manages both firms, while DAP is an independent organization. JH is heavily invested in the physical room where fixed costs are high; meaning that the stage and the bar cannot be moved around once it is put in place and their central location indicates high monthly rent. DAP outsource productions and keep mostly human resources in-house. The most important case similarities and dissimilarities are summarized in Figure 4.
Case Specific Change Processes

Despite the dissimilarities between the firms they have faced analogous challenges and gone through a similar set of changes. Both JH and DAP have gone through all the different types of change, namely, structural, strategic, processual and people-oriented (Smith, 2002; Nadler, 1995). Examples of change processes both firms went through are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Jazz House</th>
<th>Danish Architectural Press</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New top management</strong></td>
<td>Svendsen started in 2012</td>
<td>Wall-Gremstrup starts in 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downsizing</strong></td>
<td>Eliminating 100% of the existing staff over the first year</td>
<td>Eliminating 30% of the existing staff over the first two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative numbers</strong></td>
<td>Both firms had large financial deficits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost cutting</strong></td>
<td>Optimizing efficiency through reduction of uncertainty through thorough planning and preparation</td>
<td>Elimination of social perks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Re-branding/Re-positioning</strong></td>
<td>Eliminating the association of JH as a nightclub</td>
<td>Reducing focus on book publishing and experimenting with digital platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eliminating figurehead</strong></td>
<td>Previously endorsed by the charismatic booker</td>
<td>Previously endorsed by the charismatic CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elimination of negative aspects of old culture</strong></td>
<td>Cacophony, ad hoc solutions and lack of accountability</td>
<td>Poor psychological work conditions, social benefits taken for granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externalities</strong></td>
<td>Negotiations with commercial funds</td>
<td>Financial crisis threatened the firm´s primary source of income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
**Limitations**

By carrying out the interviews in Danish there is a risk of linguistic misinterpretation where substance might get lost in the translation process. However, this issue was actively dealt with by transcribing the recordings within two days of the interview to align the written word with the experienced thoughts and maintain subjectivity from the interviews. Another limitation is that the interview objects from the editorial teams at DAP were all directly associated with Arkitekten, which might imply an overemphasis on the magazine over the other business units. Nevertheless, it is regarded as the most important part of DAP’s operations, which supports the limited source diversity. Additionally, the author has facilitated two research projects with JH prior to this, which indicates an imbalance in the insight of the two cases. However, the research objective is seen as significantly dissimilar not to obstruct objectivity and reflect a bias towards JH.

**THEORY**

When presenting the theoretical framework two approaches to change are paralleled in order to provide a rich and balanced basis of analysis. The distinction is drawn on whether change is seen as primarily disruptive or continuous, where the Punctuated Equilibrium (PE) is placed in the first category and Emergent Change (EC) and Sense Making is in the last. PE is allocated with the traditionalist’s view of change management while EC is located closer to the complexity theorists, though not at the most radical end with Ralph Stacey and Patricia Shaw. The key discrepancy is that a firm either sees inertia as central or peripheral, where PE predicts superior performance in long convergent periods of stability, while EC predicts superior performance in periods of constant instability and adaptation (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985; Weick, 2000). Vocabulary of change will be directly derived from the change literature, thus terms from Table 1 will be used to address the juxtaposition of change and constancy.

**Punctuated Equilibrium**

Michael L. Tushman and Elaine Romanelli proposed in their 1985 paper on organizational evolution a new concept to describe how firms change. Their goal was to synthesize incremental, transformational and ecological approaches to organizational evolution in a concept that particularly looks at three defining
constructs; 1) processes of convergence, 2) periods of reorientation and 3) executive leadership. The general prediction is that organizations go through relatively long periods of convergence where small incremental changes occur in the form of adaptations, while reorientation periods are short and discontinuous and infers a strategic transformation that challenges the existing equilibrium and culture. This is aligned with Table 1, where several notions of change is juxtaposed with constancy. This text provides categorical summary of the 16 propositions from the original text in order to establish clarity of the terms and their applicability. Firstly definitions will be provided, secondly explanations about the forces that drive the different movements and then a presentation of the impact of executive leadership will be offered (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

**Convergence**

Convergence is a period where small incremental movements are the dominant state, which means the organization is fairly stable. Convergence strives to achieve a clear strategic orientation, achieve internal alignment and to move in consistency with the external environment. Strategic orientation is realized through alignment between:

1. core values and beliefs that sets constraints as to how and why a firm competes
2. business unit strategy that defines the nature of the products produced
3. intra-organizational power distributions that control the allocation of resources
4. structure and control systems defining hierarchy (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

Inertial factors in convergent periods are exemplified by increased social and structural complexities; and increase in coordination costs that promote further convergence upon established strategic orientation. This can ultimately serve as a resistor to fundamental change (Proposition 2; Proposition 2A). Inertial factors are positively associated with the length of convergent periods and the size of firms, which suggests increased reliance on incremental as opposed to fundamental change (Proposition 3; Proposition 4). An underlying assumption for a convergent period is for the firm to be both effective and efficient, making sure to effectively produce a product or service that is desired by the external economy and efficient with respect to the internal utilization of resources (Katz & Kahn, 1967). Convergence is a process that derives from socially emergent inertial dynamics and rational attempts to accomplish the numerous constraints of organizations, such as political-economic systems and institutional elements.
**Reorientation**
Whenever the incremental modifications to values, strategies, power systems, structure and control fail to maintain consistency or to establish them in the first place, the organization will also fail to achieve a sustainable level of performance. As a result the firm will be forced to a fundamental reordering of activities. These involve a series of rapid, simultaneous discontinuities and fundamental changes to the organization that alters its fabric and character. Reorientations are motivated by either sustained low performance, major social/legal changes, significant changes in power structures or new dominant designs that changes the product class conditions (Proposition 11). Factors of product class evolution are demand, technology, users and institutional conditions, and all four factors change systematically over time moving between different levels of certainty and uncertainty (Proposition 11A). The response to these changes affect the same elements in the aforementioned strategic orientation (points 1 though 4), though with increased intensity of the necessary change and with a substantial emphasis placed on the core structures of a firm. The most radical form of reorientations are termed re-creations and are apparent when changes in fundamental core values and beliefs are carried out, and requires a complete re-definition of the business. Re-creations are the most severe and traumatic form of reorientation, and can be paralleled as a paradigm shift (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985). Reorientations will be more frequent in technologies whose rate of change are substantial and in emerging phases of a product class, i.e. innovation intensive industries, and responsiveness to changing environments is associated with high-performing organization (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

**Forces of Convergence and Reorientation**

**Turbulence**
High-performing organizations have according to PE longer and less turbulent convergent periods than low-performing organizations and have reorientations that correspond to radical change, i.e. product class discontinuities (Proposition 14A). Low levels of turbulence experienced in a convergent period would indicate an organization with superior effectiveness and stability, while high levels of turbulence in a convergent period are associated with greater internal dissensus and less resistance to fundamental change. Less social and structural rigidities indicate less focus on reinforcing the status quo, and thus less organizational inertia (Proposition, 14).
Success
Success can impede an organization’s ability to undergo fundamental change and is a contributing inertial factor, which in turn is associated with a greater degree of turbulence and risk of failure in the event of a reorientation. The greater its prior success the greater is the emphasis on cohesion and conformity, which in turn increases commitment in the teams and future actions are closely related to prior courses of action (Janis, 1972; Shambbaugh, 1978). This indicates that success has an analogous impact as organizational culture. This lies in the relativity between the comfort that success provides and discomfort that turbulence causes, and this contrast is further emphasized in re-creations. (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).

Tenure
Long-tenured individuals, i.e. senior executives, create stability that is associated with effective organizations in convergent periods (Proposition, 16). Katz (1982) found proof to support the importance of inertial forces in culture over time when it was observed that old organizations were less motivated to change and relied on operating procedures more than younger groups. The potential liability of seniority and corporate culture is supported by Granovetter’s concept of embeddedness, where over-embeddedness describes a state in which critical questions are not asked and group thinking occurs as a product of the given social context. The justification of exchange between individuals is based on trust that originates from social ties that have been established through previous contact (Granovetter, 1985). This is supported by Lewin’s thoughts on group behavior coming from a sociologist’s point of view: “It is fruitless to concentrate on changing the behavior of individuals because the individuals in isolation are constrained by group pressures to conform” (Lewin, 1947).

In his discussion about emotional capability and intelligence, Huy (1999) claims that the more emotionally capable an organization is the more successful it will be in its change efforts and a firms absorptive capacity is an essential element of this organizational skill. However, an overembedded organizational culture is potentially unable to adapt swiftly to pressures if it is not appropriately designed to accept the ambiguity of future states. This overembeddedness is especially risky within the creative industries where it might inhibit necessary responsiveness.
**Interplay**
There are two inherently conflicting forces, internal and institutional pressures for inertia on the one hand, and pressures from low performance due to strategic misalignment on the other. These polarities evolve in periods of convergence and are punctuated in periods by discontinuous change, which lead to the next convergent period, as illustrated in Figure 5 (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985).
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**Executive Leadership**
The role of the executive leadership is to mediate between internal and institutional forces of inertia, which becomes especially important in periods of reorientation. The dominant responsibility for executive leadership is to exhibit symbolic behavior that serves as a compass for corporate culture and direct change activities. (Proposition 15). Tushman and Romanelli propose that only executive leadership can mediate between forces of convergence and forces of change and initiate a strategic reorientation. Inertial forces operate to maintain status quo and only executive leadership can initiate direct intervention, and these are most frequently initiated by outside successors, as supported by Keller and Aiken (2008) and their investigation of the superior impact of external consultants have on change management processes. Christensen (1953) and Grinyer and Spender (1979) found evidence indicating that executives tend not to initiate reorientations from within, but rather that major reorientations are realized only after the entrepreneur died and/or after the senior executives were replaced by outsiders.
E&O

A natural expansion on the subject of executive leadership is the introduction of the concept of Theory E and Theory O by Beer and Nohira (2000), which deal with the impact on performance. Their research culminated in a distinction of “hard” and “soft” approaches to change where the Theory E (hard) is based on economic value, top-down, focus on financial incentives, while Theory O (soft) is based on organizational capability, bottom up, focus on learning and experimenting where motivation comes from commitment. Isolated implementation of the respective theories has yielded sub-optimal results and Beer and Nohira propose that one way to manage the contradictory strategies is to sequence them, starting with Theory E. However, due to the time consuming and inherently unpredictable nature of managing change simultaneous use of E and O is more likely to be a source of sustainable competitive advantage, though more complicated than sequencing. This relates to the notion of ambidexterity described in the literature review, where a balance is sought between polarities that are equally attractive dependent on context (Birkinshaw et al., 2009). Although the study of change has primarily been focused on large and mature companies the concept of E and O also applies to entrepreneurial companies that experience rapid growth and turbulence.

Implications

A byproduct of seeking consistency and strategic alignment are webs of commitment and interdependency, both indicators of increased organizational complexity and structural and social rigidities. Increased levels of social and structural complexity indicates stronger interdependencies among activity systems, which promotes further convergence upon established strategic orientation and might serve as a resistor to radical change. As environments become more structured, institutional factors are a homogenizing and constraining force on organization-environment relations (Stichcombe, 1965). This tendency is grounded in the notion of mimetic isomorphism where legitimacy is obtained through alignment with other actors in a specific field, which ultimately promotes uniformity and consistency (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Commenting on size it is proposed that the larger the organization the more levels in hierarchy, the greater the use of formalized procedures that coordinate through formalized ritualized behavior, and not through feedback (Merton, 1968).
**Emergent Change**
Karl Weick presents a framework that emphasizes the importance of continuous change in his 2000 paper called “Emergent change as universal in organizations”. He claims that there is a general overestimation of the liabilities of inertia, the centrality of managerial planning and the promise of fresh starts. The inverse relationship is stated as an underestimation of the extent to which change is continuous, the ability of small experiences to travel and the value of sense making. Weick distinguishes types of change in their level of intention, where a central assumption is that planned change is triggered by the failure of creating continuously adaptive organizations. Weick predicts that a firm with superior performance demonstrates a dominance of emergent change over planned change. The effectiveness of either type of change is affected by how an organization views three elements; inertia, programmatic change and un-freezing.

**Planned change**
Planned change is infrequent and slow to see the results due to typically wide scopes with strategic content initiated deliberately by higher levels of the hierarchy. Advantages of planned change are that it affords a pretext that allows for a more informed choice among options for implementation and is more directional in its explicit mandate. Liabilities with planned change are high probability of relapse, potential large short-term losses, and ignorance in top management about the capabilities at the front line and lags in implementation.

**Emergent change**
Emergent change is ongoing and evolving based on recurrent interactions, which makes the change process cumulative and self-organizing. The nature of emergent change is recurrent and reciprocal variations in practice over time where new patterns of organizing are realized in the absence of explicit prior intentions (Orlikowsky, 1996). Advantages of emergent change are that it increases readiness for planned change, is sensitive to local contingencies, shorter feedback loops and is suitable for experimenting, learning and sense making. Limitations are slow accumulation, restricted impact and the unlikeness to cause a change of frame of reference, and being limited by preexisting culture and technology.
Assumptions of Inertia
The more a firm believes that the organization builds up inertial structures the greater its reliance on planned change, which ultimately might result in organizations not being able to change as rapidly as the environment. Viewing inertia as central one would claim that it requires transformational interventions in the form of planned change, which is a complex process. Habitual routines, complacency induced by success, top management who have been in place for too long and outdated technology are all aspects of an organization that might be sources of inertia. Interdependencies among the aforementioned aspects is what creates a solid structure whose direction is potentially inertial and tightened during periods of relative equilibrium at the expense of continuous adaptation. By viewing inertia as peripheral in the determination of change processes of organizing becomes more important than structures of organization; coordination is a dynamic process and a constant collective adjustment to internal and external forces through continuous updating. Together with Weick Orlikowski (1996) also belongs to this persuasion and describes ongoing adjustment as the essence of organizational change, and Nadler et al. (1995) describe these movements as incremental variations on the same theme.

Assumptions of programmatic change
The typical top-down, standardized, off-the-shelf solutions that are prominent in planned change have proven very limited positive bearing due to the failure to simultaneously impact three important drivers of change: coordination, commitment and competence (Beer, 1990). This is closely related to how Theory E managers make use of external consultants, which is at a much higher level than Theory O managers (Beer & Nohira, 2000), and are a direct critique to the traditionalists within change management.

Assumption of un-freezing
In Lewin’s notion of un-freezing lies the assumption that people are inherently resistant to change. However, if an organization focuses on emergent changes then it is already unfrozen. Interference with this ecology might disrupt a complex adaptive system that is already working. Ineffectiveness will not lie in inertial forces, but might be due to blockages that would reduce continuity (Weick, 2000).
**Sense-Making**

Based on the dismissal of the importance of inertia, programmatic change and un-freezing, Weick proposes the notion of sense making as the process through which an organization achieves acceptance for a desired change. This process is grounded in the psychological need to reestablish trust and comfort in the face of an unexpected change. The four concepts are:

1) Stay in motion; this activity animates people
2) Have a direction
3) Look closely and update often
4) Converse candidly through facilitated respectful interaction

These four behaviors are increasingly activated in emergent change than in planned change under the assumption that increased activation implies superior efficiency in the change process. Ambiguities increase when intervention inhibits animation, direction attention and dialogue, which result in a slower rate of change because people will be distracted by their efforts to reduce ambiguity. All four activities are crucial for adaptation, learning and change in a turbulent world, but they are also likely to be curbed severely in a hierarchical commando-and-control system. By taking emergent change more seriously and focusing less on the importance of inertia there will be a broader range of options for change than those associated with planned change.
**Discussion**

The choice of PE and EC over other theories from organizational behavior and change management comes from their ability to incorporate both internal and external elements that influence change cultures. PE talks about executive management, tenure, turbulence and culture as central internal aspects, and the notion of sense making from EC also primarily refers to internal processes. Both theories present the inability of adapting to external forces as the source of inertia and competitive disadvantage, where PE suggest new dominant designs through product class evolution and/or major social or legal changes as examples of affective externalities. This is an important dimension to the compatibility of the two theories. EC is primarily focused on internal processes and how organizations react to change when critiquing programmatic change initiatives and un-freezing, while PE includes more specific external elements to give a broader base of analysis. This gives rise to a rich fundament to base the investigation on, and allows for the researcher to include the impact of market structure and institutional forces in the analysis. This would not have been possible if only EC was applied, and the internal signifiers of change cultures would not have been obtainable in the same detail applying only PE. This provides some legitimacy for the compatibility of the two theories.

There are several conceptual similarities between PE and EC. They agree on the drivers and motivators for reorientation and planned change, and they agree on the scale and pace of change in convergent ant emergent change. They differ, however, in what type of change is predictive of superior performance. PE predicts convergent periods as outperforming reorientations in effectiveness, while EC emphasizes emergent change as being more effective than planned and programmatic change. Planned change can conceptually be both convergent and reorienting; though in its disruptive temperament it is more natural to couple the term with periods of reorientation. Emergent change is more closely aligned with convergent periods, though can be scaled up in intensity to be seen as turbulent convergent periods. If this was to happen, then over time the discomfort of disruptive change, however planned or emergent, will be gradually reduced if the organization is sufficiently activated through sense making processes according to Weick. This can be seen as an optimal outcome for a firm facing rapid market fluctuations. PE demonstrates awareness of how change processes are affected by industry specific features: *Proposition 13: The greater the rate-of-change in environmental conditions, the greater the frequency of*
reorientation. This correlation is illustrated in figure 7, and provides some validation of applying this theoretical framework onto cases from the creative industries.

Another major distinction between PE and EC is how they view inertia. PE views organizations as structured with relatively high reliance on executive management to facilitate change processes. Underlying this is also an appreciation of bureaucracy and hierarchical structures. Inertia is regarded as a central aspect of organizational efficiency and this notion is positively associated with corporate culture. PE sees change as a negative disruptive act that forces an organization out of a convergent period and into a short period of high turbulence that will in turn gravitate towards a new convergent period of stability. This supports the attractiveness of positive inertia that provides stability, comfort of predictability through repetition and is adversely disrupted by change.

EC sees organizations as self-emerging systems where sense-making individuals, independent of status, are the change agents. EC regards inertia as peripheral and where dominance of emergent change is positively associated with superior levels of adaptability. EC dictates that adaptive organizations are in a constant state of disequilibrium and defines change as continuous, organic and cumulative. Weick (2000) claims that the greater reliance on inertial structures (as indicated by resilient cultures) strengthens an organization’s reliance on planned, disruptive and injected change rather than emergent change. According to Weick
change starts with failures to adapt and that change never starts because it never stops, which is in the same line of thought as Lamarck’s concept of adaptation from the field of evolutionary studies (Weick & Quinn, 1999).

Weick argues against the traditional assumptions of external implementation of change by seeing change as a flow rather than a static image, claiming that standardized change programs do not sufficiently activate the organization, where insufficient activation produces a barrier to change due to the discomfort of not fully grasping the change in question. When revisiting the industry specific features of the research objects and paralleling them with the distinctions between PE and EC there is some indication of increased likelihood of a firm within the creative industries to have relatively higher levels of emergent change than planned change. This is supported by the following criticism: “The elaborate system of stable, mutual dependencies that Romanelli and Tushman describe is less characteristic of network organizations with their chronically salient large set of alternative partners” (Weick & Quinn, 1999).

On an organizational level Weick criticizes group thinking and lack of individual evaluation when he claims that: “habit becomes the substitute of thought”, and argues that it is through active thought that cognitive dissonance is reduced and sense-making is obtainable. As comfort seeking habitual beings individuals attempt to reduce uncertainty and increase levels of predictability and control in work settings (Crozier, 1964). Weick propose that joint decision-making through socialization cultivates a positive sense of community and shared commitments, and the beliefs upon which these routines are based on justify previous actions and are accentuated over time.

Western management academics construe organizational change as a problem to be managed, a predisposition that remains endemic in the literature of organizational change (Chia, 1999). However, paradoxes are normal in nature, which conflicts with the dominant western idea of change where prescriptive, cause-and-effect, standardized models with high predictive power are preferred to those models that deals with high ambiguity, uncertainty and complexity (Stacey, 2003). Planning and control systems are social defense mechanisms to reduce anxiety and are determined by the success or failure to cope with needs for discomfort avoidance in the face of weak culture, and PE and EC represents two opposing ways of dealing
with change (Schein, 1992). Table 5 summarizes the differentiating elements of PE and EC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Punctuated Equilibrium</strong>((...planned, episodic, programmatic))</th>
<th><strong>Emergent Change</strong>((...evolutionary, continuous, organic))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizations are inertial</td>
<td>Organizations are emergent and self-organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change is infrequent and discontinuous</td>
<td>Change is constant, evolving and cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change is driven by failure to adapt to changing environments</td>
<td>Change is driven by an inherent organizational instability and daily contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong culture = stable, predictable, comfortable</td>
<td>Strong culture = constraining, a potential liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change is Lewinian (linear, goal seeking, outside intervention)</td>
<td>Change is Confucian (cyclical, processional, eternal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change agent is the executive management</td>
<td>Change agent is the sense maker who redirects change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Change&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Changing&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 (Tushman & Romanelli, 1985; Weick, 2000; Weick & Quinn, 1999)

It has been established that PE sees inertia as central, periods of reorientation as disruptive and convergence as preferred to optimize efficiency. EC sees inertia as peripheral and associates optimal efficiency with dominance of emergent change contrary to planned change. The discrepancies and similarities of the theoretical framework have now been presented in order to set the context in which the analysis will take place.

**ANALYSIS**

The analysis is divided into two parts where the first presents the findings and the second section will introduce a broader discussion where elements from the findings will be synthesized and debated.

**FINDINGS**

This section offers an analysis of the factors that are shaping of a firm’s change culture and will be discussed according to the PE and EC theory to demonstrate empirical parallels the two cases share with existing literature. Firstly, the change
culture in general will be investigated to give an insight to the impact initiates changes has had on the respective firms. Secondly, distinct elements in particular will be presented as composing parts of that general change culture. Categories include workflow, nature of the products, organizational dynamics, executive management, turbulence and structure. Executive management and turbulence are categories derived directly from PE theory, while the remaining are derived indirectly from the two theoretical texts and the literature review based on relevance for the objective of identifying defining aspects of change cultures. Additionally, they are seen as indicative of the notion of inertia, which is relevant for both EC and PE, and will be useful in the subsequent discussion. A review of the vocabulary of change is appropriate to maintain consistency in the application of terms. This is to establish clarity when different terminologies are applied, seeing that several of the terms will be utilized in order to provide variety and create a situational fit to the observations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change processes</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incremental</td>
<td>Radical change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First order</td>
<td>Second order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent</td>
<td>Reorientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fundamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Episodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>Programmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the analysis is commenced by a revisit of the central change processes that both firms endured after the new manager was effective:

- Downsizing
- Negative numbers
- Cost cutting
- Re-branding/Re-positioning
- Eliminating figurehead
- Elimination of negative aspects of old culture
Change Culture
This section will feature stories about the experiences with change and the realized outcomes of these processes.

Ever since JH reopened in June 2012 there has been focus on disentangling the problems that caused poor performance. The goal was to reduce redundancy in order to improve efficiency and effectiveness, both in manpower and in the new physical house, and to establish a professional structure. Nielsen summarizes this process: “We went from chaos to structured chaos. A venue needs chaos”. He elaborates on this thought when stating: “You need to be able to say: “This system is perfect” and change it completely the next day”. The system he is referring to is time is spent on developing during planning and preparations in between events to ensure a smooth execution. The goal is to develop a system with some predictive power to reduce unwanted instability.

