SENSEMAKING IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: A STUDY ON THE RELATION BETWEEN SENSEMAKING STRATEGIES, KNOWLEDGE AND OBJECTS OF CHANGE.

Student name: Margot van der Meulen

Student e-mail: m.vandermeulen@student.utwente.nl

Student number: S2025213

Supervisor name: Mireille Hubers

Supervisor email: mireille.hubers@utwente.nl

2nd Supervisor: Bas Kollöffel

2nd Supervisor email: b.j.kolloffel@utwente.nl

Abstract

This research focuses on how individuals make sense in organizational change. Organizations in the healthcare sector redefine their goals and values to ensure its survival in a competitive environment and expect cooperation of their employees to create a successful change. Even though it is known that every individual changes in a different way, it remains unclear if there are individual differences in sensemaking and what these differences are when individuals try to make sense of organizational change. The current exploratory case study gives insight in the different sensemaking strategies employees apply on, the knowledge they gain from these strategies and the objects of change as result of these strategies. Semi-structured interviews with employees who just went through the process of change are conducted to gain in-depth understanding of the individual sensemaking process. Data is analyzed using a thick description with member check and coded using the literature review, which leads to patterns and correlations to answer the research questions. In this explanatory case study, it is expected to create a deeper understanding of individual sensemaking by comparing different sensemaking strategies, and its influence on gained knowledge and behavioral outcomes. These new insights might help organizations to better understand (the importance of) individual sensemaking in a change process, which is expected to increase the possibility for successful organizational change.

Keywords: sensemaking, sensemaking strategies, knowledge, objects of change, organizational change

Table of Contents

Sensemaking in organizational change: a study on the relation between sensemaking strategies, knowledge and objects of change

With the successful implementation of organizational change as a challenging activity in today's business, organizations redefine their goals and values to ensure its survival in a competitive environment (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Employees have to cope with these changes, which in turn influence their adaptive responses in their work environment (Kuntz & Gomes, 2012). However, although change is communicated to all employees in the same way, individuals differ in their anticipation and needs to meet the new conditions (Bartunek, Rousseau, Rudolph & DePalma, 2006).

As a result of individual differences in focus, orientations and undertaking actions during organizational change, the change success is at stake (Mills, 2003; Maitlis, 2005; Bartunek et al., 2006; Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). In research on organizational change failures, many scholars investigated resistance to change as an important aspect in this matter. However, no attention was paid on how employees understand the change, or how they feel about it (George and Jones, 2001). Overall, scholars keep asking themselves the same question: how it is possible that not everyone goes along with the change (Hibbert, Callagher, Siedlok, Windahl & Sun Kim, 2019)?

In an environment with changing and turbulent circumstances that bring uncertainty, it is important to build and sustain meaningful understandings to maintain relationships and facilitate collective action (Weick, 1993). Recently, there seems to be an increased interest in this matter, in which scholars investigate how individuals make sense of these situations of uncertainty (Weick, 1993; Bartunek et al., 2006; Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). This raises the question if there is a relation between differences in how individuals cope with a changing environment and how they make sense of it.

Sensemaking – the process through which individuals try to understand unusual, unforeseen or confusing events – precedes any kind of change (Weick, 1993; Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Moreover, it is through sensemaking, and therefore the creation of rational aspects that facilitate action, that people are supported to deal with their uncertainty and ambiguity that comes with a changing environment (Maitlis, 2005). This makes it an important and logic first step to investigate this concept before investigating individuals' behavioural outcomes of the change, as many scholars initially did.

Individuals vary in history and personal background and therefore create exceptional frames of reference per person, which draws them to take on different roles in their sensemaking process (Mills, 2003). Thus, individuals differ in their sensemaking, but is that a problem? What is known, is that sensemaking plays an important role in adapting to organizational changes (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). One individual goes along with the change, another doesn't. In order to overcome organizational barriers in change failure, it is important to determine what organizations can do to support individual sensemaking.

In this research, it is investigated how individuals differ in their sensemaking during organizational change. This is significant to understand, since the possibility exists that employees understand the change in an undesirable way, which can result in incorrect ways of implementing the change (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014) or unwantedly encourage resistance to the change (George & Jones, 2001). In turn, this resistance might lead back to differences in interpretation among employees. This is not so much about the matter of a good or bad interpretation of the change, but rather to get understanding of how individuals make sense of it, which eventually initiates them to be either positive or negative towards it. It is assumed that when individuals have a better understanding of the change, they would implement it better and more extensive. Therefore, it is relevant that we get a good understanding of how individuals go through a change process by investigating their sensemaking, the knowledge that is gained from their sensemaking strategies and to which objects of change it has impact.

The purpose of this study is to increase understanding of the important subjects that are part of individual sensemaking in a changing environment, and the impacts these may have. Change-related sensemaking is investigated, together with sensemaking strategies employees apply on, the knowledge they gain from these strategies and the objects that changed after their sensemaking process. This is done by an in-depth study of staff nurse experiences in a healthcare organization undergoing organizational change in terms of a transformational learning process. This study is distinct from much previous research, since it is based on in-depth interviews investigating the relation between individual sensemaking strategies, knowledge and objects of change. Through these interviews, researchers and practitioners are provided with deep insights into the important components of employee sensemaking in organizational change.

2. Theoretical framework

In the following paragraphs, the concept of sensemaking is explained, followed up with different sensemaking strategies that are commonly used among individuals when dealing with a changing environment. Thereafter, different types of knowledge are explained, that can result from applying on these sensemaking strategies. Finally, objects of change are discussed to investigate whether employees' behaviour contributes to these change outcomes.

2.1 Sensemaking

Sensemaking is the process that involves the meaning people give to their experiences (Weick, 1995) and through which they work to get a hold on events that appear to them as uncommon, unexpected and complicated, or are not in line with their expectations (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). This goes further than interpretation; sensemaking involves the active construction of events and frameworks for understanding, since individuals construct the situations they try to understand (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). It is about gathering information, after which a cognitive process grows to create meaning about the unknown event (George & Jones, 2001).

When members in the organization experience moments of ambiguity or confusion, people attempt to clarify the situation through deriving and interpreting cues from their environment (Weick, 1995). For example, sheets lying around in a healthcare organization is an environmental cue that other colleagues did not keep to the cleaning norm. As shown in the previous example, individuals use these cues as ground for a logical explanation/interest that provides order and makes sense of what took place, and how they will continue to determine the environment (Maitlis, 2005; Weick, 1995). Sensemaking can therefore be understood if you understand how people manage interruptions (Louis, 1980) and is therefore a central activity in organizations since these are dynamic institutions who are often in the middle of interruptions, such as change and decision-making processes (Gioia & Thomas, 1996).

Previous research shows that sensemaking plays an important role in organizational change (Maitlis, 2005; Maitlis & Christianson, 2014; Weick, 1995). In all levels in the organization it is significant in generating successful change: leaders influence members to understand and make sense of its redefined environment. As a result, strategic change can further develop through leader-member sensemaking, a guiding vision is formed and new meanings are created by change recipients when they understand the new reality (Maitlis, 2005). However, deeply rooted practices or team attention to alternatives can function as a barrier for the change process and are likely to obstruct the sensemaking process among change recipients. This can prevent the change initiative from being successful (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Nonetheless, the process of forming a new vision and meaning towards change is a process in which individuals need to redefine the reality that they became used to. They gather information about the change and continue this with cognitive processes to create meaning of the change and make sense of it (George & Jones, 2011).

It is noteworthy to state that much research about sensemaking is focused on change agents' perspectives instead of recipient experiences (Bartunek et al., 2006). By doing this, it is indicated that change agents' perspectives are corresponding with recipients sensemaking and understanding about the change. However, there seem to be differences in understanding in all groups, and between individuals, that are exposed to the change process (Kanter, Stein & Jick, 1993). For example, change agents are pinpointed on the results and outcomes of the change. However, change recipients merely focus on their personal experiences (Rousseau, 1996), which is also different between individuals. In addition, when change recipients are asked to evaluate organizational change, they come up with answers regarding their personal benefits, improvements and the scope of what increased the quality of their work and if the change improved their worklife or not (Bartunek & Moch, 1987; P. S. Weber & Manning, 2001). Even though the change intervention is the same, this can be understood differently between all change recipients, since they form various meanings among the change, even if they see mutual benefit in it (Bartunek et al., 2006). And exactly this matter can make sure that the change process remains unsuccessful.

Although sensemaking lies at the core of organizing, in the past few years research on sensemaking and its definitions has become divided in different ways. It is therefore important to clarify the process of sensemaking and which perspectives are used in this research to prevent ontological differences (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Scholars diverge on how sensemaking is accomplished, the degree to which it is collective process and what it incorporates. Even when sensemaking is defined, different meanings are given.

One of these key ontological differences involves whether sensemaking occurs within or between individuals (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). The individual perspective focuses on sensemaking as a cognitive process, in which frameworks, schemata or mental models are developed and derive from appraisal and interpretation (Weick, 1995). Through these frameworks, individuals create a vision or mental model on how the situation works and therefore make sense of their environment. This individual sensemaking occurs within a person's head in which collective sensemaking occurs through more influential individuals convincing others to think alike. When enough individuals support the same understanding and therefore act together, collective sensemaking will pause (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). In contrast, sensemaking is also positioned as social process that takes place during conversations between individuals. Through these on-going and constant conversations, individuals make sense and shape, contest and co-construct their meanings (Maitlis, 2005). Sensemaking is therefore seen as a discursive process in which the social world is constructed and interpreted (Gerphart, 1993). If enough individuals engage in a discourse that provides them to act together, collective sensemaking will pause (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014).

Even though social dynamics play a role, the focus in this research lies on individuals' interpretive acts in sensemaking since major emphasis lies on the cognitive process individuals go

through when applying on a strategy. This gives us a clear understanding about individual sensemaking and adds to existing literature about how individual processes of sensemaking vary in a changing environment. First, it is explained which sensemaking strategies can be utilised by employees.

2.2 Sensemaking strategies

When organizational changes occur or are deliberately put into motion, employees try to make sense of the situation by looking for reasons that allow themselves to stay in action (Weick, Suthcliffe & Obstfeld, 2005). These reasons are drawn from frameworks like plans, expectations, traditions, organizational grounds and institutional restrictions (Weick, Suthcliffe & Obstfeld, 2005). Distributed through different levels in the organization (Kuntz & Gomes, 2012), employees collect and transform input from different sources, formal and informal, spoken and written, verbal and non-verbal (Gioia and Chittipeddi, 1991) and try to give meaning to their circumstances. However, since employees often miss a sense of direction within the change, they still struggle with their sensemaking in change processes (Weick, Sutcliffe & Obstfeld, 2005). Employees start looking for reasons that allow them to continue their practices the same way they are used to (Weick, Sutcliffe & Obstfeld, 2005), but the change makes it either less effective or not even possible continue working this way. Sensemaking activities are therefore key elements that significantly influence strategic change and organizational decision-making (Gioia, Thomas, Clark & Chittipeddi, 1994).

To deepen our knowledge about individual sensemaking, five strategies investigated in empirical research which employees can use to make sense of an organizational change are discussed. The first three strategies, creating a shared narrative, using metaphors and adjusting to sociocultural context, are drawn from the research of Maitlis & Christianson (2014), who examined discursive practices employees use as sensemaking resources to eventually construct intersubjective meaning. The latter two strategies, engaging in social processes of interaction and making use of designed change interventions are drawn from the research of Balogun & Johnson (2005), who examined how interventions and events were interpret and why, and how these interpretations result in different outcomes. These two resources are combined to get the broadest idea of sensemaking strategies employees can apply on, since further research has not been conducted on these strategies.

The first strategy is creating a shared narrative. Research on narratives covers a broad set of discursive work when focusing on organizational sensemaking (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Narratives are often approached as 'tool' that make the experiences of individuals meaningful. Through narrative, it does not only show which individuals are involved in the change process, but it also illustrates the different meanings individuals establish (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Different narratives harmonize or clash, and sense is made when narratives are questioned and negotiated. As Abolafia (2010) stated, individuals go through four steps when they create a shared narrative. Initially, they compare their operating model to the present conditions in the process of abduction, in which employees compare their used model in a specific action or operation to the current conditions in which

it takes place, to determine the facts of the situation. Then, they map out the narrative as they discover that their operating model does not fit situational facts. Subsequently, they incorporate facts and key events into a believable story that suits the context, to make it coherent and explanatory. Finally, they negotiate about the narrative of recovery that is created, and eventually agree through selective retention (Abolafia, 2010). For example, employees usually follow a list of instructions for approaching a situation with a client but are asked to do this without the list and think about how to approach the situation themselves. They first map out their current way of handling the situation, find out that they cannot reach their new goal in the way they normally did by using the list. They try to find other facts to fit the new context, for example asking superiors or colleagues for input and communicate with other employees and the client to collectively find the best option. Together, they eventually agree to this method and adjust to the new situational context. The creation of such shared narratives can be studied by examining discussions, debates and power dynamics, to find out how employees collectively work through a challenging and emotional process, to create a rationale that is supported by most, yet not all (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014).

The second strategy is the use of metaphors. Metaphors are valuable for sensemaking since they are evaluative and bring some sort of justification for specific individual actions (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014), precisely what sensemaking is concerned with by means of explaining actions to the individual self and others (Weick, 1995). Employees can use metaphors to connect cues and frames, such as approaching organizational change as a learning curve, construct their social identity, formulate their role in the change by re-evaluating themselves and make use of durable influence on other individuals' understanding by establishing new units of analysis (Gioia et al., 1994). Employees clarify former actions to themselves and others, that helps them to justify what is valuable and what not (Weick, 1995). These experiences and imaginations guide new perceptions and interpretations about reality, through which patterns of activities are structured in organizational change (Patriotta & Brown, 2011). Individuals combine metaphors to make sense of an experience and use that to determine their series of action. However, when a conflicting situation occurs, individuals start use single metaphors that join others' expectations. This shows that using discursive tools such as metaphors depends highly on the relationship to the situation and the audience surrounding the matter (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). For example, when an employee sees the change process as learning curve, but team leaders and colleagues are not motivated to try to handle the situation in a different way, their relationship can ensure that the employee becomes convinced about the negative perspective of team leaders' trying to control their activities and losing the focus on his own learning curve.

The third strategy is trying to understand the sociocultural context. This refers to the process through which individuals constantly adjust practices in their daily routines and conversations to make sure that their interpretations of change match with their audiences and that it is suitable for the changing context (Rouleau, 2005). This is highly important for the development of meaning making in an organization (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Through this process, employees create the ability to use

the right language, attitudes and emotional exposure towards stakeholders (Rouleau & Balogun, 2011), and therefore make sense of the situation since they acknowledge the established environment (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). For example, when employees approach clients' families and try to include them in the caring process as requested in the new way of working, they constantly adjust their language and behaviour to match it with opinions and expectations of families and colleagues.

The fourth sensemaking strategy in the context of organizational change is engaging in social processes of interaction between the different actors, for example colleagues and managers, responding to the change initiatives (Balogun & Johnson, 2005). Within this strategy, interaction is used to create a new structure about the change and develop new interpretations to make sense of the new situation, roles and responsibilities (Balogun & Johnson, 2005). During these interactions, verbal, behavioural and non-verbal signals are used to get insight in the diversity of the social and conversational practices that are occurring. When employees are asked to work in a different way, they engage in gossip, negotiations, rumors, exchange stories about past experiences and observe physical representations of colleagues and their non-verbal signals (Gioia et al., 1994). For example, employees gossip about how other colleagues handle the change and if they do it 'wrong' or 'right' in their opinion to get a new perspective of how they handle the change.

The fifth strategy individuals can apply on is making use of designed change interventions; events and happenings identified as triggers for sensemaking during organizational change (Balogun & Johnson, 2005). These events involve the numerous designed change goals, interventions and the faced behavior of other organizational stakeholders, such as team building activities, change plans, total quality training, process redesigning, briefing and counseling and launched communications (Balogun & Johnson, 2005). For example, employees who struggle with the new way of working even though they get a hold on everything that was formally communicated by the organization about the change, get the opportunity to do a workshop on how to work in the new way or get a quality training to investigate new procedures.

Taken together, there are five strategies that facilitate sensemaking: creating a shared narrative, using metaphors, understanding sociocultural context, engaging in social processes of interaction, and using designed change interventions. These five strategies for sensemaking will be taken into account in the present study. However, it is not only important to look at the strategy that is used to make sense of the change. In between the process of on one hand using strategies to make sense of the change, and on the other hand the outcomes in terms of objects of change, a knowledge phase makes sure that individuals continue to develop their interpretations to come to specific actions and behaviour (Balogun & Johnson, 2005). Therefore, it is important to find out what knowledge is gained by applying on different sensemaking strategies. The next section describes the knowledge content that can be addressed through sensemaking strategies.

2.3 Knowledge in sensemaking

Research on what knowledge individuals draw from their sensemaking strategy is scarce. For example, Balogun & Johnson (2005) explored different intended and unintended outcomes about the change that arose from individual interpretations and found that these processes mediate between individuals' interpretations and change interventions. However, it was unclear what specific knowledge was gained from the activities they applied on during the change intervention, such as making use of designed change interventions or social processes of interaction. Furthermore, Bartunek et al. (2006) underscore the value of three categories of meaning they discovered among change recipients: meaning consistent with change agents, perceptions of inconsistencies or contradictions with aims of change agents and perceived personal impacts of the change initiative. In this research, in which sensemaking activities and change outcomes include more than solely resistance to the change, such as personal impact, empowerment and inconsistencies, no attention has been paid to individuals' active role in this process and the knowledge creation that follows from these activities. Therefore, the present study focuses on four different types of knowledge according to the framework of Van der Heijden (2000), to get insight in individuals' knowledge creation in terms of sensemaking during change initiatives: declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, conditional knowledge and meta-cognitive knowledge. By using four types of knowledge, Van der Heijden (2000) claims that it is operationalized more specifically than only categorized in three types as Eraut (1994) and Tynjälä (2008) did by using declarative-, procedural- and meta-cognitive knowledge. Therefore, Van der Heijdens' (2000) framework of four types of knowledge is used for this research and will be explained in the following paragraphs.

Declarative knowledge, also referred to as explicit or theoretical knowledge, is knowledge that is universal, formal, abstract and non-contextual. It is about 'knowing that' (Van der Heijden, 2000), which can easily be explained from books and lectures for example (Tynjälä, 2008). Declarative knowledge can be divided in episodic and semantic declarative knowledge. Episodic declarative knowledge is the knowledge that individuals gain about specific events; the personal experiences gained during a specific time and place such as a location, time and emotions. Semantic knowledge is the knowledge of facts (Tuomi-Gröhn & Engestrom, 2003). For example, employees are constantly aware that they understand the given information such as rules and accept facts, theories, methods and practices within the organization.

