Kristine Målsnes Veum

Leading change

Leaders experiences of navigating change
and influencing their organization to become more adaptive

Master`s thesis in Counselling

Trondheim, May 2016

Supervisor: Jonathan Reams

Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Social Sciences and Technology Management
Departure of Pedagogy and Lifelong Learning

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to explore how four leaders from a Norwegian engineering company experience navigating change and influencing their organization to become more adaptive.

Organizational change is presented as an introduction to the theoretical field going more into adaptive leadership, organizational transformation, consciousness, self-awareness, developmental theories on stages of leadership, helping skills in the counseling field and the LIFO method.

This is a qualitative study based on an Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) as the methodological approach. The participants lived experiences are explored and made sense of through contextualized interpretations. IPA`s roots are presented through phenomenology, hermeneutics and ideography. The analyzing process is described to give an insight of the research process, as well as the validity of the study, the researcher role and ethical considerations.

The findings are presented in four main categories; the experience of change processes, controlling change and creating the correct behavior, influence in decision-making processes and inner development in the change process.

To make more meaning of the findings they are discussed in light of relevant theory, in the four categories; control, communication, adaptability and influence. Through analyzing the participants experience according to the literature it is shown a complexity gap. The literature describes how navigating change in an adaptive way requires a complex mindset and this being a gap to how the participants experience it. It is further linked to how learning counseling skills can contribute to close this gap.

SAMANFATNING

Hensikta med denne oppgåva er å utforske korleis fire leiarar frå eit norsk ingeniørselskap opplever å navigere endring og påverke organisasjonen til å bli meir tilpassingsdyktige.

Organisasjonsendring er presentert som ein introduksjon til det teoretiske feltet, som deretter går meir inn på adaptiv leiing, transformasjon i organisasjonar, bevisstheit, sjølvbevisstheit, utviklingsteoriar om stadiar av leiing, hjelpeferdigheitar innan rådgjeving og LIFO-metoden.

Dette er ein kvalitativ studie basert på ein fortolkande fenomenologisk analyse (IPA) som metodisk tilnærming. Deltakarane sine levde erfaringar er utforska og presentert gjennom fortolking. IPA sine røter er presentert gjennom fenomenologi, hermeneutikk og ideografi. Analyseprosessen er beskrive for å gi eit innblikk i forskingsprosessen, samt gyldigheita av studien, forskarrollen og etiske hensyn.

Funna er presentert gjennom fire hovudkategoriar; "opplevinga av endringsprosesser", "behovet for å kontrollere endring og skape den rette åtferd", "innflytelse i beslutningsprosesser" og "indre utvikling i endringsprosessen".

For å framstille meining i funna er dei diskutert i lys av relevant teori, innanfor dei fire kategoriane; kontroll, kommunikasjon, tilpassingsdyktighet og innflytelse. Gjennom å analysere deltakerane sine erfaringar i henhald til litteraturen kjem det fram eit kompleksitetsgap. Litteraturen illustrerer korleis det å navigere endring på eit adaptiv måte krev eit komplekst tenkesett- og bevisstheit. Dette er eit gap i forhold til korleis informantane opplever det. Vidare er dette knytt til korleis rådgjevingsferdigheitar kan bidra til å lukke dette gapet.

PREFACE

It is spring 2016, and this master thesis is symbolizing an ending of two incredible years at the counseling program. I am both happy, when I think about all I have achieved, but there is also a feeling of emptiness, having to leave these people that have filled me with so much laughter and unforgettable moments. Through this counseling program, I have met talented lecturers and students that together have created a unique environment for learning, both professionally and personally. These two years have been a journey of growth. Learning to reflect on what I notice in my self, in others, and in the world has made think and behave in new and more meaningful ways. I now see things that I have not noticed before, and this makes me both curious and humble to it being so much in this world worth discovering. I have learned more through this study than I could ever imagine, and I see this as a gift that I will take with me and use as a strength in life. The class created a warm and supportive environment from the first day we met, and I believe that this has been the success factor to being able to stretch as far out of the comfort zone as we have done- accepting tears, surprises and laughter. I want to thank my unique and inspiring class for what each of you have brought with you into the class. It allowed me to grow more whole as human being, and you will all have a special place in my heart.

I want to give special attention to my supervisor, Jonathan Reams. You have been a role model to me since the first day in class, with your unique presence. When I started this thesis I wanted to picture the outcome, but you have facilitated me to trust the process. This made me curious and confident about not knowing what to come but trust this being a learning process that would end up in something interesting- and it did. I believe that this approach made me relax and have more fun through the process. The way you have facilitated me has given me more learning than the writing itself. I think you are very gifted, with your high level complex thinking and supervising. You have balanced the perfect amount of challenges and support, and enabled me to grow and learn a long the way. You inspire me to a new understanding of the world, and I will continue this journey of growth.

Thank you to the participants for sharing you experiences. This has become very valuable data. Thank you to my family and friends for being supportive and keeping up the spirit. I will direct a big thank you to, my partner in crime, Marit Pettersen Hongset (nesbø) for finding structure in my yellow and chaotic thesis. I have learned so much from you- how you write and think different from me, as well as your congruent and honest feedback. You are special to me. I also want to thank Marianne Kristine Sundby for loads of energy and laughter, climbing out of our comfort zones, and an unforgettable trip to Asia.

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Through the counseling program I have been exposed to ideas of leadership and different ways to navigate change. This has given me some ideas of how organizations, leadership and change are linked to general principles in the counseling field. I became curious about how leaders in organizations experience leading change and therefore decided to do research on this for my master thesis.

Looking at the society we see that the oil crisis is given some of the blame for the high numbers of unemployment in Norway that in May 2015 was at 4.3%. This is especially due to the increasing layoffs in the oil industry. Low oil prices put projects on hold and the demand for labor will continue to be reduced (NTB, 2015). This tells us something about how serious the consequences of change can be. We are surrounded by changes in different areas in our society today. Some examples are 110 municipalities being in a process of melting together with neighboring communities (Regjeringen.no, 2014) and hospital mergers being challenging because the change processes happen fast without enough resources, economic planning and information to people involved (Johannessen, 2010). This illustrates how changes affect us in our everyday life, and being able to adapt successfully to the change then seems to become an important skill in today's society.

Within the next two to five years, rapid organizational change is expected to bring huge challenges. Even if change is supposed to be a top priority, 50-70% of planned change efforts fail. While the structural and operational side of change has been better mastered, the people side has gotten little attention. To improve this, mindsets and beliefs must be addressed and people can be helped to adapt to change through practice. Leaders must operate at three levels; the self, the others and the organization, to navigate change (Dinwoodie et al., 2015). In the past century the focus on leadership development has been on behaviors or skills (Reams, Gunnlaugson & Reams, 2014). Today, there is a growing understanding of the need to focus on internal qualities of the leader's self: "Leadership is not a science or art, it is a state of consciousness…we can now begin to grasp the phenomenon of leadership as the field of awareness rather than personality trait or mental attribute" (Chatterjee, 1998 in Reams, 2005, p. 123). This illustrates how looking into yourself can be a way to start developing as a leader to help the organization navigate change.

So being able to master the "people side" in change processes seem to require human relation, communication skills, and the ability to adapt and help people to grow. I therefore see it as useful to link this to general principles in the counseling field. Within organizations people relate to each other in different ways, and being a good helper becomes important. Schein (2009) describes a helping relationship as a good relationship with space for open communication and trust. In that way, being a good helper seems to require good helping skills from the counseling field. Through counseling skills one can help others to help themselves to use their own resources and develop something that is already there (Kvalsund, 2005). This requires asking questions in a humble and empathic way, to find the other person where he or she is, and to balance support and challenge (Berg & Ribe, 2013). I think this thesis will give information about how leaders think, behave and adapt to demanding changes in their surroundings, and a good link to the counseling field.

The participants in this research are leaders from a Norwegian engineering company consisting of engineers with technical expertise. Their situation is being in the middle of reorganization in a competitive market. Today's cuts in the oil industry gives the organization less resources, and creates pressure internally and externally. This causes huge challenges in how to make the most out of what`s on offer, deliver quality and be able to compete in the market. Some of the changes can require implementing new tools. An example of a relevant tool can be Lean Product Development (LPD) that uses lean principles and tools, techniques and practices to improve the process of product developing and reducing waste. The quality can be improved by reducing problems that can occur during the process (Tororella et al., 2016). LPD can have a huge impact of the success of organizations, but there is a need for a system perspective when implementing this tool (Letens et al., 2011). This illustrates that implementing new tools requires a mindset taking multiple perspectives. It is important for the company to stay competitive in the market and it`s therefore highly relevant for the leaders to develop good capability to navigate change processes successfully. I am therefore curious to find out how these engineer leaders experience leading change in a reorganizing process, so my research question is;

"How do leaders experience navigating change and influencing their organization to become more adaptive?"

In the context of this research project, navigating change is seen as the ability for a leader to lead change processes that make the best possible outcome for the whole organization. This in terms of how one uses one`s internal qualities (thinking, believes and behaviors) to enable the transformation needed to benefit from the change. Influencing their organization refers to include and empower employees to be involved in the change together. This could mean taking an active role in being a visible, self-aware and a caring leader. Becoming more adaptive means to evolve as a leader, to increase flexibility and consciousness about one self and others in the organization. It is also to deal with adaptive change, that means to address the underlying issues related to values, innovation, learning and changes in the system itself and really work with the DNA of the system or organization (Heifetz, Linsky & Grashow, 2009). Navigating adaptive change requires more than a shift in behavior, it requires a shift in mindset (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). This will require a certain level of self-awareness and the ability to take multiple perspectives to see the whole organization.

I will explore these terms more in depth in chapter two, together with other relevant theory. In chapter three I will describe the methodology I have used according to my science based stance and the analyzing process of the data. Chapter four is a presentation of the findings, where I present the description of the participants' experience. These findings will be discussed in light of relevant theory in chapter five, before I end with some concluding thoughts in chapter six.

2.0 THEORY

I will start the theory chapter introducing organizational change to frame the field before I point to what I will be looking at within the field. In organizations, resources, job activities and responsibilities are being defined and organized, and people often have an established belief about them. Change is seen as something difficult because one must deal with an uncertain future, and when implementing change the consequences can be difficult to predict. It is seen as an intellectual task to successfully make change, which can be challenging for management and leadership teams (Carnal, 2007). It is difficult to handle large-scale change in organizations, and mistakes are often done due to lack of exposure to highly successful transformation (Kotter, 2002). Within this field, I will focus on adaptive leadership and organizational transformation. To explore how leaders can develop growth I will look at some aspects of the phenomenon consciousness and self-awareness. I will present developmental theories from Joiner & Joseph`s leadership agility and Torbert's action logics to describe how leaders navigate change based on stages of leadership. To make a link to the counseling field, I will present some helping skills necessary in counseling and different communication styles through the LIFO method.

2.1 Adaptive leadership and organizational transformation

Adaptive leadership is one way to navigate change, and I see this as relevant to the thesis topic because organizations are forced to learn new ways to operate and develop new strategies due to the changes in societies, markets, customers, competition and technology (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997). This can create a need for organizational transformation that contains adaptability and interrelated changes across the systems. As mentioned earlier, adaptability in this context means to become more adaptive in terms of dealing with adaptive change; like grasping the underlying issues within the system itself and mobilizing the organization to meet and overcome the challenges they are faced with. The ability to navigate adaptive change involves self-inquiry and self-exploration, and willingness to see your own entrenched patterns through a fresh lens (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). This differs from technical changes that are more of a quick fix, wanting to use operational structures to solve ordinary problems. This is not so likely to have an effect on its own. Adaptive leadership is about mobilizing people to handle though challenges. Important abilities for adaptive leaders are to be patient, persistent, identify obstacles and overcome them (Heifetz, Linsky & Grashow, 2009). In this way it can seem like adaptive leadership is essential to gain growth and success from the changing processes.