Another important part of this system is cost cutting. No one person had previously been in charge of productions, which led to suboptimal and expensive solutions. Nielsen’s main priority is to create a system and structure that reduces unnecessary expenses, which will ultimately promote professionalism. “We are asking our self: How can we be mobile enough to embrace everything?” (Nielsen, 2013)”. Nielsen articulates a central ambition of JH, which is to be a capable house that will not have to compromise artistic quality due to technical insufficiencies. Also of importance is the pace at which this question is being asked. Nielsen explains this process as iterative and continuous evaluation and improvement. “Changes are not reduced in size but they are more structured”, Nielsen explains to illustrate the achieved benefits of this improvement.

Steffensen explains the iterative and tacit nature of the change culture at JH: “It is rare that we sit down and are told: “Now this is going to change”. Mostly change is left out of protocol, a lot of small things, undefined things that are not verbalized or articulated but just happens automatically”. This is a strong indicator of change processes being emergent rather than planned, where the change agent is the person who identifies the potential for improvement, assumes responsibility himself to carry out that improvement without being activated or directed by a manager. An adverse outcome of ongoing change processes that are primarily tacit and unrecorded is that accountability is sometimes left unclear, as stated by Steffensen: “It is all right
to make changes, but most changes at JH have been unarticulated and I have not known what messages I should relate to”.

A dominant focus area for DAP has been creating an efficient organization with a healthy organizational culture. The previous manager had left the organization in a very fragile psychological state of anxiety, paranoia and protective anti-social behavior. Navalad illustrates some of the consequences this critical work condition led to: “The informal exchange stopped because you never knew the consequences”. As a result of the organizational disarray, members felt feeling unsafe and interaction decreased due to the fear of negative reactions. This can be seen as an inertial force in a convergent period, seeing that this period was leading up to a period of reorientation. This breaks ¾ of Weick’s requirements of sense making by there being lack of frequent updating through reduced interaction, activation and motion and respectful conversations, which substantiates the indication of negative culture as an inertial force.

Wall-Gremstrup made some transformations that left “no more arbitrary work” (Bjerring, 2013), which was a distinct difference from the previous management who had not been in control of business processes and had acted as an emotionally unpredictable leader. The subtle coordination of responsibility is further explained by Bjerring: “There is a strong informal clarity about what people do through what people are used to do, in tacit knowledge”. As a comment on both size and autonomy Arpe from the administration stated: “We all have management titles, but there is really not much to manage other than yourself”. In a conversation about autonomy Navalad, the proofreader from the editorial team, said there are two layers of autonomy: one that is dictated by Wall-Gremstrup and another that is dictated by the editors, illustrating the increased reliance on hierarchy that comes from a departmental structure. Navalad identifies tension between authority and autonomy and explains the weakness of the empowerment when stating: “It is like dad would say to the older sister: Take good care of your younger sister”.

“I think we have become more effective, because there were many more employees under him” (Arpe, 2013). This indicates the realized gains of the drastic downsizing going from a team of 25 to 15 during Wall-Gremstrup’s first two years. The lay-offs were one out of several drastic cut-backs that Wall-Gremstrup initiated during her first stages of constituency and her decisions were not always welcomed positively: “The reactions were visible and expressive. There was openly negative
talk about her” (Arpe, 2013). Together with many other initiated changes DAP has now reached a point that is more accepting of the new management style: “Their reactions are less intense than before after having been exposed to change so rapidly. They will be emotional to begin with but the feeling is shorter and less intense” (Wall-Gremstrup, 2013). Commenting on adjustment to both internal and external fluctuations Bjerring states: “There was a very turbulent phase where we did not know what to expect about the future, but now we’re in a more stable phase “.

JH demonstrates a change culture that is iterative and responsive where the change agents are the people in charge of a specific responsibility. DAP experience layers of autonomy within the hierarchical levels, though with limited interaction and high interdependence between them seeing that they are reliant on intervention either from Wall-Gremstrup or from the editors to make changes. The impact of change has been reduced in both firms to a point where both firms have reached increased stability compared to prior states.

**Firm Specific Workflow**

*We are not a festival so we have a continuous flow. (Nielsen, 2013)*

The workflow at JH has been intense from the opening and through deliberate attempts to create structure and professionalism in the house the internal workflow has become more even. This is due to reduction of noise and cacophony through layoffs; the improved overview the house based on an ongoing investigation of its resources and capabilities; less adhocracy because of improved clarity about responsibilities and thus accountability; establishment of a new organizational culture shared among the new members; open and shared work space where people are simultaneously present from 10am; improved coordination of tasks; and a collectively shared responsibility to facilitate events independent of organizational status.

*It went from being a circus to being a place to work. (Svendsen, 2013)*

Little activation is needed for tasks to be initiated and/or finalized and the realized gains of this progress is stated by Steffensen: “More areas of responsibility have been defined and that makes it easier to work together, which makes it easier to know when
we are collaborating”. Ten months a year JH is a traditional music venue that showcases concerts Thursday through Saturday, while two months a year the space is utilized as a part of festivals (i.e. Copenhagen Jazz Festival, Vinter Jazz). Thus the stability that comes with professionalism is primarily applied to the majority of the work year. However, when illustrating workflow it is the dominant condition of JH that is used as a point of reference. This seasonality causes workflow to be varied on an organizational level during the year and the different responsibilities also vary workflow on the individual level. As soon as Svendsen makes a booking he communicates this to Nielsen who deals with all technical and logistical details with preparation and facilitation, and Steffensen prepares a press release for that booking. This creates different work intensities at different times due to the relationally interdependence among the responsibilities (See figure 8).
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Although JH strive for stability in the natural workflow it is already stated that as long as every event is unique there is an inherent need for responsiveness and some level of flux. Working with artists there are a lot of unforeseen challenges that needs to be dealt with, especially during concert facilitation. Steffensen articulates some of the challenges associated with this issue: “We are often given urgent problems to solve that leaves little time to focus on innovation”. An example of ad-hoc problem solving was being approached by an artist wanting to screen a movie before his concert, a
request that JH was initially unequipped to realize. However, as a facilitator JH tries to meet the needs of their artists and some days later the upper stage had a projector installed in the ceiling, also enabling the room to expand its area of usage.

The natural workflow at DAP is fairly predictable in three stages; finding content for the next issue, preparing and coordinating content collection, and finally content production and editing. Peak times will vary individually according to areas of responsibility, where Kieding (the editor) will be focused on finding content for the next issue while the current issue is in production, Bjerring will be assisting Kieding in his ideas and following up his initiatives with the necessary coordination and as soon as content is gathered, while Navald proofreads all articles before print. A final edit is done collectively reviewing the layout, graphics, written articles, photos and the ads. Navald summarizes the process like this: “There is a monthly rhythm where one week is meditative, two weeks of creative and one week that is productive”, as is illustrated in Figure 9.

![Intensity](Image)

Figure 9

Figure 10 illustrates how JH’s product life cycles are shorter and more frequent with approximately three events per week, while DAP issues Arkitekten once a month:
Nature of the Product(s)

Every event is unique (Nielsen, 2013)

This describes the unpredictability that lies in concert facilitation where on the artist’s end there will be special needs to fulfill, technical requirements, rider specificities, tights schedules, etc. On the event execution’s end the audience will be different every time depending on the booking and as an extension of that there will be fluctuations in consumer patterns (i.e. traditional jazz will sell more red wine and increase the need for comfortable seating, while noise-jazz will sell more beer and demand space in front of the stage to interact with the music), the set of volunteers will vary from event to event, the number of tickets sold depends on marketing and competing events and unforeseeable incidents in the house might complicate an event. This demonstrates how JH is a two-sided market and how they face uncertainty from both ends. An event at JH is in other words comprised of many uncontrollable elements across the scale particularly due to the fact that the experiential product is human centered.

DAP share that same sense of uniqueness in that no issue of the magazine is ever the same, an obvious requirement for an academically grounded publication whose mission is to promote advancement through critical dissemination and accentuate trends within the field of architecture. Each issue will have different ads, new content, customized graphics, diverse freelance writers and relevant works on
display. The uncertainty lies mostly in funding, seeing that ads are their primary source of income and is renegotiated on a regular basis, leaving DAP in a volatile financial position. The interdependency between the editors and the administration is evident in that without ads there is no magazine, and vice-versa.

Since Wall-Gremstrup took over DAP has gone from producing 10 books per year to 1 or 2 per year. This is due to declining demand, high production cost both with regards to time and complexity. Book publishing required involvement of external editors and contributors at a much higher scale than what is needed to publish magazines, and a downscaling of this business unit was a deliberate strategic move by Wall-Gremstrup to improve the financial position of DAP. Kieding explains how this affects the office: “Because we have fewer books the workflow is more continuous and rhythmic”.

Both JH and DAP fulfills the requirements of belonging to the creative industries by dealing with unique and experiential products. The events at JH are relatively more complex due to the personal involvement of the audience, where the magazine is a relatively more controlled product that the audiences passively and personally consume.

**Organizational Dynamics**
An important part of the organizational dynamics at JH is the collectively shared responsibility of concert facilitation. Despite the individual members of staff have respective areas of responsibility they all contribute to make sure every event has a manager and go-to person who is held accountable. This encourages a high level of interaction among the staff through knowledge sharing and alignment of expectations, which ultimately increases collective commitment. Another unifying factor is that Svendsen will not be quoted in the media to ensure that whenever there is public coverage of JH attention will be shared on the brand Jazz House, not the personification of the house. This is a major change from the old structure, where the charismatic host (also the booker) was the personal embodiment of the house and represented JH as the figurehead. By rejecting this personified representation and redefining JH to be a collective rather than individual task, individuals feel empowered through even and joint distribution of responsibility and this provides an important sense of commitment. “I think it has been beneficial for the team spirit that
now it’s Team Jazz House and not Lennart and his invisible helpers” (Nielsen, 2013). Shared responsibility of the core activity of JH unifies the team and facilitates continuous interaction, which fosters natural sense making and is an indicator of emergent change where little activation is needed.

Similarly DAP has reoriented their image outward by instilling new top management in Wall-Gremstrup. This was an important shift away from the influential media person the previous manager had been, in the analogous figurehead role as the booker at JH. Kieding explains how the previous manager regarded himself as essential, though his dismissal had a limited impact on the operations of DAP: “He had this idea of him being indispensable for the organization, but he wasn’t. He imagined that it was him alone who had built the organization and who knew it all, but the day he left the operations still went on as if nothing had changed”. As social perks were eliminated this too changed the organizational dynamics. Perks such as communal breakfasts and Friday lunches created a social environment where informal interaction was facilitated. However enabling of increased activation, Wall-Gremstrup saw it as a necessary sacrifice and strategic choice in an attempt to change a culture that was taking these privileges for granted without knowing how costly they were for the firm in monetary terms.

**Common Denominator**
At DAP you have a team with matching academic backgrounds. As previously stated Wall-Gremstrup is the first CEO without a degree in architecture nor does she have previous experience working with architecture. This presented a challenge, both being disruptive in the mindset of architecture in general and in the mindset of DAP in particular. “You are supreme because you have some kind of ambition, or vision, or opinion and a wish to leave a mark and have influence” (Kieding, 2013). This notion is potentially excluding other disciplines to partake in the discussion about architecture, creating a conflict of interest between the departments and in relation to the new CEO (Kimmelman, 2003).

*You cannot communicate academically well about architecture if you don’t have a background in architecture.*
(Kieding, 2013)
However, both conservative and more relaxed interpretations of this notion are recorded at DAP. When discussing the relationship between architecture and dissemination Kieding states: “I don’t think you can do both simultaneously”, while Bjerring presents a more humble approach to working with the magazine: “We are architects who write on behalf of other architects and we believe arrogantly that we do that job better than journalists writing about architecture. In my place there could have been a journalist” (Bjerring, 2013). Kieding and Bjerring work closely together and the discrepancy on this topic can be accredited to difference in personalities, age and experience, however still agreeing that there is a certain ego associated with the architect role. This point illustrates that there is an articulate awareness of and acknowledgement of the importance in an architectural background, which ultimately produce a fairly homogenous team. According to Weick this increases the risk for DAP to experience group thinking that will inhibit critical thought that comes from diverse backgrounds. However, it may have a positive impact on sense making, seeing that within the editorial teams the objectives are aligned and directed. The tension that comes from the difficult balance between the editorial teams and the administrators reduces the effectiveness of sense making due to their lack of communication and interaction.

While the common denominator at DAP is formal architectural education the common denominator at JH is a passion for music and work experience within that field. All staff members at JH have either worked at another music venue or music festival or been a performing artist at one point. JH is seen as having higher organizational diversity in that their backgrounds are so diverse and academically independent of one another, despite DAP’s staff having more variation in age and areas of responsibility. These are strong determinants of organizational culture, where DAP has a relatively formal social culture and JH has a relatively relaxed and informal social culture. Employees at both firms share a passion for the arts, which are the central attraction to the creative industries, though staff members at DAP formalize this passion through extensive education. Both firms have fairly explicit common denominators, which forms the basis for commitment, though JH allows for more variety than DAP.

However, DAP’s academic orientation is predominantly a signifier of conflict of interest that exists between the different objectives of the departments. JH does not
have this problem when they only have one department. This can either contribute as a stabilizer in convergent periods according to PE, or be seen as an indicator of social and structural rigidities when the formality academics provide is put in context with departmental structure.

**Executive management**

*I am supposed to make it fun for people to come to work and make sure that they can do what they do best, and can in turn have as many good experiences of working at JH as possible.* (Svendsen, 2013)

The management philosophy at JH is highly intuitive, informal and inclusive. When being asked what kind of manager he is Svendsen said: “*It is a difficult question because I don’t really think too much about how I am as a leader*”. This illustrates how instinctively Svendsen runs JH where there is not a planned approach to dealing with management. When explaining what he bases his management style on he states: “*To me it is more about humanity*”. The style of the office space is lowbrow, casual, and highly personal in that there is space for the staff to freely unfold. “*It is informal enough that some people will find it noisy, and difficult to work for a manager who interferes as little as I do, but I just cannot be that kind of manager*” (Svendsen, 2013). This point illustrates how the culture is shaped by the behaviors in the organization and how Svendsen applies a spacious management strategy as a reflection of his personality. Svendsen’s approach to hiring is: “*I employ people who I think are more capable to do their tasks than I am*”, and commenting: “*I am an 83% worse production manager than Klaus is*”. This view implies humility and a deliberate interdependence among the staff members, where each person brings something unique to the team.

There have been instances where Svendsen’s management principles have been challenged, e.g. when the constituent CEO asked JH to cover the cost for a seminar he wanted to attend. Svendsen declined his request arguing that everyone should have equal access to resources and exploiting his managerial position was unacceptable. Svendsen feared that this could send an image that could potentially reduce solidarity and loyalty from the staff. “*You have to walk the talk*” (Svendsen, 2013). This illustrates how Svendsen strives for full transparency, democratic ruling
and fair distribution of resources. This anecdote illustrates how Svendsen is aware of the symbolic value and behavioral determinant of executive leadership has as a defining factor of corporate culture. This is an attempt to create aligned perceptions of what desired values is to strive for a suitable strategic orientation, which is one of the main tasks of management according to PE. Despite the flat structure Svendsen is still acknowledged as the manager, and exercises this power with subtlety yet effective execution. This becomes increasingly important in such an intimate team.

My philosophy as a leader is to push the leaves away from the ground to have the seeds grow. (Wall-Gremstrup, 2013)

Being both an educated and experienced CEO Wall-Gremstrup brings a relatively formal management style to DAP. With a degree in Organizational Psychology and in Economics she has learned the traits and vocabulary she is formally equipped to making the turnaround that DAP needed. Wall-Gremstrups management style is analytical, relatively formal and stern. In explaining her objectives as a CEO she states: “I manage operations, growth, development and transformation of the organization in relation to the external demands and internal ambitions”. This articulation demonstrates her corporate jargon as a direct product of her academic background. Wall-Gremstrup explains her management style as strict yet considerate, and Bjerring confirms this relatively high level of direction: “Not lassiez-faire, Wall-Gremstrup is in control of things” (Bjerring, 2013). This is an indicator of strong reliance on executive management to initiate change and exercise control, which would allocate DAP closer to PE than EC. Wall-Gremstrup is highly deliberate in striking a balance between soft (Theory O) and hard (Theory E) management styles, which is apparent when she states: “You risk becoming either sadistic or too weak” (Wall-Gremstrup, 2013), where she clearly acknowledges the benefits of both management styles.

**Empowerment**

With a clearly elevated status within the organization Wall-Gremstrup is seen as a: “connector who should have the overview but not interfere at detail level” (Bjerring, 2013), which sheds some light on the empowerment the editorial teams experience from her lack of academic insight in the field of architecture. The change in leader
style also affected how the work was carried out: “There are increased levels of self-management today. We are working under so much pressure that there is little explicit coordination and in its place is this mysterious autonomy” (Kieding, 2013).

This indicates an empowerment of the individuals, especially in the creative teams, where the previous manager would be more intrusive and corrective. By going from having a manager as a practitioner to manager as a non-practitioner for the first time DAP’s editors experience increased empowerment. This indicates that lack of academic grounding within the field of architecture is an important determinant for the autonomy at DAP under the new manager. Navald, expresses an appreciation of the specialist insight of the previous manager when he talks about expectations, and skepticism, towards the current management: “When you have that overview you can fly over the water, but you need also be able to dive down deep once in a while and ask critical questions, but that requires she knows what’s down there”.

Organizational Turbulence

The crisis situation Svendsen entered a year ago has gradually been reduced and he explains the consistent high levels of flux: “Ever since I’ve been with JH it has been one long change process” (Svendsen, 2013). Nielsen, who had experience working with team members from the old structure illustrates how this high pace of change was a constant even before either of them came to JH: “The people who used to work here would complain just as much over there being no coffee left as over new top management”. In other words, the impact of large-scale change was drowned out by the noise created by consistent high levels of incremental change, which ultimately served as an act of divergence. This was also evident in the reactions to the lay-offs that were executed during Svendsen’s first year.

When describing the reactions to when Trine, a member of the old structure who welcomed the new vision but was unable to adjust according to the new structure, was fired, Svendsen states: “The strange thing was, and I’ve thought about this a lot as an example of how misaligned the house was, that people were indifferent when I fired her”. The same goes for when Rekyl was fired, who was a party fixer and DJ strongly oriented towards the nightclub scene in Copenhagen. He had difficulties working in a structured and organized environment, brought his dog to the office and frequently focused on non-JH-related projects while in the office. Svendsen
explains how the staff reacted to these events: “(the people being fired) only created stop-blocks and noise, so it was very unsentimental for the organization when they left”. This is aligned with Weick’s comment on un-freezing, stating that activated organizations are ineffective when blockages hinder continuity, rather than traditional inertial factors. This can be partially explained by high levels of sense making at JH, in that everyone was informed and accepted the initiatives. Additionally, it can be explained by individuals working in the creative industries experience high mobility in the labor market, and people typically have engagements in several projects simultaneously, and are in turn able to shift attention to other opportunities fairly quickly.

When talking about scale and pace of change Svendsen states: “The consequence of a realized change is large, but getting there takes a lot of small steps. In that sense changes have a character of adjustments and refinement, small things”. This is using May 2013 as point of reference at which point many of the radical changes have already been sustained and the comment is on how JH deals with change in their everyday life. This indicates a shift from frequent reorientations to convergent periods with moderate levels of turbulence. Emotional indifference to radical structural changes and an acceptance for high levels of turbulence indicates that JH has been in a constant state of reorientation, which translates into an increased readiness for change according to Tushman and Romanelli. Additionally this gives rise to the liability of corporate culture in the form of old staff members representing inertial force that hindered radical change through over-embeddedness, which Weick would propose as social liability and thus a limitation on productivity.

Uncertainty has been a companion this whole time where most aspects of that process have been out of our hands. (Kieding, 2013)

In dealing with restructuring, cost cutting, reduction of books published, lay-offs, redefinition of the media platform and format and new style of top management DAP has undergone a major transformation. Navald explained the discomfort that followed these events, particularly emphasizing the downsizing, where he stresses the frustration associated with uncertainty: “We were not served with a plan that predicted this would happen”. Additionally, the financial crisis in 2008 posed a significant threat to DAP’s survival, seeing that they are completely dependent on
revenue created by selling ads. When willingness to invest in such marketing drastically declined so did the probability of DAP’s continuation. This was also grounded in the competition from digital advertisement where ROI would be higher, initial investment lower and scale of audience is larger (McColl et al., 2010).

In mediating between the departments and negotiating with third parties Wall-Gremstrup sits on a lot of sensitive information about the future of the company, and is personally accountable for the strategic choices that are being made. This requires some information to be undisclosed to the staff in order to maintain stability: “There a lot of things I can’t tell them” (Wall-Gremstrup, 2013). This limits transparency, a necessary cost of an organization with increased complexity and in a financially vulnerable situation. The discomfort that occurred in DAP in the face of these events is a direct consequence of the lack of transparency that comes with a hierarchical structure. This suggests that DAP is relatively dependent on planned change initiated by executive management. The fact that the staff members experienced it as surprising might indicate DAP’s structure as an inertial force, despite how deliberate these initiatives may have been from the management’s point of view.

Both firms indicate that consistent high levels of turbulence reduced the emotional impact of that turbulence over time due to the predictability of those high levels of uncertainty. What was initially experienced as a shock, and thus caused strong emotional reactions, were translated into a higher expectancy and thus acceptance of that turbulence, and in turn created a more embracive organization by demonstrating an improvement of its emotional capability (Huy, 2000). This can be illustrated as one long period of reorientations where intensity of the impact of change was gradually reduced over time. This is aligned with Tushman and Romanelli’s claim that high levels of turbulence will reduce resistance to change, though JH shows relatively less resistance to change due to an activated organization. Weick would interpret this as especially beneficial for DAP, seeing that it might foster a culture that is embracive of constant organizational instability.

**Turbulence and Motivation**

Wall-Gremstrup proposes that this uncertainty is a central element for maintaining motivation in creative organizations: “There needs to be resistance. If everyone were happy, there is no drive. Creative people are motivated by curiosity and the unresolved”. As every issue is unique there is an inherent attraction in the editorial
teams to creating something new with their skillset. When discussing stability and turbulence Kieding explains how much turbulence is necessary to keep him interested and how that relates to his personal motivation: “20% is too dull, then I wouldn’t be here”. This gives some substance to the definition of creative individuals as divergent thinkers who have an entrepreneurial spirit in that they are attracted by the challenge of creating something novel and are not put off by the risk that comes with it (Caves, 2000; Bilton, 2007). On a personal and professional level these are accepted aspects of work life, and as Kieding states: “Architects are educated, if finances are going well, to work with uncertainty”.