Procedural knowledge, also known as practical knowledge or skills, is the knowledge gained through practical experiences, such as habits, unspoken rules and familiar actions. It is about 'knowing how' (Van der Heijden, 2000). This knowledge is often implicit, intuitive and unique, instead of being universal and easy to explain as theoretical knowledge is (Tynjälä, 2008). It is about what an individual must do (Rauner, 2007), that eventually leads to acquiring generic skills when working towards a clear goal (Tynjälä, 2008). For example, employees learn how to do something, such as feeding a client or tucking them into bed, filling in their dossier or handling a computer.

Conditional knowledge is knowing the situation you are in, and what knowledge and skills you can use in that specific situation. It is about 'knowing when, where and under which condition' using the declarative and procedural knowledge you already have (Van der Heijden, 2000). It is the knowledge individuals have about the usability of cognitive strategies for different situations (Van der Heijden, 2000). For example, employees know when they need to conduct CPR on a client and why this is necessary in a specific situation, but also when not to use it and why some strategies work better than others.

Metacognitive knowledge, also referred to as self-regulative knowledge or meta-cognition strategic knowledge only to mention a few, is about individuals' insight in themselves and their self-consciousness (Van der Heijden, 2000). It is about knowing your own strengths and weaknesses and figuring out which strategies you can use to solve problems and tasks (Zimmerman, 2002). Therefore, this is closely linked to the concept of self-regulation. This self-regulation concept refers to the extent to which individuals are meta-cognitive, motivational and behavioral active in their own learning process. Individuals are proactive, have the intention to learn, set personal goals and set out a strategy to reach them (Zimmerman, 2002), on which they critically reflect to boost their personal development (Tynjälä, 2008). This knowledge creating process adds to individuals' self-satisfaction and motivates them to carry on their personal learning process by choosing and organizing a learning environment in which they personally thrive (Zimmerman, 2002). In addition, it can prepare individuals for personal change (Zimmerman, 2002). For example, employees plan how to approach a learning task, use their best strategy and skills to solve a problem and self-correct when necessary and evaluate the progress and outcomes of the task.

These types of knowledge are useful to explore whether individuals who apply on a specific strategy have a certain understanding of the change. This is important to know, since peoples' interpretations about the change often differ between individuals (Mills, 2003). Even though this research does not focus on whether individuals' interpretations are good or wrong, it is important to find out how individuals' interpret a situation of change to be either positive or negative about it, how they would handle the changes that are to be made and investigate the extent to which they understand the change better.

Therefore, the following research question was posed:

- *What kind of different sensemaking strategies do employees use, and what knowledge resulted from these strategies?*

2.4 Objects of change

Previous research on organizational change shows that people do not change in the same way, which brings change process in jeopardy. Remarkable in many studies about organizational change and its outcomes, they merely focus on outcomes of resistance to change (Bartunek et al., 2006; Hibbert et

al., 2017), without further acknowledgement of different embracing modes. For example, Hibbert et al. (2017) explain individuals' reflective practices and its relation to action in terms of individuals avoiding or engaging in changes to change themselves or the social context. However, they only focus on resistance in this matter. Furthermore, individuals arrive with their own interpretations about the change, either positive or negatively constituted, referred to as developing schemata (Balogun & Johnson, 2005). These developing schemata construct change outcomes, which become noticeable through actions and behaviours of change recipients and appear as counteracting or congruent change results. However, Balogun & Johnson (2005) focus on meaning making as an outcome, without clarifying what specific knowledge and actions develop in the sensemaking process, to illustrate what the outcomes of the change might be. It is therefore important to get broader understanding of individuals' sensemaking process with its resulting knowledge and the behaviour that follows from this.

To illustrate what changes and to classify employees' behaviour contributing to the change, four levels of the content of change from Mintzberg & Westley (1992) are used. According to Mintzberg & Westley (1992), there are different levels in changes within an organization, which can be more conceptual in terms of thoughts, culture and vision, or more concrete in terms of action, people and facilities. This change can take place in two scopes: referring to the organization or referring to strategy. Concerning the organizational scope, there are four objects of change (Mintzberg & Westley, 1992).

In the first, and also most concrete object of change labelled as people, organizations change their people or the job-related functions they execute. For example, employees add more tasks to their job and expand these with giving medication to their clients.

In the second object of change labelled as systems and procedures, the organization changes employees' procedures they are used to work with, or employees start to use other systems which can be redesigned (Mintzberg & Westley, 1992). For example, human resource procedures, intake conversations and the ways of reporting are changed.

In the third object of change labelled as structure, organizations alter their structure and find different ways in which work and their work tasks can be divided. The coordination of these tasks must be secured, and always relates to two or more departments in the organization or two or more subjects of the organizational structure (Mintzberg & Westley, 1992). For example, organizations merge departments or remove organizational layers.

The fourth and most conceptual object of change labelled as culture, refers to organizations' norms, values, believes and expectations that employees broadly accept, and which regulates how employees think about their job, the environment they're in and how they react to it (Schein, 1985). For example, employees see the importance of good communication between all stakeholders, and therefore try to include everyone in the process. With regard to these four objects of change, Mintzberg & Westley (1992) underscore the importance of also taking the lower concrete levels of change into account when the change is more conceptual. For example, to change organizational culture, changes in structure, systems and people are also necessary since otherwise there is only a change in thinking, and not in

action. In contrast, people can be changed without changes in systems, procedures of culture (Mintzberg & Westley, 1992).

These objects of change are useful to explore whether individuals' behavior contributes to the change at one of those four levels. Even though many scholars already addressed certain types of behavioural change outcomes to different situations (Hibbert et al., 2019), it never stood in relation to individual sensemaking strategies and the knowledge individuals gained from these strategies. Individuals play active roles in organizational change processes, and do not simply receive them. They make sense of the processes, have feelings about it, which is more than solely resisting or engaging in these processes (Bartunek et al., 2006). By bringing the concepts of sensemaking, knowledge and objects of change together, a broader understanding of sensemaking and its influence on change outcomes will be established. Therefore, the following research question was posed:

- *How do the five sensemaking strategies relate to employees' change outcomes in terms of people, systems and procedures, structure and culture?*

3. Methodology

3.1 Context

To specify individual sensemaking strategies, the knowledge employees gained from these strategies and what as a result changed within the organization, an exploratory case study has been conducted within an organization that embodies an example of a healthcare organization in the middle of a transformational learning process. The organization, purposively selected for this case study, is a healthcare organization in the Province of Overijssel, with 20 locations and around 2300 employees.

The main objective of the organization is to increase clients' way of living through incorporating all actors that clients were surrounded with before they needed care, directed and supported by 'Teams for Personal Care' (TfPC – Teams voor Persoonlijke Zorg). The approach in TfPC requires a different organizational structure than in regular healthcare services, in which high levels of standardization and centralization are lived up to (Bartunek et al., 2006). Through the organizations' change, employees and voluntary caregivers need to adjust their way of working to live up to the new standards, which require more autonomy, accountability and independence. In addition, they need to participate in decision-making affecting patient care but also govern their section with their team. It can therefore be assessed as an intervention that is aimed at empowering its recipients according to the organization. The organization wants their nurses to know that they are the trained professionals whose expertise is fundamental to the effectiveness of the institution and therefore give them more ownership over their work through TfPC.

The nature of caring asks for a broad understanding of work processes and knowledge of human nature. In truth, sensemaking seems an important factor in the matter this a change process (Maitlis & Chiristianson, 2014), in which all caring elements need to be continued and carried out without mistakes. Analyzing employees' differences in sensemaking strategies they use and what knowledge they gain from these strategies is relevant for providing more insights into how individuals understand the change and, as a result, what they implement in the organization.

3.2 Respondents, data collection and instrumentation

The exploratory case study contains interview protocols about the organization, with a variety of nurses divided over two teams. The different sensemaking strategies employees can apply on are explored and researched. From these strategies, it is assessed what knowledge respondents gained about the change process and if this differs among recipients using the same strategy. At last, it is assessed what influence this degree of understanding had on recipients' daily actions. This combination verifies not only employees' sensemaking strategies, but also gives insights their richness in understanding the change and the behavior that they show as a result of this understanding. The following paragraphs explain the respondents, interviews and the collection of strategies analyzed in the present study.

Interviews. In-depth interviews have been conducted to investigate employees' sensemaking, focused on sensemaking strategies employees apply on, what knowledge employees gained when applying on these strategies and what changes they made after this. Twenty-five participants were interviewed from two different departments within the organization, who passed all change projects and who are currently working according to the TfPC method. Current sensemaking literature focuses merely on single-case studies to get deep understanding into specific examples of sensemaking. However, this makes it hard to compare different context to assess possible boundary conditions on theory (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). Therefore, members of two different teams who underwent the same change intervention were asked to participate in this research, to elaborate on theory, compare differences between sensemaking in departments and provide additional theoretical insights (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014).

As shown in Table 1, the sample of the team members consists of solely female employees, working variating their educational level from MBO level 3 to HBO, according to the Dutch educational system. Based on random sampling, within two teams that finished the change project, a list of all members was created. From both teams, 15 members were randomly selected with a random number generator in excel. All 30 members received an email with a request to participate in the research, 25 eventually replied and participated in the research since they were available during the data collection period. For this research, all twenty-five conducted interviews are used.

The semi-structured interview scheme was based on the theoretical framework, focusing on sensemaking strategies, gained knowledge and objects of change. To answer the first research question, questions were posed based on which strategies employees used to make sense of the change process and on which information they base the decision of their strategy. For example: *'Where did you gain your knowledge from to start working differently?'*. To answer the second research question, questions concerning employees' behavior, emotions and feelings were prompted. For example: *'What do you do differently on a daily basis?'*.

The interviews took place approximately 3 months after they have finished the change process. The duration of the interviews differed between 45-60 minutes. All interviews were transcribed and summarized, creating a thick description (Ponterotto, 2006), and were send to the respondents for a member check with the question to reply when they disagreed with the content. Through this strategy, respondents' perspectives are ensured to be translated precisely into data (Ponterotto, 2006). All respondents granted permission to use the transcriptions.

Table 1

Participants Education, Gender and Job Satisfaction

Educational level	Number of participants	Gender	Job satisfaction
MBO 3	2	Female	Satisfied
MBO 4	20	Female	Satisfied
HBO	3	Female	Satisfied

3.3 Analysis

The interviews were studied intensively to identify significant categories of meaning, commonly used. The coding process was done using the ATLAS.ti transcription tool. Three main categories were used to code the interviews; codes were based on sensemaking strategies, gained knowledge and objects of change (Appendix I). Different categories were considered and resolved if necessary. In addition, even though not being part of a research question, the concept of attitude was frequently found and is therefore included in the codebook, to investigate differences in outcomes in terms of objects of change. The transcribed interviews were consulted for understanding or gaining insights in the results when needed. To determine the interrater reliability, another researcher coded 20 % of the interviews, in which Cohen's Kappa was found $\kappa = 0.62$ which is considered to be of substantial agreement (Viera & Garrett, 2005).

Five strategies found in literature, which individuals can use to make sense of a changing environment, are used as a frame for analysis in this thesis: creating a shared narrative, using metaphors, understanding one's sociocultural context, engaging in social processes of interaction, and using designed change interventions. Even though there will not be an equal focus on all five properties, as some are more significant than others based on empirical data, all are discussed in-depth in the theory section since they are an essential part of the thesis.

To get a deeper insights on the knowledge employees gained out of their sensemaking strategy, Van Der Heijdens' (2000) four category framework of different knowledge types is used as frame for analysis: declarative knowledge – knowledge derived from books and lectures, procedural knowledge – knowledge gained from practical experiences, conditional knowledge – knowing the situation where you're in, and metacognitive knowledge – knowledge about the self. Taken these concepts together, a broad view about the different sensemaking strategies individuals use, why they use this strategy, and what knowledge they gained out of the strategies is created. All strategies and knowledge types are coded according to this scheme and are discussed in-depth in the theory section.

To classify employee behaviour in terms of the changes made after employees used their sensemaking strategies, four categories of objects of change are used: people –increased personal development or the functions employees execute change, systems and procedures – individuals change the procedures they are used to work with or use other systems, structure – change in organizational

structures, such as the organization of work tasks and how these are divided and secured and culture – organizations' norms, values, believes and expectations that employees broadly accept, and which regulates how employees think about their job and the environment they're in (Hubers & Mulder, in preparation). All objects of change are coded according to this scheme and are discussed in-depth in the theory section.

Through a cross-case analysis, by comparing all cases on the theoretical framework, several differences between employees are identified that provided further insights in the process of individual sensemaking in a change process. Going back and forth between the interview data, sensemaking strategies, gained knowledge, objects of change and literature, resulted in meaningful insights in patterns about employees' sensemaking. For example, employees applying on activity x, y and z have a richer understanding of the change, whereas employees applying on activity x and y have a narrower understanding of the change. Besides, it is investigated whether gained knowledge increases using an extra strategy, or if knowledge increases because of combining different strategies. This gives clear insights about individual sensemaking, how this can influence individuals' understanding of the change and what their results in behavior are.

4. Findings

In the following paragraphs, sensemaking strategies that are found among employees, gained knowledge and the objects of change as a result of using these strategies, are described within the context of the healthcare organization. First, findings will be described for each of the three concepts. including an additional finding: attitude. Second, these concepts and their relations are described together resulting in different patterns in strategies, knowledge and objects of change, varying from sufficient to rich outcomes of change. By comparing these patterns, an additional finding was exposed: attitude. The concept of attitude was highly present in employees' explanations and opinions towards the change and is therefore included in the result section.

4.1 Findings of the concepts

4.1.1 Sensemaking strategies

The first research question was: *What kind of different sensemaking strategies do employees use, and what knowledge resulted from these strategies?*. Here, an overview will be given of the different sensemaking strategies that were used, how they were used and who used them.

Creating Shared Narrative. Employees who created a shared narrative as sensemaking strategy explained that they argued about what the best way to handle the change would be, or elements in the change process that had to be carried out. Twenty out of 25 employees used this strategy to make sense of the change. They created an approach on how to handle the new situation, shared this with colleagues, family or clients, and together analyzed the cases that did not work out properly. For instance, one employee explained: *'If we came up with something, but this turns out not to work, we'll discuss this with each other and look for alternatives'*. Overall, employees experienced this strategy as a good way to look for alternatives when something didn't work and therefore try to improve the existing ways of working through trial and error and reflecting on them.

Although employees who used this strategy seem very aware of the importance of a good relationship with their colleagues to make this change successful, they emphasize that discussion and negotiation about how to approach clients mainly had to be done with other disciplines, and not with their 'own' colleagues. As stated by one employee: *'We had discussions about which approach would be best, especially with the other disciplines'*. As a result, employees state that this changed or increased their perspective on caregiving. As explained by one employee: *'By negotiating with other disciplines about the case, you also learn from each other and find out that caregiving can also be carried out in different ways than you're used to'*.

Metaphors. Employees who use metaphors as sensemaking strategy either refer to the change as cooking without a recipe or as a family construct. Eleven out of 25 employees used this strategy.

Referring to the change as cooking without a recipe, these employees state that all opinions, skills, knowledge and characteristics come together. They start to work with all these elements, aiming for some sort of team vision however not exactly knowing what they're aiming for. As one employee stated: *'You can only learn and grow from this, and eventually you discover possibilities and skills of which you never thought you've had'*. Referring to the change as a family construct, employees aim for thriving as a family in the new vision, in which they collectively search for solutions and therefore change. According to one employee: *'That we're doing it together, and that I give my colleagues the feeling that they are important and heard'*. Employees realized the importance of this by tuning in with other colleagues, giving them the feeling that they are heard and work together to reach a certain goal. Overall, they experience this strategy as pleasant, since they realize you are not alone in this change, and that you can come further when you approach it as a team and combine everybody's strengths.

Using this strategy, employees seem really aware of the importance to include not only their close (team) colleagues in this matter, but also other disciplines, family and voluntary caregivers in the process, to make the change a success. As one employee exemplified: *'I got more people involved. Earlier we only focused on care giving, however now we also focus on families and voluntary caregivers and doing this together and asking their opinion about our vision'*. Employees also tried to bring the change to a higher level and realized their gains: *'I gained so much knowledge about working together with the disciplines. Sometimes I thought I had to do it myself, however I do not always have to do everything on my own. Together you get a lot further'* as stated by one employee. Moreover, this seems to be a mutual vision of employees using this strategy.

__Understanding Sociocultural Context.__ Employees who tried to understand their sociocultural context as sensemaking strategy explained that they tried to focus more on adjusting their practices in routines and conversations to their clients and their needs, to give more customized care. 14 out of 25 employees used this strategy. In relation to other colleagues, employees who used this strategy noticed that every individual had a different way of handling the change process and they tried to adjust to these practices. They did this by looking around and figuring out what colleagues or clients need, or conversate about it. However, employees explain that they did not change their vision towards the change by doing this, but either started to share their vision more. As exemplified by one employee: *'I tried to be conscious about how to handle the change and its facets in the environment I am currently in'*. Overall, employees experience this strategy as something that is necessary in caregiving when you want to take good care of someone and provide customized care, and therefore seem to experience it as 'obvious' and easy to establish. There is a high degree of self-evidence among employees who used this strategy.

When employees try to understand their sociocultural context, they also experience differences in expectations, especially noticeable in how family can be included in the caring process. On top of that, there seems to be some kind of communication disorder between colleagues and clients. As one

employee stated: *'I found out that there is lacking communication about expectations towards each other'.* Yet, employees using this strategy actively engage to work on this, by setting up project groups about this topic. In addition, employees also seem to increase their realization and get greater understanding that every individual is different, with other norms and values, difference in work/life experience and intellectual ability, which can be subject of differences in experiences and discussions. Though, they often seem to find a good middle ground.

        Engaging in Social Processes of Interaction. Employees who engaged in social processes of interaction to make sense of the change spoke merely with colleagues to find out what the change was about, and to internalize the process. 18 out of 25 employees used this strategy. Through communication with colleagues, employees seem to find differences between themselves and other colleagues about how they handle the change and how they position themselves in the new situation. In addition, they also observe colleagues on how they handle the process, how they change daily activities and their approach towards clients and family, and refer to this as something they learn a lot from. As stated by one employee: *'When a colleague has another approach towards a client, I want to find out how he/she does that, because I can see that his/her way goes easier than mine'.* Overall, employees experience this strategy as one that added much value in the process, through asking members from other teams how they position themselves and asking colleagues what the change is about when they did not understand it properly.

        Employees who used this strategy seem to find good understanding on how to approach the change process together, and therefore seem less individual based. They found out that they had to handle some things differently than they were used to, that one colleague is better in certain activities than the other, and that it might bring them further when making use of this. As one employee exemplified: *'Everyone has their own qualities that we have to use in this matter'.* However, through these social processes of interaction, there also seemed to be some gossiping and opinions among employees, about that they had to change things again. This provoked mutual resistance towards the change. These conversations mainly seemed to happen during coffee breaks, either one-on-one or within the team.