Transformation is a qualitative shift towards a more adaptive organizing form at all levels, which means that the whole organization must change its way of thinking, experiencing and behaving (Edwards, 2010). This will require that leaders handle complexity. Changes can create confusion and insecurity, and challenge one`s feelings of being worthy and having control of the situation (Bolman, 2009). People tend to resist the loss that comes with the change, not the change in itself (Heifetz, Linsky & Grashow, 2009). Giving support, training and opportunities to actively participate in the change processes can prevent resistance against the changes. Within these processes leaders must be capable to see what “glasses” that are most effective to see through in a certain situation, and use different frames of references at the same time to see the whole picture (Bolman, 2009).

Leaders must invest time in guiding people through the transition, and adaptive challenges requires a learning strategy where people are engaged to confront challenges, adjust values and change perspectives. Leaders must get on “the balcony” to keep the whole game situation in mind and move back and forth between actions while having this overview (Heifetz & Laurie, 1997). To enable growth, leaders must create a holding environment with sufficient challenges and support to give people an opportunity to examine assumptions, priorities and believes (Reams & Caspari, 2012). Reflection is used in these reassessing processes to reach transformative learning (Mezirow, 1990). According to this, adaptive leaders experience that their groups have a greater impact on the organization and exert more individual effort, which make them more highly effective groups (Hawkins & Dulewicz, 2009).

Consciously transformational organizations want personal transformation as part of transformation in the organization. Here, we can find committed people who want to increase the passionate employee engagement. These organizations have three things in common. There is an overarching mission of being selflessly served, part of the mission is personal transformation and a methodology to master this transformation. This can result in a change of heart that means that you put others` interests ahead of your own. We are most satisfied and happy when we sacrifice for something bigger than ourselves. This is basic to human nature and something we all want. Selflessness is described as a permanent, effortless spontaneity, where we “loose ourselves” in a pure, good mission, with passion and no reservation. Organizations with selfless people are more likely to be successful. A permanent transformation of being is a transformation from selfishness to selflessness (Turak, 2013).

2.2 Self-awareness and consciousness as keys to make shifts in your mindset

The leader's capability to navigate adaptive change requires a shift in mindset, that is more than a shift in behavior (Kegan & Lahey, 2009). Reams & Reams (2015) pinpoints that self-awareness and consciousness plays an important role in leadership development. I therefore want to highlight these two terms to describe some of the process in shifting mindset. In this context, self-awareness is the ability to turn the attention toward the process going on inside oneself, to be able to notice what kind of thoughts, feelings, desires and impulses that are there (Jordan, 2011). When we are totally present it is easier to listen deep enough to our self and other people (Greenleaf, 1977 in Reams & Caspari, 2012). Deep presencing in the domain of self-awareness is a key factor in engaging the leaders` self. Being aware of what`s arising from our engagement with the present moment requires to notice, suspend and let go of our preconceived notion of who we are (Reams, 1999 in Reams, Gunnlaugson & Reams, 2014). Cultivating presence can increase authenticity in leadership (Reams, Gunnlaugson & Reams, 2014), which means to own one`s personal experience (Harter 2002 in Walumbwa et al., 2008), and can create environments that facilitate transformation (Reams, Gunnlaugson & Reams, 2014).

Consciousness, in this context, is understood as a structure of meaning making (Lahey, Souviane, Kegan, Goodman & Felix, 1988 in Reams, 2015). It requires strength to be fully conscious about where you are, where you are going and why, as well as everything that is happening around you (Gallwey, 2001). Self-knowledge is the most valuable knowledge of all. When being willing to open up about your life and motivation, this allows developing more productive and rewarding relationships (Turak, 2013). It is likely to believe that growth in consciousness is necessary to facilitate transformation, when the later stages of cognitive development enable leaders to open and hold deep and complex spaces (Reams & Caspari, 2012).

One can experience growth in consciousness and to move from what Kegan presents as a third order of consciousness (socialized mindset) towards a fourth order of consciousness (self-authoring mind) through the "Immunity to change" program. Effective leadership is challenging for leaders with a socialized mindset. This mindset contains embeddedness, fearful thinking, a strong need of control and vulnerability is connected to weakness. They experience loss of power and a lack of social and emotional intelligence, reflective capacity and self-awareness. Leaders with this mindset have a need to meet external expectations and to define themselves through others. A self-authoring mind can improve leadership and personal growth. This mindset contains being more relaxed and growing into yourself. One is comfortable with uncertainty, have less use of force, more empowerment, better quality of presence and increased creative imagination. Therefore, moving to a fourth order of consciousness one is more likely to lead with a more appropriate structure of meaning making (Reams & Reams, 2015). A leader`s increased self-awareness is important to develop an understanding of oneself and can further help colleges and the organization (Fikse, 2015). I see this literature as pointing towards where leaders need to go to become successful leaders.

2.2.1 Resistance to change and awareness raising processes

It is common to resist exploring ones subjective, social-emotional world, and being scared of facing the shadows inside you. Unexplored selves are more likely to have protective behaviors, projection, defensiveness, dis-identification and self-deception (Reams & Reams, 2015). Defensiveness can make it more difficult to work towards a common vision and collective learning (Senge, 2006). Protective behaviors mean thinking that others can be blamed for a problem, and if the other person expresses resistance this will prove your assumption about him or her being the cause of the problem (Argyris & Schön, 1996 in Bolman, 2009). The danger with resistance escalating in organizations is that you attack others not wanting to discover own behaviors, which lead to even more uncertainty and makes it impossible to discover mistakes (Salovey & Mayer, 1990 in Bolman, 2009). Being resistant to change can prevent us from making positive changes in our lives and is often rooted in unexamined beliefs. By developing a more conscious and constructive set of beliefs, we are more capable to shift our behaviors (Kegan & Lahey, 2009).

Through awareness raising processes one gets help to perceive hidden values and commitments that drive unwanted behavior that makes it difficult to change (Reams & Reams, 2015). When having the ability to test one’s assumptions, one is more likely to evolve to a more adequate and complex meaning making system (Kegan & Lathey, 2001, 2009 in Reams, 2015). Salovey & Mayer (1990, in Bolman, 2009) also points at when testing your assumptions, one can increase better behaviors and communicate more openly. Through this, one can discover blind spots that can have an impact in our leadership (Reams & Caspari, 2012). High performing leaders have the ability to evaluate what impact their behaviors have on others and evaluate their skills (Ashford and Tsui, 1991 in Tang et al., 2013). Through learning counseling skills this can give access to what you have been subject to and start being more proactive. It can make it easier to let go of control and preconceived assumptions of identity. It allows you to take a perspective on this process of outgrowing your old mindset. In this way, reflective insights can expand awareness and be a container for growth (Reams & Reams, 2015). Growing to develop leadership skills can happen through reflection about yourself and a reframing of who you are (Fikse, 2015). Reflection is used as a synonym for higher-order mental processes and is a tool that can assess the grounds of one`s beliefs and examine assumptions. Reflection can therefore be used to enhance self-awareness (Dewey, 1933 in Mezirow, 1990).

2.3 Developmental theories on stages of leadership

I will now present stages of leadership through developmental theories from Joiner & Josephs and Rooke & Torbert. Joiner & Josephs` (2007) theory about leadership agility points out that growth in leadership competencies is necessary to succeed with leading organizations that need to handle effectively in fast, complex and transformative environments. There are five levels of personal development one can go through to increase leadership agility and become a more effective leader. The development level affects the ability to adapt new leadership skills as the emotional and mental capacity grows in this process. In the later stages one is more capable to respond better to changes and complexity (Joiner & Josephs, 2007).

Rooke & Torbert (2005) refer to action logics as stages of leadership. Action logics are how one interprets the surroundings and react when power is challenged in leadership. There are seven leader types with different action logics and they will be distinguished as lower- and higher action logics in this context (Rooke & Torbert, 1998). Based on research about leaders in American and European companies in diverse industries, Rooke & Torbert (2005) estimate that 55% are opportunists, diplomats and experts (lower action logics). They are less effective to implement organizational strategies. 15% are individualists, strategists and alchemists (higher action logics), and more effective in such implementations. The last 30% are achievers are some place in between but belonging to the lower action logics. They are outcome oriented and see the value of motivating others. Of the 55% of the lower action logics, 45 are experts. They believe in problem solving and wanting to be respected with their expertise (Rooke & Torbert, 2005). These are the two relevant action logics that will be referred to in this thesis. Another study shows that the leaders at the pre-strategist stage had zero progressive organizational transformations. This resulted in loss in personnel, recourses and money. The leaders at the late-strategist stage supported fifteen progressive organizational transformations (Rooke & Torbert, 1998). These numbers indicate that few companies have leaders with implemented high action logics that actualize the need for growth to meet the change processes the organizations are faced today.

2.3.1 Expert

Within the stages of development, I find it relevant to discuss the expert and the achiever. Joiner & Josephs (2007) describe leaders at the expert level as wanting to be respected as experts by solving problems or improving already existing strategies, often isolated from the context. These leaders are good at thinking independently and analytical, but not very open to change, feedback, or other people's ideas and perspectives. Their reflection level is moderate and they experience others as not living up to their own standards. They see more value in working with one individual at the time rather than groups, and find it difficult to be creative and see the whole picture. They have difficulties taking one step back to look at their strengths and weaknesses. Leaders at the expert level do more of "advocacy" (telling others what you think is right), and less of "inquiry" (invite others to express themselves through open questions). Rooke & Torbert (1998) present this expert level action logic as wanting to demonstrate power by their own knowledge, dislike that their own view is challenged, avoid conflicts, and do not pay much attention to feedback. It is pointed out that there is a need for leaders at the expert level to develop to make the organization handle changes (Joiner & Josephs, 2007). According to adaptive leadership it seems necessary to improve from this level in order to get closer to becoming an adaptive leader.

2.3.2 Achiever

Joiner & Josephs (2007) describe leaders at the achiever level as wanting the whole organization to work from shared visions and viewpoints. Different from the experts, these leaders see the value of collaboration and have an increased self-awareness and ability of reflection. They facilitate and coach groups, check out their assumptions in communication, and balance to be assertive and listen empathically. These leaders have the ability to take a step back from their own standards and values, to gain a more nuanced understanding. They are positive to feedback, have the capability to integrate others` values into a system and can hold different perspectives in mind at the same time. Leaders at the achiever level are good at reflecting about what they have learned in specific situations and see connections (Joiner & Josephs, 2007).

Leaders with higher action logics, beyond expert and achiever, are willing to work with the uncertainties of the design process, manage complex initiatives where changes and influences take place, and are able to adapt their design along with shifts in the context. Leaders who hold the most mature action logics have the ability to take a systems view, manage conflict frames, perspectives and emotions. They are deeply accepting of themselves and others, and have a trust in the process (Brown, 2012). Based on this it seems like development of action logics and leadership agility can be necessary to navigate change and to approach the adaptive challenges.

2.4 Counseling skills and the helping relationship

I now want to link some of the broad issues these leaders might face to the counseling field. Good qualities for a counselor are for example to be positive, accepting, empathic, present and congruent. Through counseling skills one can create a dialogue to help the other person to help him- or herself to use their own recourses and develop something that is already there. When training your self-observation one become more capable of reflecting and helping oneself. There must be a mutual learning- and discovering process, and when becoming more self-aware it can be easier to increase ones action opportunities (Kvalsund, 2005). All types of changes start with observing oneself. The counseling skills will increase ones ability to ask questions in a humble and empathic way, and stay in the tension between own opinions and at the same time listening. With such skills one creates trust, being interested in other`s needs, thoughts and feelings, have a mutual openness, with a good balance of challenge and support (Berg & Ribe, 2013).