Nielsen describes autonomy and freedom in designing his own work to be one of the major attractions for him to be working at JH: “I am inventing it myself”. Prior to his employment there has never been one person in charge of productions, which leaves him with the ultimate opportunity to fill that role with whatever he sees as appropriate and necessary. With this lies uncertainty in that quality criteria are set continuously and personally, however drawing inspiration from how other music venues organize their staff as an example of mimetic isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). Another aspect of motivation comes from the joy of developing and implementing new ideas: “Thankfully no event is the same, even though you would want that on the days you are tired, but it really develops the house and we do it together with artist, which makes it fun because they will leave and say I’m a part of JH now, and that means a lot to us” (Nielsen, 2013)

**Emotional Capability**

DAP went through a drastic overhaul when Wall-Gremstrup started and coming from an optimizing point of view her challenge was to strike a balance between being financially sustainable while not compromising the quality of creative and academic work. “We were losing money on each issue and I think that was the largest change. Then there was the optimizing, downsizing and reorientation of how we work” (Wall-Gremstrup, 2013). Though, when revisiting the story about how the previous manager overestimated his importance to the firm, we see that DAP have some interesting self-organizing qualities that allowed the magazine to maintain its frequency and quality, despite the absence of the manager. This illustrates the power of the operational machinery that comes with years of experience, where the system becomes self-reliant and self-sufficient in its operations. This demonstrates how DAP has the
capacity and ability to be self-organizing based on the cumulative experience that is shared in the collective memory of the firm. This ability indicates high levels of sense making, absorptive capacity and emotional capability (Cohen & Levintal, 1990). Kieding comments on the shift from the previous manager to Wall-Gremstrup: “We have the same structure as before”, which suggests that the changes have affected more so how the work is being carried out and not so much how the firm is structured, which also signifies low levels of innovation but high levels of variation through reorientations.

JH demonstrates high levels of emotional capability in that all members of staff is new and contributes collectively to design the quality criteria of the venue without having to endure resistance from the previous organizational culture.

**Structure**
With its 4 full time employees JH has a structure of a project coordinator organized in a flat hierarchical structure where specialized skillsets are tightly coupled in a small structure (see Figure 2), where the daily manager, production manager, PR manager and accountant work closely together. The main advantage of this structure is the transparency that follows such an intimate organization. Associated benefits are the increased efficiency that comes from close communication, which in turn leads to knowledge spillover effects. The small size allows for high levels of autonomy and the individuals in the team are empowered and self-organizing. Frequent interaction creates an activated organization that updates often, a necessity based on the shared responsibility of event facilitation, and provides a collective direction, fulfilling Weick’s requirements for sense making. The restraints of being a small project coordinator are JH’s limited capacity and resources, where bounded rationality might inhibit JH in making the best possible decisions. JH’s small size makes it highly dependent on external networks, i.e. utilizing volunteers for peripheral activities such as bar and service personnel, which can be especially complicated during large-scale productions.
DAP with its 15 people on permanent staff is designed as a system house in a three-level hierarchical structure. This ensures a clear sender of strategic change initiatives, highly specialized teams that are predominantly homogenous in their respective departments. The hierarchal structure offers obvious accountability by editors having the last word on the publications. The editorial teams are fairly autonomous in their operations but rely strongly on strategic direction being provided from the CEO, though dealing more with business strategy than interfering with the operations and the creative process. The system house consists of several skill containers that are bundled according to specialty, e.g. the graphic designers interact mainly with the other graphic designers, etc.

The challenge in balancing these departments is that due to their different objectives, yet strong interdependence, there exists a conflict of interest between them, as stated by Navald: “*There been some sense of devaluation of the ad-department because it comes from* the dirty world”. This illustrates another liability of having a departmental structure with little interaction between them. According to Weick’s sense-making model DAP is losing yield due to the lack of activation between the departments. The infrequent interaction has them forego the opportunity to establish an aligned direction, and thus causes blockage in the corporate culture, having adverse effects to productivity and effectiveness.

Hierarchical levels indicate increased social complexity, which in turn dictates higher coordination cost for communication and logistics. DAP is in other words
relatively less activated than JH where the departments evolve independent cultures based on their respective work objectives and where change is seen as a disruptive act initiated by the CEO.

**DISCUSSION**
This section will integrate the elements from the findings and discuss the implications they have on change culture. Firstly, the observed elements of change cultures will be evaluated according to the notion of inertia. By comparing the findings a tentative score will be given to indicate which of the firms is more inertial. The objective for this section is to map out the differences in order to understand how they affect the change cultures of JH and DAP. The outcome will be synthesized in a figure that illustrates the causal relations of structural factors. Secondly, there will be established a theoretical fit between the empirical data and the chosen theoretical framework, in order to establish how the change cultures at JH and DAP relate to PE and EC. As size is regarded as a critical differentiating factor between the two firms a discussion about the impact and definition of change is presented. Fourthly, a discussion about how JH and DAP articulate change processes will be offered as a comment on their level of self-reflexivity.

**Inertial Factors**
Several factors have been discussed and analyzed with regards to how they affect change processes at JH and DAP. The theoretical frameworks applied in this project differ in their take on the notion of inertia and whether that state is seen as central or peripheral. A systematic comparison of the aforementioned aspects of change will be presented in order to indicate which of the firms is more inertial.

Academics serves as the major common denominator for DAP and is seen as a precondition to work with architectural dissemination. Homogenized social environments like this are likely to create a culture of group thinking and the lack of criticism that comes from broad consensus of rules and norms serves as a potential inertial force (Weick, 2000). Large group settings typically induce stereotyping, decreased ownership of ideas, increased abstraction and reduced willingness to express unique thoughts (Weick & Quinn, 1999). The staff at JH is educationally diverse and the common denominator is personal experience with and thus passion for music, which provides high levels of personal diversity but low levels of
organizational diversity due to the non-departmental structure. This implies that homogenous teams serves as an inertial force that is relatively stronger at DAP than at JH, primarily due to the conflict of interest this creates between departments at DAP. Both new managers overtook organizations in chaotic states where a strong contributing factor was the prior management’s inability to establish a sustainable strategic orientation, which caused both organizations to lose money. Consistent poor performance is, according to Tushman and Romanelli, seen as a sign of inertia, which only can be medicated through direct and radical interaction from executive management. This was the case for both organizations, which indicates similar levels of inertia caused by prior executive management. DAP’s three-level hierarchical structure caused negative tension between the administration and the editorial teams, increased coordination cost and internal power struggles contrary to JH with its high levels of transparency. DAP’s departmental and JH’s flat structure are products of the firm size where it would be unnatural to bundle skills differently, as modeled by similar industry actors. This indicates size and thus structure as increasingly inertial at DAP relative to JH. With this follows a natural acknowledgment of top management as an authority where strategic decision making lies, where DAP is more dependent on executive management to exercise strategic control than JH. Increased size also indicates increased dependence on corporate culture that dictates the social norms and a blueprint for desirable behavior. This is evident at DAP where most members of staff are long tenured, staff who worked with the previous manager, contrary to JH that consists of 100% new members. Both firms exercise a strong tolerance for turbulence; both in the nature of their conceptual belonging to the creative industries but also by having endured consistent confrontation with radical change since the new manager started. The findings are summarized in Table 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inertial Force</th>
<th>JH vs. DAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>JH &lt; DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>JH &lt; DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>JH &lt; DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>JH &lt; DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogenous team</td>
<td>JH &lt; DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Transparency</td>
<td>JH &lt; DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior executive management</td>
<td>JH = DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Turbulence</td>
<td>JH = DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Turbulence</td>
<td>JH = DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In total</strong></td>
<td>JH = 3/9; DAP = 6/9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Theory
This section will integrate the empirical findings in the theoretical context that PE and EC provide.

**Punctuated Equilibrium**
Change is disruptive according to PE, and indicates that long periods of stability and convergence with low turbulence are preferred to and is more efficient than periods of reorientation with high turbulence. DAP shows that departmental structure within a hierarchical organization fosters reliance on executive management to initiate change processes. DAP has large numbers of long-tenured members, which in turn promotes a resilient culture and social rigidities. Strategic change is top-down, which jeopardizes communication in that the right information needs to be directed to the right person, which is an example of increased coordination cost due to lack of transparency. This is further compromised in an organization with two departments with different objectives situated separately in the office space. Additionally, DAP is at risk of seeing over-embedded staff members due to a high number of long-tenured staff being unwilling to change to new conditions. Predictable and relatively long product lifecycles indicates the need for stability in the repetitive though uniquely creative production process. Sustained low performance, change in power structures and industry shocks have been the catalyst for changes at DAP; which are all aligned with
PE’s drivers of reorientation. Paralleling this analysis with the Tushman and Romanelli’s text the findings are closely aligned with proposition 2 and 3:

*Proposition 2: Internal requirements for coordinated action and flows and external requirements for accountability and predictability are associated with increased social and structural complexity.*

*Proposition 2A: Increased social and structural complexity engenders patterns of interdependence among activity systems, which promotes further convergence upon an established strategic orientation and resistance to fundamental change.*

However, when dealing with proposition 3 the empirical evidence shows another outcome:

*Proposition 3: The larger the organization, the greater is its structural complexity and interdependence, and the greater the emphasis on incremental as opposed to discontinuous change.*

In the case of DAP and JH there was proof of a positive relationship between size and discontinuous change, rather than incremental change, as proposed by PE. The relative increase in size at DAP increased complexity and thus reliance on planned change. This can be explained by the conflicting objectives that occur between the two departments.

**Executive Management**

DAP exemplifies how executive leadership can negatively affect the organization and amplifies the importance of ensuring appropriate management style to provide direction and communicate what is acceptable, and in this case unacceptable, behavior. The importance of executive leadership is emphasized more so in the PE theory than in EC theory as it places increased significance on hierarchy and bureaucracy. Additionally, PE predicts that tenure has positive associations to effectiveness in convergent periods, which can only hold true if that tenure is positive. In the case of DAP the tenure was the source of negativity, and thus has a deteriorating effect.
Both firms have gone through similar change processes, however they have interestingly been managed quite differently. Immediate change initiatives were downsizing and optimizing operations with emphasis on cost cutting and establishing a financial awareness. Secondary initiatives were re-positioning, re-branding and emphasis on establishing a new corporate culture. However, due to level of formal education, relative firm size and differences in organizational structures Svendsen have been relatively less authoritarian than Wall-Gremstrup. Relating to the Theory E and Theory O framework both JH and DAP sequenced E and O, which would indicate superior performance than if the one or the other was used individually. There is also proof of simultaneous application of E and O when Svendsen explains how he manages differently externally with third parties than internally with the goal to achieve transparency and equality within the firm, and when Wall-Gremstrup presents her management philosophy that deals with facilitating personal growth while making sure that the firm is financially sustainable. This indicates ambidextrous management qualities that are typical and necessary for working within the creative industries. However, due to differences in personal temperament and background it is likely for Wall-Gremstrup to put more emphasis on Theory E than Theory O relative to Svendsen whose approach to management is focused on social interaction, close group work and promoting commitment through empowerment.

The symbolic role executive management plays is similar in both firms in that they make strategic choices that aims to create an appropriate strategic orientation. Though, it is tempting to say that Svendsen plays a more important social role when working so closely with his employees and shaping the organizational culture to be informal and playful. Conversely, it is tempting to say that Wall-Gremstrup seems detached from the staff and only provide direction and control sporadically when seen as necessary. However, Wall-Gremstrup and Svendsen impacts the social environment at DAP in equal extent, only differently. It is the firm size and structure that allows Svendsen to be seen as an equal team member and elevates Wall-Gremstrup to be an authority. Where DAP is reliant on intervention, one could claim that JH is even more reliant on the symbolic value executive management has that is greatly accentuated in a small firm with such high transparency.
**External Environment**
The publishing industry has been subject to disintermediation through increased competition digital media and the decline in interest in printed media. This shift has initiated strategic choices of reducing focus on book publishing and establishing a digital presence, and are examples of new dominant designs caused by product class evolution. These are responses to technological innovation that alters consumer patterns and impacts non-digital companies like DAP indirectly. Digitalization of the music industry has caused disintermediation in the consumption of recorded music, but has not had a significant negative affect on live music. In fact, there is proof of increased importance of live music due to the lack of revenue generation of recorded music, which leave JH relatively unaffected by technological advancement (Wikström, 2009). Interestingly, DAP shows a dominance of PE at higher levels on inertial forces, despite them being relatively more affected by digital technology than JH. This indicates weak correlation between organizational structure and responsiveness to technological advancement.

Due to fluctuating market conditions, complex products, high levels of turbulence and short product life cycles that are highly network dependent PE is considered inappropriate to reflect change processes at JH. However, it is fairly reflective of the change processes observed at DAP, due to traditional a hieratical and departmental structure that acknowledges the need for involvement of executive management.

**Emergent Change**
According to EC an activated organization that acknowledges adaptability as the main parameter of efficiency will have a competitive advantage in the inherent agility that comes from an acceptance of organizations as self-organizing beings in constant instability. Sense making facilitates activation, which arises from constant and respectful interaction. JH with its intimate office space filled with strong personal characters working both with individual tasks but also with a shared commitment as event managers indicates a highly activated organization. JH fulfill the requirements of sense making by demonstrating a clear direction where the staff is constantly in motion and there is frequent and respectful interaction. The relatively small size and flat hierarchal structure facilitates this activation, which indicates a dominance of emergent change at JH. Additionally, the relatively short product life cycles together with a human oriented experiential product that requires customized solutions for
every event suggests high levels of motion and continuous change. This signifies consistent high levels of turbulence, where convergent periods are irregular due to the high level of motion at JH.

It is difficult to refer to convergent periods at JH due to the consistent high levels of turbulence, which is seen as a positively integral and necessary part of operating a music venue but also negatively caused by organizational instability. This reduces the applicability of the PE framework for the case of JH where there are superior indicators of a dominance of EC at JH. In the case of JH and DAP, JH indicates relatively fewer inertial forces and demonstrates relatively high levels of emotional capability facilitated by organizational transparency, close interdependency in the team, intimate work space and short term product life cycles that requires constant updating and interaction. This demonstrates relatively high levels of emergent change at JH.

DAP shows signs of self-organizing based on the operationalized routines that exist in the firm. However, DAP only fulfills the requirement of direction in that they have a strong culture, while it is seen as relatively inactivated organization as a whole due to the tension that exists between the departments.

**Organizational Culture**
Granovetter’s notion of embeddedness describes how organizational culture potentially promotes undersocialized performance that automize human behavior arguing that pre-existing social ties affect social exchanges. This illustrates how organizations are products of past experience and are prone to repeat previous actions based on path dependency, and the choice to do so is legitimized by the standards provided by organizational culture. As DAP is of relatively larger size, they are also more dependent on organizational culture to align behavior and direction. Thus, they are more disposed to experiencing over-embeddedness and group thinking.

A strong organizational culture might serve as an important tool for communicating desired behavior, reduce ambiguity and create stability especially in a large corporation with departmental structures and standardized work being carried out, though it might have adverse effects on responsiveness and innovation. In the event of radical, second-order change that challenges the fundamental identity (organizational culture) a firm will experience major emotional reactions, and resistance to change should be anticipated (Huy, 1999). This is evident at DAP where
the existing culture served as a barrier to change seeing that despite the significant downsizing the majority of the staff also worked for the previous manager.

Due to high transparency, weekly product life cycles, complex experiential events, shared responsibility and high interdependence among the staff JH demonstrates a dominance of EC over PE. Relatively high social and structural rigidities reduces the levels of activation at DAP, which leaves them with relatively lower dominance of EC to PE (Figure 12).

**Synthesis**

Incorporating more organizational qualities in a synthesis of the aforementioned observations will function as an extension of the discussion about the theoretical framework of this assignment. The relative size of JH and DAP are, together with appropriateness according to industry mechanisms through isomorphism, determinants of structure and leadership. These are parameters where JH and DAP vary significantly, though both firms maintain core activities in-house at MES. A team of four dictates a flat hierarchical structure with an intuitive and informal management style seeing that there is little direct management required. JH indicates high personal diversity in that they all have different backgrounds and educations, while low organizational diversity in that there is only one team working together. This intimacy and uniformity in objectives reduces social complexity due to the strategic alignment that is possible in a transparent structure. Emotional capability is thus increased based on the immediate sense-making that comes from transparency, where in the event of radical change reactions can openly be shared and uncertainty and ambiguity reduced based on an activated organization. This activation increases readiness to change, as indicated by Tushman, Romanelli and Weick. This, in turn,
indicates a dominance of emergent change at JH rather than planned change due to consistent high levels of turbulence that makes convergent and reorienting periods indistinguishable.

DAP’s homogenous team of primarily architects indicates low personal diversity and relatively high organizational diversity in that there are two separate departments and three hierarchical levels. A team of 15 is naturally bundled in departments, where the complexity of having high number of independent areas of responsibility would be chaotic and counterintuitive. With departmental structure comes increased bureaucracy and hierarchy. This structure increases coordination cost in that information has a longer way to travel and the departments’ different objectives have to be catered to. This indicates relatively higher levels of social complexity, which is negatively associated with emotional capability (Huy, 2000). The departmental structure together with homogenized backgrounds indicates that managerial intervention is required in order to initiate change and serves as potential forces of resistance to change. This indicates that DAP is relatively more dominated by planned change. A synthesis of the discussed themes is illustrated in figure 13:

Figure 13
Size
Regarding size as a central determinant of organizational structure an investigation of the definition of size is called for. This section will discuss what is meant in relation to organizational size. What constitutes small in terms of government support and tax policy varies by country and industry, ranging from fewer than 15 employees under the Australian Fair Work Act of 2009, 50 employees according to the definition used by the European Union, and fewer than 500 employees to qualify for many U.S corporations (Lepoutre, & Heene, 2006). An international research on job flow found that small firms account for the majority of total firm dynamics in the 16 economies investigated, and that job reallocation is highest in firms with less than 20 employees and lowest in firms with 100+ employees (Halitwanger, J., et al., 2006). Thus, in absolute terms, JH and DAP unquestionably qualify as small firms.

Nevertheless, the relevant distinction lies not in their absolute but in their relative size. The difference between 4 and 15 staff members allowed JH to reduce existing staff by 100%, while DAP had a staff reduction of only 30%. Similarly, one new addition to the JH team would have a qualitative impact of 25%, while at DAP the effect would only be at 6.7%. The core activities at JH are shared on individuals who become indispensable to the organization, while DAP have relatively superior opportunity of job creation in house if a team member should be forgone. JH does not employ musicians but facilitators, which means that they are 100% dependent on establishing attractiveness for artists to be associated with the venue, while DAP have content providers in-house who can maintain operations if external writers are unavailable. Due to the short product cycles at JH they inflate and deflate in size quicker and more frequently than DAP, which remains relatively stable during the production process, implying a relatively high degree of fluctuations and complexity at JH to DAP. This indicates relatively high organizational volatility at JH, where small quantitative changes will have a major qualitative impact on the firm.

The aforementioned study on international job flow clearly establishes large disparities across industries, where some have a higher intrinsic need for job mobility, and are exposed to greater variance in demand and higher pace of technological progress (Halitwanger et al., 2006). These are institutional pressures that impact the size and structure of a firm. Firms within the creative industries are often specialists rather than generalists, keep core operations in-house, are highly network based and
apply creativity in their work (Caves, 2000). Based on this insight it is not correct to
call JH and DAP “small” companies in absolute terms without accounting for industry
specific features. In fact, their respective sizes are absolutely analogous with other
actors within their respective industries, and within their competitive scale,
comparable to weight class. JH and DAP are structured according to institutional
context and are modeled after other actors facing similar conditions. This establishes
isomorphism as a strong determinant of how they deal with change. DAP experience
superior stability, and consequently rigidity, provided through organizational
structure, and product life cycles are dictated by industry specific requirements, while
JH has a flexible yet volatile organization.

**What is lost when going from 4 to 15 employees?**

As absolute size increases so does social complexity and coordination cost, which
makes an organizational structure more rigid and potentially less productive.
Inversely, as absolute size decreases so does social and intellectual capital, which
increases dependence on external networks at the cost of independence (Huy, 1999).
The intimacy of small size is an indication of high emotional capability, which
according to Huy would increase an organization’s ability to realize radical change.
Traditionally small firms are seen as flexible and agile, and inertial theorists argue
that large firms have complex internal procedures and constraining power structures
with external stakeholders – all examples of potential inertial forces (Hannan &
Freeman, 1984; Barker & Duhaime, 1997). This tendency is evident in the
comparative study of JH and DAP, seeing that more inertial forces are identified at
DAP than at JH. However, the benefit of greater resource position would indicate that
change in the face of low performance would be more achievable for relatively large
firms than relatively small firms (Barker & Duhaime, 1997). Barker and Duhaime
also hypothesize that there is a positive association between successful turnaround
and level of diversity and size of a firm, as observed in the case of JH over DAP.
Despite being relatively larger DAP is still a small and financially volatile firm and
thus it is unlikely for them to reap the benefits of increased scale of resources. As for
diversity, the staff at DAP is highly homogenous while more complex at JH, which
might indicate that increased diversity has positive effects on change.
What determines size?
In the case of JH and DAP the macro-industry context is provided by the creative industries. Implicit in that term are some general tendencies, such as a dominance of small firms due to freelance work, individuals that are typically entrepreneurial and risk seeking, firms that are often network based and produce complex products on project basis in order to move flexibly along to the next opportunity (Carr, 2009). Conceptually, both JH and DAP belong to the creative industries, though within the respective fields of live music and magazine publishing. This distinction is important because this already indicates that there are some micro-industry specific discrepancies that might affect firm size and structure.

Traditionally live music and magazine publishing has been established with respective sets of value chains. This provides the template in use for the production of events and magazine publishing. The scale of production is determined by the market position of the firms, where in this case both firms operate as specialists in a niche market, which indicates relatively small target audiences contrary to large commercial firms. This indicates a relatively lower scale of production than other firms within their respective fields, i.e. JH is not a large pop and rock oriented venue (e.g. Vega in Copenhagen), and DAP is not a large fashion magazine (e.g. Vogue).

However, the scale of production is contingent on given the micro-industry context. Event facilitation and magazine publishing does not make use of the same value chain, components of production or target the same audience, thus their workflow and product life cycles differs. JH produce a relatively socially complex product that inflates and expands the organization every weekend during an event, demonstrating high levels of fluctuation and instability. DAP produce a relatively passive product where the production of the monthly magazine motivates a relatively stable and predictable workflow. The difference in product life cycles and workflow are dictated by the nature of the product in question. These micro-industry differences are critical to the size of the respective firms. Despite the fact that JH and DAP share macro-industry context, they vary significantly in the way they deal with change.

Being structured at MES and being a two-sided market are generic organizational features that are independent of industry context. Operating as a specialist in a niche market is also a generic feature, though more probable in the creative industries due to dominance of small business structures. Nevertheless, this suggests that it is the scale of production together with product life cycles and
A workflow that determines firm size in the case of JH and DAP. The way internal elements are structured is by modeling after firms facing similar conditions, i.e. through isomorphism. This is evident in that neither JH nor DAP attempts to structure significantly differently than their close competitors, accepting and applying the dominant template in use. This demonstrates the power of institutional pressures and industry pressures on firm size and structure.

It is more so the micro-industry specificities that are determinants of size and structure, not the macro-industry context provided by the creative industries. Having established this reduces the fairness of comparing a music venue and a magazine publisher. Because they are so highly influenced by the micro-institutional forces, paralleling them as equal due to similar macro-industrial context would be unrealistic. It would be like paralleling apples and pears because they are both fruit, which demonstrates that you can only agree on certain qualities they share in common, because they are inherently different identities.
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**Figure 14**
Semiotic confusion
This section will discuss how JH and DAP address the notion of change differently.

It is very far between the successful innovations within the format of live music. (Svendsen, 2013)

Whenever there is talk about innovation the conversation naturally gravitates towards the question of format. This can be paralleled with the notion of frame bending (Nadler & Tushman, 1989). Live music has for decades been performed on a stage with acoustic or electric equipment, in a room with a stage where people come in and take the time to concentrate on a temporal piece of experiential art, to socialize and exchange impressions from the experience. You will see the same template being applied in opera and symphony houses, nightclubs and raves and large stadium shows – they all work within the same paradigm. “It is a difficult business to be innovative in. Either you do pop-up venues in developing countries or CO2 friendly initiative” (Svendsen, 2013). There is no indicators that it is necessary to radically alter this format in order for JH to stay relevant as a music venue: “We never experience someone leaving JH saying: I am so tired of the concert format” (Svendsen, 2013).