        Making use of Designed Change Interventions. 25 employees who made use of designed change interventions as sensemaking strategy either went to events about the change, such as meetings with coach, briefings, workshops, and/or made use of the launched communications as newsletters, e-learnings and messages on the sharepoint page. All employees were required to attend the meetings with coach and therefore used this as a sensemaking strategy. These meetings started off with an explanation about TfPC from the supervisor together with the coach. Every team had a different coach, who supported the team to find answers on questions as: what we want to see differently in this vision, what goes right/wrong, what are we already doing, all depending on what was going on in the team and what

the team asked to discuss. Attention was also paid in terms of mutual cooperation, also with other disciplines, finding out personal- and each other's talents, and increase individuals' ownership. However, which changes specifically had to be made during this process of organizational change were not fully developed by the organization before employees started to work with it. It was the organization's intention to let them find their own suitable way of working in the new vision, which could be different per team. This has been experienced in various ways. For instance, one employee explained: *'No one within our team had any idea what actually was going to happen, and what was expected from us, but with our coach' help, the penny dropped'*. This statement is a good example of the overall experience almost all employees got during these meetings with coach. Yet, three employees were less enthusiastic about these meetings and experienced them as *'toe-curling'*. This seems mainly the case when employees expected some kind of guideline/direction after which they could embark on a certain course, or when they experienced a lot of repetition in the meetings. However, it was not the intention of the organization to convey guidelines or a certain direction in the change to these meetings, only share a vision.

21 employees also made use of the launched communications in addition to the meetings with coach using designed change interventions, such as e-learnings and newsletters about the change, read about the goal of the change and what it implied. They seem to be less defensive towards the change and the meetings with coach, and already had an idea about what the organization wanted to carry out with the change. They experienced it as very pleasant to read in advance about the change and wanted to bring this to a more active level. However, they cannot remember what they specifically read, and do not know if these topics were the same as the ones treated during the meetings with coach.

Taken together, all 25 employees applied on designed change interventions in terms of the meetings with coach, which helped them to understand the vision of the change and get insights in better mutual cooperation at the work floor. Employees who also applied on the launched communications before these meetings already got some understanding about the goal of the change, which made them less defensive towards the change. The second strategy often used by employees (twenty out of 25 employees) is creating shared narrative, which helped them to develop a suitable approach to handle the new situation, share this with colleagues and increase their perspective in caregiving. The third strategy that was often used (seventeen out of 25) is engaging in social processes of interaction, which helped employees to internalize and position themselves in the change process.

4.1.2 Knowledge

The second part of the first research question was: '*(...) what knowledge resulted from these strategies?'*. Here, an overview will be given of the different kinds of knowledge employees gained during the change process and what they learned.

Declarative Knowledge. The declarative knowledge that is gained using specific strategies in the sensemaking process mainly focused on what TfPC means and what employees had to do with it. Especially in the meetings with coach, part of the designed change intervention strategy, employees seem to get a good understanding of what the change was really about, and what the organization would expect from them. As exemplified by employee: *'We learned what the symbolic apples in the tree meant, such as quality of care, satisfied clients and family, satisfied employees and voluntary employees and a financially healthy organization'.* Employees who used launched communications in their sensemaking process also gained declarative knowledge in terms of the new method, however also emphasize that they needed the meetings to reduce their reluctance towards the change and were searching for a guideline or something to get a hold of the change process. They experienced the coach as very important for shaping this process. However, even though these meetings gave employees a certain impression of what is expected from them, they did not immediately know what role they had to play in the change process.

Personal experiences and emotions were also an important part in declarative knowledge, which seems to be gained especially by making use of social processes of interaction as sensemaking strategy. For instance, employees spoke about personal experiences during coffee breaks, which gave them insights in each other's' opinions, how their work levels differ and their personal practices, but also caused disagreement in some ways. For instance, as one employee exemplified: *'The knowledge I gained from these conversations is that it is hard to carry out agreements in a whole team, which I think is often the biggest problem. Some people just don't follow it because they find it nonsense'.* However, some employees seem to also relate this in a positive way to the meetings with coach, since they state that: 'a coach is very guiding in this whole process, to shape and that you have to do it as a team'.

Procedural Knowledge. Procedural knowledge gained by using specific strategies in the sensemaking process is mainly focused on knowing 'how' employees do something, such as how they give and receive feedback, how they create a more client centered approach or how they could include family in the caring process. For example, in the meetings with coach as part of the designed change interventions, employees gained procedural knowledge in terms of how to handle different situations and were given tips and tricks how to implement changes. Employees also learned how to communicate with family and voluntary caregivers and adjust their reporting about the clients, since family is currently allowed to read these reports: *'I learned how to write and how to put it in a different way'.* In addition, employees who used social processes of interaction learned to use different conversational techniques by observing other colleagues or filming them, analyzing it and eventually convert this gained knowledge into generic skills for themselves, such as doing these conversations on their own in a purpose-oriented way.

Conditional Knowledge. Conditional knowledge gained by using specific strategies in the sensemaking process is mainly focused on knowing 'when, were, and under which condition' employees do something, such as knowing what and why something is necessary for a client or colleague in a specific situation, and how you cooperate with each other in these moments. Employees gained conditional knowledge in terms of what is necessary to create a more open-dialogue culture towards each other in the meetings with coach, such as giving compliments and holding each other accountable for made agreements. In addition, as one employee exemplified: *'We learned to be more aligned as a team which is necessary when you want to provide good care, and for which you improve the quality of this matter'.* This focused mainly on knowledge about colleague interactions and relationships, and how to use their procedural and declarative knowledge to create an approachable environment.

Employees seem to deepen this conditional knowledge by communicating with each other, therefore using social processes of interaction. For instance: *'I found out that everyone is different, and you have to think about how you approach a situation because one colleague is not the other. Therefore, we need to communicate with each other'.* In addition, also negotiation, and therefore using shared narrative as a strategy, between colleagues seems to be an important strategy to gain conditional knowledge*: 'How do you handle this? I did it this way, but it went wrong. Let's go back to this situation, and what happened beforehand? And the next question resulted then in: How are we going to do this next time?'.* Employees know the importance of, and include their own vision in these narratives, try to find support in this by consulting colleagues and create proper insights in the situation they are in and what is necessary to use in that specific situation. Conditional knowledge is also gained when employees try to understand their sociocultural context, in which they investigate clients' needs to reach a certain goal themselves, and not solve every issue in advance: '*I learn to listen what somebody needs and try not to fill in this in myself but hear what the client needs. He might need a listening ear and not our advice and what we think that might be good for him'.* This also exists between colleagues: *'Conversations are at different levels. It is different to talk to a cleaning lady than to someone working in the disciplines. Therefore, I try to think about that how to approach this'.* Employees carefully assess these different situations and use their previously gained procedural and declarative knowledge necessary to handle the situation to come to a desired result.

Metacognitive Knowledge. The meta-cognitive knowledge that is gained using specific strategies in the sensemaking process focused on personal insights and self-regulative knowledge, for example about employees' strengths and weaknesses and the ability to evaluate about situations. To find strengths and weaknesses, employees did a DiSC assignment (personality test) or the coach used other methods to let them investigate their personal characteristics during the meetings. Employees gained meta-cognitive knowledge in terms of knowing when to take some extra space, but especially found out that everyone handles the change in a different way and that they could use that to learn from. One employee exemplified: *'It is about taking and getting space. You also learn from each other; everyone*

handles change in a different way', and another stated that*: 'This awareness had specially to do with the fact that we as a team could make sure that this was going to work. That we can achieve this as a team'.* When employees shared these findings with each other in social processes of interaction, they got a deeper understanding about themselves as participant in the team, for example by learning how to effectively communicate and how to get a hold of the deep thoughts of their colleagues. For example, one employee shared her insights in this matter: *'I found out how my colleague handles some clients and colleagues, and I thought to myself: is that something I also want, or would I do this differently?'.* Aside from employees increased meta-cognitive knowledge about their ability to learn from differences between each other, employees' gained self-consciousness in terms of finding the role they have to play in this change.

Meta-cognitive knowledge was also gained in terms of increasing assertiveness and speaking up more, especially visible with employees who used shared narrative as sensemaking strategy. Self-consciousness plays an important role in this matter, which merely seems to focus on how to reflect on personal behavior. As one employee exemplified: *'I consciously started to look at myself, whether my behavior is good in a certain situation, or that I had to change myself in some ways. It is about some kind of self-reflection, that I am not always conscious about, but can also be more unconsciously. And that automatically results in thoughts like: "I should have tackled this differently". Which is a learning process for yourself'.* Through negotiating with colleagues about these personal thoughts and experiences, employees know how to look beyond the situation they are dragged into, increase their self-regulative knowledge and know the personal strengths they have and the impact they can make. Another employee adds to this with: *'We merely talk about what you think of the situation and what your opinion is about it. I get insights from that like: I have to speak up for myself next time. I become more aware of the personal impact I can exert'.* This gained meta-cognitive knowledge is also present with employees who try to understand their socio-cultural context, as one employee stated: *'You look further and try to get an overview of the situation. I try to feel how my client would feel in this situation. You try to think more conscious about this, and about the personal impact you can make in this matter'.*

Making use of metaphors, employees state that they were also able to develop themselves in terms of raising their voice more often, yet also found out they are good listeners and therefore gained extensive knowledge about their personal vision and position in the change and that of others'. As one employee exemplified: *'Some colleagues have taken huge vulnerability in this process, and I should really pay more attention to them'.* However, some employees state that they took things personally, yet since approaching this change as learning process, they learned to exclude these thoughts from their private lives: *'I took things home, but not anymore. This was not in terms of how to give care, but when a colleague mentioned something, I took it personally'.* Also, with regard to themselves and the actions they carry out, one employee realized that: *'I have to speak up when someone did their job not properly, instead of fixing what was wrong myself. I never did that and realizing this has been a big learning*

moment for myself. I am still struggling with this but am proactive to improve this for myself". Eventually often revealed by multiple employees who made use of metaphors as a strategy.

Overall, employees gained greater consciousness about themselves and their surroundings and gained regulative knowledge. This seemed to help employees to make good choices and gain insights about their own behavioral role, and together with others evaluate and improve this. In addition, aside from behavior, employees try to regulate thoughts, feelings and abilities together. As one employee phrased this: *'I realized that I can be pretty autistic, but I see a lot of myself in others. It is a lot easier to work within a certain box, than within a huge circle. That demands more of you, however a big circle is asked in this way of working'*.

Taken together, declarative knowledge gained by employees entails knowledge in terms of information about what the change was really about, what new procedures will be like, and gave them insights in each other's' opinions on how work levels and personal practices currently differed. Procedural knowledge was gained in terms of how employees would give or receive feedback, create a more client-centered approach or how they could include family in the process, mainly focusing on how to communicate with each other by using different conversational techniques. Conditional knowledge was gained focusing especially on colleague interactions and relationships, knowing the situations employees are in, why something is necessary for a client or colleague and how you collaboratively work to come to the best results to create an open-dialogue and approachable environment. Meta-cognitive knowledge gained by employees entails knowledge in terms of increased self-consciousness and regulative knowledge, such as speaking up more often, knowing what role to take and how to position themselves in this change. Employees also seem to develop some kind of helicopter view over the situation they are drawn into and learn to know their strengths to contribute to this change and the impact they personally can make.

4.1.3 Objects of change

The second research question was: *'How do the five sensemaking strategies relate to employees' change outcomes in terms of people, systems and procedures, structure and culture?'*. Here, an overview will be given of the organizational changes that resulted from employees' sensemaking strategies, distinguished in four objects of change: people, systems and procedures, structure and culture.

People. The first object of change, related to people, resulted both in changes in functions that employees execute and increased personal development. Functions that employees execute changed in terms of adding more tasks, and also do different, more challenging tasks they did not do before the change, such as giving medication to the clients they take care of. They state that it was therefore necessary to increase their alertness and communication, as well as towards clients as towards colleagues. In addition, employees experience more autonomy and responsibility. For example, as

exemplified by one employee: *'There is more autonomy. And I have the feeling that we've been heard more. Besides, we are now the point of contact for the families, and this gives way more sense of responsibility'* and exemplified by another employee: *'You talk more easily with people, you dare to say more about what you think'*. However, even though employees added more and even challenging tasks to their working routines, they also seem to experience more feelings of calmness and feel less rushed after the changes. Some employees attribute this feeling to the increased structure they have during the day, or the improved relations they have with clients' family, of which one stated: *'You're more on one page with the family, you are the one that involve them more in the process'*. The majority of employees seem to refer to this change process as something that adds more value and deepening to their work, because of the increased responsibility that they all personally have to take in this process.

In regard to personal development, employees state that their self-reflection increased. As exemplified by one employee: *'I became aware of my personal pitfalls and shortcomings'*. In addition, employees seem to be more aware of themselves in terms of who they are, what they are doing and why they do it that way, what they are good at and what they care about. There is an increase in their self-consciousness and employees are more aware of how to communicate with colleagues in different situations, and how to give and receive feedback. One employee, among others who phrased it differently, states that: *'It (the change) made that I am more conscious in my work. What are we doing and which agreements were made? That we adhere to these agreements.* Above all, employees specifically seem to attribute their behavioral changes to the deepened insights in the self and the increase in their self-consciousness. This resulted in more personal empowerment and daring to speak up about personal opinions and activities in the organization. Overall, most employees seem to take a more active role in their job. As one employee stated: *'I've become more active and enthusiastic about my job. I am more empowered and dare to express my skills nowadays. I've learned how to deal with this'*. In addition, some employees relate this to being more open towards differences among colleagues, themselves and/or the environment they surround themselves with. As one employee stated: *'I am just like many others: oh men, we have to deal with some kind of change again? However, this time I really learned to handle this smoothly and remain more open towards new things and other changes in the future'*. Through this personal transparency, employees overall seem to understand what is expected of them but also understand the importance to express their opinion about different subjects and explain why they handle a situation the way they do.

The increase of employees' self-consciousness seems to empower their ability to find the role they have to play in the change and their work, take on this role in their job and being more autonomous and responsible for everything they carry out. More importantly, employees who intensively spoke about their increased self-consciousness with other colleagues, critically reflect on themselves and the changes around them, even after the change period. It seems that these employees have the intention to continuously develop themselves in this matter, also after finishing with the change process.

Systems and Procedures. The second object of change, systems and procedures, resulted in changes in procedures employees used to work with, or using other systems. One of the biggest changes in procedures is that all employees started to work in two shifts on one department, divided in two sides. Earlier, employees worked across the full department taking care of everyone. However due to this change, they decided to work on one side of the department, which gives them more structure, more time per client and overall creates more feelings of peace in their work. As exemplified by one employee: *'We work with two colleagues on one side instead of across the full department. This gives us much more peace and overview of activities and clients'.* In addition, since employees changed this procedure, they experienced more feelings of responsibility for the clients they care of, started to look more specifically at clients' personal needs, and examined what is required from them as caregiver to see whether they can meet clients' needs as good as possible. Getting a good understanding of clients needs seems to go hand in hand with changing the procedure of including family more in the caring process, as one employee stated: *'We try to provide the best possible care by combining what someone wants and what someone can do themselves, all in consultation with the family'.* More time is created for these matters, personal attention and activities, which results in a more client-oriented approach, more personal contact with clients and family and the ability for clients to direct their own life in consultation with family. For example, as one employee exemplified: *'In the past, everyone had to be washed before coffee time, now it is the question who sleeps in today and who does tomorrow'.*

Another change in procedures in which employees seem to experience feelings of increased structure, is the added positive content of meetings. One employee describes it as: *'a more structured process in which we make sure that made agreements are lived up to and that these agreements are only changed during these meetings',* which perfectly phrases the overall thought of all employees who changed this part of systems and procedures after the change process. In addition, since these meetings are interdisciplinary, there seems to be a clearer vision on goals that are set, and changed employees' views towards other changes that might happen in the future. As one employee exemplifies: *'Decisions are made together, and you work on clear goals allowing you to give targeted feedback on colleagues'.* Calendars are merged together including all disciplines, which creates more clarity for all stakeholders, and therefore seems to increase employees' structures and 'know how' about who does what exactly: *'Because of these changes we can do our job better, and this is going to be continued'.* Many employees describe these changes as something they are going to continue with and seem aware that they are the ones that can make these different ways of working a success. In addition, employees also extended their 'usual' activities on the work floor, now taking care of doctor visits and being the first point of contact for clients' families, volunteers and caregivers. Even though some employees experienced this as hard in the beginning, they now refer to it as: *'Some things you just have to do. Keep repeating it and it becomes easier'.*

Nonetheless, employees indicate that there is a big difference between how they learned to give care during their education and how they currently have to work. They describe that, since the change

process and therefore the increase of clients' self-direction, it is not merely about how they as caregiving professionals would take care of a legwound, but they explain their advice to the client, and it is the clients call what will happen. For instance, one employee exemplified: *'If he does not want to be treated in the way we as employees advised, it is ultimately the clients' own direction that comes first'.* This is an interesting finding, since even though clients' self-direction is increased, employees on the other hand seem to experience more feelings of responsibility in changing these procedures.

In terms of changes in systems, employees started to create 'Our Plan' with their team. In this plan, employees collectively made agreements and processed them, included clear job requirements and incorporate explanations of who is responsible for the different aspects at the work floor. Acting as important subject in team meetings, 'Our Plan' acts as reminder to keep track of made agreements. As one employee exemplified: *'First we had all these different subjects an eventually nothing was improved. Now we have these few big subjects that we created together, and we can divide these in smaller subjects and therefore give everyone the feeling that they contribute to this'.* Employees stated that they experienced the change process of TfPC as some kind of instrument to start working differently, but now seem to realize that they are the ones that have to continue with this process and improve it time after time through evaluating, communicating with other disciplines, being open towards each other and keep on developing. This also seems to be noticeable in the workgroups that are established during the change process and in which employees still continue to work to either tackle remaining issues or come up with new ideas. These workgroups cover a broad range of topics variating from including disciplines more intensively, thinking about improvements in intake conversations and rehabilitation consultations.

Focusing on the more individual changes in the use of systems, employees changed their client reporting. Employees stated they had to change their way of reporting according to a special method, since families are more included in the caring process and are now also allowed to read these reports. Reports are now more person specific, which is also noticeable in clients' personal care plans. However, this can still be improved. For instance, as one employee stated: *'We basically work according to standards and personalize these for our clients. In itself it happens; however, we currently experience this as not good enough, and a sequel is missing'.*

Although employees changed some procedures and systems, they emphasize that there are still areas of improvement in these fields. Employees regularly indicate that agreements are still made without them, and instead happen via the supervisor. As one employee exemplifies: *'When new clients are coming, we are the ones that should have that information directly, and not hear from our supervisor that we have an intake conversation at that specific time. I'd rather see that this is being discussed with us'.* In addition, some employees still find some deep-rooted structures that seem hard to overcome. For instance, one employee mentioned: *'A client asked me to help her out of bed, so I did. So then my colleagues said to me that they never do that, that they never put her in the living room that early'.*

Overall, employees indicate that their work activities itself did not change much, however, experience it as a challenge to keep good communication going and up to date. According to one employee: *'It just needs something small and you think: we'll do this later. Things easily creep in'*.