Helping skills are necessary within counseling. This could be attention skills like active listening where one is focused and empathic, checking out if there is a mutual understanding, or paraphrasing were one mirror what the other one has said with a parallel meaning or pinpoint expressed feelings. Other helping skills are influencing a contribution to change. Examples are to interpret what is being said, with a clear understanding of what the interpretation is built on or confrontation in a respectful and empathic way. An important part of this helping process is to be able to facilitate and give support in the exploring process, as well as accepting the experience as it is and presenting alternative ways to be in contact. Through this the other person can get access to understanding one’s self and opportunities for action (Kvalsund, 2006).

I believe that through such skills one is able to create a helping relationship being described in the introduction. The helping relationship is unbalanced because when you are asking for help you are putting yourself "one down" which makes you vulnerable and dependent. You gain power when being trusted as a helper, because you are asked to use your wisdom to solve a problem (Schein, 2009). Based on this, I believe that when being good helpers in this helping relationship one is able to make the other one the expert, and see their needs in the growth process.

2.4.1 The LIFO method

Atkins & Katcher (2002) developed the LIFO method to assesses personal styles in communication in order to maintain and develop personal strengths. This is to identify the individual`s basic orientation to life, as well as favorable conditions when things are going well and unfavorable conditions in stress or conflicts. The use of one's strengths depends on its relevance, and strengths can be weaknesses when being overused. This is important to understand how behaviors may impact others under these two different conditions. LIFO introduces four personal styles of communicating and relating to others. These are Controlling/Taking (CT), Conserving/Holding (CH), Supporting/Giving (SG) and Adapting/Dealing (AD). Some people tend to use primarily one style, while others adapt smoothly to all of them depending on the situations and how they act. It can be a strength to not overuse one style, but it can also be a weakness if one is difficult to identify. Through being more aware of ones preferred styles one is more able to avoid overusing these, use more of the least preferred styles, increase perspectives, and match this with others preferred ways of communicating (Atkins & Katcher, 2002).

The CT style's strengths are to create initiatives, control the world through actions, focus on the task, let others know where you stand and take action fast. People preferring this style are confident, responsible and productive in the situation. When overusing their strengths, they prefer to take too much control, doing the work themselves, be commanding and impatient. They have a need to see personal advantages, cut others off and want freedom to figure things out themselves. They tend to influence or pressure others to accept their ideas, react defensively to disagreement or criticism and might take on a challenge for the sake of the challenge (Atkins & Katcher, 2002).

The CH style's strengths are having a holding function that is important for the dynamic in the organization and stabilize the system over time. People using this style like facts, systems, logics, details and slowing down to prevent actions from being done too fast. Progress is measured with specific milestones, and they are being practical, economical, reserved, and analytical. They make sure everyone knows exactly what to do. When the CH types overuse their strengths they fail to pay attention to emotional factors, get lost in details and don`t see the bigger picture. They become stubborn, unfriendly, critical, uncreative, locked in their arguments, not moving forward, and cannot let go of things (Atkins & Katcher, 2002).

The SG style's strengths are wanting to meet others needs with support, being considerate, idealistic, thoughtful, trusting, loyal, helpful, and cooperative. Those who prefer this style allow others to take charge, provide help to facilitate progress and support others development. They like to be an achiever and to do something to benefit people, listen to what others have to say, seek and invite help and guidance. They show respect for authorities, and expect them to be role models. When people with the SG type overuse their strengths they tend to not allow others to do things themselves, being self-denying, impractical, easily influenced, over-committed and passive (Atkins & Katcher, 2002).

The AD style's strengths are being empathic and taking care of others needs. They are flexible, experimental, enthusiastic, adaptable, humorous, being social and people oriented and want harmony. They recognize people's feelings, look at feedback and encouragement as important, use intuitive and non-linear thinking processes, and able to see all sides of an argument. When AD types overuse their strengths they tend to be inconsistent, avoid confrontation, and are too adaptive and not taken seriously. They can be too concerned about feelings and can be overly hopeful and enthusiastic about the outcomes of conflict situations (Atkins & Katcher, 2002).

3.0 METHODOLOGY- A QUALITATIVE APPROACH

In this chapter I want to explain the methodological approach for my thesis. I will reflect about my choice of method and my science-based stance that can be seen in relation to the choices I have made along the way.

3.1 Choice of method and design

The aim of this study is to look at leaders' experiences with leading change. Qualitative data is communicating the participant's experiences from their lifeworld (Patton, 2002), and I therefore find this method suitable to approach my research question. Through qualitative research, one can look at how social meaning is created and given value, and how the relationship between the participants and the researcher shapes the research (Dezin & Lincoln, 1998). I wanted to do an interview research, and the aim of this is, from the interviewee's perspective, to understand different shades of the everyday life and interpret central themes that appear (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2012). My intention has been to approach the interviewee's experiences, thoughts and feelings (Thagaard, 2003), which supports the choice of a qualitative research interview as a method for data collection. I find this suitable to understand the interviewee`s subjective world from their viewpoint and reveal a sense of meaning coming from experience (Dezin & Lincoln, 1998). I have chosen to use a semi-structured interview with an interview guide. This opens up an opportunity to get closer to the people that experience the phenomenon. As a researcher, I have had an openness to understand what`s being studied, which I interpret as being aware of not being biased. As well as phenomenological bracketing that helps me to get into the participant's life-world (Patton, 2002).

Because of this being a qualitative approach, it`s important to gain rich information in the data. I have therefore actively tried to influence the quality of the information (Patton, 2002) by having asked open questions as well as follow up questions to grasp the participant`s world and be open to the unexpected (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2012). I was flexible and changed orders of the questions from the interview guide or formulated new questions according to what appeared in the interview (Patton, 2002).

3.1.1 The interview guide

I now want to describe the process of constructing the interview guide (appendix 2), which ended up being a guide with formulated questions and suggested follow-up questions (Tjora, 2012) to freely explore the content of the specific themes (Patton, 2002). I started out with a brainstorming to create ideas to ask about, while reading theory on the field. Some of the theory I read was about change, adaptive leadership, organizational transformation, consciousness, self-awareness, stages of leadership and literature from the counseling field. As I got more knowledge from the theory I saw more clearly what questions were relevant. I also wanted the questions to highlight different aspects of the research question. Discussing these elements with my supervisor, I got some guidelines and ideas to continue the revising of the guide. I was conscious about trying to match all the questions so that they would answer all aspects of the research question. I reflected back and forth with my supervisor and created several drafts before it was done. I wanted the interview be built up in a way, making the participant comfortable to reflect that required the first questions to be more general and the later ones to be more challenging.

3.2 Recruitment and selection of participants

I started the recruitment of participants by sending out information letters (appendix 1) to leaders in a relevant organization where my supervisor had been coaching and arranged leadership training. To answer my research question I was dependent on getting participants with experience from navigating change in a large, complex organization. I therefore chose to do a strategic selection of participants, to ensure a rich material that can highlight the research question from different angles (Malterud, 2011). The selection criterion become; being a leader at the top level of the organization and having experience with changing processes in the organization. Out of six people asked, I got four participants for the research. I have chosen not to include the participant`s age, education and previous work experience to ensure confidentiality in case of transparency in the organization. There are mostly male participants and they will therefore be referred to as "he" in the study. I scheduled the interviews through e-mail, either by the participants themselves or their secretary. To test the interview guide and get some practice I also scheduled in a pilot interview. The interviews were completed in mid-March.

3.3 The interview situation

Ahead of the interview I felt excited, but not nervous. To keep an open mind, I choose to not read through theory right before the interviews and rather trust the knowledge I have gathered through the semester would give me an understanding of the participant's world. I read through the interview guide to free myself from being dependent on the guide. I had the impression of the participants being very busy so I wouldn`t let the interviews last for more than one hour. I had a short introduction of myself, the overall theme and confidentiality. The interviews were done through phone because of the participants being busy traveling, in various locations and sudden important things that could appear. I used a stationary phone at my supervisor`s office to ensure good sound quality. I listened actively and confirmed what they were saying with "yes", "mhmm" and "I understand" to create a relaxed atmosphere where the participants could feel comfortable enough to share their inner thoughts and feelings (Tjora, 2012 & Malterud, 2011). I experienced some limitations using the phone, not being able to use clues from the participant's non-verbal communication like facial expressions or other body language to make adjustments (Nilssen, 2012). I also experienced some advantages like being able to concentrate on taking notes without having to act in a certain way and show interest with my body language. I could still listen actively to their tone of voice and how they used their language, to assess the quality and the relevance in the response and looked for open and hidden agendas (Patton, 2002). I noted what I expected to find before the research, which is something Nilssen (2012) value as important. I thought the participants would have similar experiences and reflections. I imagined it being more difficult to talk about inner connected change than change outside in the organization. I therefore got surprised when they brought up very different themes. This gave me new perspectives and a lot of learning for follow up questions during the interviews. I expected one hour to be very short but the interviews lasted form 34 min to 49 minutes, which I felt covered the questions being asked.

The period after the interview is critical according to the validity of the interview (Patton, 2002) and it is valuable to grasp impressions and reflecting thoughts about what`s not recorded (Malterud, 2011). I therefore wrote reflection notes imediately after each interview containing of preperations, impressions about the interviewer, main themes and my experience as an interviewer. I will sum up some of my reflections and what I learned during the interview periode in the next paragraph.

In my reflection notes I noted things I did well during the interviews were to ask open questions and follow up questions to increase reflections. I had good flow and transition between the questions, without being dependent on the guide. I looked for clues to ask relevant questions outside of the guide. I summed up my interpretation to check out if I had understood the participant correctly and presented some of my interpretation to give some different perspectives. I asked for practical examples to concretize and draw the attention back to how the participant experienced himself when it was needed. I took notes of interesting things to follow up later in the interview. I was more difficult in the first interviews than later to remember to come back to these notes.

I also noted things I could have done better like to not be sharing my interpretations that often, to not influence the participants own experience. I could have been more confronting about dodging answers and asked more about directly about feelings. Sometimes I ask two or three questions at the same time that gain less information. Keeping too much track of time, can have led to not follow some important clues from the participant. I reflected about my process as a researcher with my supervisor to improve during the interview process. I learned a lot from this and my reflection notes, which is important according to Smith (2011) saying that the interview is a critical part of the process, which can require spending much time on to develop expertise.

3.4 Transcription

Kvale & Brinkmann (2012) describe transcription as a process where the physical conversation between two people is transformed to written text. I felt, as Nilssen (2012) refers to, that the transcribing was an important part of the analyzing process, because I got some thoughts and ideas about the coding when I listened, wrote and saw what words and sentences that were repeated. I chose to do the transcribing myself, a couple of days after the interview to get to know the material well and discover important shades (Nilssen, 2012). When reading through the transcriptions. I got the opportunity to remember how I experienced the situation in the present moment (Tjora, 2012).

3.5 Science-based stance

My methodological approach to the science-based stance is based on the Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA). This is used to research personal lived experiences and how people make sense of their major life experiences (Smith, 2011). There are two main aims, where the first is to explore and understand the participant's world. The second is to take the initial descriptions to a broader cultural, social and theoretical context through interpretative analysis, to go further than the description of this experience. To do this one has to find out the meaning behind the participants' claims, without having the opportunity to remove ourselves, our thoughts and our meaning systems from the world. The relationship between the subject and the researcher must be taken into account and see the persons-in-context, which is how the subject relates to the phenomenon (Larkin, Watts & Clifton, 2006).