This separates innovation from the refinement and adjustment that JH have been referring to when asked about change and innovation. When Nielsen installs a video projector in the ceiling that is a technologically enabling improvement. When coordination mechanisms are put in place, i.e. calendars to give transparency as to who is present at the office, those are organizational improvements. When from one night to the next JH caters to a solo pianist and a six piece progressive jazz ensemble this is an adjustment. When you need more people in the bar and in the wardrobe because a loud noise band is playing and there will be dancing and drinking, this is an adjustment. When Svendsen determines that there will be no more nightclubs that is a strategic decision.

Svendsen acknowledges that these different alterations have different significance and pace, where deliberate large scale changes are impossibly realized before a stable fundament that provides clarity and predictability is established: “Up until now it has been all about refinement, clean up, improvement, efficiency and saving and all the boring things that we thankfully find fun, but now we can start going beyond that”. Steffensen express concern about the implementation of new
ideas emphasizing how the small team does not have the capacity to fully realize them: “The ideas we have about raising the bar are never really executed because there isn’t really time for that; it is difficult to find priority for that” (Steffensen, 2013). This illustrates the cost of having a firm of such intimate size, where resource constrains threatens their ability to realize innovative initiatives. When Svendsen took over in April 2012 JH was characterized by lack of accountability, cacophony in communications and suboptimal and expensive ad-hoc solutions and as new members were added to the existing team conflicting tensions occurred – all demonstrating barriers to change. When explaining the status quo of how JH deals with change as of April 2013 Svendsen states: “I think it is more about creating a culture for improvement rather than for change.” Relating to scale improvement is of a lower intensity than change, where the first deals with promoting desirable qualities in a process and the second has a strategic or political feature in that it is often dictated from top management.

DAP experience adjustment in layout of the magazine when determining what goes where and balancing pictorial stimuli and writing. During the last week of production everyone contributes in a process of refinement where anomalies and impurities are removed. When Wall-Gremstrup detects discontent among staff members she gets involved with them and engages them in a conversation with the motivation to help solve a problem to ensure improved work conditions. Perks being eliminated (i.e. one hour office breakfast) exemplifies initiatives that seek to improve and develop a desirable attitude and work morale. Cost cutting and increased financial awareness promotes growth and sustainable development for the company. When increased emphasis is placed on digital presence the format is being expanded via a novel and relevant platform. When the magazine changes its graphic identity (i.e. every fifth year), or a new magazine is added to the portfolio these are examples of innovation that sets the frames for a new paradigm in which DAP will be operating in the foreseeable future.

DAP publishes magazines and books, and have a website that updates about relevant topics within architecture. These are established formats that create the frames within which DAP operates. These frames set the boundaries for the content providers. Commenting on how working with creativity within a paradigm Kieding explains the iterative process that goes into dissemination at DAP: “It is like building a house, or painting a picture where the canvas and the brush serve as limitations
and yourself as a self-censoring party, even though you would have the experience of complete freedom, and then you start paining, you step away, come back again and notice that it is starting to gain structure”. This also refers to the work process of an editor as well as the creative process of any artist. The tension between academics and artistic expression has been touched upon previously and the question about whether an architect loses credibility as a disseminator has been debated. It is obvious that there exist some ambidextrous qualities on an individual level when being torn between two processes of creative output, that for some people are seen as mutually exclusive.

In conversation about whether DAP is a creative organization Wall-Gremstrup argues for dissemination being highly creative: “If you ask a newspaper they would claim that they as journalists and writers are creative, because they produce new content” (Wall-Gremstrup, 2013). However, the journalist would not experience the same competing commitment as the disseminating architect, which might indicate some level of cognitive dissonance at the individual level.

When talking about sources of innovation Bjerring allocates policy decisions at the top: “There is some strategic innovation in the administration”, while Wall-Gremstrup excludes the editorial teams as change agents: “Innovation does not come from the floor”. This implies that decisions about format alteration is not relevant for the editorial teams, though decisions about aesthetics and material is kept ‘on the floor’: “In my area there is a continuous evaluation where ideas comes up for next issue in the ongoing discussion about form versus content” (Bjerring, 2013). Speaking on the pressure the editorial teams are under with cost cutting and working in small teams Kieding states: “We don’t have time to be innovative, there is more focus on operations” (Kieding, 2013). This demonstrates how DAP is shaped by being a two-sided market together with an acceptance of the template in use while still embracing the market position they have as a facilitator and disseminator.

In order to navigate among the terms that are being applied a structured table will explain the differentiating factors in impact and scale:
This semiotic confusion reveals a conflict in the self-defining aspects of the two firms. While DAP claims to be relatively creative, JH is realistic about how difficult it is to be innovative having a facilitating role in the music industry. DAP’s desire to be regarded as highly creative might come from the sense of pride and status their educational background provides, while the heterogeneous team at JH have a more laid-back approach to their level of creativity. As facilitators it is not conceptually in DAP’s nor JH’s intention to change the way live music is presented or how critical dissemination about architecture is communicated, but they will be responsive and reactive to external pressures that force them to change the way they operate in order to stay competitive and relevant. This indicates they are less creative organizations relative to the more technology driven firms.

It has been established that DAP and the publishing industry have been relatively more exposed to reorientations motivated by product class evolution, where digital communication has caused disintermediation of book publishing and the establishment of an online media platform. This has not required the same responsiveness at JH, where live music has not been affected as gravely. It is interesting then to see DAP having the highest amount of inertial factors potentially serving as inhibitors of change. This demonstrates how change cultures are not perfectly aligned with market pressures but are more so affected by micro-industry specific requirements of effective production.
What can they learn from one another?

It has been established that JH and DAP are appropriately designed firms according to their respective micro-industry requirements. They have successfully endured several radical change processes, where JH have demonstrated dominance of emergent change, while DAP showed dominance of planned change. According to the writings on business models in the creative industries there is a tendency for new business to emerge where the traditional models does not satisfy new environmental requirements (Corr, 2006). An underlying assumption in this is for these firms to strive for flexibility and adaptability as their main competitive advantage in a world facing exponentially technological advancement. This holds especially true for small design agencies, software developers, tech-firms and independent artists, based on the direct impact technological advancement has on them. However, regarding the impact of technological innovation as indirect together with building on existing traditional institutional models, JH and DAP are designed according to the needs that their level of micro-industry context dictates. This would be the case too if you scale up production within their respective areas, e.g. Vega and Vogue, where the tasks to be performed and the relevant value chain would be similar but naturally expanded in size, where departmental structures and hierarchal levels would be necessary for both firms.

Both structures offer positive aspects, but they will not be positive for all firms. The benefit of a flat structure is the transparency, low coordination cost, easily facilitated strategic alignment, immediate collective response to change that encourage sense making. The benefit of a hieratical structure is clearly defined areas of responsibility, well-defined sender of strategic change initiatives, bundling of knowledge that inspires collaboration and it is easy to know who to address if there is a problem. These trade offs are examples of ambidextrous qualities that each firm accounts for when determining organizational structure.

According to Weick emergent change is obtainable disregarding size. We have seen here that small size facilitates emergent change where an activated organization is more easily accomplished. Emergent change embodies some characteristics that are attractive for any firm operating with changing markets and consumer behavior. The benefits of JH’s structure might be inspirational for DAP. As a modern media house they may benefit from keeping a smaller core and take on a more coordinating role, e.g. like the aforementioned project coordinator. This structure can potentially solve
the conflicts of interests that are caused by horizontal tension and power struggles that are caused by vertical tension. Additionally, this might aid DAP’s financial situation by engaging writers and content providers only on project basis managed by a small team of competent editors. This would characterize DAP as a more contemporary member of the creative industries, by challenging existing business models and tailoring one that fits the market demands.

In the event of JH scaling up the organization areas of responsibility would naturally be bundled and create groups of expertise in skill containers. Though this would be the product of a reorientation of market position, e.g. becoming a more democratic music venue. These are potential alternative solutions for DAP and JH, and are worth reflecting on, seeing that isomorphism does not necessarily reflect the optimal organizational design of a firm. This demonstrates that it is possible for both JH and DAP to be structured differently although as of today both follow the dominant and established template in use for their respective micro-industry context. Challenging them might be necessary to stay competitive in an exponentially changing technological world.
CONCLUSION

This project suggests that macro-industry conditions do not suffice to provide comparative ground for investigating firm specific details. Despite similarities in absolute size and generic firm features, micro-industry features are seen as relatively more defining of change culture. Both firms operate within established fields and this cause them to adhere to the dominant template in use, which puts them at risk of imperfectly accommodating new market pressures.

Empirical data from this case study shows that discrete changes in quantitative terms have a major qualitative impact on organizational structure. Going from 4 to 15 employees the firms significantly impacts their flexibility and responsiveness to changing environments. The subtle increase from one to two departments drastically impacts the organizational culture, seeing that the conflict of interest between groups becomes a source of inertia and hinders the establishment of shared commitment. Even though the publishing industry is more influenced by technological advancement, DAP is somewhat surprisingly still relatively more inertial than JH, which demonstrates the effect of isomorphism where changing market conditions are not included.

This difference in size and structure inspires JH to exhibit a dominance of emergent change due to relatively low social complexity and coordination cost, and relatively high emotional capacity, while DAP demonstrates a dominance of planned change due to the reliance on executive management as a product of hierarchical and departmental structure.

The PE theory is deemed unable to fully grasp the macro-industry specificities dictated by the creative industries, where firms have an inherent appreciation of uncertainty, turbulence and ambiguity. This means that firms within the creative industries are generally not inertial, but accepts the premises of working in a hit-or-miss industry. However, PE showed relatively greater applicability to the case of DAP over JH, which was facilitated by their relatively higher levels of social and structural rigidities. Consequently, EC proved greater applicability to JH due to its flat structure, high transparency and level of activation. This is supported by DAP being relatively more inertial than JH.

Several polarities have been visited; generalist vs. specialist, Theory E vs. Theory O, turbulence vs. stability, convergence vs. reorientation, rigidity vs. transparency, in-house vs. outsource, etc. These ambidextrous qualities are not unique
for the creative industries but are general conditions all firms have to deal with, either explicitly or implicitly. However, the creative industries encompass some features that make them deal with these polarities in greater intensity and have thus served as interesting objects of analysis.

In order for JH and DAP to stay competitive in their respective micro-industry contexts it might be fruitful for them to at one point challenge their business structure in order for DAP to potentially achieve greater flexibility and JH more stability to deal with future challenges.
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Danish Architectural Press
SANNE
People will have stories about changes that have affected their work, and only a few of them will be dealing with organizational change in the big picture
Lars is so old that he would never change
In creative organizations people are used to live with chaos, but you will also have those people who are more conservative
Sofie has difficulties adjusting, she works on reduced time, and we’ve discussed whether we can find a type of work that is suitable for her
Some people can deal with and enjoy more uncertainty, she is very fragile
Many creatives are very fragile
People here have so many different needs, e.g. the PhD student or personal reasons, and that requires different working hours and being flexible
They are very sensitive people who can be very angry and sad
Age: 47
I’ve been here for 6 years
I am the CEO and have the overall responsibility for the firm, answer to the board
A precondition to doing so is to ensure operations, growth and development and transformation of the organization in relation to the external demands and internal ambitions
Can. Polit
Management consultant
Been in the creative industry from 2000, where I was the CEO of an ad-agency manager for the Danish and Finnish segments
Autonomy?
Large degree of autonomy.
I don’t demonstrate much control
If I am the editor of a magazine I will of course be in control of that
Personalities?
There is both a push and a pull, there is a difference between who we attract and who we want to attract
We are a business run fund so we are not capitalized
We don’t have a strong economy
If we want to ensure high quality employees then it sometimes comes at the cost of social skills
We have some shortcomings on our ability to collaborate, which causes stress for the organization
We have some people here with obvious social challenges
This means that we probably have a graphic designer who is a lot more skilled than we would otherwise have been able to get
There is the evaluation of the quality we strive for, the product we make and the environment for collaboration
They all come down to the quality and efficiency we can deliver, and creating a balance between these different aspects
We easily attract architects
We are a medium and that gives us power to affect the industry we are investigating
We are both a part of it, but we are also on the edge of it
It is important for us that in the editorial groups there are people who are disseminators, and there are not many architects who are good writers
There are a lot of people who wants to work with us, and there are a lot of people who are very talented and good with doing projects, but we don’t have the finances to employ them
We have well-run machinery but not a lot of money, and not a minute to spare to develop, and that is critical
Workflow?
It is very dependent on the finance department, and all departments have different life cycles and workload
Finances are pressured when there is revision or special issues
Editors have their flow relating to monthly issues, where it is busy in the phase before a new issue and some space to breath when it is done, but that breathing space is small because you are already behind on the next issue
It is carried but in a predictable pattern, but within that predictability are a lot of unforeseen issues, where external writers can’t hold their deadline or some of our clients have some issues, renegotiations of advertising contracts, so that pressure comes on top of the existing pressure that the organization already has
It does not take much to rock the boat, and that makes us vulnerable
Collective vs. individual?
The people on Arkitekten know exactly what their individual tasks are, but they work collectively to prepare the next issue together
They would feel that if they asked the ad-department that there wasn’t too good collaboration
Sofie and Lars know what they need to do in order to have the magazine published
If you are supposed to produce four articles you can’t expect that your colleague will do it, however they help each other if it is asked for, an I think that has worked fairly well
We are one man missing at Arkitekten DK, and I have told Arkitekten to help, and support the editor to realize the new issue, but they wouldn’t have done so voluntarily
That’s where I as a manager have to interfere and tell them how it should be, and then they do it
I think we have a fairly high degree of role clarity
Where that becomes difficult is my job, where some people would ask too many questions and some too few
Innovation?
Innovation comes from the vision
We have to make money and one driver for that is that we need to innovate
Returning to the subject of radical change, we have had better economy in the past
The financial crisis has left of with little fat on or body
We are very dependent on two large clients
We target innovation in order to free us from that dependency, we would like to spread our risk and our income profile
And it comes from a desire to do something good for society and give something back
We are a fund based business, but we also want to do something nobel, and that is probably one of the biggest conflicts we have
We would like to do something for society on the one hand, but on the other hand we want to make sure that we can continue to do something good for society, and that requires we make money
Before I got here this was not an established fact, the need for revenue in order to stay in business, and that has been a long process
Before there were a lot of good ideas about how to innovate, but this was detached from the economy
We can’t just go to the bank and borrow money, I have to go out and fund it and that is a very tedious and time consuming process
I think we are ambitious, we have a new project that is a welfare design project with a new media platform where we present international projects
We have started applying for funds, but we will start even if we don’t get funding
We have moved a lot of things around, e.g. Martin as the new editor for Arkitekten and take chances
There is also development and innovation in small scale and large scale
Dare to give people new responsibility, move them around and take the challenge
Innovation does not come from the floor (Sofie and Lars), but it happens in collaboration with Martin, Jesper and myself who will discuss new projects and set some criteria
It is in resistance a lot of our innovation occurs
Without some resistance and disagreement new ideas won’t come up
We have all different interests and capabilities and points of view, so we discuss a lot and even become unfriendly sometimes, we have different political orientations
We also have different educational backgrounds
E.g. discussing innovation and design theories there are a lot of similarities with societal research, and these are things we spend a lot of time on
We have a lot of different theoretical views here, and we have a research paper of high academic standards
It is more complex to work in an academic and creative business, compared to working in an ad-agency where you had the struggle between art and commerce
There is something about the academic aspect that is such a big part of peoples identity, and they love talking about it and love problematize
The coupling between academia and art complicates things
You have prima donnas in both research and art, and when you have them together it can be very problematized

Management?
I am not an authoritative leader
My job as a leader is to push the leaves away from the ground to have seeds can grow
That is my philosophy
I like people and I believe that it is through people that we as an organization create our success
But I make a lot of decisions that people disagree with
People here have a lot of personal dreams they want to realize, writing for other books etc, and is not like the dreams of the individuals are aligned with the dreams of the organization
People will say that I spend too much or too little resources on some things, but that is my call
I believe in my plan
I will take the confrontation with the person who disagrees, just as a disagreeing child
Because we don’t have an authoritative management structure they think they can talk to me as they please, and I won’t take that
Then I tell them that they need to figure out themselves if they want to be here, the know the premises, it is their choice
What you see is what you get

Shared vision?
My vision is not clearly articulated either
Right now we are in the middle of some big negotiations
We are so fragile, and I constantly work with different scenarios because this negotiation could not come through and we could close tomorrow
There are a lot of these scenarios that I can not share with the staff, because I need them to have a comfortable level of safety and trust in their work
There a lot of things I can’t tell them
I know we need a new vision
If we don’t get funding for Arkitekten then we have severe problems
We almost lost funding two years ago, so there is this built in anxiety in the organization, and we have moved and done a lot of things
Just as we have reached our ambitions and are about to build on from there we encounter new problems
And from that point we have not really been able to formulate a new strategy
We have tried to mend the broken bucket first
There is a strategy for each of the products and magazines
The overall strategy is that we want to be independent of Arkitekten, that’s our goal
We don’t know exactly what the road is to that point
We are launching a new magazine, but we don’t know if that will be a success, but we believe in it
Everyone knows that we’re doing it, but some would disagree and prefer resources to be spent on Arkitekten. There are only 7000 architects in Denmark, the whole board consists of architects. If we really wanted to make money we should target other demographics than only architects. The organization do not want that, they are all nerdy architects, nor is the board. So you can’t just come up with a new vision of perfecting what we have. What we’re doing with 21st is targeting anthropologists, economists and others, but it has taken a long time to convince the board of that because they are too concerned with their own field, and that leaves us few opportunities. The challenge with being a small and capitally constrained company is to have many big dreams being shot down if you can not fund them, and striking a balance. We need to develop a vision gradually where we do not get disappointed all the time. Getting this negotiation is absolutely crucial for us.

**Influence?**

I think it is a good place to develop our products according to your own potential, because we have high autonomy and freedom. You are also given specific tasks and areas of responsibility, because people need that. That is why I make sure to move people around so that they won’t grow stale and get stuck. I could have closed this place within my first three months if all you wants was a streamlined structure and efficiency. I feel that my choice of leader style was worked well. I have had conflicts with my colleagues, and I confront them. There is this constant balance between limitation and freedom, and that is hard. There needs to be resistance. If everyone were happy, there is no drive. Creative people are motivated by that curiosity and the unresolved. I want my editors to seek for something and wanting to prove themselves by providing better articles and content. Instead of doing things like you used to, I need them to be hungry. It is not easy, sometimes I tighten the rope too much, sometimes too little. E.g. right now I hate the way the graphic for Arkitekten looks, but I have to be careful not to shoot them down directly but also having to change it. Then they will ask “Who am I to say? You’re not an architect”, and I’ll say I can because I have eyes and authority. That’s when I interfere. But if there are bigger fires somewhere else I will focus my attention there.

**Old management?**

When I came here people were filled with anxiety, bad collaboration and had developed to become monsters. They did exactly what they wanted. Breakfast till 10am, which was very sweet but I stopped that and ever since the girls wouldn’t talk to me, I even heard they spit after me. They never saw it as their problem, they saw themselves as perfect employees and it was always someone else’s fault, a lot of goddip and complaining, and I really think we’ve managed to change that. Now people like being here. People are talented and that is not something that I have created, we created that together. If there is anything positive about the animalization, at least I have trusted them to do what they are good at. Sometimes they can not cooperate, and that is because something is blocking them. I have spent a lot of time trying to deal with that, and the people who have not wanted to change and adjust have been fired over a period of two years. A culture might survive although you get rid of those people who carried it, but having new ones come into place. You need the offended, the pissed off and the complaining, and that surfaces sometimes. We have a Christmas party and it is at 6pm, and some people were offended because it’s not at 1pm like it used to be, and I only explain that it is voluntary. Another problem is that the administration have felt that the editorial groups were given a lot of freedom, and that is because they don’t see them when they work till 11pm. The question is “are you happy to be there”, and to focus on what is good for your work, and for the administration it is important to know that you’ll go home at 4pm. Why focus on what others are allowed to do? You establish your opinion on that little part you see, and that is unjust. It comes down to the value of the self and taking yourself seriously.

**Good things from the old structure?**

The academic level. People are incredible talented. Even though they had a bad leader who was constantly looking over their shoulder they were productive and made sure that the magazine came out. There is a very professional and ambitious culture. That is the greatest gift. It is very difficult to teach an org something like that, that comes from the inside. I do not think we are critical enough. We need to dare more, “set the ass in slapping height”, which is one of the weaknesses we have because people will be concerned with accept from others. Critical writing has become more important. Consensus was more important and there was focus on the political debate. There is an anti-polarization, which is not good, or the debate, there is nothing to discuss, which is not good for the degree of innovation. I have hired a journalist that starts this summer, and people are afraid of having new academic backgrounds come in.

**Change?**
It will vary with the individual. Some people might be really pissed off about something, which would be a change. There have been radical changes since I started, especially the two first years. We had to completely redefine how we worked with a new structure. Fewer on permanent staff, more freelancers. There have been many large scale significant changes based on the organizations survival structure. There has also been large organizational changes, from being very defensive to being very proactive and understanding the concept of finances. There is a new culture of saving and cutting costs. No more soda. Biannual instead of annual raises. Rules about when you take vacation. People showing up on time and letting people know when you’re in the office. All these things affect the culture. I am very attentive if people are not feeling good, but I am not stupid, I am strict but considerate.

Stability? I would say that we had higher stability a year ago. We haven’t had time to decide on new direction. Kjeld going back to the school was a major change, him and I worked really well together and his shift was a major loss for us. I have become dissatisfied with some of the staff. I think the stability of quality is very good. When I started Arkitekten was really bad and cost more to make.

Radical change? When I started we had no contracts for our largest clients. We cancelled the client, with the risk of losing 80% of our funding. The old manager had tried to negotiate, but could not figure it out and there was big resistance to that decision being made. We were losing money on each issue, and I think that was the largest change. Then there was the optimizing and downsizing and reorientation of how we work. Before people had not heard anything about finances. Firing people the organization thought of me as an evil witch, losing people from your professional family. And hiring new staff and moving people around and making priorities. Moving people from Arkitekten in order to spread resources and create independence from Arkitekten is important. And moving.

Adjustability. They were really bad at it to begin with, because they were faced with many new changes. But it is like surviving a critical illness that you look back at it and think that it wasn’t so bad. It is as if they are less mad now, that their reactions are less intense than before after having been exposed to change so rapidly. They will be emotional to begin with but the feeling is shorter and less intense.

Do you work differently? Yes. I did not like being here to begin with. I was more authoritative in the beginning, but really I think I am making more decisions now than I did back then. The transformation is difficult. It is hard to manage specialists not being a specialist yourself, and that gives inherent specialist. The way I would demonstrate my skills were in management consulting and finances, but I had trouble interfering in the operations. Now I am more skilled at working with the organization and I need less management to have myself do things and express my opinion.

Either you risk to become sadistic or you become too weak. Leadership and authority is both provided from the top and from the bottom. People adjust to things that seemed horrible to begin with isn’t that bad after a while. Now they would look at me and ask “what now?”, which they would not do before. There will be a cross fertilization of cross disciplinary work between e.g. journalists and architects where you give and take.

I have a lot more of my personality with me in my current leadership than I had to begin with, sometimes I was ashamed. Just because you are the CEO doesn’t mean that I know what to do all the time. I can bluff it, but I don’t know for certain all the time. There is a lot less competition between my personality and my leader style now than it was to begin with. In non-creative industries, from my experience, the differences and intensities have not been as strong.