Structure. Focusing on the third object of change, there seems to be no changes in organizational structures, such as different organization of work tasks and how these are divided and secured. No departments are merged, and no organizational layers are removed in this change according to employees.

Culture. The fourth object of change, related to culture, overall resulted in more openness and transparency in a few different areas, according to employees. First, employees describe an important outcome of the change to be a lowered threshold in regard to having contact with other disciplines. As exemplified by one employee: *'The disciplines are more involved in our department. You see them more often. Previously they were at their offices upstairs, but now they've become really visible at the work floor'*. All employees refer to this as a positive outcome and have the feeling that they can pull some strings if they want them to take a look or think along. Before the change process, the majority of employees had no idea why the disciplines were at the departments at times and were reluctant to ask about it, since they were scared for their reaction and thought asking questions like those would be weird. Now this has changed, through which there seems to be less hierarchy. As mentioned by one employee: *'Collaboration has improved a lot; lines are shortened and there is less difference between colleagues'*, which is noticeable for all employees. Focus lies more on multidisciplinary work, in which decisions are made together and plans are carried out together. As a result, employees seem to be more aware of the beneficial elements that working together can develop, and that you can learn from each other.

This point of increased awareness seems to be the second result in employees increased openness/transparency. Employees realized they had to cooperate more with the disciplines, to increase the personal approach towards clients and that they have to undertake action when something goes wrong. For instance, one employee exemplified: *'They (the disciplines red.) don't really do that on their own'*. Now employees describe that their colleagues and themselves are more aware to take action: *'It's not going well; something needs to be done. There is more awareness'*. In addition, there seems to be more involvement from everybody at the department, and all employees really want to contribute to the change together with their team. It is no longer: *'Here's a decision, so we have to do it that way'*, but employees are asked to discuss decision making with their team, find out what is asked from them, what their opinions are about it certain topics and how they would implement it in their own way. As a result, employees are more empowered to do so, are proactive and seem to experience more ownership and freedom to contribute to their (team)successes, the third result in the organizations' cultural change. However, employees also recognize that some colleagues are more active than others.

With being more open towards each other, employees seem to create a more open-dialogue culture, as the fourth result in organizations cultural change. *'The communication among colleagues is changed. We communicate more often, also about the negative things that we normally took for granted and never spoke about. I think that this is a very positive change',* as stated by one employee. Because of regular meetings with disciplines and healthcare workers, employees describe that they get to know each other better, also in the private sphere and not only when they actually need each other for work related business. One employee phrased: *'It also makes it easier to address each other. Which is important, because then you ensure an open dialogue culture'.* This open-dialogue culture is also noticeable in the communication towards clients' family. For instance, one employee exemplifies this as: *'I used to shy away from that, but now I see it as a challenge to have difficult conversations'.* Nonetheless, employees state that there are still improvements to be made in this open-dialogue culture. Even though they see it as an important part of good collaboration, giving continuous feedback to each other seems difficult sometimes. For instance, one employee mentioned that: *'If you receive solid feedback, you can do something with it. Nobody is perfect and if I do something wrong, I want someone to hold me accountable and have a conversation about it'.* However, in turbulent times employees indicate that they fall back to their old patterns of not giving feedback to others and communicate less with each other. More importantly, employees describe a lack of continuity in this matter, as phrased by one employee: *'You have to keep it active, otherwise it will be watered down'.* This also might have something to do with staff changes after the change process. New staff has no idea about made agreements which, according to employees, fails to create a successful team.

In terms of decreased hierarchy, this open-dialogue culture also seems to be more present between healthcare workers and the board of directors. The board started to show up more at the work floor and is helping with activities. An employee: *'I like that, because then they can see how we roll, and they can speak clients themselves. Besides, I have the feeling that I'm taken more seriously now because of this'.* Lines seems shorter in terms of communication, and employees feel that they've been taken more seriously and listened to. For instance, one employee exemplified: *'It's a long process, however the board is very involved in the process. We were not familiar with that at all, but it's very positive. A very open environment, less thresholds, less hierarchy'.* Some employees notice that there is still room for improvements in this way and seem to hold some grudges against these old layers in the organization, however also state that they are working on this and are following resilience training to learn more about how to approach this in a different way.

Taken together, the first object of change related to people shows employees who broadened and deepened their tasks, in which they experienced to increase their alertness and communication at the work floor. In terms of personal development, employees increased their self-consciousness and autonomy and therefore feel empowered to find out the role they have to play, dare to take on this role in their job and feel more responsible for what they do. In terms of systems and procedures, employees

carefully examine what is required from them as a caregiver, to meet clients' needs and include family in the process, and through merged calendars all stakeholders have more clarity and structure in the caring process. In addition, by creating 'Our Plan', employees are reminded and can keep track of made agreements which gives them continuity in this process. Together with all disciplines, evaluating and developing new ideas for different processes and systems, employees try to work to some kind of continuity. In terms of cultural changes in the organization, more openness and transparency are created in contact with other disciplines, thresholds among each other are lowered, lines are shorter and there seems to be less hierarchy. Employees see the benefits of working together, which results in more proactive employees who experience empowerment, ownership and freedom, and are willing to contribute to their (team)successes.

4.2 Relationships between concepts

In the following paragraphs, individuals' sensemaking strategies, gained knowledge and objects of change are analyzed in relation to each other, to assess whether there are differences in employees' meaningfulness towards the change. This will give a broader understanding in terms of the second research question of this research: *How do the five sensemaking strategies relate to employees' change outcomes in terms of people, systems and procedures, structure and culture?*. Distinctions are made between employees who have a thinner or richer understanding of the change. Since attending the meetings with coach was mandatory for everyone, designed change interventions are included in every case.

Pattern A: meaningful understanding of the change but kept personal. As drawn from the interview data, employees who described the use of two sensemaking strategies to make sense of the change are assigned to this pattern. Since the meetings with coach were mandatory for all, there is only one additional strategy that employees decided to use. In this research, all employees in this pattern adjusted themselves to their sociocultural context as second sensemaking strategy. However, this combination of two sensemaking strategies might not be exhaustive: different combinations in other settings are possible to be made and therefore might show other patterns. In total, four out of 25 employees displayed this pattern, of which the meetings with coach were mandatory for all.

Employees who used two sensemaking strategies to make sense of the change developed a meaningful understanding of the change, but mainly keep it for themselves. By applying on designed change interventions, employees describe that they made use of some launched communications and gained declarative knowledge, however experienced that it only gave them an impression about what was expected from them but had no idea what role they had to play in the change process. Going to the meetings with coach, employees seem to have gained procedural knowledge in terms of learning how to give proper feedback to each other and how to use certain handles that were given to them. In addition,

they gained conditional knowledge about other disciplines' opinions and learned how to address each other in different occasions, that you value each other and get the best out of everyone.

This group of employees found differences in expectations and chose to adjust themselves to their sociocultural context as second sensemaking strategy. They gained conditional knowledge in terms of better communication with clients, colleagues and families. In addition, employees got some insight in creating better results when you discuss actions and proceedings with each other, and approach everything with a more open perspective, even though they experienced this as hard since you never know exactly how someone would react. However, when you explain 'why' you do something, employees seem to experience higher tolerance towards each other.

Even though there are quite similar results in the knowledge this group of employees gained after applying on the same two sensemaking strategies, differences seem to lie in their objects of change and attitude towards it. Two employees who described themselves as reserved and had to see which way the cat was going to jump during the change process, have been mainly concerned with including family in the process and facilitating workgroups to transform TfPC ideas into more concrete actions and rules, referring to systems and procedures. Referring to culture, this group of two employees focus on including the client more in the caring process and create a more central position for them. In contrast, the other two employees who describe themselves as actively participating in the change try to include other disciplines in meetings and came up with more changes in systems and procedures, such as longing for inclusion in the process of appointment making for new intakes instead of the manager who's fully taking care of that. Changes in organizational culture are described by the latter, more actively participating, group of employees as an environment in which employees are more open towards each other, which creates a lowered threshold to ask questions to other disciplines. As one employee exemplified: *'It is about how you interact with each other. I think that is what TfPC stands for, and that is wat we do now. We regularly say that to each other, and that you have to address someone when something is wrong'*. Referring to people, all four employees in this pattern got insights in why they do something in a certain way and found out the opportunity to have more voice, which seems about equal even though the differences in attitude. However, the two employees who seem to have a more active attitude towards the change spoke also about listening more to others and seems to have a deeper understanding of the purpose of the change, in which they indicate the importance of working together as a team, focusing on personal qualities and making use of them, and rewarding personal qualities and good actions. This group also relates this to what is expected from them as employees. Employees who have a less active attitude towards the change mainly describe the change purpose as, according to one employee: *'raising awareness that you are heading in the same direction with clients and family'*.

Overall, employees with a more negative attitude towards the change and using only two strategies are mainly concerned with including the client and family in the caring process and transforming TfPC ideas into more concrete actions and rules. Yet, employees who describe themselves as actively participating in the change and using two sensemaking strategies, aim for including other

disciplines in meetings, more changes in procedures and creating an open-dialogue culture. In addition, they also seem to listen more to others and indicate the importance of working as a team.

Pattern B: rich understanding of the change, kept personal with being more open towards others. As drawn from the interview data, employees who described the use of three sensemaking strategies to make sense of the change are assigned to this pattern. Since the meetings with coach were mandatory for all, there are two additional strategy that employees decided to use. In this pattern, five employees used social processes of interaction and shared narrative as second and third sensemaking strategy. However, two employees used two different strategies than the others as addition to designed change interventions: adjusting to their sociocultural context and using metaphors. These results will be described in the last part of this paragraph. Regarding the differences within this pattern, these combinations of sensemaking strategies might not be exhaustive: different combinations in other settings are possible to be made and therefore might show other patterns. In total, seven out of 25 employees displayed this pattern, of which the meetings with coach were mandatory for all.

Employees who used three strategies to make sense of the change developed a rich understanding of the change, in which they still keep it personal but try to be be more open towards other colleagues. As in Pattern A, all five employees in this group applied on designed change interventions and gained declarative knowledge in terms of getting an impression of what is expected from them by making use of the launched communications. Also, procedural knowledge was gained in terms of how to give proper feedback to each other, and conditional knowledge in terms of better communication with clients, colleagues and family, and focus on a more open perspective towards actions and proceedings.

Differences with Pattern A compared to this group of five employees with a richer understanding of the change lie in the following. In terms of launched communications, this group of employees emphasize especially that they made use of an e-learning, which seemed to deepen their declarative knowledge about the change. As one employee exemplifies: *'I've learned what TfPC meant and what the purpose is'.* In addition, during the meetings with coach, they gained procedural knowledge on more topics than in Pattern A, such as how to work more client-oriented and how to include family and voluntary caregivers in the process. Also, more topics are visible in terms of conditional knowledge, in which they gained knowledge about how others experience and handle the change and what works better or less using different cases on how to approach a situation. Interestingly, even though all five employees in this group seemed positive about these meetings, they also state that there should have been fewer meetings since they had the feeling that there was a lot of repetition in it. These feelings were discussed with other colleagues in social processes of interaction.

By communicating about the change in social processes of interaction, this group of employees gave their opinion about the change either positive or negative, and heard experiences from others. A few introduced stories from others as cases in the meetings about TfPC, to discuss how to improve these

problems in the future. This strategy increased their conditional knowledge, in which employees notice others involvement, engage more with colleagues and address each other when agreements are not kept. One employee exemplified this: *'Before TfPC, we let each other flounder. Now it seems everyone is on top of what needs to happen'.* Another employee, who observed a colleague, gained deeper procedural knowledge on how to handle a certain conversation: *'You learn a lot from this and learn how to apply different conversation techniques yourself'.*

By comparing the new way of working with what they were used to and negotiating with other colleagues to gain insights in the importance of cooperation and communication with others, this group of five employees shared their narrative with each other with the intention to make this change workable for everyone. They gained conditional knowledge in terms of knowing that there is not only one way to handle something, but that it can also go differently. As one employee exemplified: *'Sometimes you come up with a good idea, and another time it is my colleague who comes up with another strategy that is workable. And you make agreements about this together'.* Employees state that they are still working on this, to internalize these discussions at the work floor, yet now see the importance of discussing how to handle a situation and sharing their opinion about these matters.

In regard to objects of change, there seem to be differences in employees' attitude towards the change and these outcomes. As in Pattern A, this group of five employees is also concerned with including family in the process and turning TfPC ideas in more concrete actions and results. However, two employees who describe themselves as calm and not necessarily the driving force behind the change, yet are able to oversee it, state that they add to this by making clear agreements with other disciplines. This also includes discussions in why you would do something and why not, or why adopt a certain way of working, instead of adopting ideas from other teams because this works for them. In addition, they find that by using 'Our Plan', there is room for reflection and therefore experience some sort of continuity after the change. In terms of personal development, besides having more voice as in Pattern A, this group of employees have the feeling of being more empowered to address someone when this is necessary. However, one employee who is really negative towards the change and describes it as: *'Something that you have to agree with, because they command that you have to change'*, did not seem to experience any kind of personal development in which she only focused on creating more targeted reports and improving intake conversations in terms of systems and procedures.

In contrast, two employees who easily went along in the process, or saw others putting more effort in it and realized that they had to get more motivated, pushed themselves towards the change. As in Pattern A, they tried to include other disciplines in their work and longer for inclusion in different processes at the work floor in terms of systems and procedures. In addition, they take more time to give personal attention to clients, provide input for meetings and actively participate in these meetings to get more voice in what will be on the agenda, on top of making clear agreements and creating time for reflection. In terms of the people object of change, this group of employees seem to add to having more

voice by describing that they continue to learn a lot from their colleagues, and clearly label this change as personal development process.

In terms of the culture object of change, there seems to be no difference in employees' attitude towards the change. As in Pattern A, this group of five employees is more open towards each other and ask questions to other disciplines. However, by using these three sensemaking strategies they not only ask and discuss client issues in these conversations, but also conversate about collaboration and group dynamics. They especially refer to negotiation as important strategy to contribute to this, thence they experience more feelings of being heard: *'Your opinion is also listened to, and your vision is also included in the way we all are going to work'*. This is also visible in employees' collaboration with other disciplines, who besides of being easier to approach, feel more like 'one group' and are aware of the importance of this matter: *'Communication goes a bit smoother, also with the disciplines. Lines are shorter and there seems to be less distance between us and the disciplines'.* However, even though employees state they have more voice and that it is easier to discuss different topics with each other, they also mention that one has more voice than the other.

Overall, employees with a more negative attitude towards the change seem to have a narrower understanding of the change, in which they indicate the importance of working more client-oriented and that they expect that you think along and sympathize with clients and colleagues. Yet, employees with a positive attitude seem to have a deeper understanding of the change, in which they emphasize the importance of being open towards each other, feel more empowered, actively participate in discussions, in addition to increasing the client-oriented way of working. Besides, they describe this change as a process in which they can learn a lot from their colleagues.

The two employees who used two different strategies, apart from the mandatory designed change interventions, describe the meetings with coach as 'toe-curling' and unpleasant due to the fact that a person coming from outside has to tell them what to do. The procedural knowledge gained from these meetings was how to work in weekends and making rules on how to do this, in which they not at all refer to gained procedural knowledge in terms of how to give feedback as in Pattern A. In addition, no conditional knowledge seems to be gained in these meetings.

Differences in regard to employees who adjust themselves to their sociocultural context, compared to Pattern A, seem to lie in the following. Even though this group of employees also gained conditional knowledge in terms of increased communication with clients, colleagues and families, they also gained declarative knowledge concerning the realization that discussions are not good because you can't work it out together and it will only contribute to frustrations. As one employee exemplifies: *'You sometimes just have to accept another when you're not on the same page. It has everything to do with character, I'm not going to flog a dead horse anymore'.*

By referring to the change as a family construct, and therefore using metaphors as a sensemaking strategy, working together with other disciplines seems to improve awareness that they are not on their

own in this change: '*You don't have to solve problems on your own all the time. Together you'll get further'.* This resulted in meta-cognitive knowledge in which employees increased their self-consciousness and deepened their insights in perceiving how other colleagues are, which seems to add up to the people object of change in comparison with Pattern A, in which they got more voice. As one employee exemplifies: *'I rather change my own perspective in this matter, that is easier and eventually will work better'.*

As in Pattern A, there seems to be an increase in communication between colleagues, clients and family in terms of systems and procedures in this group. No other differences in work operations are visible, however there are some changes in the way employees approach clients in which they try to give them more self-direction in their caring process.

In terms of culture, this group of employees also experience an open-dialogue culture as in Pattern A. However, even though they mention that employees opened up towards each other, showed some vulnerability and because of that they realized to pay more attention towards others, they experience shortage on acceptance and the feeling that they can count on each other. As exemplified by one employee: *'When I look within my team, there are only a few colleagues that I can rely on'.* However, to a certain extent they also seem to maintain this themselves: *'It really has everything to do with people's characters. You know some people exactly how they put it together and then you think I'm not going to ask you. I'm going to discuss it with someone else. As a result, I sometimes take certain detours to creatively solve this differently.*

Overall, these employees did not really see the need for change, and both approached the change with a merely negative attitude. However, they seem to have a good understanding about the change in terms of the vision the organization wants to carry out: '*I do not come here to do my thing and walk out again. It involves more. It is about the overall wellbeing of the department and not waiting for another to take action but do it yourself'.* Yet, employees seem to maintain the shortage on acceptance among colleagues themselves and therefore do not have the feeling they can count on each other.

Pattern C: Richer understanding of the change, being more open and shared personal insights. As drawn from the interview data, employees who described the use of four sensemaking strategies to make sense of the change are assigned to this pattern. Since the meetings with coach were mandatory for all, there are three additional strategy that employees decided to use. In this pattern, all employees used social processes of interaction and using shared narrative as addition to designed change interventions. However, five employees supplemented these with using metaphors as fourth sensemaking strategy and four employees adjusted to their sociocultural context as fourth sensemaking strategy. Regarding the differences within this pattern, these combinations of sensemaking strategies might not be exhaustive: different combinations in other settings are possible to be made and therefore might show other patterns. In total, nine out of 25 employees displayed this pattern, of which the meetings with coach were mandatory for all. First, strategies, knowledge and outcomes of the first three strategies used by all are

discussed. Subsequently, the fourth sensemaking strategies and employees' differences in gained knowledge and outcomes will be mentioned. There are no differences in attitude towards the change among these employees.