IPA has its roots from phenomenology, hermeneutics and ideography. I therefore want to explain how I have been inspired of these methodological directions in this research. Phenomenology is interested in, what Edmund Husserl claims as, "go back to the things themselves" (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). This is a method that is supposed to explore structures in consciousness and objects that present themselves by presenting the participants direct experiences of the phenomenon (Giorgi, 2009) and meaning from their lived experience (Starks & Trinidad, 2007). A phenomenological attitude is to remove perspectives from the consciousness and look at the object like the participants experiences it, whether the reality is like they experience it or not (Starks & Trinidad, 2007). Phenomenological reduction is to put knowledge and presumptions away to preventing earlier experiences to affect and becomes similar to the new experience (Giorgi, 2009). This is because we automatically tend to evaluate the new experience with previous experiences. To prevent this, it`s important to write as proper as possible what one sees, and try to find the essence in it. In this way one can prevent the new experience to be identical with the old one, at the same time as one can try to discover the participant`s world to put away one's own presumptions (Giorgi, 2009).

The double hermeneutic in IPA enables the researcher to both make sense of what is happening to the participant and at the same time what is happening to him of himself through interpretation (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). Heidegger focuses on the hermeneutic circle, and that we must be aware of not having thinking patterns that will prevent us from seeing the case itself. When one starts to attribute meaning in the data material, it is based on an expectation for a certain meaning. To be able to see the case itself, one must always revise the meaning in the material as one goes deeper into the meaning (Gadamer, 2012). Through hermeneutic one can approach the material with an interpretative understanding, focusing on the context and original purpose. This can be used to establish the meaning for what people do, based on a belief about that we construct our reality (Patton, 2002).

Ideography is focusing on details and going in depth in the analysis to understand the phenomena from particular people and contexts to help people to create meaning (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). Constructivism also helps people to create meaning and I therefore want to briefly present this to explain how I have approached the ideography part of IPA. Constructivists study multiple realities constructed by people, and what this means for their lives and interactions with others (Patton, 2002). Constructivism means that the interaction, in an interview for example, has a direct impact on the knowledge being assessed instead of it standing in the way for the authentic understanding. The skills to bring off a successful interview are shared by the interviewee and the interviewer (Silverman, 2014). Based on this I will focus on how both parts influence the knowledge being analyzed.

3.6 The analyzing process

I have chosen IPA analyzing methods for the further analyzing process because it opens up to conduct a detailed analysis of each case (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). This typically contains of cumulative coding (when patterns of meaning are generated within a transcript) and integrative coding (when patterns of meaning are generated across a set of transcripts) to develop themes and connect it with theoretical concepts. I have been aware of the epistemological openness that IPA requires to be able to critically reflect upon the process of collecting and analyzing data (Larkin, Watts & Clifton, 2006) and have therefore spent much time on data collections, transcriptions and analysis (Howitt, 2010). I have focused on gathering strong data to make the IPA research good, as well making the analysis interpretative and pointing to both patterns of similarity and the uniqueness of the individual experience (Smith, 2011). I give voice to the participants from the phenomenological aspect, and make sense of it by contextualizing it through interpretations. IPA`s flexibility can be mistaken and the methods complexity can be overlooked. It can be difficult to deliver a meaningful “insider`s perspective” when the method has a greater potential to explore, understand and communicate the participants’ viewpoint (Larkin, Watts & Clifton, 2006). I therefore want to start this description of the analyzing process by describing some of my own process, in the next paragraph, to give my “insider perspective”.

Through interviewing, I have become more aware of myself, and how I meet the data. During the interview process, I learned to be more confident and present in the role as an interviewer, and able to listen carefully to follow clues from the participant without being too aware of how I appeared through the phone. I recognize that I get interested in wanting to ask participants about themes that previous participants have talked about, but decide to not to this to fully explore each participants' unique world. Because I didn`t expect the participants to reflect a lot about their inner change I might not have pushed them enough to go there. During the interview process I learned to trust the guide, and not skip questions that I though the participants might be uncomfortable with. Even if they couldn`t answer questions straight away, they sometimes answered later on in the interview when they were more comfortable reflecting. I learned to have less expectation about the participants since I experienced how different they were. I think this made me more open for the unexpected and able to follow their story.

In the analyzing process, I have tried to build a bridge between the raw data and the results, by organizing, interpreting and summarizing the material through discussing empirical findings in relation to theory (Malterud, 2011). To make the transcription as reliable as possible, I went through the soundtrack from recording twice to make sure I had registered all pauses, and sounds like laughing, sigh and "mhmm". Since the IPA methods doesn`t have strict rules and flexible validity criterion, this has been a creative process. I have been open-minded, patient, flexible, and willing to both enter and respond to the interviewee`s world and engage in complexity (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009).

I will now describe the steps I have followed in the analyzing process. The first step is to read and re-read the data material with an open mind where I noted anything of interest (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). I started to read the transcript of the first interview a couple of times where I took notes on a separate sheet to get some first ideas about what this was about. I marked interesting words and themes on the side, to compare the two documents and start reflecting about the first findings.

I then went on to the second step, starting some initial noting with descriptive comments on the participant`s explicit meaning of how the things they describe matters to them. Focusing on the process rather than the outcome (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). Based on my first two documents I wrote some free first impressions of what these things could mean to participants, and reflected about this together with my supervisor. I got some new perspectives, which helped to increase the understanding of the participants meaning. I also noticed how the language was used and made conceptual comment (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). The interviewees had different ways of speaking. Some needed more time to think before they answered and others spoke very fast. They expressed different enthusiasm about the questions being asked, and some used many foreign work-related words.

The third step is to develop emerging themes, which reflects the participant's words and my own interpretation. I was aware of trying to map the interrelationship and connect the patterns between exploratory notes. I reflected on my own interpretation and captured an understanding of the themes, and from there develop a map of some potential themes and how they can fit together (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). I sorted the themes I had noticed and marked the line number from the transcriptions. The day after I looked at the document again, and got ideas for new themes that could fit together. I went through these three steps for all the interviews to get a good insight in each case before I went further. This, to have some ideas to themes from each case, before looking for patterns across the cases. Still keeping an open mind for exploring.

In step four I connected the emergent themes. IPA suggests that this can be done through organize the themes in different ways. From there one can develop names of the clusters, recognize polarizations of oppositional relationships between emergent themes, find differences and similarities and look for connections within the themes by identifying contextual elements. It can be useful to notice the frequency of when the different themes appear in the transcript, and organize the themes in several ways (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). With this as an inspiration, I made an overview map where I wrote down my first impressions of interesting and prominent themes and made clusters of what could be connected. I discovered the themes "the experience of change processes" and divided into "outer" and "inner" experience, "influence", "role model" "decision-making", "information", "leadership style" and "communication". This helped to start sorting some thoughts and get an idea of the big lines in the material as well as getting some clues to look for when going deeper into the data. I continued to write down the most central themes from each participant, to discover the material more in depth, and colored some of the themes that replicated. Along with this process I also noted ideas for discussion and relevant theory connected to it. Still keeping the participant separate, to really fill out the meaning within each category and see what categories that are similar and different for several participants. I wanted to go more in depth, and colored potential categories in the text. Text that could fit into several themes, did I mark with several colors. I ended up with 13 themes, that both consisted of main categories and subcategories. I also wrote some reflections about what this could mean.

Step five, in the IPA analyzing process, is to move to the next transcript and bracketing the ideas emerging from the analysis of the first case to allow new themes to emerge (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). I created a draft of how the colored themes could be structured through main categories and subcategories, inspired of the map I had made and illustrated with quotes. The sixth step is to look for patterns across cases to both see the uniqueness and the shared qualities (Smith, Flowers and Larkin, 2009). It was now time to look for what the participants had in common and difference to complete the themes. I noted this and during this process, I reflected critically and had alternative interpretations to find the best way to highlight the participants voice according to the research question (Malterud, 2011). I also note in parenthesis some thoughts that can be used for discussion. I know got a clearer view of the categories and moved 5 categories into other similar categories. I`m glad I started out with broad categories and then connected them together later because this gave me more knowledge about the material and the different nuances and aspects of the categories. I chose to write everything in Norwegian to make sure I held on to the original language and expressions of the participants. I later translated everything to English.

For the final work in the analyzing process I compromised and rewrote the text several times and added some quotes. I then needed to get some overview and perspective before the last refinements. I read the other chapters and notes from the supervising before the last refinements. I also went back to the original transcriptions to double-check the validity of the participants' original expressions. Going through these steps, described in the analyzing process, it has stimulated a lot in me. I have generated thoughts a long the way that has become ideas of themes and resulted in the categories presented in chapter four.

3.7 The validity of the study

Validity is about the quality of the interpretations and how well the knowledge can be supported by other research (Ringdal, 2012). I have been critical about my own findings during the process and considered the validity in every phase of the research to ensure a logical connection between the research question, theory, method and data leading to the knowledge (Malterud, 2011). A limitation of this study is that I don`t know how well I can critique myself because of my limitation of knowledge. Malterud (2011) describes that the internal validity is about the method being relevant according to the research question. I believe that through choosing a qualitative interview to explore the participants experience is a valid way to highlight the research question. External validity is about transferability, and about how these findings can be applicable in other contexts (Malterud, 2011). This is highlighted through a presentation of suggestion about how this knowledge is relevant within the counseling field.

3.8 Reflexivity and my role as a researcher

Reflexivity is the researcher's assumptions and ability to interpret framework in addition to being critical to one's own approach (Malterud, 2011). I have therefore considered doubts, reflected and made it explicit how I came to my interpretations, through the research process, to increase credibility (Tjora, 2012). The pre-understanding contends of the theoretical framework, experiences, values and knowledge, research philosophy and attitudes to the field (Nilssen, 2012). The knowledge I have gained as a counselor is a part of my pre-understanding. This might influence to expect an unrealistic level of reflections from the participants or interpreted some of the material based on what I expect to see. A big trap is if the pre-understanding makes you blind to the knowledge the empirical data could have delivered. It is important to discover one`s own blind spots, to be able to recall the participant`s story (Malterud, 2011). My supervisor has facilitated me to discover some of my blind spots through reflection. Nilssen (2012) says that the pre-understanding influences what questions one ask and how they are asked. I have kept this in mind both while interviewing and when analyzing the data material. I have consciously been open about the study and its purpose, and reflected about the choices I have made during the process.

3.9 Ethical considerations

Before I sent out the information letter to potential participants, I applied with a project description for approval to Norsk samfunnsvitskapleg database, NSD (appendix 3). The guidelines highlight the duty to inform the participants about the participation being voluntary, where the consent is freely without external press to make the consent valid (De nasjonale forskningsetiske komiteene, 2006). The participants shall know the research project well enough to consider if they want to participate or not (Malterud, 2011). I therefore added an information letter to the invitation for the participants they signed up for in advance for. I also repeated information about confidentiality before the interview started. I followed Tjoras' (2012) guidelines about trust, confidentiality, respect and reciprocity needing to characterize the relationship between the researcher and the participants. According to the research material being confidential (De nasjonale forskningsetiske komiteene, 2006). I presented the participants through fictive names. The researcher shall strive for the truth and I have therefor written explicit about my process to give the reader an insight in this by writing about the processes and what has influenced my pre understanding.

4.0 PRESENTATIONS OF FINDINGS

In this chapter the data on the research participants` experience will be highlighted. I will present their experience of the change processes they have gone through within their organization the last months, and how they perceive different phenomenon's related to that. To secure anonymity, I present the participants with fictive names; Henry, Arthur, David and James. As mentioned earlier, I will not present background information like age, education or previous work experience, due to confidentiality.

The findings will be presented in four categories, with up to three subcategories within each. These are; "the experience of change processes", "controlling change and creating the correct behavior", "influence in decision-making processes" and "inner development in the change process". To highlight the participants` voices, relevant descriptions of statements will be presented as quotes throughout the text. I have emphasized to clarify what elements all or several participants have common, and what they have different experiences about. In that way the reader will get to know the different participants' experiences with the phenomenon. Pauses in the quotes will be illustrated by (…).