Main challenges? Existents, negotiating with the unions. Creating a path and a strategy where we do not only depend on the 7000 architects od Denmark. We should make a product we believe in. I do not think we will survive depending only on Arkitekten.

Creative organization? Creational? Yes. We create something every day. There is a conflict in the architectural field in that if you don’t create buildings then you are non-creative. It is so visible ad obvious.
But if you ask a newspaper they would claim that they as journalists and writers are creative, because they produce content.

There is a humbleness that exists here.
The word is a creative act.
It is a disseminationing organization just like the radio, TV.
We live off of asking questions.
Then you have art.
We are not an artistic organization, we don’t make art.
We are a creative organization.

SOFIE
Age: 33
Since January 2009, so just over four years.
I am educated architect from the Danish Design School.
Was associated with AF through freelance work.
Interned here and was employed after.
Sanne had been here in a year or 6 months when I started.
The house used to be bigger and has now grown again, and these things had happened before I entered the organization.
I have not been a part of that change.

I have 30 hours a week here.
My role is very similar to an editor/cutter of a film production team, where Martin is the director who draws the big lines and I make sure there is a nice pace and tempo.
It is a close collaboration.
I orchestrate and help realize his visions.
I write primarily shorter texts.
I am more editing than writing.
If you want to write for us you will present to us an idea that we will discuss and I will be the one maintaining contact with you and providing feedback, and react to the ideas and propose changes.
I am sure I have a work description somewhere, but it is a lot more floating.

In many ways Martin and I have the same tasks, but he deals with the heavy stuff and I handle the light stuff.
The editors and their teams are seated together now for the past year, which is a lot of work that can be checked off collectively.
If you can help on a project, contribute with some knowledge you just put it out there quite seamlessly.

Before the editors would sit together and the creatives in another room.
Now they are all collected, the graphics and the writers and the editors.
Sometimes we interrupt each other, but it is primarily good.

This is my first job.
The reason for my interest for magazines was my experience with the school magazine.
I liked the editing role.
Grew up in Århus, not from a creative family.
I was ok in science and interested in art and human science, so it became architecture for me.
I started the Architectural School and had some very creative beneficial years, and also a lot of personal growth.
I never built models, but I worked at an architectural bookstore.
It’s very intense to attend the architect school, you spend your entire life there.
Kjeld was my supervisor for my master project and we had a good relation over several years, and he took me in to the publishing house, though I would have tried that nonetheless.

Sanne is both administrator and editor for one of the magazines.
She is not included in all the editorial work, which I think she does fairly well.
She has this distance that says, alright I trust that you guys will do this.
Arkitekten is the largest magazine.
It will look as though we have nothing to do with one another.
All the people in the editorial group are architects and it is natural that we have different groupings.
Lars work closely with the administration in that he needs to coordinate with the ad department in creating the layout for the magazine, while I have less to do with the admin.
There is no magazine without the ads, and there is no ads without the magazine, so there is this symbiosis that can be conflicting sometimes.
The two different groups have different interests, and want to defend their respective turfs, which might lead to some tension.
You can tell that Lars and Lone have a good collaboration because their personalities match so well.
That how you deal with things, accepts that people who get along solve problems together and communicate well.
Sanne is a connector who should have the overview but not interfere at detail level.

Arkitekten brought the world to the Danish architects and Arkitektur brought Danish architecture to the world.

Hierarchy?
Because we are a small company there is no need for the big management group, so we have a group of four people in the management group.
Knowing that Martin is my superior allow me a lot of freedom, because I know that he’ll back me up.
I can experiment knowing that there is someone who will let me know when things are good and bad, provide direction.
It is like someone takes on the responsibility of setting forth, but not like a German hierarchy.
There is a lot of openness as to what you want to bring to the table.
The editor has the last word and veto.
But if the idea is good then it is indifferent whether it came from the intern or the editor, which I think is very positive.
There is a strong informal clarity about what people do, through what people are used to do, tacit knowledge. Obvious tacit knowledge about who does what, and if someone does not do it then that person makes sure that someone else does it, because people are counting on you to do it. It can be clear without being articulated.

I really appreciate that we contribute to each others work, we read each others texts, to make it bullshit proof, to give direction and feedback. There is great openness to that end and we use each others competences actively. There is always one person who is held accountable for a task, but the process can be fairly collective. I will have a clear idea of a responsibility being mine but will not be afraid to ask for feedback or help. Frequent cross check with colleagues. Good at accrediting each other for work that they’ve done, even though there is only one persons initials on the work. Strong sparring culture.

**Personalities?**
In my place there could have been a journalist. We are architects who write on behalf of other architects and we believe arrogantly that we do that better than journalists writing about architecture. It is only Lars who have a literary background, and after 25 years he has almost become an architect. He is the linguistic expert and is very knowledgeable that we use him as a dictionary.

**The way you work?**
There are a lot of people who are good listeners. Creative theft never happens, people always accredit ideas to the origin. That is surprisingly good. The team we have now works really well. When the editors switched they took their graphic person with them based on good chemistry developed over ten years. There is a certain temperament. There is a notion of honor and love, and that people like being that way. We like what we do.

**The artist type?**
I am glad that there isn’t more of those personalities, that I know I can trust the people I work with, that they are predictable and accountable. They won’t have a melt down and abandon tasks. They are very professional. The head or the heart?

**Workflow?**
We publish a magazine every month. We have quick deadlines, where there is a week with intensive work before a release. I like that you have an idea, find some pictures, talk with the team, get some feedback, and work on it. Short product life cycles. You can always see who is approaching a deadline, when one magazine are pressed they will spend a lot of time in the office and chill after a deadline is met.

**Lifecycle?**
After a publication there is a wee of post traumatic stress. What lies ahead seems very difficult to overcome. Then after a couple of days something specific needs to happen, and things start to open up and take shape. I am on the magazine that is being prepared for publication, while Martin is working on the next issue adding tasks and ideas to the pipeline. Articles start coming in and I will have to react to the material that comes in and have a dialogue with the writers. Eventually it comes back together and you print the final draft, because you walk around with the red pencil and make final corrections, which is a collective process where sometimes principal discussions are carried out, although mostly small adjustments. Then it is sent to print, and there’s I final round of corrections.

**Innovation?**
There is some strategic organization in the administration. In my area there is a continuous evaluation where ideas comes up for next issue in the ongoing discussion about form versus content. If the admin makes a strategic decision to work with a new format it is up to us to facilitate that change, which affects what content we put into it and we have to adapt to new media requirements, which is iterative. Adapt, adjust, iterative. Innovation is in every day life.

**Management?**
There is of course Sanne who calls the shots. She is deliberately very clear. It is a very flexible workplace and a lot of freedom to adjust your workday after your specific need, work from home, come in late, several of us work on lower hours. Not lassiez-faire, Sanne is in control of things and that is very obvious, that is why she was appointed this position. I did not experience the old management, but I am under the impression that it was quite arbitrary.
Now it is more articulated who does what
The old manager was very emotional, and his mood had a lot to say and affected the organization significantly
Now there is a more even and professional attitude, according to what I have heard

**Affect on how work is carried out?**
Now there has been established some frames, which allows for that freedom we have under our respective areas of responsibility
You should not underestimate the importance of people feeling safe, if you don’t feel safe you won’t come up with anything new
I think the stringent and professional leadership allows people to know what is going to happen, and it allows for me to be close to my editor
Sometimes I can paint myself into a corner that I cant get out of and I feel that there’s room for me to approach my manager and ask for help and he will help me out of it
There is compassion for one another, a consideration
When I cam back from sick leave my manager was very focused on finding a solution that was appropriate for my condition, and that nurtures loyalty, in that I owe them a lot and I provide a lot of work to them
Strong interdependence, you give and take

**Changes from the old management?**
No more arbitrary work
If Sanne was to be dissatisfied about my work we would sit down and talk about it and it would be clearly articulated what the problem was
No one get yelled at anymore, confrontation is more orderly, which I am under the impression that could happen before
I never experienced that half of my colleagues were fired, which was not easy
I came in as a new person filling a new function, so it was not like I was taking anyone’s job, so I never had problems with that
Daily change?
There was a turbulent period where we were in conflict with Arkitekt Forbundent about who should have ownership over Arkitekten
That was one of the first large tasks for Sanne, but that has stabilized the past year and a half
Now a day it is primarily small changes
We are a good team
I don’t feel like that there are a lot of changes as of today
There was a very turbulent phase where we did not know what to expect about the future, but now we’re in a more stable phase
I came in as the turbulence was decreasing

**Stability?**
We depend on finances, just as everyone else, but in comparison to architects working in studios they might have had 5 employments in the same period as I have been here
In comparison to an architectural studio of similar size I would think we were positioned more in calm waters, or at least have done in my time here

**Radical change?**
E.g. when the two editors changed places
Different personalities, different ambitions, different ways of communicating
It has turned out, but you get used to working with a team some years and accept that as the status quo to it all changing the next day
This was in 2011
Kjeld had to go back to the school; it was not a “lets try something new”-change, and Sanne has been the editor of Arkitekt.dk since
I was only informed of it on a Monday morning meeting
The management had known, but we didn’t know
In that way it was unexpected
He was my mentor and was very supportive so it was good to have him here for my own development, but I also think it was good for me to work with new people

**Adjustment? Reactions?**
It went pretty well, because there was better chemistry in the new group than in the old group
Some things became easier, based on social mechanisms
Since spring 2012 things have been really well
It took time to learn each other codes and figure each others mechanisms

**Work differently?**
I am better at asking for help, which has a lot to do with having a manager who were considerate and compassionate to my needs

**Challenges?**
The question of what media it should be
Print? Digital?
I would prefer print not only because that is what I do but also because I have a strong love for printed media
The development of out website has been a long process, where I feel we’re getting closer to a cross platform media, in that we make sure that there are spin-offs among medias, and create some kind of alignment
The question of whether we should keep publishing books
The question of being an ad based magazine, and how the climate is for that in the future

**Internally?**
Perhaps administration and editors could come closer somehow
The tension between different educations, is it counter productive or is it a part of our identity?
Architects are very much obsessed with being architects, and what constitutes that. You can clearly tell when someone from the administration or editors is throwing a party, mini golf vs. excursion to a beautiful school with nice food after. It can also be fruitful to be in an environment where you are not continually confirmed in a homogenous group. The monthly meeting about the magazine is always a reminder of our interdependency, and that we create this together.

Creative organization?
It has a lot of creative people employed. If we only had business as usual then our product would be outdated and obsolete if not being up to date, irrelevant. It needs to be optimized, and you could probably have less creative people to do that, but also in some kind of flux and that change and find that balance between form and content.

MARTIN
Architects are educated, if finances are going well, to work with uncertainty.

Age: 55
Fulltime since 2001
I am the editor of Arkitekten.
I decide what goes in the magazine and to make sure that it comes out on time and that we have consistent content and are well positioned in our industry.
I ensure visibility on as many platforms as possible as a representative for AK as a lecturer, seminars and conferences.
Educated architect.
I have worked at Danish architect studios and spent 7 years working at studios in Spain.
I was interested in dissemination because I could write and was interested.
It came to the point where I had to decide what I wanted to spend my time doing, and I would not both do drawing and writing at a professional level.
It was a gliding transition, but I think I reached my conclusion when I was in Spain, so that when I went back home I went in that direction, and I have been very happy with it.

Structure?
Management group of four people with Sanne, Steffen, Eva and me.
Then we have independent editorial groups that are fairly autonomous; perhaps they should work more together.
Perhaps clouds would be better, I see them as clouds.
The ads are important for our finance, but if you want to be a little square about it you could say that Arkitekten is our main magazine so that they take up a lot of space.
I do not think there is a close symbiosis between the administration and the architects.
I think that there is an important quality in that they are not too involved and do not interfere too much with our work, e.g. Sanne, otherwise I would not want to be here.
Sanne is the editor for Arkitektur DK, which is probably a short term thing qualified by her interest in the magazine.
People here are quite…not special, but quite supreme, self-managed and can sometimes be difficult to manage and deal with.
You are supreme because you have some kind of ambition, or vision, or opinion and a wish to leave a mark and have influence, and people will only unfold if they are given a certain level of freedom and responsibility, and part of my job is to make that work.
It is funny, because if you look at the old management things would still operate but it was more like a battle field, which I don’t think we have anymore.

Personalities?
It is possible to imagine that people at Jazz House have a background in music as artists?
(…) Then everyone working with dissemination of architecture failed architects.
I don’t think you can be both simultaneously.
You can’t be both a musician, a writer and a critic.
A lot has happened in the division of the architectural field.
Institutions deal with dissemination of architecture and have a critical perspective.
If we don’t have that critical perspective, then architecture will die, or become weak or poor.
You cannot communicate academically well about architecture if you don’t have a background in architecture.
I really think that is a problem.
In that way, people at a place like this would benefit from not being the ones who are looking at the zoo observing the animals, but they are themselves the animals in the zoo, and the difference is very large even though I think some people don’t think there is

Our position is in resistance against the animalization of the architectural field, in schools and in practice.
There is need for a counter movement, which traditionally architects themselves can’t initiate because of their relation to clients and customers and the need to make money.
What you have left are the schools and places like us that are able to speak more freely and critique the environment and tendencies.
There is a strong architectural critical tradition in Denmark, some kind of ying and yang between the architects and critics.
In the 40s the editor would also be a practicing architect, it was grounded in the practice.
That’s not how it is today, today it has it’s own universe it’s own life and magazines and critic that is not changed by the practice nor education, it lives its own life.
There is this autodidact phenomenon of architectural writers; it is not something that has been professionalized even though I believe that dissemination should be a part of the syllabus for architects because a large part of being an architect today is to be able to disseminate your works.
You see architectural studios publishing books about themselves fairly uncritically, where much of it is PR and very little is critical writing.
There is an expansion in the dissemination of architecture and large competition.
This is why I believe that the firm is more important now than it has ever been. I see AK as a place that is challenged structurally. In Norway the architectural magazines are a part of the architectural union, which provides structure and financial support. In Denmark they are independent institutions and the firms put out magazines by subscription with less institutional support, which creates a very different content, but it is also very fragile and dependent on establishing attractiveness. There is one large competitor who receives a lot of governmental support from funds that are structured to support architectural projects. Then you have the Danish Architectural Center that receives money from the state and from the fund. 20 years ago there was much less competition and the environment was a lot less complex, which left the position as a disseminator more privileged. Now it has turned into big business. Also there has been an explosion of writing about architecture online. During the past 20-15 years the conditions have changed dramatically. This creates tremendous pressure. One part of the fight is to maintain a high academic level because we think it has been deteriorating for years and we need to be a part of the change for the better. You do that through critical dissemination, where you have to point to problems. The other part of the fight is the financial possibilities, where there are ongoing negotiations about who pays for what. Then there is the discussion about digital media where no one knows. Text online is less popular than ever, but pictures are more, which can leave us with a potential uplift, because the printed media is made for reading. We insist on something that architects are interested in, namely reading. Though they too gravitate towards pictorial stimuli rather than reading. Though there will always be someone who reads. “The grey gold”, retired people with a lot of money.

**Workflow?**

You facilitate that yourself as best as you can. There has been a change, where we used to have emphasis on book publishing and had up to ten books out per year while we did the magazines simultaneously, using the permanent staff for both lines, which only accounted for stress and confusion. Today we produce one or two books a year. In order to keep a high quality in the books the content needs to be narrow, and to demonstrate an academic substance and position in the market. We don’t do it to make money, no one makes academic books to make money today. Because we have less books the workflow is more continuous and rhythmic. Even though we sometime exceed the number of pages we have room for we are not over worked. Before we worked more chaotic because there was a different kind of production and a different way to manage. There is increased levels of self management today.

**Collaboration vs individual?**

My experience is that my work is, or should be, collective. I’ve been in charge of two magazines and have had 4-5 people on each and have made sure that they did what they were supposed to. I have insisted on giving trust and expecting that they would assume responsibility in return, I have had limited interference, I have not been too obsessed with being in charge and making decisions. We do not have a culture for working across magazines, we’ve never had that. Perhaps there should be. I would like for there to be even more of that. We are working under so much pressure that there is little explicit coordination and instead there is this mysterious autonomous. With book production most parts are outsourced, the only thing my colleagues would notice of my partaking in that is that I produce a lot myself. We are a team where we share and exchange. When we approach deadlines I will move on to preparing the next issue. The workflow has been largely affected by my responsibility with publishing two books during the past five years. In that is fundraising, budgeting, finances and other administrative and multi-faceted tasks, which have little to with the publishing of magazines. However, there has been little use for over work.

**Innovation?**

The question is whether there is enough innovation happening. We don’t have time to be innovative, there is more focus on operations. Of course there are new magazines with new articles and pictures. There is a continuous seeking for new filters to apply, but there is no strategy of vision for them.
Is there need for that?
I think it is necessary because we are very sensitive
There is a new magazine on the way, because we need to have more feet to stand on
In such a small agency we focus on production and there is little time for the big innovations, and that is a difficult balance
I think everyone want that

Type of management?
A bit of both (professional and laissez faire)
Sanne has had to educate herself for this job, she has little baggage when it comes to architecture at all
Over time she has been able to build up more authority by understanding how things work
Being the CEO and not interfering with the editors has been important and a good thing
I think that is the right model
A weakness would be whether she is spending our resources the right way
By resources I mean manpower and money, and you spend what you have, but on what?
One could imagine that resource allocation could be improved long term
We could be doing more things within the framework we have now
The question of book publishing used to be with the administration, where they all were architects
Of course it is not like that today when our administration don’t have a background in architecture, so now it is at the editors
If we for example used to publish more books we would have needed to get editors from the outside because we don’t have the resources here
There are some structural barriers the way things are now that will hinder innovation
I don’t think the editors would have time to take that on themselves

Work differently?
Part of the problem was that we had red numbers on the bottom line, and I helped clean that up
I was put in charge of the book publishing
There was an entire year where we didn’t have a director
We have the same structure as before
The old manager was fired, and then there was none
Sanne was put in charge, constituent CEO, and I was in charge of productions
It was like this for a year
Then the board was more activated in that period
We just wanted it to work
I knew nothing about finances or book publishing and then someone left me with all this money and all these books and told me to publish them by tomorrow, so it was really leaning by doing
We solved it and made it work, though there was a lot of trouble related to it
Then Sanne came to place, still with the board playing an active role
We tried to achieve business as usual for a long time
There was a lot of turbulence and the period is called “the hard period”, that middle stage
Many of my colleagues had it rough under the previous management because he was very difficult to be around
Him and I got along well, there was some kind of respect there, but those who he didn’t respect had it rough
He was very intelligent and a good writer but did not know how to manage, which was rough for a lot of people
He was not very compassionate (psychopath)

Work differently?
I have more freedom to schedule and plan my own days
By Sanne not interfering comes more freedom, but then where is the creative sparring? The old manager could discuss with me with the correct concepts and apply things in a historical context and check for quality in a different way, but we have that now within the editorial team

Is that a good change?
My sparring is more abstract and happens with colleagues, other writers, internally, but by the end of the day, just as the painter, it is important that it is your work and your idea, in the fear of an idea becoming under known
The old model had developed to become a monster, where you had an academically competent leader
I think parts of the old model could work today, but today’s conditions are very different in that there are some clearly businesses oriented and professional negotiations about finances, which makes me believe that the structure we have today is good for now
We went from a traditional idea of the charismatic authority of a leader to a more modern solution with a more hierarchical structure and a less charismatic person
Now I become the charismatic leader
The old manager was the figurehead and the personification of the firm
People react to charismatic leaders

Daily change?
If it happens there is mostly small changes
Two years ago we had the negotiations with the unions, which is still an ongoing battle
That was never something that created significant change for us but it left us with a strong sense of urgency about the future
Uncertainty has been a companion this whole time where most aspects of that process has been out of our hands
I am not a negotiator, but I have also been a part of the administration at one point
I can imagine that Jazz House’s uncertainty lies in whether people will come to the concerts and whether they can get funding
Small companies are always looking for money to have operations function
That is our companion here, and I think that has become more evident after what happened here a few years ago that traumatized the entire organization, and that has changed significantly
The previous management would deal with all the finances and the rest of the organization would never notice these processes, to the point of manipulation
That has become more open now, where everyone is more included in what is going on

*Turbulence?*

20% is too dull, then I wouldn’t be here

There was a lot of trouble at the office, we were working out of Arkitektenes Hus where they increased the rent to push us out, where the pressure was psychological and financial

Financial pressures are motivating for turbulence

*Necessary? Correct?*

I was in charge of production
I think it was very important that Sanne came in, to deal with all the different actors and institutions that did not know what was going on with us

We had to put someone in charge
I also think it was important that it became more administrative management
I think it was necessary, but you should not underestimate the self-management character that AK had, also during the previous management who did fairly well because he had a strong team supporting him

He had this idea of him being indispensable for the organization, but he wasn’t
He imagined that it was him alone who had build the organization and knows it all, but the day he’s gone the operations still went on as if nothing had changed

No problem whatsoever
Everything still came in the same frequency with the same content and quality

Same goes for the period where we didn’t have a director
People just said “we can do this”, and that would have kept on going because these people are supposed to do this job

It was important that an administrative leader came in, especially outward to the external world

Our task was to be positive about the new management
To begin with it was more important to the external world, now we also see positive gains from it internally

She jumped on board on a train that was already moving
It was not like people were sitting here having no idea what to do

Challenges?

Finances.
We just need to have our finances in order
There was a period where people were fired right and left, I think I suppressed it
Perhaps I should have placed more emphasis on that

Creative?
Yes, I think so
Just like a painting making a magazine is creative
It is an artistic process
To write is an artistic process and to write is an art, same goes with graphic
Books are creative products also, not just historically

LARS
Age 63
Been in the organization since 1986, which gives 27 years
I was employed as editor assistant, but that has been given to Sofie
Now I am a member of Arkitekt Forbundet
I have a background in literature
I am a writer
I make the layout of distribution of articles, pictures and ads in the final stages of production
My responsibility is quite fluid
I’ve worked under three editors and have been an editor myself for two years as an emergency solution
I mean by principle that an architect should be the editor

There was one editor who was here for 20 years and was fired in 2006 and then Sanne came in
Then there were some new negotiations with the union and I was forced to take on the role of editor, then Martin took over

The first editor was fairly strict, he decided the theme and content
Martin does things more freely, where things are a bit more unstructured
I can be working on a competition and Martin can make that into a theme and get some articles from the outside, which leaves the question of what to do with the old ideas and products
In that sense things are more improvised
A theme will change many times before the magazine is done

I studied Danish literature
I’ve taught in sociology, Danish and psychoanalysis with literary analysis

Arkiteketten is one of the very few magazines that still focus on good writing and language
I inspect every single article that gets printed, there is no written word in print that I haven’t proofread to make sure that the language is up to par and has a good rhythm
That is what I spend most of my time doing

Structure?
This also has something to do with size
Sanne placed one person in charge for the different magazines in middle management
Finances were separated from the editors and consolidated with the administration having an overview of what money is possible to spend
There is a large degree of autonomy within the different groups
The ad department is deliberately smaller than Arkitekten, because that is how it is viewed internally even though it is that department that brings in the money
I am one of the few who has a fairly gliding role between the two groups, partly because I have been here for such a long time
There been some sense of devaluation of the ad-department because it comes from “the dirty world”

**Personalities?**
By and large people need to be autodidact within their area
The architects use language about architecture, but they haven’t got any training in journalism or in writing
In the ad-department, I don’t know where they are from
The girl who does marketing comes from copy land
I come from many places
The lay-outers are the only ones who are not autodidact, because they went to the architectural school and took the module that was called graphic design
And out new CEO is educated in business

**Workflow?**
Publishing frequency is once a month
There is always a week where we digest the most recent magazine where it kind of simmers what the next issue will be about
Then follows two weeks of production and one week with proofreading and adjustments
There is a monthly rhythm where one week is meditative, two weeks of creative and one week that is productive.