Employees who used four strategies to make sense of the change developed a richer understanding of the change, in which they are more open towards each other and even share their personal insights. Regarding designed change interventions, this group of nine employees gained declarative knowledge in terms of a clear impression of the change and learning the underlying idea behind it, as in Pattern B. Also, the same procedural knowledge was gained in these meetings, on how to give proper feedback to each other, work more client-oriented and how to include family and voluntary caregivers in the process. In addition, this group of nine employees add to their procedural knowledge in terms of now knowing how to make changes in existing patterns. For instance, one employee exemplified: *'It is pretty hard to have a meeting in a proper way, without discussing for hours about certain agreements. But we learned how to do that'*. Another difference with Pattern B is that this group of employees also gained meta-cognitive knowledge during these meetings. They learned where they stand and what their strengths and weaknesses are. This seems to also add up on more conditional knowledge in comparison with employees in Pattern B, since these employees got a good understanding about the differences in personalities they are working with and what to use in specific situations, and not only what works better or less in a situation: *'I really liked that we learned to see things from different angles and perspectives, and that you did not learn for nothing'*. Making use of the launched communications such as e-learnings, this group of employees gained the same amount of declarative knowledge about the content and different facets of the change: *'It's not that I gained a lot out of it, however it was some sort of raising awareness towards the change'*.

In the conversations with colleagues when applying on social processes of interaction in which they shared experiences, this group of nine employees also gained procedural and conditional knowledge as in Pattern B, however increase their conditional knowledge by focusing on differences in why somethings works in one situation and not in the other: *'I try to gain the knowledge why it works one time, and not the other'*. In addition, through evaluating their progress with each other and gaining insights in why someone works for someone personally and why not, meta-cognitive knowledge was gained.

As in Pattern B, this group of nine employees used shared narrative and negotiated about how to improve the way of working and keep it workable for everyone. However, they also state that they used this strategy to keep developing with their team. Aside from gaining conditional knowledge in terms of the importance of good communication and cooperation with others and knowing that there is not only one way to handle something as in Pattern B, this group of employees also increased their knowledge in terms of whether they did the right thing at the right moment or that they have to do things differently next time. In addition, also meta-cognitive knowledge was gained using this strategy in terms of increasing knowledge about the self and others. According to one employee: '*I found out that I can*

be a bit autistic sometimes, however I also learned that we all have certain parts of this in our behavior'. This insight might come from the fact that these employees seem to realize that they are currently triggered to think outside the box in this new way of working, even though they also state that it is easier to work inside the box. As exemplified by one employee, however endorsed by several: *'They ask a big circle now, and this demands more of you than that box'.*

The group of five employees who applied on using metaphors as an addition to these three strategies merely refer to the change as a family construct. Together they make sense of this change gaining meta-cognitive knowledge in perceiving how other colleagues are as in Pattern B, however in contrast, the focus lies not only on direct colleagues and disciplines, but employees also actively include voluntary caregivers in this view. In addition, this group of employees seem to search more for solutions and continuous development at the work floor. Two employees also refer to the change as cooking without a recipe, in which they experience higher feelings of team commitment and seem to develop a stronger team vision. As one employee exemplified: *'All opinions come together and together you find a way to work with that, I find that very positive'.* Through this, these two employees gained metacognitive knowledge about the self, in which they learned to recognize that they are good listeners and learned how to take the necessary information about the bunch provided. Also, they learned to put things in perspective, don't take things personally and prevent that they take stuff home.

Remarkable, all five employees who applied on metaphors as sensemaking strategy and used four strategies in total describe themselves as the driving force behind the change. As stated by one employee: *'I quickly realized that this change could be a success through my commitment to it. You do this together, but since I am enthusiastic, provide colleagues with examples and make agreements with them, you can also evaluate the result and experience the success with each other'.* Even in moments that other colleagues resisted the change, this group of employees seem to have a strong will to make this change a success and try to convince other employees to cooperate, even though they experienced this as hard. As one employee exemplified: *'I stood in front of two colleagues who were very opposed towards the change, and I thought 'oh dear', but I thought it was necessary, so I stood up and said something about it'.* However, even though they tried to convince others to participate, they also note that they were sometimes struggling to find a way how to get them to participate. Yet, when employees notice that the change is not carried out by everyone, they come up with clear agreements to bring it back to life and experience people to take over again*.* As one employee stated: *'You have to keep it active, keep it lively otherwise it will be watered down'.*

Regarding objects of change in terms of systems and procedures, the same components are visible as in Pattern B, focusing on including other disciplines, give more personal attention to clients, active participation in meetings, improve intake conversations, making clear agreements and creating time for reflection. In addition, this group of employees changed procedures in terms of working only on one side of the department per shift and are given more responsibility since they are now the first

point of contact for families. Besides, by creating 'Our Plan', employees add to the positive component of reflection as in Pattern B through the experience of having more insights on everyone's goals and therefore creating better opportunities to give proper personally targeted feedback to each other. However, they state that they still see changes for improvements in this matter, concerning interferences with their supervisor who demand that they still report everything. As one employee stated: *'There are still opportunities for our own empowerment and self-direction in this field. Is this reporting really necessary? Or can we actually decide for ourselves where we store our administration just because it works for us'*.

As in Pattern B, employees experience a more open dialogue culture towards each other, asking other disciplines has become more accessible, overall communicate better with also focus on collaboration and group dynamics. In addition, this group of employees extended this communication with having more interest in each other's' private spheres. Besides, they experience less hierarchy, since decisions are made together in which everyone within the team is involved, equally important and has an equal say in topics discussed. However, some employees still experience difficulties about being completely open towards others when something is negative, or when something happens that they don't like.

In terms of personal development as in Pattern B, employees experience more feelings of empowerment, have more voice and are open to learn a lot from their colleagues. This group of employees add to the experience of the change as personal development process by experiencing more feelings of empowerment to do the things they are good at and also getting enough space to carry them out. Yet, they experience that the organization asks more of them: *'It is some kind of rethinking of which we do not yet know exactly how to do this and how we can deal with this. I notice that this requires more of me than before'*. However, through increased communication with colleagues and family, employees state that they experience more feelings of peace: *'Sometimes I think, o dear I have to deal and conversate with this difficult family, but when it's done I feel relieved and happy that I did it'*. This seems to increase employees' courage to dare to look at themselves, find their role in the process and improve their surroundings.

Overall, this group of five employees using metaphors as fourth sensemaking strategy seem to have a deeper understanding of the change and actively try to create awareness about the change towards other colleagues, try to take them along in the process and give more targeted feedback to each other. In addition, they seem to have more critical views about the things that currently run not optimal and try to find improvements for these matters. Personally, these employees dare to reflect on themselves and try to find their role in the process.

The group of four employees who adjust practices to match their sociocultural context as an addition to the first three strategies, gained conditional knowledge in terms of increased communication towards clients, family and voluntary caregivers as in Pattern B. Also, declarative knowledge was gained in

terms of creating an open perspective through discussing actions and proceedings with each other as in Pattern B, however merely positively referred to. This group of employees state that it remains a challenge to meet everyone's expectations, especially coming from the organizations demand to include all family in the process, which is hard when clients don't have much family, family lives far away or when they do not exactly know how to include them. As one employee exemplified: *'Your expectations should not be too high, you have to bring the two together somewhere in the middle'.* In addition, in terms of colleagues, one employee experienced little communication about expectations towards each other and saw the use of improving this: *'There was some kind of communication disorder which needed more attention'.* Employees conditional knowledge was increased through evaluating and elaborating on these cases and situations in which communication plays a big role. In addition, metacognitive knowledge was gained in terms of putting yourself in others' positions. As one employee exemplified: *'You look further, and you mirror. How would the client/colleague feel? How would I feel in that situation?'.* By doing this, this group of employees created insights in the self, gained more self-consciousness and understanding about their surroundings in which they develop themselves.

As in Pattern B, the same components are visible regarding objects of change in terms of systems and procedures: including other disciplines, give more personal attention to clients, active participation in meetings, improve intake conversations, making clear agreements and creating time for reflection. Through these made agreements and more structure in the meetings, this group of employees explained that they got clear insights in everyone's job responsibilities and job requirements. In addition, they use 'Our Plan' to weekly discuss care plans and assess whether it is still accurate or if aspects need to change for clients. Besides paying personal attention to clients, this group of employees actively create the opportunity for clients to do as much as they can by themselves: *'I am more aware about the freedom of the client, and increasingly let them solve things themselves'.* They do not hesitate to take action when they notice things going wrong at the work floor.

As in Pattern B, employees experience a more open dialogue culture towards each other, asking other disciplines has become more accessible, overall communicate better with also focus on collaboration and group dynamics. Even though some difficulties were experienced with being completely open about negative aspects as employees in Pattern B stated, these four employees state that they created an open-dialogue culture that reduced frustrations and created a culture in which also negative aspects can be spoken about. In addition, they overall value and see the importance of personal happiness at work, freedom in work and work methods and taking responsibility. Employees are motivated to hold on and propagate the new vision together and speak about the importance of a financially healthy company as necessary to achieve that.

Regarding personal development, employees experience more feelings of empowerment, have more voice, are open to learn a lot from their colleagues and experience the change more as a personal development process, as in Pattern B. However, this group of employees add to this by experiencing more feelings of responsibility and autonomy. As one employee exemplified: *'You have more voice,*

people listen to you and this increases my feelings of responsibility in my job'. By experiencing to be more empowered in doing what they like, employees have more insights in who they are as an individual, the role they play, the strengths they have and especially how to use them. According to one employee: *'I now know how to use the qualities that I have'.* In addition, this group of employees experienced more awareness in terms of what they do, observing clients' needs, communicating with colleagues and giving feedback to each other. Besides, when they feel some resistance towards changes at the work floor, or find colleagues to experience some resistance, they take on their role and make sure that it not grows fonder.

Overall, this group of employees who adjusted themselves towards their sociocultural context as fourth sensemaking strategy describe themselves as active towards the change, but also as calm and good listeners, which makes that they have the ability to oversee everything well. They often seem to put themselves in a coaching role towards other colleagues, and make sure they share their vision and take others along in the change. They seem to have a deep understanding of the change and see the importance of a client-centered approach. However, this group of employees clearly state that this can only be reached when employees cooperate together and listen carefully to each other. They focus on the importance of becoming a unity with disciplines, voluntary caregivers and family, and bundle everybody's strengths to give the best care to their clients.

Pattern D: Richest understanding of the change, with insights and influence in full organization. As drawn from the interview data, employees who described the use of five sensemaking strategies to make sense of the change are assigned to this pattern. Since the meetings with coach were mandatory for all, there are four additional strategy that employees decided to use. In this pattern, all employees used all five sensemaking strategies presented in this study: making use of designed change interventions, metaphors, social processes of interaction, shared narrative and adjusting to sociocultural context. In total, five out of 25 employees displayed this pattern, of which the meetings with coach were mandatory for all. There are no differences in attitude towards the change among these employees.

Employees who used five strategies to make sense of the change developed the richest understanding of the change, in which they have all the elements mentioned before and expand this knowledge and behavior with insights and influence in the full organization. Regarding designed change interventions and as in Pattern C, declarative knowledge was gained in terms of gaining a clear impression of the change and learning the underlying idea behind it. However, by making use of launched communications, this group of employees added to this by using different theories and increasing their perspective on, for example, how to do an intake by looking beyond the organization and draw extra information from various professional journals. The same procedural knowledge was gained as in Pattern C, on how to give feedback, work more client-oriented, include family and voluntary caregivers in the project and how to make changes in existing patterns. As in Pattern C, conditional knowledge was gained in terms of more knowledge on how others would experience the change,

knowing different personalities in the team, what works better or less in different situations and what to use in these situations. However, this group of employees add to this with gained knowledge about the relationships between each other and gave meaning to either others' personal- as work perspectives. Also, metacognitive knowledge was gained as in Pattern C, however besides knowing each other's strengths and weaknesses and knowledge about the self on where they stand, they also learned to bridge the gap between the desired and current situation of clients and colleagues through increased empathy.

In conversations with colleagues when applying on social processes of interaction, employees gained procedural knowledge as in Pattern C, on how to handle certain conversations. The same conditional knowledge was gained as in Pattern C, in which employees notice others' involvement, engage more with colleagues, address each other when agreements are not kept and know why something works in a certain situation and not in the other. In addition, this group of employees try to find out how other colleagues think about something, what their work level is and why someone thinks the way he/she does. Also, they seem to register certain topics that need more attention and propose dates and times to evaluate on these topics to increase continuity in the change process.

Using shared narrative and negotiating about how to improve the way of working also let employees gain conditional knowledge as in Pattern C, in terms of good communication, cooperation and doing the right thing in the eight moment or do things differently next time. In addition, this group of employees experienced using shared narrative as a tool to help them to, according to one employee: *'stay positive when colleagues think negative about the change and put extra effort in it to make it a success'*. In addition, an extra knowledge type was gained by applying on this strategy: metacognitive knowledge. As one employee exemplified: *'During these negotiations, I have consciously looked at myself whether my behavior was good in this, or whether I should change this behavior. A piece of self-reflection that keeps coming back'*. Employees state that they regularly run into things that they afterwards feel bad about or should have done differently and speak about a continuous learning process because of this.

As in Pattern C, employees who adjusted themselves to their sociocultural context gained conditional knowledge in terms of increased communication towards clients, family and voluntary caregivers, and evaluating and elaborating on situations in which communication plays a big role. This group of employees add to this by recognizing the situation they are in and what is necessary in terms of communication for that specific moment. For instance, as one employee stated: *'Expressing your expectations is good, and de family must do that also, even when you think differently about certain matters. However, you should be able to make a change in your position when the result goes more towards families' expectation when you know that it is not achievable'*. However, they also state that it is important to stay positive in this matter and that you learn how to positively communicate about more negative issues. In addition, they heavily weigh the importance of having a personal opinion in these discussions, but that you are not at work to make your point: *'Your truth is different from someone else's truth. You have to be able to keep communicating with each other, to move forward and gain progress'*,

as one employee exemplified. Employees gained good understanding about the differences in personal values, norms, experience and thinking, and seem able to understand things from other perspectives, and compromise.

Using metaphors as a strategy, employees refer to the change as a family construct and gain metacognitive knowledge in perceiving how other colleagues are, search for solutions and focus on more continuous development as in Pattern C. Referring to the change as cooking without a recipe, employees in this group experienced possibilities and found skills of which they did not know they had them, in addition to gained metacognitive knowledge in Pattern C as putting things in perspective, don't taking things personally and preventing they take stuff home. Besides, they started to consciously look at themselves and started reflecting on their personal behavior.

Remarkably, all employees who used five strategies seem to have a very active attitude in the change process, in which they came up with ideas, joined workgroups, gave their opinion and raised their voice to convince others to take part in this change. They also experience the feeling that this active role is expected from them and approach and appoint this change solely positive.

Regarding objects of change in systems and procedures, the same components are visible as in Pattern C, such as focusing on working on one side of the department, being the first point of contact for family, reflecting on goals and giving feedback, including other disciplines, give more personal attention to clients, making clear agreements and actively participate in meetings. However, in this group of employees, there seems to be much more of a change in how employees work together. Employees seem to have a deeper understanding of how to handle conversations with each other, and how to reach a certain point of continuity after the change. For instance, realizing small goals did not work for their team, employees changed it to bigger goals and divided these in different subjects, so everyone could choose a topic of their interest and/or expertise, with a result of increased feelings of usefulness improvements in their jobs. Above all, they underscore the importance of continuity in the change process and question whether they can keep alive what they accomplished now. As one employee exemplified: *'The focus of TMZ is shifting quickly. Once we have a new course and complete it, we move on to the next one without actually implementing this knowledge'*.

As in Pattern C, employees experience a more open-dialogue culture, better communication with each other with focus on collaboration and group dynamics, including other disciplines, showing interest in each other's private spheres, less hierarchy and an equal say in topics discussed. In addition, this group of employees actively try to carry equality out at the work floor. As stated by one employee: *'We also radiate this at the work floor, which makes clients feel better'*. Besides, they emphasize increased feelings of responsibility and being more independent after the change. One employee exemplified: *'We are very independent and together we find solutions for all situations without needing a supervisor'*. Employees in this group note that they strive to keep this open culture, in which there is little absence, the team and everyone personally is doing well and feels appreciated, which according to

them makes healthcare better. However, they still see the possibility for improvements in terms of giving and receiving feedback, which remains hard for some employees.

In terms of personal development, employees think about new ideas, make changes when necessary, have more feelings of empowerment, are open to learn from their colleagues, have more voice and know what their role is, as in Pattern C. In addition, this group of employees approach changes as a learning process in which they develop their own ideas on how to handle something, continuously make changes and evaluate about their own process. They also seem to find other ways to take others along in the process. As one employee exemplified: *'When colleagues are negatively towards changes, I sometimes not mention that however I will change and show them how that goes. So not only with words, but also take them along in behavior'*. Employees seem to have a broader perspective in which they try to view everything from all angles and try to emphasize with others' thoughts, think along and take responsibility for their actions. According to one employee: *'The increase of responsibility for the team enhanced our whole team and personal performance at the work floor. We all want to show what we can accomplish'*.

Overall, this group of employees seem to have a very rich understanding of the change and know the importance of continuity in this. They seem not very focused on the client level in this change since this is just a matter of course, but are merely focusing on personally taking an active role in the process, develop a broader understanding of the self, cooperating with colleagues and contributing to thinking and implementing new ideas and changes in the future. Even though they value the wellbeing of the client most, they have a deep understanding of the importance of good cooperation among colleagues, including all disciplines with their personal expertise. As one employee phrased it: *'It's some kind of cycle. If we are right, we radiate this on the work floor. Clients notice this and will also feel better'*. However, this group of employees are also critical towards current ways of working and seem aware of the importance of being enthusiastic towards colleagues to take them with them in the process of continuous development: *'We must work together, in a certain direction'*.

In summary, the results as shown in Table 2 illustrate that employees have a meaningful understanding of the change in Pattern A when applying on two sensemaking strategies. However, some of these employees have a more negative attitude towards the change and, in comparison with employees with a positive attitude using two sensemaking strategies, show less understanding of the change. These differences between a positive and negative attitude towards the change are also visible among employees in Pattern B, using three sensemaking strategies, in which employees positive attitude gained more knowledge and showed more changes in terms of objects of change. They overall gave more meaning to the change as employees with a negative attitude. However, negative three strategy users still increased their knowledge and behavioral outcomes in relation to positive two strategy users. In Pattern C, employees were solely positive about the change and gave more meaning to the change than in Pattern B, by adding on to the already present components in terms of knowledge and objects of

change. The same is visible with employees in Pattern D, who used five sensemaking strategies and have the richest understanding of the change and carry it out in the broadest way compared to the others.