4.1 The experience of change processes

The participants have gone through huge change processes within their organization the last months. I therefore want to start this chapter by presenting some examples of their experiences with these. Common for all the participants is that they experience change as complex and chaotic transformed conditions, like doing something different from how it has been done before, change of behavior or new ways of working. They describe these organizational changes as being consequences of the market change, and these being necessary processes to "survive" as company. David adds that he believes these change processes will continue in the future.

The participants have different experiences of how much their work-tasks has changed and how they experience this. James and David describe that they are in control because their tasks have not changed much, which is something that James illustrates by saying that the way he works towards his leader is the same as before. David express that he is happy about not having to fly around and "play hide and seek", and points out that his experience of control might be a result from many years in the company. He exemplifies this by saying;

> *When getting some experience in this industry, you learn to understand that things actually goes up and actually goes down again…and yes, one doesn`t get too excited at the tops…and one doesn't jump of the bridge when being at the bottom (David)*

This quote shows how David feels that many years of experience helps him to handle the change processes they are going through now. James believes that; *this reorganizing has mostly been at a leader level, so it has been many arms and legs. About which leaders having what legs to stand on, and what area of responsibility and so on (James)*. Further he expresses being impatient due to having seen the need for reorganizing the leader structure for a long time. David shares the same view, and argues that it has been created inefficiency through the years. He points to it being unfortunate and demanding that the reorganizing is happening parallel to the downsizing process because they work against each other.

In contrast to other participants who see the need of the change, David experiences that the organization is "changing for the sake of changing" as part of today's concoctions. He believes that tasks are changed unnecessarily as a result of new initiatives being measured as something positive. Especially when people are recently hired, they like to show off in front of their leaders by starting initiatives. In this way, changes are done fast without deep analyzes of how things really are. David is also frustrated about the organization exaggerating this change processes to be difficult and depressed. *I think that we…create an unnecessary, a little bit artificial compassion to people's destinies, when what we are a part of is very cynical (David).* The quote describes how he experience that people overreact to the downsizing and how it is being drawn too much attention to this.

All the participants have a common experience of structural and operational factors being important to influence the change processes. Arthur highlights the importance of change having an operational mode where goals are in focus. Henry wishes to simplify and make the work more efficient. He describes that they work with structures, boxes and how the financial parameters shall contribute to control behaviors. He exemplifies this by telling that they lead change processes through bonuses and rewards where wanted behavior is rewarded, and one getting consequences if one doesn`t deliver. It is a belief that this shall motivate increased performance. Further, Henry demonstrates a "fixing mentality". *So we work pretty much with defining today's situation, call it the problematic situation. What is it that we shall fix? (Henry)*. The quote illustrates how Henry approaches the change based on what`s not working, and something that can be fixed. He doesn`t believe that anyone can manage to see the whole picture and also sees the use of someone having blinders on, which illustrates they approach change in separate sequences.

4.2 Controlling change and creating the correct behavior

Through the data it becomes visible that a main goal the participants have as an outcome of these change processes, is to create the correct behavior in the organization, and in that way control the changes. In this category, there will be a description of how the participants experience this need for control, with three subcategories containing of distributing information as a tool to lead change, different communication styles, and being role models. Henry is very clear about the organization`s need to behave in a certain way;

> *It is about making people understand where I want to go and being able to communicate this in a clear way, that they understand, that makes them understand and want to go there. As a leader that is completely crucial (Henry)*

The quote illustrates Henrys need to control people through clear and understandable communication, and in that way make himself important. To change people's behavior it is therefore emphasized to explain why things are done the way they are and what expectations that comes with it. Henry stresses the importance of people understanding him and his leader group's wishes for improvements in the organization. Based on that it can look like his own needs are the most important underlying factor in the change processes. At the same time, he expresses that people don`t have to be scared of changes; they should contribute with innovations, new thoughts and ideas and challenge the way they work.

James believes that the change processes have to be driven from the top of the organization. He exemplifies this by showing how people don`t take responsibility in the downsizing processes with attitudes like "the others have to downsize". David has the same experience about the lack of responsibility in the organization. He expresses a frustration about it not being conveying that everyone must participate, which is something that he thinks everyone should. Henry expresses his wishes for improvements by saying;

> *So we have tried to create a very clear awareness of being responsible, and that this is transferred to the contribution of every individual. It must be measurable, visible, and people must be informed about expectations. So about responsibility, there must be consequences if one doesn`t deliver (Henry)*

Based on this, I wonder if the need for control might influence people into not being responsible. We are now going to look at thee "tools" that the participants use to approach the need to control change.

4.2.1 Distributing information as a tool to lead change

Common for all the participants is that they experience distributing information as a key tool to lead change. Henry expresses the importance of this through; *the need for information is extremely important. Someone has told me, think about everything you can communicate to an organization and add it by ten. Then it might start to be enough (Henry).* He further points to how information can reduce insecurity, create trust and increase productivity. To make change happen, one must express good reasons for why it is necessary and what expectations comes with it. Arthur illustrates how information can be used to clarify the new structure.

> *A new structure appears, which people will of course have difficulty to understand, how this new structure will work out. Because it`s not necessarily that one knows what responsibility each of the boxes has from seeing a map of the organization. And this leads to a good amount of uncertainties, about who is doing what (Arthur)*

The quote illustrates that insecurity around new ways of working and distribution of responsibility, are some of reasons why sharing enough information becomes very important. Arthur expresses that he finds new roles and structures as difficult himself. James express that he has a consultant role between his leaders and his employees. This involves telling his employees what the leader group has decided. From there he does a recalibration where he gathers the employees' views and takes it back to the leader group. He seldom experiences to get the same result, which makes it necessary to work with matching assumptions and objections. In this way, the leader group gathers more details and insight in the real world and can use this to improve quality.

The participants describe how they distribute information through different channels. Henry uses meetings, blogs, intranet and web pages for questions and answers. Through giving out information in every situation, one contributes to make it less scary for people to ask questions, were visibility is highly valued. *I stand in the front together with my leader group, to be visible. It is not so important what I say, the most important thing is to be there (Henry)*. He continues with it also being important to walk in the halls and be visible. It seems like being visible and available as a leader is more important than the content of the information being given. James is responsible for a global network in addition to giving information through meetings, were he explains situations, and define goals and follow up. He adds that he is not working with personnel-related tasks. Arthur and David experience that distributing enough information is an important contribution to make people accept the changes that have been done.

> *As a company, one has to communicate well in advance. To prepare people on what`s coming…that one in a sense gets an opportunity to prepare for it mentally…and the process must be built up to make people understand how the evaluation has been done (Arthur)*

Arthur expresses a discomfort with the downsizing processes. He believes that clear communication about what guidelines, criteria's and rating, like seniority, the downsizing is based on, makes it easier to understand and accept. He wants this process to be 100% fair to make it easier to deal with. He points out that through this reorganizing, the most important thing he has learned through these change processes is that one can never communicate enough. This, because communication increases understanding, motivation, and makes it easier to accept change. His view differs from the other participants by saying that communication is always limited and has improvement potential. Several participants highlight that the organization has challenges with the communication not being pointed enough towards the target groups. They therefore wish to make the information more relevant and closer to praxis. Arthur illustrates this by saying that;

> *One can go into the trap of giving the same message to everyone, when leaders, employers and investors are interested in totally different things. So one must take the target group into account, one must tune the message towards the target group and make sure one hit home (Arthur)*

The quote illustrates Arthur's focuses on hitting home, by elaborating background information to increase the understanding of what this means. It then helps to speak the same language that will demand that the leaders translate their information to an everyday language. David experiences it being important to buy into change. He exemplifies this by describing it being easy to start out with the good idea, but than it is not spoken enough about the benefits for each one; *what does this contains in practice? This is where the difficult part comes…Lean for example can illustrate that. It is easy to idealize on a PowerPoint slide, and difficult to put into practice…for the existing reality (David).* This illustrated how David believes it being necessary to communicate the benefits of all steps in the change process to make people want to be involved and to the change that is required.

4.2.2 Leading change through different communication styles

In this category, I will present how the participants use different communication styles to control the change processes. Common for all the participants is that they experience to communicate open, where they involve their employees in the process. At the same time they express that this involvement is mostly for inputs, and that they make decisions on themselves. James is, however, not so concerned about giving huge loads of information. *No, it is often very easy to just say, this is how it is going to be (James)*. Like the quote illustrates, he wants to give quick information without discussions forth and back. He also describes how he works; *I do much myself, but must of course relate to others input on how…others input is on this (James).* Based on this it can look like James doesn`t want many inputs in connection to leading change. A paradox that appears is that on one hand he says that he wishes to take care of everyone's worries, but on the other hand he feels that it is difficult to include people with little insight. He sees it as the best approach to cut through when there are disagreements and he is not a fan of democracy. This in despite of meeting much resistance as reactions to this. Arthur has similar thoughts as James about communication style, and points out that he believes that the best leaders are mild dictators. He describes that he makes decisions without having discussed in plenum. At the same time he also say that he tries to complete what`s being asked for by arranging meetings without a fixed agenda once every other week, to make the employees able to speak about what they have a need for. *They know that within that hour they have my full attention, where I`m not writing e-mails or talk in the mobile phone or picking up the phone or such things like that. Then, it`s 100% us this is about (Arthur).*

Arthur stands out through seeing the value of involving stakeholders and key persons from the outside of the organization. He describes work experience from abroad were relational work got a lot of attention.

> *We had teambuilding's and processes where we did that 360-degree evaluation of each other. Gave each other feedback, clapped for each other and did many things that were good processes, but here in Norway it comes a huge reorganizing just like that, and none of these things are being done (Arthur)*

He experiences that there has been a totally lack of relational work in the organization he works for now. Nevertheless, he keep his experiences in mind and take initiatives to improve the relationship where it is room for it, like building relationships through lunch or meetings. David describe that he adjusts to the commands that has been given and convey this further. He has dialogues and persuades, spending extra time with people having difficulties.

4.2.3 Role model as a leader coordinating information

The participants experience being role models, and that this can be a way to drive change and control behavior by demonstrating how things should be done in practice. Henry illustrates this through saying that he wants to ”walk the talk”.

> *It starts out with putting out expectations; clear responsibilities…make clear role descriptions, and clear job descriptions. I make clear goals, communicate this clearly and I follow up on this, to the leaders that reports to me…Then, I can expect that they do the same with their employees and so on. And it has to do with the culture I create, because the organization becomes a mirror of me (Henry)*

We see from this role model description how the employees seem to be controlled from all angles and have little freedom. Henry experiences to be a very important single piece in the organization that others can learn from. This results in him having huge expectations to himself and experience that others expect him to preform even better now than earlier. He describes that he handles this well since he is confident in himself and secure in his role. Arthur experiences, in contrast to Henry, that it is difficult to understand his own role. He also expresses a frustration about all the new roles and relations that must be created in reorganizing. Colleagues have to quit and one has to collaborate with people that are less experienced, in addition to it being difficult to report to leaders one doesn`t know. The distribution of the new responsibility creates insecurity, where one can risk that tasks are being forgotten.

James experiences that a lack of responsibility taking is one of the biggest challenges in the organization. He believes that the responsibility is not well enough described in terms of who shall own what resources, which can mean that there is confusion around the new responsibility- and role distribution.

> *The actual distribution of the responsibilities has been the biggest problem…that they have not been well enough defined…I believe that this has been the biggest issue, who shall own what recourses, and how many recourses will this contain of, it`s moved around…and what kind of answer will the others let go of, about moving the resources (James)*

At the same time, he says that they work towards prevent that people are pointed out related to improvements to make it easier to improve initiative. James continues to say that little ownership can make it easy to avoid responsible and this being a huge challenge.

4.3 Influence in decision-making processes

This category I will explore the participants' different experiences of influence in the decision-making processes through the reorganizing. This will be presented in two subcategories where there is a difference between Henry and David who experience to have a large scope of influence and Arthur and James who experience to have less influence.