**Innovatio?**
Up until recently innovation was mostly in the books we published
Now we only publish 2 per year
Ca. every fifth year we would reorient the graphic design
In the past five years one new magazine has been launched, Nordic, and arkitekt DK has been through a radical change, and now it is being changed again to something a new magazine

**Triggers?**
Whether the magazine can live off of as few ads as possible
That makes it important for us to attract foreign readers, and then you have to adjust to that market
External pressures
For Arkitekten renewal lies in the graphics
We make 10 000 exemplars a year, 6500 of them goes out to architects through the union

**Type of management?**
Will she hear about this?
It was a big change, partly because she was so young
The previous manager was very deterministic and called the shots, decided on the theme etc, but other than that it was total anarchy
Sanne started out being a strong authority, which was tightly coupled with approximately half the staff getting fired
We went from 25 to 13 in two years, and it was communicated very poorly
We were not served with a plan that predicted this would happen
All of a sudden we were called a media house and there was emphasis on the website
There was four years with large words
We were ready for change
We were called a multimedia house, things that a literary man has difficulties relating to

**Transition? Differences in ways to work?**
Before Sanne, the manager being very everyday-like, and I were two years apart and had gone through the whole thing together, while on the other hand he was a baron, and you can only imagine the cocktail that created
That was connected with that by the end of it there was a very strong authority
By the end there was 20% very strict management, and the remaining 80% was all over the place
People did as they pleased, there was a high degree of flexibility

**Same flexibility as today?**
No. It is as if there has been a flow of autonomy into the new structure but the middle management (editors), also because Sanne doesn’t spend too much time here, and she has always been very indecisive and had difficulties making decisions
We have all experienced it
I’ve asked her very direct and concrete questions, and she’ll tell me we’ll talk about it later, but we never do
If we’ve asked about how to manage a vacation, and she’ll say that it’s up to us to figure it out
This means that the middle management have to take upon themselves some of that administrative work, more so than before
There are two layers of autonomy, where some is allowed from Sanne and some is allowed from the editors
The struggle between authority and autonomy
It is like dad would say to the older sister “take good care of the younger sister”
On the other hand, there is some autonomy in the departments, e.g. between Sofie and I

**Different from the old structure?**
It is different in that the old manager had been his managers apprentice and learned everything from him, which means he knew everything about the craft, even the ad-department
He could not sell anything, but he knew down to the detail about their contacts and their methods
He knew everything about paper quality, punctuating, standards and concepts, all those things in detail
That is a major difference
We know that Sanne does not know these things
She’s learning gradually but she will never be deep down in the material like the old manager.

Is that good or bad?
It is good for an anarchist like myself, but overall that’s not good.
I was making the magazine and we had very little money to do it, and I was told not to use too many pages and she says 52, which is totally absurd because a management is in 16° and the 52 pages were ridiculous.
The previous had been 52 pages but that was out of total crisis.
We could have with better economy made an issue with 54 or 56 pages.
In cases like that it is absolutely absurd that she is in charge.
When you have that overview you can fly over the water, but you need also be able to dive down deep once in a while and ask critical questions, but that requires she knows what’s down there.

Management style and influence?
No, not really.
I think we are too independent to be affected.
The ad department has been here for 10 years and I’ve been here for 27, and Martin in 10, so we know what we’re doing.
If the management was to be gone for 6 months we would have been able to run things our self.

Change?
You can’t say that.
We’ve gone from 24 to 13 in two years.
It is difficult to know for sure.
Perhaps it happens on middle management level, where the changes are presented to us at some point, e.g. emphasis on the website and partly the new magazine and the relation with Arkitekten.
There will obviously be some changes, but we are not informed of them yet.
Strong parallel between innovation and change.

Radical change?
The old structure was some kind of safe village environment with a fairly predictable everyday life, then we stepped into the modern room where there’s gossip and talk about a dynamic future, and this happened in a year.

Adjustment?
Since Sanne started the three first years people were wearing parachutes and were very protective and introverted and scared.
New people came to the team who had temporal employments with us, and other people on part time who had not been through that shock, and that contributed on that unsafe.
The informal exchange stopped because you never know the consequences.

Stability?
I would say high.
I would say that it is because we agree that our products will we relevant for the next five years.
If people stop reading we will die.

Challenge?
Retirement.

Creative organization?
80%

EVA
Age: 62
Position: financial manager.
When I started there was one more person on this post, but we restructured and he quit.
Our secretary took some of his work, which is what deals with subscriptions and that is a very important task.
So this department consists of Helene, who is responsible for the subscriptions, and me who does the rest (accounting, finances and book keeping).
We sell books so we account for royalties and commissioned work also for publishers who’s books we sell.
We make agreements with the writers we employ.
There is accounting for the books we publish and for staff.
I make sure to have an overview, to keep track of the atmosphere and try to detect if something is wrong and deal with it immediately.
If you hear about something then fix it.
We are too small to have big problems.
When I had been here for two weeks there was major let offs, and that was difficult for all of us because there was an old core, and that has shrunk and a lot of new people have joined.
There are some people who have had 25, 10 and 5 year anniversaries, so we still have a lot of the people here from the old culture.
The new additions to the staff are trying to create a new culture where you respect each others areas of responsability.
I can in principle do whenever and wherever, but the people who do subscriptions have to be by the phone during the day to reach customers.
Designers and editors can work whenever, and they do that too.
The respect between departments can be problematic because sometimes the editors and designers can get to the office at 11pm, and some people would ask “is that okay?” and yes it is, because their workflow is different and they worked till 1pm last night, but you don’t see that, you don’t know that, you only see that they are arriving to the office later that you are.
That is something we have worked a lot on trying to change, trying to create an accept for those natural differences, and not spend any negative energy on it.

I’ve been here for 4.5 years

Broad CV
Veterinarian, 2.5 years
Animal testing (Novo Nordisk)
Accounting and administrative work, and I really liked having that overview
Patent and branding agency and got an education in accounting
Research Center with 45 labyrinths, 3-4 years
Cosmetology School as administrative manager
Carpentry firm as administrative manager and personnel, fun to do something entirely different
Danish Architectural Press

I’m also a creative person, although my work is not creative it makes it easier for me to understand the processes. The business that was the most exciting for me was where I had a lot of organizational responsibility, but this has been by far the best job I’ve had.

I can participate in all different aspects of the firm, but never be a publisher but contribute to other important parts of the org, e.g. kitchen service and contribute over the whole pallet.

It is a very exciting place to be and everyone is very passionate about what they do.

We are so few people so that if someone is sick their workload piles up.

We are cut to the bone.

The leader group talk together all the time.
Once a month we have a sit down and share developments and status quo.
We have a very flat structure.
Martin has his stab that he manages.
If one of his stab members wants to talk to Sanne, then that’s no problem, but they normally answer to Martin.
We’ve had interns for the past year and that has been very positive.
Gives a lot of live, different way to speak and interact, and a lot of questions are posed and we’ve been forced to give proper explanations for the way we do things around here.
They are here half time during 6 months.
Sanne is really good at thinking outside of the box and challenging the way we do things.

We are in a very small industry that is very threatened, e.g. during the financial crisis that cut our income in half based on the ads not wanting to invest.
It was very grave.
Then she is very good at thinking differently, changing frames and trying to make money on other things and adapting to change.
The freelancers depend on the content that is curated for that specific editorial.
We all have management titles, but there is really not much to manage other than your self.

When I got sick I needed to work less and we found a way to work around that.
She is a manager who shows trust until the opposite is proven – really!
I have great respect for her.
And it is so much fun working here.
I have a hard time working for someone who decides what I do and what I should think about certain things, which is why I have changed jobs so frequently.
If I do not look forward to going to work than you should do something else.
If something is wrong we deal with it.

Workflow?
Administrative, we have a large workload during fall, because most subscriptions are running through the calendar year.
500 a week that is sent out.
And busy during revision.
Because we are cut to the bone we always have something to do.
There has come so much structure to this department.
When I started it was just one big pile, and I was able to come in and say “can I solve this?” and I made it work, and I think that is a lot of fun.
We have structure, deadlines, bulks and boxes and routines that makes it easier for us, and then we can move on to do analysis and other things, but that comes last due to shortage on staff.

Collective vs. individual?
Most people work within their boxes.
I can’t go in and help Sanne.
The people involved in book sale can help one another.
Administratively we can help one another but not interfere too much in each other’s systems.
Most of us have out special assignments.
Among the editors they might share graphic designers among them between issues.
The freelancing writers can help one another on different projects.
This collaboration is based on similar backgrounds.
There’s another magazine where Landscape is not paid by us.

Typical lifecycle?
I have something very clear ideas of what I’m doing and why.
Every morning I check the bank and send Sanne a status on the numbers.
The previous finances manager had no control and minus
Then I do the books ASAP, so that we are ajour and make book keeping and relations to our debtors a lot better, who I make payments to every second week
I make payments approx. once a week, which is approved by Sanne
I am dependent on Sanne or Steffen to approve expenditure so that no one is held accountable alone and for safety reasons
We have a lot of writers but the payments are small
Our books are not cheap, and they are amazing
I try to prepare revision all through the year, on a monthly basis so that work does not build up to before/during revision

Innovation

Steffen comes with a lot of ideas on how to attract more and different ads
Sanne is amazing
Martin develop ideas on how to meet audience, e.g. a collaboration we did with the engineers’ magazine
The person in charge of the books is really very committed about it, it’s her little baby
Within the areas of responsibilities there is room to innovate
If something costs money you check with Sanne or me
We meet new ideas in the house we work in, and I think we’re good at that
We have a Christmas party and a Summer party
There is strong openness to new ideas

Management

I think she is a very open and trusting leader
She trusts her stab, and that allows for a freedom
If she’s disappointed she’ll confront it, she’s not afraid
She does the necessary things, e.g. firing people
She is caring and makes sure that you get the help you need if you are not feeling good, attentive to peoples needs
She’s good to talk to and good to have people understand the processes in the firm
If she is annoyed with someone then she deals with it immediately
The engages with people if they are not motivated, or if they are giving signals of being so
I would not say she is a strong authority, but I have a lot of respect for her
I’ve never experienced her being angry with me
We do not have a hierarchy in here, but we know our places
If someone asks me something I cannot answer then I check with Sanne
We are such a small organization that small things become large

How does management style affect the way the org is run?
I think most people think she is a good manager, but there will always be some people who are not as supportive
She encourages cooperation and collaboration between departments
When I became alone on this post she was very good at delegating the workload among the rest of the staff
Some of that responsibility was left to the secretary who was not very fond of working with numbers, but she has been motivated by Sanne to keep doing it
You can clearly hear that she now knows exactly what she’s talking about, contrary to how it was in the start
We invite the board to the Christmas party so that we can have a relation with them
I think that is a very good thing

I was not here during the previous management
We moved out here in 2009 from Christianshavn, because the room did not really to work with
Here we can put out the entire magazine on the table in the common room to look at what we are presenting before publishing it
The old manager was an alcoholic and that was not very comfortable
There was a lot of art at the old location, but none of that came back up in the new offices, and I think that symbolizes that he is gone
The few things we have presented we all agree on is pretty, but we sold the rest of the collection
There was a lot of panic during his management

How has the work culture changed?
I think we have become a lot more effective, because there were a lot of employees under him
Whenever there is a new manager there will always be someone who does not get along and wanting things to be the way they were
When I started there was a very odd atmosphere
The person who’s job I took built shelves around him in his office, he was negative, spoke badly about Sanne and there was a lot of negative talk and gossip
I said that I would not want anything to do with that, and that the shelves had to go
The look in his eyes changed so that the look in his eyes turned evil
Luckily there was a change in that
When we work so closely together it is important that you are enjoying work
I am not good at eating lunch with the others
We have Friday lunches and a monthly meeting and update on progress and speak informally about how things are going and what is going on
Sanne started that
And Sanne will inform what she is up to, e.g. if she is not spending much time in the office

Change in daily life?
I see change as creating a new magazine, and we’ve tried that several times during my time here and it’s very exciting
Change is developing and redefining something, changing parts of a magazine or trying to re-brand it somehow, or finding target groups and funding, etc.
This primarily happens with the editors and the other departments are activated when our skills are needed, e.g. when subscriptions and ads needs to be coordinated

e.g. is there money to go to London for a presentation or lecture

I would not go on that trip

A lot of things are happening

There are negotiations going on right now and Sanne would inform us about that, so that we know what she is up to

**Stability?**

We have very few replacements

When we had the let-offs in 2009 I was worried that some people would quit, but that has not happened

Some people have been here a long time, out of the 15 employees

Since last fall we have looked to expand again

The organization was drastically reduced and is no gradually expanding

**Radical change?**

I think Sanne had a had time in the beginning

It was very free, there really was no management and she had to implement rules

e.g. starting the day with working not having breakfast, and not having paid 45 minutes lunches – which is purely luxurious

We have so many perks here and for a lot of people that’s just how it is

Under Sanne, when you get a raise it is written down what it actually are receiving in order to clarify that this is a positive thing

A 37,5 hour workweek inclusive paid 45 minute lunch – that’s nothing!

I tried to bring up that we should change that breakfast, but nothing happened

We do not have soda to begin with

We didn’t have fruit to begin with, but that came back

There are of course some people who were unhappy at times, but you can’t really avoid that

E.g. when we’re selling fewer ads then the workload is reduced so that we need less manpower to manage that workflow, and people had to adjust in order to not get fired

There was a long hard period

**The let-offs. Was it shocking or natural?**

It happened like that, in one day

10 people got fired

They were called into the managers office one by one so that there was no waiting and thinking

It was hard on all of us

**Necessary?**

Yes, no doubt about it.

Some people were negative about it and did not feel the need for new management

The reactions were visible and expressive

There was openly negative talk about Sanne

They were fired, mostly because of changes in the company

**Adaptability?**

I think the adjustment has gone really well

There will still be some people being unhappy, but most people are happy

**Established culture?**

Yes, I think so. If not they would have found something else

The let-offs were in Nov 2009, if they were not happy they would have found something else

**Tensions**

Susanne in the book department is very insenice, which can cause a problem

Sometimes she is asked to calm down

Between areas of responsibility, there might be some kind of envy of the editors being able to come in late, but they have such a different workflow than we do

They work late and weekends

**What do you have from the old culture?**

Negative: spoiled.

The idea that it is taken for granted that you have a lot of vacation, 45 min lunches, breakfast..

I think we should be more grateful for those perks

It’s not common

There are very few companies that can have those perks

It was a lot more lassiez fair

There are more demands placed on how things should be

Most people are passionate about what they do, otherwise they would be somewhere else

The company is dependent on people to do their jobs in order to survive

Good: that creativity and passion and the joy of communicating

**Challenges?**

Understanding when to renew ourselves and to broaden the customer base

To really understand how we can reach more people

It is a very specialized business and the magazines are niche

And be present at the doctors waiting room so that people can discover the magazine
It will be difficult for the average non-architect to understand the magazines

Creative organization?
The editors are creative, but the administration is not
I am affected of being in a creative environment
I love coming in here because people are passionate about what they do
The joy that comes with new creative discoveries is incredible
Everyone cares
The pride of presenting something personal and unique

BIARKE
Introduction
Daily manager and booker
Daily manager is something you appropriate to yourself and is an established cultured term
It is first and foremost for my employees
I am not supposed to be an authority and create a top-down management but I am supposed to make it fun for people to come to work and facilitate so that they can do what they do best and can in turn have as many good experiences of working at JH as possible because they think they are good at mastering their tasks.
It is in their interest, and in the interest of the culture, that we have fun working because you’re good at what you do and is surrounded by people who also are good at what they do and you can sense an active contribution to the house.
It is additionally in the house’s best interest that everyone does his or her work properly.
That is the fundamental idea.
There is a very flat structure internally.
I am not at all trying to act a leader; I have a bit more loving approach to management, asking the questions “Are we happy?”
“Are we not happy enough?” “What can we do to improve what is not good enough?” etc.
It is only in relation to the outside world that I will act as a leader, and that is something that the staff does not really notice.
Example:
We have a very active sparring culture.
There is still not an accurate overview of the house’s economy so no one gets money to do fun stuff. No travels, no perks of any kind, and then you have to set a god example.
Yesterday I got an invoice from Carsten (“CEO”) who was going to some improvisation theater course that he wanted the house to cover the cost.
He called me up and was very mad and we had a long talk about it and I explained that this was a sparring exercise and that no one is receiving perks.
At this point we are postponing necessary reparations like parts for the drum set up that we do not have, etc., and when we ask people to be so moderate and frugal with spending then it is important that we are that too and set a good example.
And that is why you cannot have JH pay for the course, if you want to go you’ll have to pay yourself.
It was only 500 DKK but it’s a matter of principle.
And he got very annoyed about it, but that is how I believe we should do things.
You have to walk the talk.
I could see more important things to spend our money on.
If people are supposed to have the opportunity to do things like this it needs to be built into the budget and communicated to everybody so that everyone has access to those resources and not only one or two people behind the line who can spend some money that are not made available in the budget. That’s no good.
My way of managing is to insist on the culture and take the necessary fights.
So it is more like a governing of the culture, if someone wants to shoot at our staff I will step in and take the blow when the shit hits the fan.
It’s like a shield for the outside world so that I can keep focused internally as much as possible.
And booking, that’s booking music, and it’s a combination of being a Jysk business man (save money) and to establish the house’s profile, and that’s a strong contributing motivational factor internally because the complication of people/staff right now is relatively homogenous what artistic preferences are concerned.
I am aware that there is some booking I do that people think is necessary in order to maintain the artistic profile but we are also trying to attract a younger audience by doing some more quirky booking.
That helps for the outside world to brand the house profile differently but also internally because it is motivating to do some shows that have not been done before.

There is a collective aspect to the booking process despite me being the booker grounded in the shares idea of quality criteria and similar taste.
I use the staff as a resource.
For example I booked some crazy Italian noise metal in September where Claus was important. He has a better ear for that kind of thing and is more experienced and has a larger network that he can activate and it would be ridiculous not to take advantage of that.
Another example is the Jazz and Poetry project that is entirely up to Rasmuss to manage because of his background in literature and festivals, publishing and bookstores, etc. And he is a great resource for that project and will serve as an important alternative to his every day life, because it is nice to break off from your routine even if you like what you do. It is nice to do something else and JH allows them to do just that. And they are a lot better than me at many things.
It’s just like the events here, they make up this social kit in situations that you share with others.
Rasmuss is preoccupied with PR, I am preoccupied with daily management, Claus is preoccupied with production, and you can sense the interdependence between the roles during events, because people come together during events.
Events are collective efforts and we share the formal responsibility for them.
It not like we all book together, but I naturally draw on peoples’ interests and capacity.

The formal organization
I would prefer to be down there, or have them up here, but I have a certain responsibility.
Carsten is the director formally, but in reality he is more like a financial manager who reviews and approves budgets. I am responsible for the budget, but he reviews them and has a continuous follow-up on the finances. (Administrative responsibility)
There is the same structure at the festival where Carsten is the director 50/50 at JH and the festival and Kenneth is the daily manager of the festival.
They are not equal because the full time employed staff has a very valuable know-how that is difficult to replace.
It is easier to find a new Jens or Peter.
The employed staff is closer to the core business, which is not to run a bar, which is a peripheral activity.
Laust does PR and is a facilitator.
Thomas and Emil are technical support.
The roles are fairly clear.

There is a continuous discussion about fusing with the festival

How are the roles determined?
They are determined without arguing with the staff.
Before roles were determined based on sympathy for certain persons, and throw them some tasks in the organization.
Then we flipped it, which I think is the most obvious thing, namely to ask
“What is a venue?”
“What kind of tasks is there to be carried out?”
How are they bulked?
What tasks are naturally bundled?
Both within the same value chain but also relational.
That way you find out that a production person starts his work at one point and finish the work at another point.
And when you write down all the tasks then you have an overview of what that person should be able to do academically (faglig).
Additionally there are some personal features I would like people to have, good mood, punctual, responsible, that you naturally have.
Then it’s about sitting down and thinking about what we need in order to solve the problems we face in the everyday life.
We have finances, production, PR, marketing, technical and bar, and booking and daily managing.
That’s where you start.
So it is fairly clear what tasks that need to be performed.

They have large degree of freedom and autonomy with how they fill their roles.
I don’t believe in the management form that is free and rich on initiative.
I employ people who I think is more capable to do their tasks than I am.
I strongly respect insight and knowledge of a field and I am an 83% worse production manager than Claus is, and the same goes for PR and marketing, etc.
I cannot write as well, as qualified or as quickly as Rasmuss, etc.
What I can do is to make sure that they feel like they’re working for a task and a goal that is motivating for them, that they are motivated to come to work, that it is fun to be at work, and that they can develop their skills and grow at work within their field of responsibility.
You do that only if you have the freedom to develop it.
If not it becomes an ethic of duty that is very corporate, and you just can’t do that in such a small business and I cannot manage such an organization, I am not constituted like that.
That would make me bad at my job, and I think that the staff would be worse at their job.

Workflow
Inflatable: project based and increases in volume during events.
Very varied workflow.
First of all we offer a seasonal product, which makes some periods busier than others.
There are two veins.
My booking tasks are fairly constant.
Which makes Rasmuss’ PR responsibility fairly constant, same with production.
Claus will naturally be busier in periods with many shows, whereas Rasmuss will be busier in the time before the events.
When a booking is made I send a mail to PR so that information on that event can be prepared.
We are in some kind of organized pace in relation to one another, where the workflow peaks at different times.
There is an understanding of what our respective responsibility is, what it requires to fill them.
But then there is always the case of Sony coming to us and wanting to rent the house on a four days notice, and they do not know what a time schedule is or a rider, or a technical plan, so Claus needs to call around to all the sound engineers in Sweden, Finland and Norway because they can not do that themselves.
So there are all these ad hoc tasks that we need to do, like coming in early to light the table candles.
So there are all these small things that are not a part of the daily work description that important that you can do, because we have a lot of that here.
Both in relation to events, but also when it comes to fixing the chairs or optimizing the wardrobe.
Parts of the work is fairly constant with small changes, but then there are all the other things that come up, that are very sudden and unpredictable and time consuming.

Innovation
We are trying to change the program profile in what we are presenting.
There is not a lot of money for it so it is very dependent on the funds we are applying for specific projects than can allow us to do certain lines of concerts, marketing PR initiatives – there can be some initiative in that.
There is some innovation in relation do operations.
There is software that would be a big leap in the right and professional direction that will release some resources to work more innovative.
JH has only recently reinvented itself so it is important to have that new identity established before we start to go crazy. There are still some role clarity issues that needs to be worked out among the staff, that can be improves by gaining a better overview, which such software can contribute to.

It is a difficult business to be innovative in. Either you do pop-up venues in developing countries, or CO2 friendly initiative, or challenge the concert format or whatever. It is very far between the successful innovations within live music for venues, within the format of concerts. Perhaps we are conservative in that sense or it is because the format works perfectly fine the way it is. That which makes a difference is small adjustments, like better chairs or nicer candles, small lifts – rather than a radical change. It smells like a debate that comes from ministerial levels saying, “we need to challenge the concert format”, but we never experience someone leaving JH saying, “puh, I am so tired of the concert format”.

The audience is happy with the way we present concerts. Not to day that we don’t have to change anything, but it is like wanting to change something that isn’t broken.