Table 2

Outcomes of sensemaking strategies

	Sensemaking strategies	Knowledge (pattern B adds to A, etc.)	Objects of change	Related understanding of the change
Pattern A: *Meaningful understanding of the change (N = 4)*	- Designed change interventions - Sociocultural context	- Declarative: impression of change - Procedural: feedback - Conditional: increased communication, open perspective	- Systems & procedures - Culture	Negative attitude: Meaningful understanding of the change merely focused on transforming created TfPC ideas into more concrete actions and rules and create a more central position for clients. Positive attitude: employees add to the latter by including other disciplines in meetings, more changes in procedures and see the importance of an open-dialogue culture, yet do not actively contribute to it.
Pattern B: *Rich understanding of the change (N = 7)*	- Designed change interventions - Social Processes of Interaction - Shared Narrative	- Declarative: deepened impression of change - Procedural: client-oriented working, include family and vol. caregivers, improve communication, improve feedback - Conditional: what works better/less, others' experiences/involvement	- People - Systems & Procedures - Culture	Negative attitude: Good understanding of the change as in the first pattern. In addition, employees make clear agreements with other disciplines, question why you would do something, create more targeted reports and improve intake conversations. Low personal development in terms of feelings of empowerment, with really negative attitude resulting in no personal development at all.

| | | | | Positive attitude: employees add to the latter with pushing themselves towards the change, do not shy away from discussions to collaboratively find the best way of working, long for inclusion, actively give input in meetings and feel more empowered to do so. Some realization that they can learn from each other with room to reflect, which gives employees some feeling of continuity after the change and as development process.

No differences in attitude on cultural outcomes: more feelings of being heard, feelings as 'one group' and disciplines being easier to approach. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | - Designed Change Interventions
- Sociocultural Context
- Metaphors | - Declarative: discussions contribute to frustrations
- Procedural: how to work in weekends, making rules
- Metacognitive: self-consciousness and insights in colleagues | - People
- Culture | Solely negative attitude towards the change, however a fine understanding of change as in the first pattern, merely focusing on the vision of the change. In addition, employees see the importance of better communication between colleagues, clients and family and take action themselves instead of waiting for it to happen. Yet, employees emphasize the necessity to get to know each other better to count on each other which seems not to be present yet, however personally keep a lot to themselves and barely speak about this. |
| Pattern C: *Richer understanding of the change (N = 9)* | - Designed change interventions | - Declarative: same as pattern B | - People
- Systems & Procedures | Solely positive attitude: deeper understanding of the change, in which all of pattern B (positive) is present, |

- Social Processes of Interaction - Shared Narrative - Metaphors	- Procedural: knowing how to change existing patterns - Conditional: differences in personalities, situational insights - Metacognitive: personal strengths and weaknesses, increase knowledge about others behavior *especially focusing on voluntary caregivers*	- Culture	including higher feelings of team commitment and a stronger team vision. There is more interest in each other's' private spheres, decisions are made together and there is less hierarchy. Employees actively try to convince other colleagues to cooperate, make the change a success and thrive together. There is an overall experience of a learning cycle, develop new ideas, dare to be critical towards current ways of working and try to find improvements. Personally, employees search to find their role in the process.
- Designed change interventions - Social Processes of Interaction - Shared Narrative - Sociocultural Context	- Declarative: same as pattern B - Procedural: knowing how to change existing patterns - Conditional: differences in personalities, situational insights, *evaluation and elaborating on communication strategies* - Metacognitive: personal strengths and weaknesses, increase knowledge about others behavior, *increased consciousness about environment to develop themselves in*	- People - Systems & Procedures - Culture	Solely positive attitude: deeper understanding of the change, in which all of pattern B (positive) is present. Employees see it as a challenge to meet everyone's expectations, including clients and colleagues, and have more understanding about their surroundings, which contributes to their personal insights, insights in others and more overarching ideas of different situations. There is more responsibility and empowerment and when employees feel some resistance towards the change inside themselves, or experience this with colleagues, they dare to look at themselves and the role they have to play. Employees are highly aware of their own strengths and weaknesses. Overall, there is more awareness at the work floor, which even

				expands to increased importance in personal happiness at work, freedom (also of client's freedom), responsibility and an overall vision of a financially healthy company and what that implies. Employees fully see the change as personal development process in which visions are shared with colleagues by taking on a coaching role towards them, and action is taken without hesitation for improvements to be made. However, this vision can only be carried out if all stakeholders become a unity and use each other's strengths.
Pattern D: *Richest understanding of the change (N = 5)*	- Designed Change Interventions; - Social Processes of interaction; - Shared Narrative; - Sociocultural context; - Shared Narrative; - Metaphors.	- Declarative: look beyond organization, use additional theories - Procedural - Conditional: relationships between colleagues, personality differences, meaning giving towards personal and work perspectives, work level from colleagues, topics to improve continuity, stay positive when it's difficult, - Metacognitive: bridge gap between desired and current situation of clients and colleagues, personal values, norms, experience, thinking, compromise, reflecting on personal behavior	- Personal - Systems & procedure - Culture	Richest understanding of change and the importance of continuity in this, in which all of pattern C is present. Employees are not really busy with the client level, they know how to handle that and are aware of the importance of good communication, but merely focus on personal roles, team development and implementing new ideas and changes in the future aiming for continuity. Employees develop a broad understanding of the self, carry this out towards others and feel the need of being enthusiastic to take them with them in this process. They know how to bridge gaps, and do it, between desired and current situations of clients and colleagues and look beyond the organization to draw extra information from other sources. In addition, they

establish a continuous learning process through constantly reflecting on and evaluating their own behavior and methods, and experience new strengths and skills through combining and being highly aware of their expertise, knowledge and characteristics. Also, they are critical towards current ways of working and have a strong striving towards continuous development and taking action towards this.

5. Discussion

5.1 Discussion

To overcome the barriers regarding innovation within organizations, it is important to determine how employees' make sense of changes, to support successful implementation of organizational change in a competitive environment. In developing the inventory, explicit attention has been paid to how individuals understand the change and how they feel about it and the relation between the concepts of sensemaking, knowledge and objects of change as this has received far less attention to date. This exploratory case study in a Dutch healthcare organization aimed to provide more insight into the sensemaking strategies employees apply on in a change process, the knowledge they gained from these strategies and their behavioral outcomes through objects of change.

The research is driven by the following research questions: 1) *What kind of different sensemaking strategies do employees use, and what knowledge resulted from these strategies?,* and 2) *How do the five sensemaking strategies relate to employees' change outcomes in terms of people, systems and procedures, structure and culture?.* In the following paragraphs, answers to these questions will be discussed and put into perspective. Moreover, limitations are described and suggestions for further research are given.

Different sensemaking strategies

To answer the first part of the first research question, *what kind of different sensemaking strategies do employees use,* the current study shows that employees use a variety of sensemaking strategies to make sense of organizational change. Each employee applied on at least two sensemaking strategies, of which the formal meetings with coach as designed change intervention were mandatory for all. Employees added to this strategy with either verbal strategies in terms of social processes of interaction and shared narrative, and non-verbal strategies in terms of adjusting to their sociocultural context and using metaphors to gain the necessary knowledge to make sense of the change. Finding these different sensemaking strategies among employees undergoing organizational change was expected and confirms previous empirical research on sensemaking strategies used during organizational change by Balogun & Johnson (2005) and Maitlis & Christianson (2014). This study therefore fits with what we already know about sensemaking strategies employees can use. However, an additional finding in this study is that employees do not solely use one strategy to make sense of their changing environment but combine strategies to increase their understanding of the change. This finding of employees' use of multiple sensemaking strategies confirms previous research on uncertainty during organizational change, which shows that explicit change-related uncertainties among employees may best be tackled by applying on different sources of communication (Allen, Jimmieson, Bordia & Irmer, 2007). Some employees only used two sensemaking strategies, yet others combined three, four or five sensemaking strategies. Even though previous research already showed that individuals can use different

sources to make sense of organizational change (Gioia and Chittipeddi, 1991), researchers mainly gave insights in the change outcomes of using a single strategy (Balogun & Johnson, 2005). However, employees in this study seem to have multiple preferred strategies they use to make sense of their changing environment. By drawing on different sources of information to make sense of the changing environment, employees combined these preferred sensemaking strategies, which resulted in four different patterns classified from A to D. The patterns found in this study show clear differences in complexity between them and distinguish and clarify employee differences in sensemaking in organizational change. Finding these different patterns of sensemaking strategies confirms previous research on individual sensemaking, since individuals vary in history and personal background and therefore create exceptional frames of reference per person, which in turn draws them to take on different roles in their sensemaking process (Mills, 2003).

What relations are visible in these patterns focusing on the knowledge employees gained and the objects that changed as a result, is further explained in the following paragraphs.

The relation between knowledge and sensemaking

To answer the second part of the first research question, *what knowledge resulted from these strategies,* the current study shows that employees increased their knowledge using different sensemaking strategies. First, to give an overall impression of the knowledge gained through these sensemaking strategies, sensemaking strategies are set out in relation with the four knowledge types by Van Der Heijden (2000): declarative, procedural, conditional and metacognitive. Second, the relation between applying on a combination of different strategies and the increase in knowledge per knowledge type is discussed.

The current study shows clear differences in the knowledge employees gained per sensemaking strategy they used. The following knowledge types were highly present by employees applying on these sensemaking strategies. For example, declarative knowledge about procedures and what the change was about was especially gained in making use of the designed change interventions. This kind of knowledge was expected to find of high presence in this strategy, since these designed change interventions included e-learnings in which employees gained knowledge of facts, also referred to as semantic declarative knowledge (Tuomi-Gröhn & Engestrom, 2003). In addition, in the meetings with coach as 'lectures', employees both gained semantic declarative knowledge as personal experiences in terms of emotions, also referred to as episodic declarative knowledge (Tuomi-Gröhn & Engestrom, 2003). Procedural knowledge was especially gained when employees tried to understand their sociocultural context through observing colleagues and clients and trying to adjust to their surroundings. Since procedural knowledge is gained through practical experiences (Van der Heijden, 2000) and these strategies have a practical approach in which employees gained practical skills during these strategies, this was expected to find. In addition, procedural knowledge was also highly present in creating shared narrative through negotiating about the best way to handle the change, work with clients and looking

for alternatives. Negotiating and its results in a shared narrative are always unique and intuitive, to eventually find what an employee must do (Rauner, 2007) and knows how to do it (Van der Heijden, 2000). At last, conditional knowledge was mainly gained when conversating about the change in engaging in social processes of interaction, focusing on personal differences and relationships between colleagues. Through these conversations, employees were able to apply their declarative and procedural knowledge in different situations (Van der Heijden, 2000). Making use of metaphors as sensemaking strategy improved employees' meta-cognitive knowledge in terms of cooperating as a team. As also found in previous research, employees in this study used metaphors as justification for their individual actions (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Through increasing their knowledge about the self and finding their own strengths and weaknesses (Zimmerman, 2002), employees were able to explain their actions to themselves and others (Weick, 1995).

 Even though these knowledge types were highlighted because of high presence in a single strategy as explained in the previous paragraph, single sensemaking strategies consisted of more knowledge types. Finding different knowledge types within a single strategy was expected, since a sensemaking strategy encompasses different steps that need to be taken in which knowledge can be gained. As found in previous research, individuals need to go through four steps when, for example creating a shared narrative, that includes a variety of actions such as comparing, mapping out what fits or not and incorporating facts into a believable story that fits the context (Abolafia, 2010). In addition, also applying on designed change interventions includes different events, happenings and actions that need to be taken (Balogun & Johnson, 2005).

 Even though a single strategy consists of more knowledge types, differences between the richness in these knowledge types were also present. This was especially visible with employees who used a broader set of sensemaking strategies and therefore increased their knowledge to a deeper extend, compared to employees who used fewer strategies. More importantly, employees who combined several sensemaking strategies even deepened their knowledge types per strategy. In this study, as shown in Pattern A, the procedural knowledge gained through the meetings with coach was focused on how to give proper feedback to each other and how to use certain handles that were given to them. Yet, employees in Pattern B, who used an extra strategy, added to this procedural knowledge when applying on designed change interventions, now knowing how to work more client-oriented and how to include family and voluntary caregivers in the process. Looking further into Pattern C and D, procedural knowledge gained in designed change interventions is even further developed. Overall, this increase is also visible in declarative, conditional and metacognitive knowledge, and also works through in the other sensemaking strategies. These findings can be explained and confirmed by earlier empirical research on the concept of knowledge, in which was found that different knowledge types, such as declarative- and procedural knowledge, influence each other continuously (Tynjälä, 2008). During the process of learning a specific skill (procedural knowledge), declarative knowledge is used as some sort of production rule during the practice of this skill, which in turn makes sure that the skill improves in

difficulty or speed (Anderson, 1983). Therefore, by using another sensemaking strategy in which, for example, more declarative knowledge is gained, employees have the ability to increase their procedural knowledge as well. According to previous research, knowing when to apply this skill as conditional knowledge and being able to use it in practical situations as meta-cognitive knowledge, can be seen as a follow up after this previous process of gaining declarative- and procedural knowledge in the first place (Miller, 1990).

Thus, employees who applied on more strategies not only increased their knowledge about the change on a deeper level, but more specifically, the content of knowledge types enlarged when employees applied on more sensemaking strategies. Using more sources increased employees' knowledge about the change in all levels of declarative-, procedural-, conditional and metacognitive knowledge, which is necessary for employees to get a richer understanding of what happens in the change process and how to position themselves. These findings confirm previous research by Louis (1980) and Gioia and Chittipeddi (1991), who also stated that individuals need more sources to understand what is happening during changes. For instance, to improve the overall effectiveness of change processes, it is important to initiate sensemaking activities who encompass information in different fields, such as cognition and action, symbolisms and substantivizes and lead to understanding and influence (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991). Individuals expand their knowledge with combining different sources such as conversing and sharing (new) experiences with colleagues, negotiating, and try to give meaning to what is new (Louis, 1980). However, even though it seems that employees who used more strategies to make sense of the change increased their knowledge to a deeper extend compared to employees using fewer strategies, this study shows that there remain differences in the increase of knowledge types investigating the specific strategies that were used. For example, employees who used metaphors as fourth sensemaking strategy especially increased their metacognitive knowledge in terms of personal information, which resulted in more focus on voluntary caregivers. In contrast, employees who tried to adjust to their sociocultural context as fourth sensemaking strategy increased their conditional knowledge in terms of evaluating and elaborating on communication strategies and increased their metacognitive knowledge in terms of consciousness the environment in which to develop themselves.

Taken together, the current study shows that employees make use of different strategies to make sense of the change. This varies from only applying on two until the maximum of five sensemaking strategies, to get a proper understanding of the change. In addition, a noteworthy increase of knowledge is visible among employees when they combine strategies during their sensemaking process. It seems that, the more strategies you use, the more different kinds of advantages you have. For example, speaking in metaphors contains a lot of information and speaking with other colleagues contains a lot of emotions. In these conversations with colleagues, in which emotions come to the surface, employees refer to their metaphor to understand things better, which in turn makes it easier for them to dive deeper

in a specific subject or theme. As result, the more you combine these advantages, the richer your knowledge and eventually understanding is of the change processes you're in.

The relation between objects of change, knowledge and sensemaking.

To answer the second research question, *how do the five sensemaking strategies relate to employees' change outcomes in terms of people, systems and procedures, structure and culture,* this study indicates that employees who use a variety of sensemaking strategies show differences in their change outcomes compared to their behavior before the change.

The current study provides deep insights in the objects that changed because of employees' sensemaking strategies. In this study in terms of the people object of change, employees changed in the functions they executed and increased their personal development. Employees have the feeling they add more value to their work due to the increased responsibility they have to take and increased their self-consciousness, which in turn seems to empower their ability to find the role they have to play at the work floor. These outcomes were expected to find, since the following sensemaking strategies seem to contribute to these outcomes. Through the use of metaphors, employees re-evaluate themselves and make use of others' understanding to get a hold of the situation and their position in it (Gioia et al., 1994). In addition, through social processes of interaction, employees developed new interpretations about the situation and the role they have to play in it (Balogun & Johnson, 2005). Also, the designed change interventions, in terms of the meetings with coach, confirms these findings in which personal strengths are found and individual ownership is triggered (Balogun & Johnson, 2006). At last, by trying to understand the sociocultural context, employees match their interpretations with their audiences (Rouleau, 2005) and therefore increase their meaning making (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014).

In terms of systems and procedures, employees changed the procedures they used to work with. Through these changes, employees have more time for personal attention and activities, resulting in a more client-oriented approach and more contact with the family. In addition, meetings are now interdisciplinary and more structured with a clearer vision on the goals that are set. Employees therefore experience increased feelings of responsibility and know what is required of them as caregiver. Even though work activities itself did not change much, employees sensemaking strategies contributed to these outcomes. Through designed change interventions, employees were triggered to search for information in launched communications (Balogun & Johnson, 2005) and therefore created a clearer vision on the goals and the benefits of working interdisciplinary. Besides, through trying to understand the sociocultural context, employees gained insights in the right routines and way of conversating with colleagues, clients and family (Rouleau, 2005) and therefore increased their knowledge on how to give the right personal attention.

In terms of structure, no changes in the organization of work tasks and how these are divided and secured according to the objects of change from Mintzberg & Westley (1992) seem to be made in this organizational change.

In terms of culture, employees overall describe more openness and transparency between their direct colleagues and in the whole organization, which resulted in an open-dialogue culture. In addition, there is a shared vision between all employees, including caregivers and the disciplines, who actively work together to reach the goals that are set. Some strategies employees used to make sense of the organizational change contributed to these outcomes and were expected to find. For instance, through creating a shared narrative, employees find out who is involved in the change process and discuss and negotiate their thoughts with others to come to a good solution or way of working that suits the context (Abolafia, 2010), which in turn creates openness and transparency between colleagues. In addition, using metaphors and referring to the change as a family construct seems to connect cues and frames (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014), and therefore increases the collective feelings of thriving as a family in the new vision and together search for solutions. Besides, this made employees realize that you come further when you combine all individual strengths.

Even though the previous paragraphs describe employees' change outcomes in relation to the different sensemaking strategies, differences lie between employees using two, three, four or five sensemaking strategies to make sense of the change.