4.3.1 A large scope of influence in decision-making processes

Henry and David share the experience of having a large scope of influence in the decision-making processes. David experiences this in terms of being responsible for the staffing where he is involved in recommending who gets fired in the downsizing process. Henry explains how he and his leader group make decisions based on assessment from the organization, that he believes has been done in an understandable and professional way.

> *So then we have interviews according to all the phases I have talked about now. What is working and what is not working in the different parts of the organization. What do you experience as challenging? What can be improved? Where is it efficient, and what is not efficient? Then we got many different views on it (Henry)*

This shows us that the organization is part of the assessment and adjustments but not directly in the decision-making process. Henry experiences the organization respecting the authorities and that it cannot be made democratic decisions. He believes that leaders high up have more abilities to see the whole picture, and the degree of influence and ownership to the decisions increase along with being higher up in the organization. Despite of that, he also expresses good insight in how to be less involved; *I believe it feels less dramatic if one is involved in the decision-making. More dramatic if one sits and doesn`t know what`s happening (Henry)*. This image that Henry has reflected around that it can be huge insecurity among those who have less information and not taking part in the decisions. He says the employees voice can be heard through the union, which indicates that the employees do not get the opportunity to be directly involved.

4.3.2 Low influence in decision-making processes

Arthur and James experience to have little influence in the decision-making processes. They experience to not be participating in establishing the new organization, but rather pas on information given from their leaders. They describe that the reorganization is happening in closed processes with less input from a larger part of the organization than what`s ideal. They express a frustration around this and a wish to have more influence. In contrast to the other participants *James* has little influence in terms of the downsizing process. *So, this is often done in a secret situation first.., to not create panic and such things in the organization (James)*. He further says that he experiences that the reorganizing is happening at the leader's level, from a top-down model. The leader group at the top of the organization make closed decisions based on objective assumptions about what`s they believe is going to work. This based on a wish to optimize objectivity and become competitive through simplify and explain roles easier and faster. He highlights their competence by saying that the leaders are familiar with the business and thereby having good insight in the reality. The benefits with this way of working are described as;

> *It is faster with a top-down exercise than a bottom-up exercise in the reorganizing. A bottom-up exercise will take…ages right, because it is hundreds of people you can acquire with. So…you create, it is much more efficient than to gather hundreds of people and say how should we look? (James)*

James sees subsequently that it had been more useful to involve a larger part of the organization to make a more real picture of the reality and what will work in practice.

Arthur experiencing his influence differs from theme to theme. An example when he felt he was influencing is when he was interviewed in the workgroup where he got to participate with his perspective and experience. Even if he ideally would have it his way, he expresses an understanding of it being difficult to drive such processes in plenary and he respects that he has less influence than he wishes. Arthur experiences to have the role as a company man, which means to be representing the company and being loyal to what the company decides. Even if he disagrees with the decisions he`s bound to redistribute this further. *It is important to be part of the communication work that has to be done for the rest of the organization, in that way jump in at the correct side of the fence (Arthur).* This amplifies his wish to come to agreement and a how he is afraid to getting the organization against him.

James and Henry reflect about leaders being more motivated than the employees because they have more information and influence, and it being demotivating for those who loose their areas of responsibility. Arthur stands out saying that he tries to create good motivation for their employees by showing interests, give interesting tasks, protect them against unnecessary worries, give feedback and show that he is involved in what they have done. He believes that the motivation increase with being more involved and lack of motivation will give you a short carrier. This illustrates that even if Arthur not is very involved himself, he is still aware of wanting to improve his employee's involvement, which differs from other participants.

4.4 Inner development in the change process

To explore the participants' experiences of their inner development process and what they have learned about themselves, I asked how they experience changes in their inner self, according to thinking patterns, believes or behaviors. This was difficult for the participants to answer and several had little experiences of inner change.

4.4.1 Inner change

James says that change processes are about to change oneself. He feels that he is adaptive even if he has not been that affected of the change processes. Examples of how he is being adaptive are not being exemplified. From the question about change of beliefs and behaviors Henry answers*; no, I have not done that…I think I have become who I am through very many years…and me being in this job, or another job…I believe does do very little to who I am (Henry).* This can symbolize little experience of inner change. In despite of this, he expresses that he experiences himself as adaptive when it comes to improvement and being efficient, but that he has difficulties getting the whole organization along when the changes happens abruptly. Arthur experiences that having to deal with what`s unknown creates an unpleasant feeling inside him, and thinks the situation they are in now, with the downsizing, is difficult and says that this initiates processes in himself as well. He has throughout the last month's experienced to change thinking patterns from being negative to the reorganization to look at it as a positive learning process full of necessary experiences. He highlights different strategies to be able to be in the burdens according to the change processes is to differ between work and private life, choose one's fights, not worry about the unknown and use the recourse where one has influence. He describes that the change processes have given him a lot of learning where he has gotten the chance to challenge his ability to adjust to new circumstances. He thinks it is difficult to be conscious about if he has changed behaviors or believes, but believes that he has not changed behavior outwardly. David thinks he has good skills of being adaptive, and that this is important to his work in this organization, especially now these days and that this will contribute to most effect. He doesn`t either put into words how he uses his adaptive skills.

4.4.2 A need for investing more time in people

Despite of many participants experiencing the change processes as challenging because it happens fast and it being difficult to make the organization to follow, several participants also wish the changing processes had happened faster. James experienced as frustrated, both for him and the organization, that those things take time when it comes to people. David says that;

> *No one is able to shut up 100%, right, and then something slips out, this makes the information not to come fast enough. I believe that it is a, those confusions are not good to sit on in an organization (David)*

This illustrates how David believes that the changing processes should be done faster and in the correct timing to prevent making it unclear in the organization. The paradox is that he also says that it can be wrong and unhealthy for the people involved. He points to that they first of all use their time to prioritize to focus more on the people that the organizational material and written work. He experiences change take time, and that they should have had a two-five year perspective on several things, which is something that Arthur also agrees to. Arthur describes that changes should happen quickly and being experienced as having a high phase to make people see that the change is happening, at the same time as he also says that; *there is a hope that we, as an organization can manage to have a more long term perspective, and maybe land in some kind of mode or direction that contains some form of predictability (Arthur).*

Henry highlights that people doesn`t have to be afraid of change and have the ability to adjust the phase. He also says that the downsizing should happen fast, but habits are difficult to turn, and there is a need for stability and continuity.

5.0 DISCUSSION

I will now discuss my findings in light of relevant theory, and share my interpretations of the participant's stories to explore meaning within the different phenomenon. The findings will be presented in four categories; control, communication, adaptability and influence. This is to highlight the response to my research question; *"How do leaders experience navigating change and influencing their organization to become more adaptive?"* I will end this chapter with discussing a complexity gap that is shown between the participants experience and the literature.

5.1 Control

The participants all seem to have a need for navigating change through control. They have different approaches to how they do this, that I will present through the three sub-categories; "navigating change through technical fixes", "preventing adaptability through controlling behaviors and driving change" and "looking at themselves as experts and role models in the organization".

5.1.1 Navigating change through technical fixes

The findings illustrate that several participants navigate changes through technical fixes that Heifetz, Linsky, & Grashow (2009) describe as wanting to use operational structures to solve ordinary problems, which is more of a quick fix and not so likely to have an effect on its own. Examples of how the participants experience such technical fixes are approaching change through structural and operational factors like financial parameters, and working with different parts of the changes separately, instead of approaching the complexity holistically. Henry describes that he leads change processes through bonuses and rewards where wanted behavior is rewarded, to motivate his employees to increase their performance. Dinwoodie et al., (2015) point to 50-70% of planned change effort fails, although the structural and operational side of change has been better mastered. This looks similar to how the participants experience it and supports their need to choose technical fixes as a way of navigating change. Some of the participants approach this way of navigating through starting out with the problematic situation and finding out what to fix, based on that. Joiner & Josephs (2007) describe leaders at the expert level wanting to solve problems or improve already existing strategies, often isolated from the context. Based on the examples I have referred to, it seems like the participants' prefer to navigate change through fixing problems through separate parts and therefore seem to have some similar problem solving strategies as leaders at the expert level.

Several participants experience the change processes as complex and overwhelming. Henry therefore sees the need to simplify and make the work more efficient, and points out that he doesn`t believe that anyone can manage to see the whole picture. He even sees the use for someone to have blinders on. I interpret the need for simplifying as a way to make these change processes less overwhelming. This could also be seen as not having a mindset that is able to approach the complexity of the change procesess taking the whole picture into account. According to how Heifetz, Linsky, & Grashow (2009) describe adaptive change, this is the ability to address the underlying issues and really work with the DNA of the organization. I believe that this illustrates that the participants are not navigating change as adaptive as the literature describes it. The participants might not be able to discover the real challenges, when choosing to navigate through technical fixes. This might symbolize a lack of exposure to highly successful transformation (Kotter, 2002) and I believe it requires a more curious, open and complex approach to work with the DNA of the organization.

5.1.2 Preventing adaptability through controlling behavior and driving change

The findings show that the participants have a need to control the change processes and shape the correct behavior in the organization. This is done through rewarding wanted behaviors and making clear instructions about expectations. A paradox to the need to drive change, is the intention of making an atmosphere where innovation, new thinking, and ideas can flourish. Heifetz, Linsky, & Grashow (2009) say that through adaptive leadership one is able to mobilize people to handle tough challenges. It can seem like the participant's experience it being necessary to mobilize people through giving clear instructions and making some structure in the chaos, that is similar to their own needs. I see this also as something that can prevent mobilizing the employees to solve tough challenges themselves and rather become a dependent relationship where the employees see their leader as a "savior" and not being capable to mobilize on their own. I interpret this as obliviousness to how controlling change might work against the intention of making an environment where innovation and creativity can flourish.

The participants' express a frustration of people not taking enough responsibility in the organization, and James points to this being one of the biggest challenges they have.

Examples of how the participants try to make their employees take more responsibility is to set goals, measure contribution, give support, and inform about clear consequences if someone doesn`t deliver according to expectations. This can be seen in relation to a strength in LIFO`s CT style, seeing the need to take action to improve efficiency in the production. When this strength is overused, one wants to take too much control and force the responsibility in a commanding way (Atkins & Katcher, 2002). I believe that the intention of increasing responsibility is good but that it can have the opposite effect when the strength is overused and rather decrease their feeling of ownership and confidence to take the responsibility. In this case it can seem like a challenge to trust the process and let go of control and the responsibility they want others to take. One way let go of control is through learning counseling skills that will allow you to take new perspectives and outgrowing your old mindset. In this way the participants can increase their reflective insights and expand awareness as a container for growth (Reams & Reams, 2015). According to Brown (2012), higher action logics will increase the ability to have trust in the process, which illustrates that trust in others and to the unknown is something one can develop through growth into a more complex mindset.

Arthur expresses a frustration about the distribution of new responsibility, roles and structures not being well enough clarified. He experiences that this creates insecurity and it even being difficult to understand his own role. Seeing this experience through the CH style in LIFO, Arthur shows some strength through seeing the needs for clarifying details and make an organized plan for how the new roles and responsibilities shall look like, and making sure everyone knows exactly what to do. Through the CH style he might take a natural role of stabilizing and holding the organization to prevent fast actions that is not well thought through (Atkins & Katcher, 2002). It might seem like Arthur experiences the reorganizing as chaotic when not getting hold of the details and logistics, which also makes it confusing and difficult to understand his own position. When overusing these CH strengths one can fail to see the bigger picture, not moving forward, and cannot let go of things (Atkins & Katcher, 2002) that might be a challenge for Arthur. This can also be an illustration of when one doesn`t understanding one's own role in this bigger picture it might be easier to focus on others.