Leadership
Are you ever in conflict between being authoritative outward and non-authoritative inward?
No, not really.
I would not be a good traditional manager, it’s not my style, being strict and clear and tough, set limits.
It’s a “we” business, mostly for the sake of the staff and for us to share a positive work environment.
JH has previously been closely tied up to personalities with a supporting team, creating these eras of certain characters. “The Lennart Era”.
It is as if these personalities somehow represent the house.
I believe the organization to be bigger than its members.
I want to create an operationally secure set up so that you fairly anonymous can replace key persons.
I don’t want people to become indispensable.
So that if someone ever leaves the organization then someone else can fall right into an established system.
So that there is no nervousness if someone decides to leave his/her post.
I want people to know JH.
I decline offers to speak publicly.
I am happy to offer background info but I do not want to be quoted by name because it needs to be JH that is the sender, not me.
It’s a way to make it a collective responsibility, so that whenever we get positive feedback it is a collective positive feedback, and not me that receives it.
We had a musician write us four days after he had performed at JH saying how great the experience with the new house was. He was met professionally and with knowledgeable and dedicated crew.
And he was grateful that JH dared focus on free jazz as one of the few in EU.
In summary he had had a great experience with the house, money was paid out on time, he had a long discussion with Claus about drums, the production details were on par.
And this is where we want to be, at a point where the house satisfies and that is not accounted for my one person’s effort.
I want people on the outside to feel the institution JH and its passion for jazz, while the people inside should feel the actual players, the people.
After Claus’ long discussion about drums with the musician then he will remember that as a representation of JH.
In that sense it is a very personal reflection of Claus’ field if interest and personality, and that is what we want people to meet when they come to JH.
That we are people and that we enjoy working here.

How does leadership style affect the way work is being carried out?
Freedom ➔ ownership ➔ joy of mastering ➔ performance/output
Perhaps someone wants more structure and limitations.
That the free way of managing might make people’s tasks unclear.
We went to the summer house some weeks back, and Rasmuss was telling me how he found it hard to know what I was doing as the daily manager, which is understandable because it is really just a thousand small things. So many micro tasks that make it difficult to explain exactly what it is that I do.
Administrative details, and information that is only really relevant to the people asking for it, which is why I don’t involve too many people in it.
It deals a lot with providing data and info to the festival, to municipal institutions, to the accountant that really isn’t interesting for other people.
I am only guessing because we have not discussed this, but perhaps someone would want a clearer/obvious leader, one that was more “the boss”.
Management from my experience with other venues have been similarly non-authoritative and organizations have had flat structures, where more authoritative managers have not been able to create a positive culture, and people have not been able to show the best of them.
It is a difficult question because I don’t really think too much about how I am as a leader. To me it is more about humanity. You do certain things a certain way that is bound up in some kind of moral codex that I have from childhood. It’s about being a decent person and that should get you far. Especially in such a small organization where you work so closely with people.
I don’t see people in departments, I see individuals.
“When one person dies it is a tragedy. When 100 000 people die it is statistics.” (Lenin)
If you are not naturally authoritative you might have to learn how to be authoritative if the organization, situation requires that.
I’ve had to fire people that I’ve worked extremely closely with.
My privilege is that I’ve been able to fire a lot of people.
We started at a place where I was allowed to define the organization over time and add to the organization some people who I trust.
Once we’ve reached that point there is little need to be authoritative. If the organization required me to keep the old employees then I would have had to be a very different kind of leader.
Then it would have been with punishment and not with rewards.
I think that her natural authority is perceived as less authoritative because she is a woman.
You have a feminine, soft leader style, which is unusual for a man.

That is what Signe was so good at. She was very strict and rough without people noticing it.
There are certain characteristics that women and men have that are different.

How has the environment changed under the new management?
It has changed radically just by the old manager being gone.
As of today there are no members from the old structure left in the organization.
I dealt with the old organization a few months as I started.
As of today it is an organization with more focus and structure.
People have focus on JH.
Previously people have not been focused on JH but with other simultaneous projects and signaled strongly that they were not entirely present, which was confusing and bothering.
It is a more professional organization.
People contribute with the information they are supposed to, and solve the problems that they are supposed to and in a timely matter without being activated.
The response is positive from the outside world; the artists are happy, etc.
Our relation to the neighbors is improved.
It went from being a circus to being a place to work.

Culture for change
The staff needs to be good at dealing with change because ever since I’ve been with JH it has been one long change process.
We wanted to go from nightclub to culture focused music venue, rebuilding and restoration and all of a sudden the house was opening, then we fired people, then we hired people, then new processes were coming into place and the continuous discussion of a possible fusion with the festival and all the questions relating to that...
Change has been good for the way we work together as colleagues, but it is not something that I find unmanageable.
Change fills a lot of the everyday life of JH.
It also depends on how you articulate it, because you can call it change and it will sound foreign and strange to people, but you can also talk about improvement as another word for the same process where you move from one point to another.
Implicit in this is some kind of constant, that you are bringing yourself through the change, that change is something that is left, sacrificed, lost – so I think it is more about creating a culture for improvement rather than for change.
That way you are more certain to bring yourself with you on to the next step.
Or a refinement culture.
When I look back at the time I’ve been here and the work that people have put down here, the change lies in the constituency of new management or initiatives.
The improvement lies in the work that is carried out after the constituency, possibly through refinement and improvement.
I feel we are at a point where there is clarity around what JH is and what kind of work that goes into it, and I think we have the right staff to do it.

High or low degree of stability?
There is still an element of chaos, but it is chaos by choice because of the personalities in the firm.
We are all lol-children, which defines how we work together.
Sometimes there’s too much chaos for some people and sometimes too little for others.
I think there is relatively strong stability in the organization.

Strong culture → predictability → reduce uncertainty → increase productivity
Strong culture → inhibits innovation → reduce flexibility → decrease productivity

JH must be responsive, many ad hoc tasks, uncertain demand, turbulent market
Must have a shared responsive culture grounded in collective ideas and behavioral ideals

I think we should have a considerate culture
If we at some point need to change the work culture, if it creates discomfort, then we will be mindful to that, especially as a small organization.
We have a natural personal expression where people can be themselves
Authenticity is important.
People can be comfortable to be themselves fully and not compromise their personalities in order to go to work, and that’s great.
The personality, individual is the strongest determinant of culture.
The team as a determining of culture, which is good and bad.
Can also serve as a barrier to change.

It is organic and authentic, but also with a risk in a highly subjective industry grounded in personal taste.
Balance expressive culture and efficiency and productivity.

I would like a culture where people can be themselves, a shared brain.
It is like a nuclear bomb, there exists energy between the particles when they collide, and it is better to give room for that than to try to restrain that.
It provides energy.

When Lennart quit I held a speech and I though about what I appreciate about him.
He was himself always, honestly and fully, which was good and bad.
He did not play against or
And just that kind of relation is what I want, to have people express their thoughts and reflections, where you articulate your concerns when they arise, deal immediately with a problem with respect for one another, and learn through that. "spill-inn-kultur, ikke spill-med eller spill-mot"
I don’t want an opposition culture

I have been in jobs where I’ve been too accepting and it is incredible how much you can take, and that should not happen at JH.

BJARKE

Change?
They are large as project
We are aware of what we want to change, but they cannot be changed over night
The consequence of a realized change is large, but getting there takes a lot of small steps
In that sense changes have a character of adjustments and refinement, small things
Because the house we took over was so chaotic we have not been able to have the largest ambitions, but rather focus on getting the basic structures settled in, and we have been fairly clear on what the basics are
Changes will seem larger if you do something you haven’t done before, while this has been a practice in developing things that we’ve done before
We have just started opening up for discussing and implementing new projects, but there is a lot of diffusion and vagueness of what the change is all about, and the consequence of the new initiative
It is not necessarily harder than other things we already have executed here, but not knowing makes it seem more diffuse and vague
E.g. we are in dialogue with Nordea Fonden about a potential video project that makes us accountable for a set of success criteria to a third party, and how on earth do you do that?
I think that is very new and something that we haven’t done
We are a lot more comfortable with adjustments, developments and refinement of our own systems, because we know them and what output it gives
It is difficult to project the gains for such a project
If this goes through we’ll have to answer to a very powerful third party, and that’s new to us
It is very positive that there is room to take on new projects like that, it took a year to get here, and people are very motivated to be part of it
It is very different from the practical work we’ve been doing so far

Stability?
I am under the impression that there is high degree of solidity and solidarity and that people do what they are supposed to and without me activating them
It can look crazy from the outside, but that is the culture we have created and we are creating stability through that
The artists are getting the information they need, the concerts are facilitated well, and finances are good
I think there are strong stability and solidity and quality in what we deliver, but from the outside it can look chaotic from the outside, but that comes from a sensation of responsibility for what we do

Established a new culture?
Yes.
It can also be a danger for the culture to be so atypical, that we might at one point loose a coworker because they need to move on
It is a very special social climate you fall into by working with us and some people might find it difficult to find their place in the way we work
It is informal enough that same people will find it noisy, and difficult to work for a manager who interferes as little as I do, but I just cant be that kind of manager
I know it works for some, and does not work for others
I think it is easier to have someone fit into a set system than in a loose system, where we clearly being in the latter category and I am aware that might be a problem for some
Lately I’ve been challenged as a leader and my principles
I will lose the fight to win the battle in operating with JH’s best interest in mind
E.g. I am provoked when I am challenged on my management principles and values for the organization, and that has happened between Karsten and me when he wanted to go to a management course, which JH wouldn’t pay for
I’ve told people to save everywhere they can, there are no perks other than social perks, we work on our own computers, and there is no travel budget or education budget
Manager needs to set a good example if we want the staff to be as frugal as us
Everyone would have equal opportunities to such funds
E.g. when Karsten claims that during the festival that they would not be paying rent, “we are doing this together”, and then all of a sudden one party has defined the principles
All of a sudden we should be subsidizing them because we are doing well and they are not, and that is very demotivating for the people working here
They are working for a low wage with no perks, why should they help finance that they don’t have their business in order
By principle I would want to do it because we have a special relation to the festival, but to receive such a dictate and I told him that that’s not in line with the values or way we operate at JH, and is an unacceptable request
He speaks of an inherent balance sheet where JH is in debt to the festival, and claiming that there is a dialogue about it
That debt can either exist through a deliberate discussion where we establish some consensus around who owes who what where we can work out a system for down payment, or it must be eliminated and start fresh
This is why we are breaking everything down in monetary terms of expenditure, utilities, manpower per hour, etc….
He speaks with two tongues, he’ll say that we work together under the same system but he’ll pull out this “debt” second it is beneficial for him
Either it is there and clearly defined, or it is eliminated and you never speak about it again.
It cannot be used as a triumph card whenever he sees it as fit
That can be dangerous and unhealthy, so there has been some occasions where I’ve had to defend my staff and the values the
house represents, to maintain motivation
I argue upwards and manage inward, to make sure that what we have here will maintain as a positive thing
I have lost some battles in order to maintain a good tone, small things, so that if I fight for something it is more strongly heard
than if I should fight for every thing

Radical change?
The death of the nightclub.
Lennars understanding of the house was music May-Britt just went to work
He was supportive of killing the nightclub
The concerts were just a necessary evil to have the nightclub going, where it has taken a lot of effort to change people’s mindset
to understand that we are a music venue
It should be about what we are, and not what we are not
We are a venue that people will chose to go to
It has been difficult to implement at the bar, because a lot of them have been here for a long time
But more people are now music-oriented, and there will be a slow fade out of the party-oriented culture

We let off four people and the fifth left voluntarily
That has not been easy, but is has been with some relief
It gave us the opportunity to design a new organization, and challenge the culture of people doing what they were doing cause
they had been doing it for a long time
It was easier to motivate new staff to take on new assignments
The new people who came to the org were music people and were professional

Signe was engaging and motivating and visible for the house
Karsten is an idiot in every way
There is with some nostalgia and positive remembrance that we speak of Signe
We make fun of Karsten once he’s left the room

Then there is the potential fusion with the festival and all the questions that comes with that
Kenneth and I are discussing what that would look like
There might not be room for everyone in the new organization
Who comes with us?

Lay-offs?
The first two were Rekyl and May-Britt
She was fired because she wasn’t good enough, which she was aware of
Rekyl was shocked. He worked closely with Mr. party who ran the nightclub and was important for that scene
He had major difficulties adapting to the new culture of sitting down and plotting information into an excel sheet and planning
He saw himself as indispensible, which is why it came as such a surprise to him because all of a sudden he was left with nothing
Kildevald was the person I had to work the most with because he was the laziest and didn’t deliver anything
He had been here for ten years and knew a lot about how the house worked and who to call if anything broke
He saw himself as an artifact of the house and could not imagine not being here
He was also shocked by being let off but could also understand because he was pressured so much by me, e.g. on deadlines that
he had set himself but did not meet
I had given him a warning
He was very bitter and thought I was annoying because I was so insisting on creating structure and planning
Trine was also shocked
I had wanted to fire her for a long time, but Signe and Karsten protected her
I thought that happened too late
She thought the volunteers worked well, and she was in charge of events but nothing happened
I could see that there were a lot of problems with the volunteers
It was a big shock for her

How did the others respond?
During the first round of lay offs last summer, Trine was the one who mostly embraced the new JH so she agreed that they lay
offs needed to happen
The strange thing was, and I’ve thought about this a lot as an example of how misaligned the house was, that people were
indifferent when I fired her
Rekyl and Kildeval used the office, as a platform to work on other projects, so that when they left there was not a sensation of
the office losing important qualifications
They only created stop-blocks and noise, so it was very unsentimental for the organization when they left
I thought that was somewhat odd
People were happy to be rid of Trine, no-one knew what she was actually doing and she complained a lot over things she was in
power of herself, e.g. not being a part of the culture but showing up at 1pm every day instead of coming to the office at 9am with
the rest of us
Lennart left, because he was so important socially for the office, knowledgeable and interesting
When he left JH had no personification any more, he was the incarnation of JH
So it went from being Lennart’s responsibility to promote JH to becoming a collective responsibility
I think we all miss his mood and his way of entering the room and he is nice to be around
There are two new eras
One where Klaus came in and Rasmus was on his way in, and the second where Lennart left
They were culture-changing events
Reactions to the change?
There was little response to the first firings because it was leading up to a summer period and there was a gap where we went on holiday. When we came back from summer holiday Klaus had started and we all kind of had a fresh start with a new and intensified focus with no dogs and less noise.

It was a rather gliding change. When Trine left there was a sensation of relief and tasks were more naturally distributed, e.g. Klaus took over the volunteers. He has different social skills than Trine, which left the volunteers better taken care of and makes them feel that he is attentive and is not correcting all the time.

Joyous is the wrong word to use, but an understanding of that we had done the right thing, and reactions were fairly unsentimental.

Adapted well and established something new?
This has been one long process of professionalizing, which has had a lot to do with getting the right personnel and to delegate the right tasks to the right people, and that requires knowing what those tasks are. That’s where I feel we are now, at a point where I don’t feel the need to keep track of what people are doing, and I want the people who are here now to stay, at least in the administration.

I feel that the staff have the same mindset and are really good to their work and that we have made a clearly defined division of responsibility, and what responsibility is collectively shared.

We want to be a focused concert arranging organization that then months a year focus on being a venue and two months a year focus on the two festivals, and only employ staff that is dedicated to that set up.

We are talking about eliminating having events here, because it is confusing and demotivating for us to produce on behalf of others.

We want to cut away all the distracting and confusing elements and only work with people who understand and agree on how to produce concerts and festivals.

That means we can merge fairly well with the festival without having to let more people off.

I think and hope that we can keep the current construct in a potential fusion.

Strategy?
The focus is to start creating a strategy.

Up until now it has been all about refinement, clean up, improvement, efficiency and saving and all the boring things that we thankfully find fun, but now we can start going beyond that.

Now we can start talking about what do to with surplus, and there is this very Protestant idea of reinvesting surplus in something that will grow, and that is where we are right now.

We need to figure out what to do now!

Klaus and I are the most efficiency loving and structured people here, wanting the Swedish software that will improve communication.

We need to go out there and get some more money.

There is no money to invest in development, which is why we are in dialogue with Nordea Fonden.

Lau, Simon and Rasmus are more focused on development than Klaus and I. E.g. having artists do posters for us, the video project, an idea about communicating jazz to children that doesn’t forces them to love the jazz, but be entertained and learn.

That can be combined with the video idea.

We want to get money to buy backline instead of having to rent, which is motivating for Klaus.

We need to sit down and define what JH is now, which has been very traditionally explained in the historical sense, which I am indifferent with.

I want us to communicate what JH is as of today and focus less on what is used to be, and rather say something about who we want to exist for, and we need to do that together as a collective effort.

Some initiatives will be developmental, others innovation driven but they all need to gather the house because it needs to make sense for everyone, because we need to be happy for one another when they succeed in their projects.

Challenges?
The rent, very boring.

To communicate to the external and ourselves world what JH is – it’s artistic image, because we have changed profile.

We are receiving positive response from the high brow jazz community, which is very motivating.

It has probably become a more difficult house.

I have deliberately booked more demanding music based on inferior cultural qualities, even though fewer people attend.

It is of course a goal to get people to love the music we love.

Another challenge is the fusion.

People are talking about it.

We need to be ready to insist on JH maintaining its identity, but also be open to listen to good ideas.

It can be a great opportunity to learn about how we can further improve.

The engagement with the festival should be a positive one, and we need to be good at listening and being open.

There will be two very different cultures that fusions.

At the festival office it is as quiet as the grave, Kenneth gives out information very late while I provide all information and details as soon as a booking is made.

It is a very different way to work.

Kenneth has this kind of mistrust to his staff, but he has only just started.

They do not communicate and bad business decisions comes out of that.

Kenneth keeps things a secret and does not talk to his associated.

We want to design our own organization, instead of having the board dictate.

Unqualified decisions are being made from the board.

Should we have a finance manager, or only have accountants communicating directly to the board?

The challenge is that neither Kenneth nor I have ambitions of being a leader, we just want things to work and are not interested in hierarchy, but we are not interested in getting new people in. Three leaders is too many for such a small organization, two is max.

Creative organization?
Creative as in creational, yes. I think we come up with creative solutions, which we have spent a year doing. I know that sounds boring, but we create new solutions and improved work environment every day. Creative processes have a undefined concept of what the end goal is and what method to apply, but I have been pretty understanding of where to go but been fairly certain of what method to apply. We share ideas and develop them together, and there is a momentum for that. When you have concepts of that constitutes creative organizations I see an ad agency with white boards and foosball table, but here it is more processes that goes on in peoples minds and in dialogue with others. That stigma is in the way for me knowing what kind of creative organization JH is.

KLAUS
Production manager
That means I am suppose to convey an idea into action, translate an idea to reality. I communicate between the artist, or Bjarke really. Someone sets up an event and I am supposed to make it happen. I have ideas too, but primarily it is my job to execute other peoples ideas. I have been a musician all my life. I have done record production for 12 years. I am here 60 hours a week, full time plus. The board: everyone answers to them, that goes all the way down through the organization. I am responsible for all practicalities concerning events. I need to make sure that there are someone here at 9 if there is a delivery. Bjarke is responsible for the bar staff, but indirectly it is me because I make sure they come to work and schedule their work. I have a lot of freedom in my work. That is in my job description. I am inventing it myself, I’m here to invent it. When I started there had never been a production manager on the house, to that role is made up from scratch. It is with a lot of creativity and productivity. The only restrain I have is budgets, which means if we spend 8000 DKK on production then the lamps won’t be fixed, strictly based on the budget. I have full insight in the budgets, I have to have that because my work depends on it. We are not a festival so we have a continuous flow. If we need to fix a piano that can happen in April, but the light have to wait till September, so we really need to plan ahead. I am always supposed to think ahead of the productions, make sure we have all the technical requirements in place, all contact info for the musicians, etc. I am usually 3 weeks ahead, but have little to do with the actual execution of the event. I have a lot of freedom when it comes to spending. If we reach larger amounts I consult Bjarke and Charlotte to see if there is any money to spend, and the prices needs to be collected in advance.

Workflow
The staff (communications, booking, accounting, production) have normal working hours within their respective areas. We try to have an office where we sit togethger, which is a reason why some people are not with us anymore because they were unable to spend time in the office with the rest of the team. We do that in order to create a flow, because there is a lot of information to be shared. However, some of us share the responsibility of facilitating concerts, which allows you to take time off. We try to keep a calendar of when people are on the house, when do we collaborate, and when do we have one man down. Having the house open during the day requires that we know these things in relation to musicians who comes and goes, deliveries. The bar, volunteers, the students are at the house absolutely ad hoc. They come in, they’re sent home. The sound engineers are on a hourly basis depending on the productions.

Do you strive for a mostly constant workflow?
The people who are steadily employed are the people who work most steady, consistently with deadlines. Due to the nature of our different processes, and different peak times, we work very fluctuating and adjust after need.
My work highly depends on whether I have my “present-hat” on or my “future-hat” on. When I’m present the workflow is constant. And the other half of my work is when I can be home planning out an event and being present at the house during the event as a facilitator.

I am the new volunteer manager. I am doing things very differently than Trine. More structure, more volunteers, more communication. I want to build up a smart way of doing things.

I’ve elevated some volunteers to be in charge of communication to the volunteer base as contacts. Some who helps the new volunteers, some does web design, some does event for the volunteers.

Strategy?
I want to be present as a person, but I do not have time for the coordination, the practical information and create a sub-organization that is self-motivating. Vi are very inspired by the model at vox:hall since I know it very well. It is very much self-organizing where all I do is to schedule the posts. The contact I have with the volunteers is social and friendly. It is very important that they can come into the house and feel that we are friends, because there is not an employer-employee setting. We drink beer and have coffee and high-five.

Work process
I receive info from Bjarke, a contract with a date and a budget. Get all the details from the artists about what they need for the production. Then I turn to booking of hotels, personal, rental. I check all availability of the proposed times and details. I hand that info back to the artists and the budget back to Bjarke, and then it’s all set. My primary task is facilitation beforehand in the preparations of an event, down to the detail (extra drum sticks, lights...). All these details are handed over to the event manager. I manage large and demanding productions myself because there is a lot of work after the event and that is easier for me to do myself.

We create a “Concert File” that is handed to the event manager, and in that is all the planning we are able to predict. And then there are all the things we cannot predict, whatever happened during the event falls on the event manager on duty.

Innovation
The house is floating, and that needs to be understood in two ways: we are on the water surface and this is where it’s supposed to be there are two types of innovation in the house. We have a few periods where we are closed where we brainstorm and ask ourselves “what can we do differently?” “Can we make a new stage? New wardrobe system?”

When there is no event we take the time to look at the house. The second, and more interesting type of innovation is the one that lies in that no event is the same. We make concerts, we facilitate for others to do concerts, rental, private events – and something new happens every time.

And every event is dealt with in a new, special way. New solutions will emerge naturally and automatically in that every event is unique. Some people will say “we want a buffet and have it places around the band” Then we say “Okay!”

There is a lot of innovation that comes through the requirements each event place on us. I had an artist from NY who said he wanted to play a movie before his concert. Then what do we do? Now there is a projector installed in the roof and I am working on getting a charger for it. That solution is not only for that specific event, now we can use it for other events too in the future. So innovation comes from need and adjustment and meeting new requirements. And that is what makes us endure the work because I would much rather be here 8 hours a day, get good ideas and implement them, but that’s not how it works.

Thankfully are no event the same, even though you would want that the days you are tired, but it really develops the house and we do it together with artist, which makes it fun because they will leave and say “I’m a part of JH now”, and that means a lot to us. The important thing here is that this makes the booker’s role very important because if you only invite the same artists with the same type of performance then nothing happens.