As previously stated, employees who used more strategies increased their knowledge to a greater extent than employees who used less strategies. This increased knowledge and therefore deep understanding of the change, also resulted in deeper behavioral changes in the objects of people, systems and procedures and culture. That increased knowledge resulted in deeper behavioral changes was expected to find and confirms earlier empirical research on knowledge and the effects on firm performance, mediated through organizational change (Goll, Johnson & Rasheed, 2006). In this study, as shown in Pattern A, employees made changes in the objects of systems and procedures, people and in culture. This encompassed including the client and family more in the caring process, transforming ideas in more concrete actions and rules and creating an open-dialogue culture. Comparing this with other patterns such as Pattern B, Pattern C or Pattern D, in which employees have a more nuanced idea and a richer understanding of the change through combining three or more strategies, differences are noticeable in terms of behavioral outcomes. That is, employees in Pattern D have the deepest understanding of the change and also see the importance of continuity in this. They think transcendently about changes in systems and procedures, focus on personal development, think about more improvements that are to be made in the future and create an inclusive culture at the work floor without losing necessary criticism on all levels to improve systems, procedures, working culture and themselves as a person even further. Employees who apply on this pattern of sensemaking strategies have the richest understanding of what needs to happen, on what levels their behavior contributes and what is expected of them. Finding these differences in employees' objects of change was expected and confirms previous research on sensemaking and change outcomes by Bartunek et al. (2006), who stated that the reason for these individual differences in change outcomes lie in the various meanings that are formed around the change. This study therefore fits with what we already know about differences in change outcomes,

even though the change intervention is the same for all recipients. However, though these differences between employees' outcomes in objects of change, this study indicates that these differences are a result of the use of a richer pattern of sensemaking among employees, in which they combine more sensemaking strategies, therefore creating a deeper understanding of the change, which results in more behavioral changes in the objects of people, systems and procedures and culture.

To conclude, this study indicates that making use of sensemaking strategies, and especially combining these strategies, is of high influence on employees' behavioral outcomes in the change process. The richer the pattern of sensemaking strategies in this study, the more influence these strategies had on employees' objects of change. Employees with a rich pattern of sensemaking strategies showed more outcomes in terms of personal changes, systems and procedures and culture at the work floor. In addition, these employees collaborate more with their colleagues, share their vision and that of the organization, and know that they have to make this change a success by working together. However, an additional finding that came to the surface during the analysis phase of this research is the concept of attitude, which seems to relate to the objects of change. That is, differences in behavioral outcomes in terms of objects of change, seem to be affected by differences in attitudes towards the change.

The relation between attitude and objects of change

Although not part of a research question, the concept of attitude came to the surface during the analysis phase of this research. Drawing on the findings of this study, the concept of attitude in terms of willingness to change and how employees feel about the change seems to influence differences in behavioral outcomes in the objects of change. However, since this concept has not been put in relation to sensemaking and its strategies before, this seems to be a new point of interest in this field.

Even though sensemaking strategies are used to make sense of the changing environment in the current study, employees were not always positive about the overall idea of the change. Some employees experienced the change as something that you have to agree with, because they command it top-down. These employees with a more negative attitude towards the change had a hard time understanding why to change the vision towards caregiving and did not see the point of changing the way of working that, in their eyes, was already going great. This finding confirms previous research on the role of attitude in organizational change, in which individuals with a negative attitude struggle to be convinced of the change (Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). Employees show differences in their willingness to change and how they feel about it, either being positive or negative towards the change. Therefore, since these negative attitudes include affective, behavioral and cognitive components (Sparr, 2018), this resulted in different behavioral outcomes in their objects of change when using (a combination of) sensemaking strategies. As such, employees with an active attitude towards the change seem to have a richer understanding of the change when they use the same combination of sensemaking strategies. In comparison with employees who are less willing to change or have feelings of ambiguity towards the change, employees with a positive attitude add extra elements to different objects of change in this research, which are not

found in employee outcomes with a negative attitude towards the change. This finding confirms previous research on resistance to change and employees' experiences of uncertainty, of which resistance might be a result of disruptions in individuals sensemaking (Maitlis & Sonenhein, 2010). For example, employees with an active attitude in Pattern A created a richer understanding of the change in comparison with employees with a more negative attitude using exactly the same sensemaking strategies. These employees changed more deeply in terms of systems and procedures and included more stakeholders in the process in terms of culture. In addition, employees with an active attitude towards the change had a deeper understanding of the purpose of the change, in which they indicate the importance of themselves and their good qualities contributing to the process of organizational change. These kinds of examples are also visible in pattern B and one pattern C, in which employees with a positive attitude showed overall more behavioral changes than employees with a negative attitude. Finding these results confirms previous empirical research on attitude, in which a relation between attitude and action focusing on company mergers was found (Marmenout, 2010). Employees' attitude was influenced due to the uncertainty mergers bring and resulted therefore in a passive or active contribution to the changes necessary. Differences in employees' attitudes were visible in willingness to participate in the process, more conflicts at the work floor and employee satisfaction (Marmenout, 2010). In addition, Bartunek et al. (2006) also indicated that a state of mind affects the extent to which the change is understood and carried out. However, in this study, a selection of employees in Pattern C, who combined four sensemaking strategies (metaphors section), and employees in Pattern D, who combined all sensemaking strategies, all have a positive attitude towards the change. Employees using two or three sensemaking strategies seem to have more colleagues with negative attitudes among them than employees using four or five sensemaking strategies. This needs further explanation. From previous research it is known that enthusiasm and activation in the process can be seen as some sort of energy that encourages employees to take active steps (Brehm, 1999). In addition, previous research shows that a positive attitude empowers employee discussions, resulting in deeper sensemaking and better compromising about the action that needs to be carried out (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). On the contrary, a negative attitude results in weaker sensemaking with individuals not being able to act as a collective (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). This might explain why there are more employees with solely positive attitudes towards the change using more sensemaking strategies than others, since they actively collaborate with each other to make the change a success and know they are the ones responsible to carry it out and share its vision. Actively sharing this vision and convincing others to collaborate in these changes with a clear explanation on how they can do this, is referred to as sensegiving (Mills, 2003). Clear results in the current study show that employees using four or five strategies have a positive attitude towards the change, actively engage in the change process, show a deeper understanding of the change process, which in turn results in more (positive) behavioral outcomes with even sensegiving to share their methods with their environment.

To conclude, even though rich patterns of sensemaking strategies show deeper understanding of the change and deeper change outcomes, this is mainly visible with employees who showed a positive attitude towards the change. In addition, these employees even start to give sense to others when having a rich understanding of the change. Nonetheless, employees in Pattern A or B, who only used two or three sensemaking strategies, showed positive attitudes towards the change, however did not develop themselves further in the change process. Question rises why these employees did not use more sensemaking strategies to get a better understanding of the change and create the possibility to carry it out in the organization more extensively, and if that might be due to certain individual differences in terms of some kind of 'degree of having a positive attitude'.

5.2 Theoretical Implications

The findings presented in this thesis touch upon the core of sensemaking in organizational change and the strategies individuals use in this matter. Differences lie in individuals sensemaking strategies, how rich their understanding is about the change and to what extent they eventually implement the change. Based on the findings of this thesis, the issue put forward by Mills (2003) with respect to individual differences in interpretations of the change appears all the more relevant. It is not to say that these differences of interpretations form solely around one strategy. Rather, it allows for the recognition of combinations of sensemaking strategies as highly relevant, perhaps even crucial, to increase individuals' knowledge about the change. As such, it seems no longer appropriate to solely focus on a sensemaking strategy as a single entity, since these strategies seems to contain different types of information which are exposed especially by combining them. The implications of the results from this study therefore extent to deeper insights in knowledge gained from sensemaking strategies. Apart from insights in meaning and interpretation, which is common in research on sensemaking in organizational change, this study found that different types of information seems to be hidden in these sensemaking sources who set out extra advantages that only come to the surface by combining these sources. Through these insights, researchers now have a deep understanding of the knowledge that is gained through the use of certain strategies and therefore can search for deeper insights in which combinations of strategies might be suitable to reach a specific goal that requires a certain level of knowledge. In addition, the findings of this study indicate that there is some relation between attitude and employees' behavior after applying on sensemaking strategies. These findings call for further inquiry into the increase of knowledge in terms of combining strategies, as well as the influence of attitude on behavioral outcomes in organizational change, especially in terms of the willingness to use specific strategies when employees have a certain intention.

5.3 Practical Implications

The current study has shown how individuals differ in sensemaking in organizational change. Differences lie as well as in the sensemaking strategies employees apply on, the different types of

knowledge employees seem to gain from combining different sensemaking strategies, and the behavioral outcomes they show afterwards. Even though the change intervention is the same and employees see mutual benefit in it, employees can understand it differently and form various meanings among the change (Bartunek et al., 2006). A practical implication of the mentioned findings is therefore that organizations might need to take special care in determining what to invest in, to accomplish organizational change. Facilitating an environment in which organizations stimulate their employees to use a combination of sensemaking strategies, might be an opportunity for organizations to contribute to a successful result of the changes they aim for. In current situations of organizational change, organizations mainly seem to invest in vertical processes in which managers influence employees and shape their interpretations through designed change interventions, such as workshops, newsletters and SharePoint pages (Balogun & Johnson, 2005). However, there seems to be that not much attention goes to facilitating an environment in which employees feel good enough to communicate with each other and dare to talk about the changes, discuss their findings about specific elements of the change or try to find the right way of approaching things differently than they are used to. Yet, these lateral interactions and its informal conversational- and social practices comprehend a great amount of sensemaking (Balogun & Johnson, 2005), and might therefore be relevant to invest in.

These elements are all part of strategies employees might apply on to make sense of the change. In addition, the current study shows that combining these elements improves individuals understanding of the change and the behavior they show. Previous research already proved that employees are motivated to change their actions and performance when they are successfully influenced by their leaders (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991). However, this research points out the importance of combining these vertical processes with lateral processes such as informal conversational- and social practices, to improve employees' sensemaking. Therefore, this research sets out practical implications for organizations to invest in, in order to facilitate an environment in which employees are stimulated to use a combination of sensemaking strategies, which might result in a richer understanding of the change and therefore might increase the possibility of a successful organizational change process.

5.4 Limitations

Several limitations in this research are worth discussing. First, no knowledge test was conducted before the change process started, which means that no baseline measurement was made in this research. Unfortunately, we therefore not exactly know the starting point of knowledge and behavior before the change process (Hawkins, Sanson-Fisher, Shakeshaft, D'Este & Green, 2007). Since this research is therefore fully based on interviews and therefore employees' impressions, reflections and evaluations, this research has limitations as the responses in the interviews would be subjective and might be not a reflection of true patterns at the work floor (Bollen & Paxton, 1998). For example, employees might be embarrassed to indicate they did not want the change or did not want to get into private details. Besides, a social desirability bias might have influenced the results (Russell Bernard, 2011). However, through

these subjective responses, this research creates deep insights in individuals' personal assumptions, information, opinions and emotions of a certain matter (Ponterotto, 2006). By conducting this research with semi-structured interviews and creating a thick description, a broad understanding of the context in which individuals operate and how they interpret this context is gained. In addition, to find consistency in the interpretation of the interview data, participants reviewed the results to see if these were representative of their beliefs and data was coded by another researcher to meet inter-rater-reliability.

Furthermore, this research is based on systematic literature review in the first place, in which the concepts of sensemaking, sensemaking strategies, knowledge and behavior are defined. Since concepts lie at the base of scientific knowledge, they determine the strength of the theories on which the research is based (Mouton, 1996). This research has some limitations the concepts used. First, in terms of the concept of sensemaking strategies, this research is based on five sensemaking strategies found in previous research. However, to create an overview of sensemaking strategies individuals apply on during organizational change, strategies are extracted from different research and merged together since further research has not been conducted on these strategies. The possibility exists that this overview of five sensemaking strategies is not mutually exclusive and that there are other strategies that individuals apply on during organizational change. However, no other sensemaking strategies that individuals applied on are found during this qualitative research. Yet, this might be different in another context (Russell Bernard, 2011). Second, through lacking previous research on behavioral outcomes after using sensemaking strategies and if so, only focusing on resistance to change, employee behavior is defined in terms of objects of change, to illustrate what changes. Even though this might not be the best option for classifying behavior, it was the most suitable for this research in an attempt to classify employees' behavior contributing to organizational change.

5.5 Suggestions for future research

The current study shows an increase of knowledge among employees who apply on sensemaking strategies. Especially when employees combine strategies, knowledge per knowledge type increases. It seems that the more strategies you combine, the more advantages you have to increase knowledge about the change. For future research, it would therefore be valuable to investigate single sensemaking strategies in relation to knowledge, to find out what knowledge exactly comes from applying on a certain strategy and find the advantages individuals have when they combine these strategies with one another. Classifying different knowledge types to the framework of Van der Heijden (2000) has proven itself useful as a method to investigate the relation between knowledge and sensemaking strategies in this study and can therefore be used for future research on this topic. This will contribute to the creation of more objective data in terms of knowledge outcomes after applying on sensemaking strategies, and therefore adds to the scarce literature on knowledge creation in sensemaking. In addition, adding the concept of attitude would be valuable as this includes cognitive

and behavioral components (Oreg, 2006), to assess whether this influences if individuals use more or less sensemaking strategies, or if they actually gain more knowledge from the strategies they use to make sense when having a positive attitude, as the current research seems to suggest. In all suggestions for future research, using a baseline measurement would be valuable to conduct before employees start with the process of organizational change, to create strong measurable effects of the change process (Hawkins et al., 2007).

6. Conclusion

Sensemaking lies at the core of organizing and proved itself as an important process to successfully implement organizational change. Through applying on sensemaking strategies, individuals increase their understanding of the change. Besides, these strategies contain different types of information, exposed especially by combining them, placing employees who use multiple strategies above others in terms of gained knowledge. As a result, individuals who use the broadest pattern of sensemaking strategies and therefore increase their knowledge about the change in the most profound way, show most behavioral changes. Above all, having a positive attitude towards the change seems to increase these behavioral changes even further.

7. References

Abolafia, M. Y. (2010). Narrative construction as sensemaking: how a central bank thinks. *Organization Studies, 31(3),* 349–367.

Adams, W. C., (2015). Conducting semi-structured interviews. In K. E. Newcomer, H. P Hatry & J. S. Wholey (Red.), *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation,* (pp. 492-505). Hoboken, New Jersey: Jossey- Bass

Allen, A., Jimmieson, N. L., Bordia, P., & Irmer, B. E., (2007). Uncertainty during organizational change: managing perceptions through communication. *Journal of Change Management, 7(2),* 187-210.

Anderson, J. R. (1983). *Architecture of Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Balogun, J., & Johnson, G., (2005). From intended strategies to unintended outcomes: the impact of change recipient sensemaking. *Organizations Studies, 26(11),* 1573-1601.

Bartunek, J. M., & Moch, M. (1987). First order, second order, and third order change and organization development interventions: a cognitive approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *23*, 483-500.

Bartunek, J. M., Rousseau, D. M., Rudolph, J. W., & DePalma, J. A., (2006). On the receiving end: sensemaking, emotion, and assessment of an organizational change initiated by others. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 4 (2),* 182-206.

Bollen, K. A., & Paxton, P. (1998) Detection and determinants of bias in subjevtive measures. *American Sociological Review, 63(3),* 456-478.

Brehm, J. W. (1999). The intensity of emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *3*, 2-22.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal, 50(1),* 25–32.

Eraut, M. (1994). *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London: Falmer Press.

George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (2001). Towards a process model of individual change in organizations. *Human Relations*, *54*, 419-444.

Gephart, R. P. (1993). The textual approach: Risk and blame in disaster sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal, 36(6),* 1465–1514.

Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal, 12(6),* 433-448.

Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Institutional identity, image, and issue interpretation: sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41(3),* 370–403.

Gioia, D.A., Thomas, J. B., Clark, S. M., & Chittipeddi, K. (1994). Symbolism and strategic change in academia: The dynamics of sensemaking and influence. *Organizational Sciences, 5,* 363-383.

Goll, I., Brown Johnson, N., & Rasheed, A. A., (2007). Knowledge capability, strategic change, and

firm performance: the moderating role of the environment. *Management Decision 45(2),* 161-179.

Hawkins, N. G., Sanson-Fisher, R. W., Shakeshaft, A., D'Este, C., & Green, L. W. (2007). The multiple baseline design for evaluating population-based research. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *33(2),* 162-168.

Hubers, M. D. & Mulder, R. H. (in preparation). Organizational change and its relation with professional development: a multidisciplinary process-view on organizational change.

Hibbert, P. A., Callagher, L., Siedlok, F., Windahl, S., & Sun Kim, H. (2019). (Engaging or avoiding) change through reflexive practices. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 28(2),* 187-203

Kanter, R. M., Stein, B. A., & Jick, T. D. (1993). *The challenge of organizational change*. New York: Free Press.

Kuntz, J. R. C., & Gomes, J. F. S., (2012). Transformational change in organizations: a self-regulation approach. *Journal of Organizational Change Management 25(1),* 143-162.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sensemaking: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 25(2),* 226–251.

Maitlis, S. (2005). The social processes of organizational sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal, 48(1),* 21-49.

Maitlis, S. & Christianson, M.(2014). Sensemaking in organizations: taking stock and moving forward. *The Academy of Management Journals, 8 (1),* 57-125.

Maitlis, S., & Sonenschein, S. (2010). Sensemaking in crisis and change: Inspiration and insights from Weick (1988). *Journal of Management Studies, 47(3),* 511-580.

Marmenout, K. (2010). Employee sensemaking in mergers; how deal characteristics shape employee attitudes. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 46(3),* 329-359.

Miller, G. E. (1990). The assessment of clinical skills/competence/performance. *Academic Medicine, 65*, 563-567.

Mills, J. H. (2003). *Making Sense of Organizational Change.* Routledge, London, UK.

Mintzberg, H. & Westley, F. (1992). Cycles of organizational change. *Strategic Management Journal, 13,* 39-59.

Mouton, J. (1996). *Understanding social research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15(1),* 73–101.

Patriotta, G. & Brown, A. D., (2011). Sensemaking, metaphors and performance evaluation. *Scandinavian Journal of Management 27,* 34-43.

Ponterotto, J. G. (2006). Brief note on the origins, evolution, and meaning of the qualitative research concept "thick description". *The Qualitative Report, 11,* 538-549.

Rauner, F. (2007). Practical knowledge and occupational competence. *European Journal of Vocational Training, 40,* 52-66.

Rouleau, L., (2005). Micro-Practices of strategic sensemaking and sensegiving: how middle managers interpret and sell change every day. *Journal of Management Studies, 42(7),* 1413-1441.

Rouleau, L., & Balogun, J. (2011). Middle managers, strategic sensemaking, and discur- sive competence. *Journal of Management Studies, 48(5),* 953–983.

Rousseau, D. M. (1996). Changing the deal while keeping the people. *Academy of Management Executive*, *10*, 50-61.

Russell Bernard, H. (2011). *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantittive Approaches.* Plymouth, UK: AltaMira Press.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational Cultureand Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sparr, J. L., (2018). Paradoxes in organizational change: the crucial role of leaders' sensegiving. *Journal of Change Management: 18(2),* 162-180).

Tuomi-Gröhn, T. & Engeström, Y. (2003). *Between school and work: New perspectives on transfer and boundary crossing*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Tynjälä, P. (2008). Perspectives into learning at the workplace. *Educational research review*, *3(2),* 130-154.