5.1.3 Looking at themselves as experts and role models in the organization

Several participants seem to look at themselves as experts and I will discuss how this influences their way of navigating change. Henry sees himself like a very important single piece in the organization that others can learn from, and wants the organization to mirror himself. He expresses, in contrast to Arthur, that he`s confident in himself and secure in his role. Joiner & Josephs (2007) points to leaders at the expert level wanting to be respected as experts through telling others what they think is right, having difficulties taking one step back to look at their own strengths and weaknesses, and not being very open to others' ideas. Henry`s way of looking at himself as a key person might prevent him from taking a step back and evaluate himself from an outside perspective. When he sees his way of leading as ideal, this can be interpreted as he sees the world as absolutely true from his own perspective and therefore wanting to navigate change based on this without being open for improvements. Another way of looking Henry`s confidence in his leader role, is that he is being responsible, productive and creating initiatives in the situation that can be linked to strengths in the CT style in LIFO (Atkins & Katcher, 2002).

Another example of this expert mentality is Henry distributing his own needs about what he and the organization want of improvements. This need to communicate his own perspectives illustrates how he wants to be looked at as a leader with good expertise, rather than exploring others' expertise. Heifetz, Linsky, Grashow & (2009) point to the importance of mobilizing the organization to meet and overcome the challenges they face. To me it seems like this expert mentality can have difficulties taking a perspective on others needs and therefore not being able to mobilize the organization through taking a system perspective that is required to be able to overcome the challenges they face. I interpret that to enable this, will require increasing the ability to see the value of equal contribution and success in the organization being based on more than one's own winning. I believe that being able to mobilize the organization like Heifetz, Linsky, Grashow & (2009) presents will require a higher level of perspective taking than what Henry is describing. I also see this according to how Turak (2013) describes personal transformation being necessary to create consciously transformable organizations, were one way to develop personal transformation is to move from selfishness to selflessness that can result in a change of heart wanting to put others` interests ahead of your own. Based on this I believe that the biggest challenge with leaders looking at themselves as experts is not seeing the need to grow into a selfless mindset.

The participants experience to control others behaviors through being role models where they demonstrate how things should be done in practice. James illustrates this through exemplifying the importance of "walk the talk" by clarifying job-descriptions, expectations and responsibilities to ensure quality in the organization. He points out that by being a role model he can expect others to do the same with their employees. I see some similarities of this to strengths in the CH style, likeing to measure progress with specific milestones, value the need for discipline and to make sure everyone knows exactly what to do (Atkins & Katcher, 2002). This style seem to give some good illustrations on how James experience being a role model through making clear guidelines and descriptions about what is supposed to be done, as well as demonstrating this through being a good role model. I interpret that this can influence to ensure quality by showing practical implementations but also decrease the freedom for the employees to create their own ways of navigating their working and adjusting to the change. A trap can be if one wants to shape the employees behaviors too much like oneself, one can be blinded from the need to scaffolding their development based on their own potential.

5.2 Communication

Communication is something the participants value as very important in these change processes. They all have different approaches that will be presented in the two sub-categories; "communication through advocacy" and "communication through inquiry in the helping relationship". I end this category with discussing the participants' way of "distributing information" that seems to be important to them.

5.2.1 Communicating through "advocacy"

Several participants experience that less democracy and mild dictatorship are the best approaches to communication. James describes that he cuts through when there are disagreements, even if this is met with resistance. He expresses that he doesn`t want many inputs from others and will rather tell people how it`s going to be without giving huge loads of information. I interpret this way of communicating as "advocacy" that Joiner & Josephs (2007) describe leaders at the expert level do through telling others what they think is right, instead of inviting others to express themselves through open questions. I believe that this can make them more engaged in their own thinking, reasoning and strategizing and less interested in exploring their employees' world. I find this communication-style having some similarities to strengths in the CT style, letting others know where you stand. When this strength is overused one prefers taking control instead of providing room for others, do things oneselves and influencing others to accept ones ideas. I see some similarities of overusing this strength with how James navigate change through one-way communication, not creating much room for dialogue or including others to contribute.

Good communication skills are described as being able to make people understand and lead them towards where you want to go. Joiner & Josephs (2007) present the expert leaders as good at thinking independently and analytical, not being very open to change, feedback or others ideas and perspectives. It can seem like the participants' goal of leading people based on own wishes through communicating has some similarities with how an expert leader is communicating based on their own analytical thinking and perspectives. Because of the participants not being very open to new learning and increasing their knowledge, this way of communication also looks similar to how leaders with lower action logics lead, that Rooke & Torbert (1998) describe as demonstrating power by their own knowledge, and disliking that their own view is being challenged. I interpret this as the participants finding it challenging to increase the helping relationship through making themselves the helpers and give power to their employees allowing them to make the most out of their potential. I think that this will require an increased open and complex mindset to really see the value of others contribution.

James also has an intention of taking care of all his employees, but finds it difficult to approach people with less insight than himself. This can be seen according to strengths in LIFO`s SG styles, wanting to meet others needs with support, being considerate, helpful and cooperative. People overusing this strength they tend to not allow others to do things themselves, being over-committed and passive (Atkins & Katcher, 2002). It is likely that James have become more passive in approaching his employees when finding this difficult, despite of the intention being to support. Heifetz & Laurie (1997) point to approach adaptive challenges through making people engaged to confront challenges, adjust values and change, as well as being able to get on "the balcony" to keep the whole game situation in mind. According to this, James seem to experience it as challenging to adjust to change, taking multiple perspectives and scaffold his employees that differ from himself. It can seem like he might lacks some adaptive skills to get the overview that is required for engaging in adaptive challenges.

5.2.2 Communicating through "inquiry" in the helping relationship

Communicating through "inquiry" means inviting others to express themselves through open questions. I believe this requires being genuinely interested in others and wanting to learn from them through being curious of their thinking and reasoning. Arthur's communication style seems to be closer to this way of communicating than the other participants. He is being more open for others' input, and expressing awareness about communication always being limited and having improvement potential. He arranges individual meetings once a week without a fixed agenda where he listens and lets his employees speak about what they have a need for. To me this way of communicating seems to have some similarities to the strengths in the SG style, though allowing others to take charge, liking to be an achiever and doing something to benefit people, listen to what others have to say, and seek and invite help and guidance (Atkins & Katcher, 2002). Arthur seems to value integrating his employees in the change processes through inviting them to express themselves to meet their needs and improve as a leader. It therefore seems like he is moving from an expert to more of a process consultant, and increasing the helping relationship through valuing dialogue and two-way communication. I believe this way of navigating change will increase others empowerment, and facilitate others discover their own needs. I also think this way of leading can give valuable information about how people think in different contexts to get a better overview of the whole organization that can contribute to an increased ability to lead in a more complex and adaptive way.

I interpret Arthur's approach to communication as moving toward letting himself go into the uncertain and being more present in these meetings. I think this is an example of how this can contribute to growth towards a self-authoring mind that Reams & Reams (2015) present as having better quality of presence, less use of force, being comfortable with uncertainty, and leading with a more appropriate structure of meaning making. With this mindset, I believe one is more able to transform power through increasing the helping relationship that Schein (2009) highlights as being a good relationship with space for open communication and trust. When you are asking for help you put yourself "one down" which makes you vulnerable and dependent. I believe that when one dares to let go of control, to be vulnerable and ask for help, one can learn to discover others` needs and lead in a more adaptive way. I also see this as an opportunity to increase the ability to be present to listen deep enough to our self and other people (Greenleaf, 1977 in Reams & Caspari, 2012). Based on this, I think that approaching others through inquiry will increase perspective seeking rather than perspective taking, being open to explore the others perceived world. I think that more perspective seeking can give opportunities to build bridges to different ways of relating to knowledge, open up for other ways of thinking and develop a more complex mindset to navigate change.

5.2.3 Distributing information

All the participants experience distributing information as a key tool to lead and control the change processes. Little information is pointed out to create insecurity, while clear and understandable communication can increase understanding, motivation, and acceptance of change. Arthur points out that this is extremely important because of the challenged they are faced through new ways of working and new ways to distribute responsibility. The distribution is happening through different channels with a goal of making it easier for people to ask questions. Enough information is seen as important to create trust, reduce insecurity and increase productivity. Henry expresses the need to communicate ten times more what you think there is a need for. The amount and frequency of the information seems to be more valued than how the information is presented, as well as being visible is more important than the content of what`s being said. Heifetz, Linsky, Grashow & (2009) describe adaptive leaders as patient, persistent, identifying obstacles and overcoming them, and this being essential to gain growth and success from the change processes. I see these qualities as important to implement when distributing information because I believe that awareness around the presence of oneself while distributing information could have reduced insecurity and increase productivity even more.

The findings show that the participants see the need for the information to be more specific to hit the target-group through elaborating background information to increase the understanding of what this means. I see this according to how Tororella et al. (2016) highlight the pressure created in organizations about making the most out of what`s on offer, deliver quality and be compatible in the market. I interpret that the participants realize that by hitting the target group they will make more out of everyone's resources and thereby deliver better quality as an organization when every individual sees more meaning in what they are doing.

It is also highlighted that information needs to be closer to praxis. David experiences that he needs to buy into change to be able to lead change and this also being applicable for the rest of the organization. He exemplifies this through Lean being easy to ideally present on a PowerPoint slide but not easy to understand the benefit of in practice. Letens et al., (2011) says that Lean Product Development has a huge impact of the success of organizations, but there is a need for a system perspective when implementing. This illustrates a need for leading the organization to adapt into a system perspective when implementing new tools to make the theory closer to practice is and seeing what`s relevant for the different target groups. I see this as an example of there being a need to work more with the content of the information being given in addition to the amount and frequency to make people better able to buy in to change. David doesn`t present any ideas for how he can distribute information more specified to each target group, which can be an illustration of that he is doesn`t have a clear idea or an action plan about how to do this. Since the participants experience to have much influence in distributing information upwards or downwards the organization, I believe they have the potential of being more proactive and responsible for such improvements, but that this is not prioritized in terms of how they navigate change. This seems to require growth in consciousness that Reams & Caspari (2012) describe as being necessary to facilitate transformation because the later stages of cognitive development enable leaders to open and hold deep and complex spaces. This is a good example of how growth in consciousness can be one way to develop in to a more complex mindset.

5.3 Adaptability

Being adaptive is something the participants see as important in the reorganizing. Despite this there is a lack of examples of how they are being adaptive. I will present this in two sub categories, where the first is about how the participants experience to have "unexplored selves" and the second about "a gap between the findings and what the literature says about being adaptive".

5.3.1 Unexplored inner selves

The participants found it difficult to answer how they have experienced inner change and development when it comes to thinking patterns, beliefs and behaviors during the change processes. Reams, Gunnlaugson & Reams (2014) point to leadership development in the past century focusing on behaviors or skills, that Reams (2005) says differs from today, where there is a growing understanding of the need to focus on internal qualities of the leaders' self. According to this there seems to be a difference between how the theory presents the importance of focusing on inner qualities and the participants not being very conscious about it. It seems like the participants experience little awareness about the value of exploring their inner selves to evolve as leaders.

When asking about the experience of inner change, Henry says that he has become who he is through many years, without the job having affected this. Kegan & Lahey (2009) highlights that navigating adaptive change requires a shift in mindset more than a shift in behavior, involving self-inquiry and self-exploration and willingness to see your own entrenched patterns through a fresh lens. This illustrates a gap in how the literature highlights exploring the inner self as a base for being able to navigate change in an adaptive way, and how Henry experience it. It seems like Henry feels comfortable and happy about not having changed who he is. This can be seen as a paradox to the participants intending to make everyone challenge the way they work, when not being aware of how they should challenge themselves. A way to interpret this is that there might be a resistance to change in oneself because of fear of the unknown and potentially discovering something unexpected. It seems like the participants rather want to control the outer change than make change inside of themselves as a way to navigate change.