As long as we have artists that want something else, then that will develop the house. Not only static development, as with lamps and practical things, but also with the visiting audience and their experience with what kind of place JH is. The more noisy events we sell more Guld Øl. The more quiet pianists we book the more red wine we sell. Everything moves. The more rock shows we do the less the wardrobe is used. All these things shift according to what we fill the house with. We do not want to be limited to only focusing on one area of innovation. We are asking our self how can we be mobile enough to embrace everything? That’s a big part of my job.

E.g. we want to be able to have a scene everywhere.
What kind of management is there in the house?
Depends on what member of staff you ask.
With my job and the communication people there is high degree of self-management.
Bjarke does not understand what I do and that is not in his direct interest, perhaps indirectly, he wants a good experience at JH just as much as a guest wants that.
He is naturally interested in my budget, because I am here to make sure we do wild things at JH but that we don’t spend too much money.
A lot of it is about saving and DIY ideas.
I live by self-management, what – when and how.
It is opposite when you flip it, when I need to make sure that Bjarke is present to coordinate an event with the volunteers as an event manager.
All political decisions goes straight to Bjarke.
In many ways he is a political leader for me and the communication.
There is more direct management with accounting, not because she can not me self-managing but would prefer direct management.
There is also a lot of direct management with the bar personnel.
I think I have more leadership responsibilities than Bjarke in relation to the personnel, despite him having the last word, but I am the one who is in direct contact with them.
I define my own work, which is convenient because I have some management education and experience and am used to working with these kinds of practicalities.
He knows that when you sit all the way up there that you can not reach the floor personnel.

How is management style determining of how the house works?
A lot. And that is about culture. Bjarke’s primary job is to try to create a culture where everyone’s values of JH are aligned.
What kind of house do we want to be?
How do we want people to experience us as personnel?
Should we be invisible or out drinking beer with the artists?
Do we show up on time or are we very flexible?
All these elements of culture is his primary concern at JH.
Much of the implementation of these values falls to me and the event managers, because we are the ones who are in contact with the personnel.
Bjarke implements it via us.
There is no need for the very authoritative leader, but there is need for someone who defines the frames within which we operate, you make notice of whenever you need to go outside those frames, but the frames are fairly broad.
It is more about values and culture than it is about rules.

Has that managed to establish itself during your year here?
There were no values here when I started.
It was all a party.
Everything is build up from scratch, in my opinion.
We have adopted everything we could use from the old culture.
It is difficult because it is like a big ship we’re trying to turn around.

What have you kept from the old culture?
The pride of the house
There is a lot of history in the house that you are proud over.
There are some things that are conserved in the curtains and the candles on the tables
You could easily get rid of these things but people are used to them and have positive experiences of returning to this experience, and we’ve allowed them to keep because it is good for the house, it’s in JH’s interest.
The fact that there’s a piano here with candles on although it’s not going to be used tonight is something that is a part of the values in the house.
You can’t teach people the friendly atmosphere among the bar staff, it needs to be self-emerge and has had to survive from the old culture, which is good and bad, but however still important.
Nothing from logistics or finances survived.

What did you get rid of?
The most important shift is that it has turned into a work place contrary to what it used to be, it used to be a party, also for the paid staff.
The staff were equal to the guests.
We have changed that.
If you’re a part of the personnel you it is a work place.
You can’t drink while working.
You can’t just rent a violin on the day and pay a fortune for it because it is missing.
We have changed a spending pattern that was unplanned.
Everything deals with spending and that makes it a work place and not a party.
It can still feel like a party, but it should not be one.

Change
Changes are not reduced in size but they are more structured.
We no longer do panic solutions, now we optimize and there is a big difference between the two.
There have been a lot of panic solutions this fall and now we have a good basic setting that we optimize instead.
That is clearly the largest change.
No more build up, but rather expansion.
We went from chaos to structured chaos.
A venue needs chaos.
Now we know what is chaotic and we let it be so, and then we are in control of the rest.
Now there is structure in the house.
There used to be a creative chaos, which was fun for the guests.
Now we can allow for messiness in certain areas as long as it is done by 2am.
There is clearly less large changes, e.g. when you’ve built this stage with sound and lights you’re not going to change too much about it.
You mobilize it instead of making it mobile.
You don’t change it entirely because you have a set fundament.
You learn that this kind of schedule works, and this number of volunteers works and then you stick with that and adjust to new events, but it is still a structured change.
That is what you would call optimizing.

Stability?
I would say it has low stability, but it more stable than before.
It has gone from 0% stability to 50% stability.
There are so many things moving around so that it changes all the time.
What is constant is the spirit, team spirit and a good team.
It has gone from panic solution to optimizing when we change something.
It’s more like “You’ll have to work part time” instead of “We have to fire you because you steal!”, and that’s a major difference.

What has caused this newfound stability?
Change of staff.
The more I get to create structure in the house allows for the office to be focused on their work.
The house is more calm, and that allows us to better measure how long certain tasks takes to be performed, and who can solve certain problems once you have the overview of what needs to be done.
It provides increased predictability.

Radical change
Changes at the top.
When Signe was replaced by Carsten.
And Lennert’s leaving us.
With Lennart’s farewell a lot of chaos left us also, but also a lot of experience and know how that we ever since have had to try to compensate for almost 5 men strong.
He was the face of JH, both for the personnel and for the audience.
The house no longer has a face, which is something that we are experimenting with.
A lot of clubs do not have a face.
I think it has been beneficial for the team spirit that now it’s “Team JH” and not Lenners and his invisible servants.
I think a lot of people have stepped up to the task and become more committed seeing that it is also their face that represents JH.
This new branding has been incredible important and a radical change.
People are still coming in to ask for Lennert and emails him.
He was JH.
It’s not like JH is now Bjarke, it’s just JH.
The logo has become very important.
The rooms have been given an important role, which leads people to look around more and experience more in “what is JH”.
This allows for our culture to be come very apparent and visible, especially for the return guests.
You get a lot of “In the old days, it used to be like this and this”.
There’s less and less of that, but it’s still there.

Another radical change is me.
There has not been a production manager before I came in, no one to provide systems for what goes on in here.
I have met a lot of resistance from the old personnel I because “this is not how we usually do it”.
In the beginning there was a lot of whispering and second guessing my initiatives and checking with Lennart.
“We used to be able to smoke in front of the stage, now this Klaus is telling us that we can’t” …
It has given the house more stability, but was met with skepticism.
Bjarke and I has become the face of this necessary change, which in many peoples’ eyes was an uncessary change, so we became the personification of that change internally but not externally.
People though it was difficult to deal with in the beginning, but now it’s ok.

There are two cultures in the house, the staff and the volunteers.
A lot of the volunteers are from the old structure.
We want for people to experience the house not us, the events not us.
If we all represent the same values it will be easier to hold people accountable and allow for freedom within the structure.
We can not entirely do that as of today because some people still want to do things like they used to.
We need a unified direction, and that will allow for increased autonomy and freedom.
We have removed a lot of freedom, and now we’ve started handing it out again under responsibility.
If you want to make a change you need to implement it really hard, saying “now we’re going to try this for a while and then see how it goes”, but it is difficult.
There is no problem doing that with all the new staff.
There is still a glorification of the old JH.
It is difficult to implement such a change because we are never all together; there is only one representative at a time working with the volunteers.

How did you learn about the radical change?
You can feel it before it happens.
When there is a insurance case at 1 000 000 DKK.
Everyone is keeping their eyes on me because money is pouring out, and I’m walking around looking for things to shut down.
It was apparent that something had to happen.
That is because we work so closely together in a daily basis, in conversations.
I don’t think it reached all the way down to the hourly paid personnel, for them everything is a surprise, but for the rest of us it comes more natural.

Relevant change?
Yes.
I have thought very metaphysical approach to it.
I am from Vest Jylland, it is easy for me to move that piano or paint those chairs.
There has been a lot of dialogue about how to change the culture, a lot of it in the heat of the moment, but it is all for the better.
I am from a culture where loyalty is more important than agreement.
A big idea is decided upon at a top level, and here there needs to be full alignment.
All the peripheral ideas you do not have to agree with completely, but you need to be aligned with the overall philosophy.
I don’t need to understand why we should host and produce a private event for 400 persons that requires a lot of time and effort for me, but if it makes sense in relation to the overall philosophy through e.g. economy, then I’ll do it.
I was employed in a rush because Bjarke and I had worked together before and he needed an ali.
I knew I was coming in to a crisis area and he needed me to be on his side no matter what he did in the start, so it ran on a loyalty principle.
I came from Telia, you just can’t agree with everything they do, you just have to devote yourself to an idea and agree the idea.

Compromises?
Yes, often, and that can be a good thing because you learn something.
Spending time in a house like this is a compromises.
You can not accept that once for all, you need to accept that every time you feel stressed or down about it and then ask yourself “is it worth it?”, and then move on.
You don’t always agree with the manager, but you have to compromise with him because it is his idea.
The benefit of working at a cultural institution like this is the amount of self-management you have, in that despite you sometimes compromise you still have the freedom to carry out some of your own ideas, so that the one thing outweighs the other.
A good team spirit would push yourself to do even more, because you are somehow compensated.
This Friday there will be single 40 year olds drinking gin and tonic and I have to be there, then Bjarke will recognize that that’s not the coolest assignment, and he will do it the next time.
There is a compensation that creates balance, and that has bled through the entire staff, so that we are helping each other out and it has become ok to articulate it.
If you want to be here at JH then you’ll also have to do some of the dirty work.

Immediate reactions?
In general there was a culture where people were complaining a lot.
There was not much to fight about.
The people who used to work here would complain just as much over there being no coffee left than over new top management.
It was very difficult to understand.
There was a lot of a passive aggressive response, you would complain a little but no very visible or dramatic reactions (no one threw themselves off a bridge), and these reactions were just ignored.
These reactions were shared openly, but never to the core of the problem.
Never addressed the person causing the issue.
This caused a lot of negative energy.
Based in lack of respect.
A way of dealing with problems, that is almost democratic.
“If I tell everyone then we will all go on strike”, which never happened.
There was a little bit of fear of authority and of being held accountable, and the resistance of philosophy of being right at the top but not right for me, dissonance.
This goes back to loyalty, and explains why Bjarke wanted someone like me who just accepts the terms and rolls with new ideas.
Make it happen, take your work clothes on.
Malicious compliance will not do.
If you have that loyalty you will potentially have a place in the future of JH.
In the old structure people would have an idea and just run with it, without any defined direction.
There was so much chaos in here, the daily life was so chaotic that the big changes seemed small next to the noise and turbulence in the organization.
The big changes were drowned out by the noise, which could be seen as an advantage in that you could implement big changes without it really being discovered, it was only discovered later.
An example is paid coat check, which the staff originally hated.
We need the money and they do it every where else, so we’re doing it!
The argument of “this is not how we usually do it” does not legitimize resistance to change, especially not in a creative organization.
If we were that creative then we should change everything every day!
That is the paradox of my job because I am to create standards, procedures and set ups and simultaneously change them all the time, which is how I am a structured yet creative person, and that’s how it has to be.
You need to want, and be able to, be both at the same time (ambidexterity).
You need to be able to say “this system is perfect” and change it entirely the next day.
It would be easy to build a venue package that is uniform and standard, like a lot of other venues does (Vega).
In that sense we are a very flexible venue because we do so many different things.
The mixer can the one night have two channels activated, and all of them the next, with the same budget.
How do you work differently now?
I was hired as an event manager but with a secret agenda, that was physically demanding. I used all my time on writing down my experiences and taking note of areas of improvement, book after book. I wrote down every problem. When I got home in the evening I would group the problems and identify specific issues of cost saving and improvement. Like a spy the first month. Everyone thought I was on their team since I was here every day. That was phase one.

Phase two was when I was set in charge for productions and phased out and gradually took over responsibility from Lennart. I built an information flow from him to me and from me to all the other associates identifying all information flows. Now 8 months later I do what I was hired to do. And I am still not happy with the way things are working. We are looking closely on the tools. I have flow charts and overview of the information transmissions and the network written down in analog format.

We need to develop tools that make me more disposable and create better standards. Especially the communication between Bjarke and me. I need something that makes it easier for myself that makes me spend too much time on certain tasks. I have been more focused on making sure that the systems around me work instead of having my own work be optimized for a long time.

There are some tools that we can buy, and some that we can develop.

Challenges
There should be focus on finances and economics. I have saved everything I can, but it’s not enough. We should continue to optimize financially, without compromising artistic quality and integrity.

How do we avoid expensive rentals?
How can we make more money to make more art?

Funds applications, sponsorship.

These challenges are grounded in the rent on 100 000 DKK which is an impossible challenge for me. Had I been at another venue and saved the amount of costs that I have at JH I would be treated as a hero. Everything we wave here is eaten up by the big rent. It’s also a very personal thing.

My work is measured by the guests and my job is to facilitate positive experiences at JH for artists and guests. If they are happy i’ve done my job 100% If the staff is happy too i’ve done my job 120% like a bonus.

That is what I measure myself in by.

There is an economic burden that lies on my shoulders, because I am the one that spends and saves money, and this is where some of these tools can come in handy.

I think we need not only some new production tools, but also for budgeting. E.g. an event budget to prove how successful an event is, in order to convince how well things are going. I can feel the board looking more and more into the finances.

Also important for media and press in order to present positive numbers for a venue that books radical culture, despite the subsidiary.

Creative organization?
Yes.
Simon and I were having beers one night and said that it is incredible that boys like you were given this house and are able to do whatever you want with it.

We are just a bunch of young boys who are passionate about music. He said it’s a bit irresponsible, why not have top educated managers? Because there is a creative culture and a creative institution. Based on strong intuition.

We are self-builders; we fill the house with whatever we want. We think it is important that we do not have experience from other venues, it can be limiting in thinking that you can translate one solution from a more equip venue to JH when that is actually not possible.

They say “well, and then you have your people to help you”; that is not the case!

We have no team, we are the team, we have such a flat structure. We are very cross-disciplinary.

RASMUS
I have been gone and been reemployed.
I do communication; I am communication manager at JH.
Simon is the strategic manager.
Press, communication, media.
Lao is in my old situation before I was employed formally.
I am the one responsible for the PR, what Lao does.

Areas of responsibility?
Tough question.
Bjarke is the daily manager.
Jazz Festival is somewhat unclear sometimes, it is difficult to know where info comes from, it is probably parallel with Bjarke.
PR is divided between Simon and me, though he is employed at the festival and dictates strategic decisions.
Booking is with Bjarke, but a clear change is that that role has been more democratic.
Now that lies with Bjarke, while before that was the sole responsibility of Lennart
There is some interdependency
The director is hard to place, because he is shared between JH and the festival
We don’t hear to much from him, he does a lot of administration
He is more closely connected to the festival, that’s where his office is
I have very little to do with him, and very much to do with Bjarke
We have this formal relation to the festival, but in reality we don’t connect too much
If I need to clarify anything I go to Bjarke, not to the festival, which has changed a lot
Before I had to check with several people in order to get press releases approved
There are several problems connected to the cooperation with the festival
We depend on information from them to process, and it is often done with short deadlines, and they expect us to be very responsive to demands from their part
It becomes hard for us to sell tickets and are left looking not so good, which often is a product of their untimeliness, especially in relation to the festival
There are challenges in relation to the strategic collaboration with the festival
There is strong interdependency, but also strong barriers especially in the flow of information, and we are left cut off
I have little to do with the bar
We only deal with that as event managers, with volunteers, production and bar
Some kind of extension of the designated roles

Definition of roles?
It is largely self-defined
I have a formal role as communication manager, and Simon is also communication manager and it creates some conflict when we introduce ourselves
I can sense that lack of role clarity creates a problem because it is difficult to know who is actually responsible and who should be held accountable
Who is the actual sender of these messages?
I am having difficulties defining my own role and I don’t think it is very well articulated
And it is confusing for the outside world e.g. when the media does not who to reach out to
There is large degree of freedom in the roles, and it would be advantageous for them to be more explicit in their description and limitation
Charlotte has a very clear function as the accountant, and the only who is not an event manager
Jens, the bar manager, too
The staff is being more included in the house systems, being used as bookers and event managers
Several people have quit and we have not had people come in and fill their roles
No direct replacements, so that work has been delegated to people who already have a lot of work
Bjarke has become booker
Klaus has become volunteer manager
It is not because they have more hours to do that work

Workflow?
There are a lot of different tasks to perform
I rarely experience that I need to create new work for my self
I have asked for the freedom to work from home when I need to produce a lot of text, because writing at the office includes a lot of distractions
I need to be in a flow to work, and have difficulties spending 15 min in the basement and then going back to the zone of writing
That’s why I prefer to work intensely and focused from home
As event manager it is sometimes difficult to get into a flow the next day after having been up late the night before
I prefer doing several events in a row and then be able to work more focused during the day and rather vary my days myself

Collaboration?
Yes, more now than before.
More areas of responsibility has been defined and that makes it easier to work together, which makes it easier to know when we are collaborating
When I started there were many associates who we did not know what actually did
I work a lot individually

Typical life cycle?
Monday meeting where work is scheduled and is a collective update
Wednesdays I normally spend at home where I prepare the newsletter, which I need to be focused to produce
The week has a fairly predictable structure for me

Innovation?
We talk a lot about innovation in the PR department
There is missing some structure when it comes to innovation
There is always a steady workload and if you don’t take the time to zoom out and look at areas for innovation
When I came back to JH we went to the summerhouse where we were supposed to think outside of the box, but the second people had their computers out there were 10 mails they should rather be checking
It is hard to execute these ideas, there is need for someone to whip them into reality
We were looking through lifestyles magazines to see whether that could be useful platforms for us to communicate through
We are a very tight team and we all have similar backgrounds in alternative music, but that can make it hard to look outside and beyond traditional music venues
We are a popular venue in the city center that attracts a lot of tourists, and they don’t read those magazines
There are many lifestyle magazines, but few niche music magazines, and it is hard to come through in that kind of media
We are often given urgent problems to solve, and that leaves little time to focus on innovation, in combination with short deadlines from the festival.

It is hard to be able to zoom out and come up with new ways to do things, and I cannot see many of the initiatives we came up with on the trip actually being carried out, which is something that is missing. I wish that in order to develop and grow

I have a background in literature so I am good at writing, but I never did any communications and I don’t feel that there are any opportunities for formal learning.

Of course you learn by doing, but you cannot take the time to properly research something or take a course in my spare time, who should pay for that?

There are some things that I would like to get better at but it is hard to do anything about it

It is hard to make yourself better

Typically you do what you’re good at and find someone else who’s good at whatever else needs to get done, which works fine, but it is also difficult because the house won’t develop and I do not know for how long I will be here and how much I should invest.

**Management**

On the one hand we have this very absent director and this very present daily manager who is included in most processes and is more like a friend than a manager, I do not think he wants to be perceived as a typical leader.

We have a flat hierarchy in JH, and then this distant director.

Informal tone among us

Some people take me for being in charge because I sit in the office, but that is just need the peace and quiet to work.

**How does management style affect the way people work?**

Hard to say…

There are a lot benefits of high autonomy because Bjarke trusts us to do the work we’re assigned to, and enjoy that freedom e.g. by being able to work from home if I need it without it being susceptible, as long as he sees the fruits of my labor

It is difficult for me to know what the others are doing, whether we are synchronized. High autonomy is absolutely positive, but sometimes I would like to be controlled a bit more and be given more priority for the tasks, I have to set my own dead lines, which can be challenging, I am being self-learning

We are employed in these positions because he trusts us to execute our tasks.

I know he is happy with my work, but it would be nice with some more feedback on my work and have more articulated expectations, follow up on events and outputs

There is little evaluation

There is little innovation, because we have no one to gather up the impressions and reflect on them, we just move on to the next thing

That is in part a product of management style

It is also because our workload is increasing as staff is decreasing and the tasks are shared among us instead of hiring someone new to deal with it

Everyone thinks things are going well but evaluation is quickly shoved away to move on to something new, new problems to solve.

A manager’s responsibility would be to insist on a debriefing after an event, instead of postponing

That could be Bjarke or someone else.

We have the Monday meeting where we all meet, but that is usually used to discuss practical issues.

The summerhouse was good, but little came out of it.

We were all equal, so it ended up with no one taking responsibility

**Change?**

There has been changes relating to people leaving the house.

It is rare that we sit down and are told, “now this is going to change”

Mostly change is left out of protocol, a lot of small things, undefined things that are not verbalized or articulated but just happens automatically.

**Stability?**

As of now I find it to be fairly stable, after having gone through a very long and unstable period.

There is a stronger sensation of being a team now.

It seems pretty stable.

I am pretty sure whom I relate to about what.

We don’t really know what to do about rental.

We know what to with concert, but we are unsure if we should keep doing events.

**Examples of radical change?**

I was at JH under both Signe and Klaus. His role has also changed from being the director to being a kind of finances guy.

We have worked a lot with rebranding of the house, getting rid of the nightclub idea and towards a serious music venue.

We wanted to be experimental.

Lennart quit and Bjarke became the booker and we had a director who wanted to through fancy cocktail parties so there were many interests pulling in different directions, which made it hard for the PR department to know what profile to communicate.

There could come commandos from higher stand with messages that spoke of rapid shifts in strategy, all of a sudden you should have a voice that was personal and excited and the next moment you should be neutral and democratic, so strong fluctuations in temperaments.

**Necessary? Rebranding.**

It is alright to make changes, but most changes at JH have been unarticulated and I have not known what messages I should relate to.

We know there is a director who has some strategic say in the house but we don’t know how much.

I relate to my daily manager, who I relate better to personally too.
It is still a fairly schizophrenic house that goes in several different directions. There can be many different ideas in the house but we need to agree on what JH is. A venue that cares for the jazz music. I think it’s good for JH that we can make more decisions on our own, which has made our work easier. In the beginning I could not send out a press release without it being approved by several people, which made my work extremely hard and exhausting. Now I can put out whatever I want and they can comment on it after if they think an emphasis should be different. I came from the outside, I did not frequent at JH before I started working here, but I know there are a lot of people with nostalgic notions of what JH used to be, asking when we’re having nightclub again, but this JH is the only JH I know. I relate to that other people relate to it differently. When I started Lennart and the others who came from the old structure represented the old culture, but now there are almost only new people at JH. We are a group of young people who were given the keys to this house, and that is quite funny. We just want to make it into something fun. I think it is to the benefit for the jazz community that someone comes in and works passionately and professionally for JH. Perhaps it would be necessary to get someone with a more formal background to help. I am under the impression that people experience that the music is being taken more seriously than before, that the artists and guests are professionally welcomed. I know that sometimes the way we work can be misinterpreted to be slacking but I know that we work hard to provide professional experiences.

Challenges?
Decide on what to do with rental. Should we get an event coordinator in, or not have events at all? The professionalism of JH should be reflected in everything we do. It will be difficult to maintain this pace of work long term. More and more responsibilities are put on a very few people, and that can work for a limited period of time. I can sense that people will not be happy with that. There should not be an accepted norm for people to save up their hours off, that’s not a sustainable norm or culture. Either we eliminate some areas of work or we have new people come in. The ideas we have about raising the bar are never really executed because there isn’t really time for that; it is difficult to find priority for that.

Creative organization?
….yes. I have a problem with the work creative, it’s a buzzword. I would initially view myself as a creative person, and I feel like I have my dream job, but that the work I do is very little creative. I do not use my creative abilities if I should be entirely honest. We are surrounded by art and culture in a creative sphere, but the work around it, e.g. to express myself creatively through the written word, there is not really room for that here.