Vakola, M. & Nikolaou, I. (2005). Attitudes towards organizational change: What is the role of employees' stress and commitment. *Emerald Group Publishing 27(2),* 160-174.

Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2000). The Development and Psychometric Evaluation of Multidimensional Measurement Instrument of Professional Expertise. *High Ability Studies, 11 (1),* 9-31.

Viera, A. J., & Garrett, J. M. (2005). Understanding interobserver agreement: the kappa statistic. *Fam Med*, *37*(5), 360-363.

Weber, P. S., & Manning, M. R. (2001). Cause maps, sensemaking, and planned organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *37*, 227-251.

Weick, K. E. (1993). The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. Administrative Science Quarterly, 38(4), 628–652.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science, 16(4),* 409-421.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a Self-Regulated Learner: An Overview. *Theory Into Practice*, *41(2),* 64-70.

8. Appendices

Appendix I - Codebook

Codes	Operationalizations	Quotations
SST	**Sensemaking Strategies**	
SST – SNA	Sensemaking Strategy: Shared Narrative	
SST – SNA: CO	Comparison: employees compare the operating model to present conditions in a specific action. Keywords: compare, do differently, match, how it was before, how I/he/she does it.	*'Hier heb ik niet echt discussies over gehad, maar wel dat ik denk: "Oh, dat had ik op een andere manier aangepakt".'*
SST – SNA: NE	Negotiate: employees discuss their findings and agree with each other through selective retention. Keywords: demonstrate ideas, facts, discuss possibilities, opinions, thoughts, how can we do it differently, what went good/wrong.	*'Dan hadden we het over wat er goed ging vanochtend en wat er helemaal niet ging, en hoe kunnen we dat anders doen. Er is wel veel over gesproken, onderling.'*
SST – MET	Sensemaking Strategy: Metaphors	
SST – MET: FA	Refers to the change as a family construct: employees pretend to be a family in the new vision. Keywords: family, together, all together, united, collaborate, collaboration with different disciplines.	*'Dat we het samen doen, en dat ik de collega's ook het gevoel heb gegeven dat ze er toe doen, en dat ze gehoord worden.'*
SST – MET: LO	Refers to the change process as a lottery: employees see the new vision as something they do not have any influence on. You never know what the result will be. Keywords: lottery, chance, outcome, no idea, no influence, no importance, doesn't make sense, neccessity.	

SST – MET: CR	Refers to the change process as cooking without a recipe: employees have to mix their skills, knowledge and characteristics to a certain outcome. Keywords: personal development, skills, knowledge, characteristics, process, learning process, work differently.	*'Ik denk altijd wel 'je kunt er alleen maar van leren en groeien', en uiteindelijk ontdek je dan mogelijkheden en vaardigheden waarvan je misschien niet wist dat je zou hebben.'*
SST – SCO	Sensemaking Strategy: Sociocultural Context	
SST – SCO: AD	Adjust: employees constantly adjust practices in daily routines and conversations to match their interpretation of change with the audience. Keywords: adjust, expectations, match, no match.	*'Ik merk snel aan mensen wat zij nodig hebben, bijvoorbeeld als ze hulp nodig hebben. Dan heb ik dat in de gaten en probeer ik het gesprek aan te gaan of hulp te bieden. Zo'n gesprek is natuurlijk ook op verschillende niveaus. Het is anders om met een schoonmaker in gesprek te gaan dan met een collega. Maar daar probeer ik altijd goed over na te denken.'*
SST – SCO: EX	Expectation: employees found differences in expectations, expectations were not on the same page with colleagues, clients etc. Keywords: differences, understanding, values, norms, difference in expectations.	*'Iedereen is anders. Waarden en normen verschillen ook onderling. En er is een verschil in ervaring en denkniveau. We hebben wel eens een verschil in verwachtingen en soms zijn er ook flinke discussies. Dat hoort erbij, en meestal vinden we dan een goede tussenweg.'*
SST – SPI	Sensemaking Strategy: Social Processes of Interaction	
SST – SPI: CO	Communication: employees talk colleagues and managers about the change, responding to change initiatives. Keywords: talks, explanation, thoughts, knowledge, respond, gossip, rumor, exchange stories, ask colleagues.	*'Om TvPZ eigen te maken heb ik aan collega's gevraagd die wel wisten waar het om ging.'*

SST – SPI: OB	Observation: employees observe other colleagues to see how they handle the change. Keywords: observe, check, see what they do.	*'Ja. Dat vind ik zelfs leuk om te doen. Dan ga ik even op een bepaalde plek zitten en kijk ik even wat diegene doet.'*
SST – SPI: SE	Setting: explanation of the setting in which the strategy took place. Keywords: coffee machine, meetings, briefings, workshops, one-on-one meetings, hall.	*'Wij zitten meestal tijdens de koffiepauze met het team op de gang en dan bespreken we dit of dat, maar tijdens de avonddiensten hebben we wat vaker één op één gesprekken.'*
SST – DCI	Sensemaking Strategy: Designed Change Interventions	
SST – DCI: EV	Events: employees attended events such as briefings, workshops, meetings to get understanding of the change. Keywords: workshops, briefings, meetings, gatherings, coach.	*'We hebben natuurlijk gezamenlijk teamoverleg gehad met een coach erbij.'*
SST – DCI: CO	Communications: employees made use of the launched communications and ongoing communications such as newsletters, powerpoint, instruction video's and a sharepoint page. Keywords: newsletter, powerpoint, instruction video's, sharepoint, website, team rules, team plan.	*'Op de website voor het personeel stond daarnaast ook veel informatie die we nodig hebben gehad, en daar zijn we ook actief mee bezig geweest. Dat hebben we als prettig ervaren en er is goed mee gewerkt.'*
KNO	**Knowledge in Sensemaking**	
KNO – DKN	Declarative knowledge: explicit or theoretical knowledge, 'knowing that', and drawn from books and lectures. Keywords: personal experiences, location, time, emotions, events, facts, rules, theories, methods, practices, what, change.	*'Wat is dan eigenlijk de verandering en wat is TvPZ?'*

KNO – PKN	Procedural knowledge: practical knowledge or skills, gained through habits, unspoken rules and familiar actions, 'knowing how', intuitive and unique. Keywords: learn how to do something, handling something, do it myself, client centered, include family, communicate.	*'De kennis die we uit deze bijeenkomsten haalden was nog meer cliënt gericht werken. Familie en mantelzorgers er ook meer bij betrekken en meer communiceren. Elkaar helpen herinneren hoe heb je dat gedaan. Rapportage aanpassen, want de familie kan meelezen in de rapportage dus je moet goed weten wat schrijf ik en hoe verwoord ik het.'*
KNO - CKN	Conditional knowledge: knowing the situation you are in, and what to use in that specific situation, 'knowing when, where, under which condition'. Using declarative and procedural knowledge you already have. Keywords: know what to do in situation, know when to do something, why something is necessary, what works better, what works less, relation between each other, how does that go.	*'Het is met name het proeven geweest van hoe iedereen met elkaar om gaat, wat de verhoudingen zijn tot elkaar en hoe gaat dat nou eigenlijk. De verschillende disciplines vanuit hun discipline maar ook wie de mensen op zich zijn en hoe ze daar invulling aan geven.'*
KNO – MKN	Metacognitive knowledge: self-regulative knowledge, having insights in the self and self-consciousness, knowing strengths and weaknesses, knowing strategies and tasks to solve problems. Keywords: plan tasks, my strategies to use, evaluate progress and outcomes, personal change, realization, speak up, personal impact	*'Ik haal daar inzichten uit als: "ik moet de volgende keer wat meer voor mezelf opkomen". Ik ben me dan meer bewust van de persoonlijke impact die ik kan uitoefenen'*
OOC	**Objects of Change**	
OOC - PEO	People: refers to personal development or the functions	*'En nu, degene die ik verzorg, daar geef ik ook de medicijnen aan. 'Het zijn maar*

	employees execute change. Keywords: personal change, personal difference, personal development, added more tasks, personal tasks, increase of, being alert.	*kleine dingen, maar het zijn wel de dingen waar je alerter op bent als er iets niet draait'. Je kunt gemakkelijk in de slaapstand gaan staan, maar nu moet je alert zijn en ben je er ook mondiger voor om met familie te praten'.*
OOC - SAP	Systems and procedures: individuals change the procedures they are used to work with or use other systems. Keywords: add tasks, other procedures, do different than before, other system, intake, different layout, include family in the process, division of labor.	*'We zijn nu bezig met een opname gesprek om dat anders vorm te gaan geven.'* *'Jaren geleden was de rapportage wat ruimer, dat doen we nu wat gerichter. We werken nu wat meer met disciplines samen, overleggen daar beter mee, dat loopt ook fijn. We zijn ons bewuster geworden dat we samen moeten werken. Dat deden we wel, maar we moeten meer aan elkaar denken. Daarnaast ook meer met de neus dezelfde kant op.''*
OOC - STR	Structure: refers to change in organizational systems and procedures, such as the organization of work tasks and how these are divided and secured. This always relates to 2 or more departments in the organization or 2 or more subjects of the organizational structure. Keywords: layers in the organization, divide, communication, reporting.	*'Departments are merged'*
OOC - CUL	Culture: refers to organizations' norms, values, believes and expectations that employees broadly accept, and which regulates how employees think about their job and the environment they're in, and how	*'Ik blijf dan ook op de communicatie terugkomen. Het bleek dus dat er best wat dingen gebeurd waren, ook voordat ik hier kwam, wat mensen best wel pijn heeft gedaan en wat er nog wel echt zat, en dat werd toch allemaal meer*

	they react to it. Keywords: better culture, more open towards each other, communicate better, do it together, cooperate, community, not alone, open communication.	*uitgesproken en dat merk je nu ook. Het team gaat heel anders werken daardoor.'*
ATT	**Attitude**	
ATT	Attitude: refers to the evaluations of objects, ideas, events or people, made out of three components: affective (emotions and feelings), behavior (when confronted) and cognitive (thoughts and believes). Keywords: nice, something new, looking forward to it, feeling, emotion, thought, believe, do not like, like, active role, passive role, preparation, agree, disagree, make to a success, stay positive.	*Ik had niet al 20 jaar in de zorg gezeten en stond nog overal open voor. Ik denk dat dat voor mij echt een groot voordeel is geweest. Ik kwam erop lopen en een jaar later begonnen we met TvPZ, dus ik dacht o leuk weer iets nieuws.*

Appendix II - Interview list

Interviewvragen

De antwoorden die gegeven worden op de vragen die gesteld worden in dit interview worden vertrouwelijk behandeld en kunnen niet teruggeleid worden naar de persoon. Wanneer de interviews zijn uitgewerkt in een uitgebreide samenvatting, door middel van het gebruik van een opname krijgt u de mogelijkheid om deze in te zien (methode: thick description with member check). Dit bestand wordt persoonlijk naar u verstuurd via email. Zowel uw werk als persoonlijke emailadres is mogelijk. U heeft de mogelijkheid in deze samenvatting onderdelen toe te voegen en goed te keuren alvorens dit gebruikt wordt voor het verdere onderzoek.

Dan zullen we nu beginnen met de interviewvragen zie zich richten op hoe jij als werknemer omgaat met veranderingen, en wat voor jou wel werkt en wat wellicht niet. Het interview zal ongeveer drie kwartier tot een uur van uw tijd in beslag nemen.

Introductie

1. Wat is uw functie binnen deze organisatie?
2. Hoe lang werkt u al binnen deze organisatie?
3. Wat is uw leeftijd?
4. Welke opleiding heb je gedaan voor (of tijdens) je bij de organisatie begon?

5. U heeft de verandering van Teams voor Persoonlijke Zorg (TvPZ) ervaren. Hoe was het voor die tijd? Hoe was het na die tijd?
6. Komt jouw eigen visie op het werk overeen met de visie van de organisatie? Waarom wel/niet?
7. Wat is volgens u het doel van de nieuwe visie, van het nieuwe werken volgens TvPZ?
8. Wat wordt daarbij van u verwacht?
9. Komen de doelen die jij hebt in jouw werk overeen met de doelen van de organisatie?
10. Hoe geef je invulling aan de werkzaamheden en kun je hier aansluiting bij blijven vinden?
11. Hoe gedraag jij je op het werk? Wat zijn je dagelijkse handelingen/bezigheden?
12. Heb je je dagelijks handelen veranderd ten opzichte van voor de verandering? Waarom wel/niet, en wat wel/niet?

Dan gaan we nu verder met hoe jij het veranderingsproces hebt ervaren, hoe jij als persoon bent omgegaan met die verandering (betekenis hebt gegeven aan de nieuwe visie van de organisatie op TvPZ).

13. Wat is uw rol geweest in de invoering van de veranderingen?

14. Wat vind je van de TvPZ manier van werken?

15. Welke voor- en nadelen ziet u in het nieuwe werken?

16. Wat betekent deze verandering voor jou?

17. Hoe is deze verandering voor jou geweest?

18. Heb je bijvoorbeeld actief informatie verzameld over deze verandering?

        - Wat deed je precies?

        - Hoe zag dat er dan uit?

        - Hoe heb je ervoor gezorgd dat jij de informatie hebt verzameld zodat je uiteindelijk betekenis kon geven aan deze veranderende situatie?

Hierop inhaken wanneer medewerkers antwoord geven / suggesties geven als voorbeeld:

- Heb je een vergelijking gemaakt tussen de manier waarop je eerst werkte, en hoe je de werkzaamheden daarna zou gaan aanpakken? (Had je bijvoorbeeld eerst een checklist maar deze kon je in de nieuwe situatie niet meer gebruiken, dus heb je deze dan veranderd of misschien werk je wel niet meer met een checklist?) (Shared Narrative)

- Heb je deze door jouw gecreëerde/bedachte nieuwe aanpak met collega's besproken om samen tot een goede aanpak te komen?

    - Wat voor kennis heb je verkregen vanuit deze nieuwe aanpak? Welke kennis was daarbij voor jou het belangrijkst?

    - Wat voor inzichten heb je opgedaan? Dus wat doe je nu met die kennis en wat begrijp je daardoor beter?

    - Heeft dit je geholpen met betekenis geven aan de verandering? Waarom wel/niet.

    - Welke kennis of inzichten mis je nog?

    - Wat is vervolgens het resultaat van deze strategie geweest op uw gedrag?

- Hoe heb je naar de verandering gekeken? Gebruik je iets als metafoor voor de verandering? (Metaphors)

- Heb je hierover gesproken met collega's (dus over hoe jij het zag)? Heeft dit uiteindelijk jouw manier van kijken beïnvloed?

- Hoe is jouw relatie met deze collega('s)?

    - Wat voor kennis heb je verkregen vanuit deze nieuwe aanpak? Welke kennis was daarbij voor jou het belangrijkst?

    - Wat voor inzichten heb je opgedaan? Dus wat doe je nu met die kennis en wat begrijp je daardoor beter?

    - Heeft dit je geholpen met betekenis geven aan de verandering? Waarom wel/niet.

    - Welke kennis of inzichten mis je nog?

- Wat is vervolgens het resultaat van deze strategie geweest op uw gedrag?

- Heb je gekeken naar jouw werkomgeving, dus welke mensen je om je heen hebt, en wat heb je gedaan om je daaraan aan te passen? (Understanding Sociocultural Context)

- Merkte je hierin een verschil in verwachtingen? En begrepen jullie elkaar uiteindelijk en zaten jullie op één lijn?

   - Wat voor kennis heb je verkregen vanuit deze nieuwe aanpak? Welke kennis was daarbij voor jou het belangrijkst?

   - Wat voor inzichten heb je opgedaan? Dus wat doe je nu met die kennis en wat begrijp je daardoor beter?

   - Heeft dit je geholpen met betekenis geven aan de verandering? Waarom wel/niet.

   - Welke kennis of inzichten mis je nog?

   - Wat is vervolgens het resultaat van deze strategie geweest op uw gedrag?

- Heb je met collega's gesproken over de verandering? Heb je het bijvoorbeeld gehad over eerdere ervaringen jullie hebben opgedaan, of hebben jullie onderhandeld/gediscussieerd over een bepaalde aanpak en welke misschien de goede of minder goede manier zou zijn? (Engaging in Social Processes of Interaction)

- Heb je andere collega's geobserveerd om te zien hoe zij omgaan met de verandering, eventueel samen met een andere collega?

- In wat voor omgeving/plek/setting vond dit voornamelijk plaats? Koffieautomaat, vergaderingen, bijeenkomsten ingelast voor verandering.

   - Wat voor kennis heb je verkregen vanuit deze nieuwe aanpak? Welke kennis was daarbij voor jou het belangrijkst?

   - Wat voor inzichten heb je opgedaan? Dus wat doe je nu met die kennis en wat begrijp je daardoor beter?

   - Heeft dit je geholpen met betekenis geven aan de verandering? Waarom wel/niet.

   - Welke kennis of inzichten mis je nog?

   - Wat is vervolgens het resultaat van deze strategie geweest op uw gedrag?

- Heb je deelgenomen aan evenementen, zoals trainingen, workshops of teambuildingsactiviteiten, briefings waarin je uitleg kreeg over de verandering binnen de organisatie of heb je nieuwsbrieven gelezen die hierover gingen? (Designed change interventions)

   - Wat voor kennis heb je verkregen vanuit deze nieuwe aanpak? Welke kennis was daarbij voor jou het belangrijkst?

   - Wat voor inzichten heb je opgedaan? Dus wat doe je nu met die kennis en wat begrijp je daardoor beter?

- Heeft dit je geholpen met betekenis geven aan de verandering? Waarom wel/niet.

- Welke kennis of inzichten mis je nog?

- Wat is vervolgens het resultaat van deze strategie geweest op uw gedrag?

19. Welke aanpak (strategie/activiteit) was voor jou het meest belangrijk/ werkte voor jou het beste?

20. Waarom was deze aanpak (strategie/activiteit) voor jou het meest belangrijk?

21. Wat was voor jou de reden om voor deze aanpak (strategie/activiteit) te kiezen? En zou je het een volgende keer weer zo aanpakken, of anders doen? - Welke factoren waren hierbij voor jouw betekenisgeving van invloed?

22. Zie je verschil met jouw gedrag voor/na de verandering? Welke gedragingen vond je gemakkelijk/moeilijk en waarom?

Overig

23. Wat is de impact van jouw aanpak (strategie/actie) geweest op anderen, dus wat voor reacties heb je gekregen tijdens het werken aan de verandering, en krijg je momenteel?

24. Wat is de impact/invloed van werken met TvPZ geweest op jou als persoon?

25. Hoe kwam je er achter wat voor impact/invloed dit heeft gehad?

26. Heb je veranderingen om je heen zien gebeuren sinds het werken volgens TvPZ?

27. Wat vind je van de visie van het TMZ gericht op TvPZ nu je er al een tijdje mee werkt?

28. Hoe voel je je met betrekking tot de verandering?