Arthur differs from the others, and expresses that the change processes have led to a process in himself, through changing thinking patterns from this reorganizing being negative to now seeing it as something positive and necessary for learning. He does not experience to have changed in behaviors but say that he has challenged his ability to adapt and adjust to new circumstances. This can be interpreted as some self-inquiry and a shift in mindset that is required to navigate adaptive change, which can be seen as one good step in the direction of how Ashford and Tsui, (1991 in Tang et al., 2013) describe high performing leaders having the ability to evaluate what impact their behaviors have on others. I think this is a good illustration of how the participants' way of navigating change shows some variety and nuances, and that some of them are moving more towards adaptive leadership then others. I believe that being more aware of yourself can make you more aware of how you relate to people, that can increase the ability to facilitate growth in others and also lead to one's own growth as a human being.

5.3.2 A gap between the findings and what the literature says about being adaptive

Edwards (2010) describes that an adaptive organizing must let everyone change the way of thinking, experiencing and behaving to become more adaptive. There seems to be a gap between what the literature highlights as important to navigate organizational change and how the participants experience it. Turning the attention towards the processes going on inside themselves might be the biggest challenge the participants' experience. Several participants find it difficult to make the whole organization change and that this can be seen in relation to how Rooke & Torbert (2005) estimate about 55% of leaders in diverse organizations leading with lower action logics, which makes them less effective to implement organizational strategies. The findings show examples of the participants having similar ways of leading as leaders using lower action logics like the expert- and the achiever level. Through appearing more controlling than adaptive can explain why the participants find it difficult to make changes in the organization. Joiner & Josephs (2007) point out that there is a need for leaders at the expert level to develop to make the organization handle change, and growth in leadership competencies is necessary to succeed with leading organizations that need to handle effectively in fast, complex and transformative environments. Growth in leadership agility will increase better mental and emotional capacities to drive effective leadership, that I believe will increase the participants' ability to adapt to new leadership competencies and navigate changes in a more complex way. Based on this it seems like the mindset and the action logics is not living up to the standards that are required to lead organizational transformation, which is supported by Rooke & Torbert (1998) saying that pre-strategist stage had zero progressive organizational transformations. I believe that a good start can be to work with exploring your own self to achieve higher action logics (Rooke & Torbert, 2005). This might also make the participants more capable of finding out what`s best for others, find other ways of thinking, grow as a person, find larger meaning in life and become better leaders.

5.4 Influence

There are differences among the participants in how much influence they experience to have in the reorganizing process, and how they see the value of increasing their employees' ability to influence. To present this I have divided the sub-categories into "a large scope of influence increases the experience of control" and "a lack of influence leading to insecurity and not living up to expectations". I end with a sub-category about "seeing the need of slow down and invest more in people in the organization".

5.4.1 A large scope of influence increases the experience of control

Henry and David experience having a large scope of influence in the change processes, especially with the downsizing process. David experiences that his tasks rarely have changed and that he has a good understanding of the reorganizing. Despite of this he seems to be less concern about seeing the value of transforming this involvement on to his employees. Henry believes that leaders high up have a better understanding of seeing the whole picture of the organization because they have more influence. They express an awareness of how influence and ownership can increase the feeling of control, and Henry expresses an understanding of it might feeling more dramatic for those being less involved. They point to their employees having little influence through only being involved in assessment and adjustments through sharing their viewpoint of the decisions already being made in meetings and influence through the union. Bolman (2009) says that giving support, training and opportunities for others to actively participate in the change processes can prevent resistance against the changes. Different from what Bolman points to it can seem like Henry and David not being very concerned about creating a growing environment for their employees to actively participate and gain more influence. I believe that this could have led to the employees feeling more control and ownership in the reorganizing and that this could have contributed to the whole organization adapting into change together. It therefor seems like being able to take a system perspective on how to increase your own and your employees influence is important to grow as an adaptive leader that Hawkins & Dulewicz (2009) describe being able to make highly effective groups through giving them greater impact on the organization and exert more individual effort.

5.4.2 Lack of influence leading to insecurity and not living up to expectations

The data shows that James and Arthur experience little influence in the decision-making processes and would want more influence. They describe that they pass on the information being given from their leaders. They express that it is a respect for the hierarchy in the organization and that the reorganizing was happening secretly at the leader level. Arthur illustrate this through expressing a concern of being loyal to what the company decides and distributes information based on this. This can be seen according to LIFO`s SG style showing respect for authorities and expect them to be role models (Atkins & Katcher, 2002). It might also illustrate that Arthur experiences a lack of influence himself, and that he seems to be controlled from the leaders above him and structures in the organization. This control might also be part of the culture in the organization and it being little awareness and critical evaluation about this. Another example of this hierarchical respect is James saying that the reorganization has happened on the leader level and he has seen the need for this for a long time without having taken any action. This lack of influence can be an illustration of how the culture might contribute to increasing people being passive.

There are different nuances in how the participants experience the change processes. David experiences it that people overreacting to the downsizing when he sees this as part of a cynical game, and experiences some of the change being done for the sake of changing. I see his experience in light of that he also experiences control due to his tasks hardly being changed. Arthur has a different experience of the reorganizing. He experiences these change processes as demanding, and it being difficult to reach up to expectations from his leaders. He exemplifies this through saying that it is difficult to report to leaders that he doesn`t know. He wishes for more predictability in the future, without being in a constant mode of reacting and adjusting to circumstances. Bolman (2009) highlights that changes can create confusion and insecurity, and challenge one`s feeling of being worthy and having control of the situation. I think Arthur illustrates a good example of how serious the consequences of changes can be and how little influence can increase the feeling of this being overwhelming.

James supports working with a top-down approach through the leader group making closed decisions on what they think works, rather than bottom-up in the reorganizing to be efficient. He also reflects that it would have been more useful to involve a larger part of the organization earlier to make a more real picture of what the organization needs from the start instead of having to adjust to that later. I interpret this as James realizing that the challenges with a top-down structure are that it does not involve enough people to lead organizational transformation. This way of working will not enable them to work with uncertainties, manage complex initiatives and adapt their design along with shifts in the context that Brown (2012) say that leaders with higher action logics have. This might be an indication of the organization not having an adaptive approach to the reorganizing and being run by leaders with less mature action logics than what Brown (2012) describes. I believe that being able to influence an organization to become more adaptive requires being vulnerable and confident as a leader, self-oriented and seeking others perspectives.

5.4.3 Seeing the need to slow down and invest more time in people

A paradox in the findings is a wish for the change processes to happen faster at the same time as realizing that change takes time and wanting more predictable long-term perspectives with stability and continuity. Wanting the reorganization to happen faster can illustrate a lack of understanding of that working with people requires more than technical fixes. Dinwoodie et al., (2015) describe rapid organizational changes as huge challenges, which supports the participants experienced need for slowing down because it can be unhealthy to make changes fast. Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, (2009) describe that adaptive leadership can make organization slow down by asking questions and expand the circle of individuals. I think this is a good example of that slowing down can increasing quality in the reorganizing process. This might also provide more opportunities to approach people with inquiry.

David points out that it has to be spent more time on people rather than organizational material and written work. He exemplifies this through new initiatives being measured as something positive, but that this is being done to fast without deep analyzes of how things really are. James tells that he doesn`t want to work with personnel-related tasks, that can be seen in relation to what Dinwoodie et al., (2015) say about that the people side in change has gotten little attention. To improve this, mindsets and beliefs must be addressed and people helped to adapt to change through practice. This supports what David points to as a need for people to be more in focus and put others interests ahead of yourself. An example of this is what Arthur highlights about the value of working with cooperative partners and stakeholders. Joiner & Josephs (2007) describe leaders at the achiever level wanting the whole organization to work from shared visions and viewpoints, see the value of collaboration and have an increased self-awareness and reflection. It can look like Arthur and David have some similar leadership qualities as a leader at the achiever level by seeing the value of putting others interests ahead of yourself and cooperate with others outside of the organization. This can also be interpreted as an intention to try to hold different perspectives in mind and a step towards a more complex mindset. I believe that this also can be seen as a step in the direction of an increased awareness will give an easier access attending to one's own assumptions, feelings and behaviors that would otherwise pass by. I believe this will give a greater freedom to adjust behavior and thereby increase adaptability.

Arthur is also trying to increase his employees' motivation through showing interest, giving them interesting tasks and follow up on feedback. This can also be seen according to how Joiner & Josephs (2007) describe leaders at the achiever level being able to facilitate, check out their assumptions, being positive to feedback, having the ability to take a step back from their own standards and values and integrate others values and see connections based on what they have learned in specific situations. It looks like Arthur can have some similarities to the achiever level through being more of a process consultant seeing his employee's needs. This illustrates that even if Arthur is not very involved in the decision-making processes himself, he is able to integrate others values wanting to improving his employee's ownership. This might also illustrate that when focusing on the people side in change, this can contribute to the organization reacting faster to changes through quality, mobilization and adaptability.

5.5 A complexity gap between the participants' experiences and the literature

Based on my analysis of the participant's experiences within these four categories, there seems to be a gap between the literature and the participants' when it comes to navigating change and influence their organization to become more adaptive. Being able to lead change is a complex adaptive challenge requiring a complex mindset to close the gap, and I therefore refer to this gap as a complexity gap. The participants don`t seem to experience this gap themselves, but based on the analyzing, I see that some have a larger gap than others due to the different nuances of experiences. Illustrated from both theory and practice, the participants illustrate the nature of the gap, through having different mindsets and action logics that indicates larger or smaller gaps. Joiner & Josephs present one way to understand this complexity gap through their descriptions of the "expert" and the "achiever". I will illustrate some examples of this in the following two paragraphs, based on some key learning from the discussion. Another way to understand this complexity gap is how Kegan's socialized mindset needs to move to a self-authoring mind to be able to close the gap.

The "expert" illustrates the nature of this gap, navigating change through technical fixes and simplifying the complexity. They have difficulties trusting the process and letting go of the responsibility they want others to take. This illustrates that the need for control and being locked in one's own perspectives makes it difficult to adapt into a system perspective of the organization. To close this gap, I believe it requires a more curious, open and complex mindset. I believe that less need to control will give the participants greater freedom to adjust behaviors, increase adaptability and leading change in a more complex way. The expert mindset seems to find it challenging to turn their attention towards the processes going on inside themselves, and being more comfortable with driving outer change. According to the literature it requires a transformation in yourself to be able to transform the organization, which is another illustration of this complexity gap. I believe that a way to move towards closing the gap is to let go of control, as well as being more open to exploring oneself and others. I believe this will increase the ability of being more self-aware and consciousness of how one relate to people and mobilize growth in others. The "experts" communication style through "advocacy" seems to be a gap according to how the literature describes the helping relationship being a necessary foundation in building relationships to others. I believe that a good steps to move forward closing this gap is to increase awareness of how their communication style affect how one enable others to be adaptive. To grow beyond an expert mindset to a more complex mindset, seems to require being more self-oriented, seeking others perspectives, and moving towards an inquiry.

The “achiever” illustrates the nature of the complexity gap, showing that there is a gap even if this mindset is moving a bit closer, than the expert, to close the gap. They want to be role models to ensure quality and communicate through “inquiry”. This illustrates how they are moving towards being more process consultant’s being more capable of taking others perspectives. The achiever mindset sees the value of cooperation outside of the organization that shows an intention of trying to hold different perspectives in mind, and moving towards a more complex mindset. I believe that when being more interested to explore others’ perceived world, this will be a good way to spend more time on the individuals in the organization that they point out that it is a need for.

6.0 CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

It is now time to present the key findings according to the participants' experiences of navigating change. The complexity gap illustrates that there is a need for increased skills within; control, communication, adaptability and influence, to gain a more complex mindset in order to close the gap. Learning helping skills can be one way to close this gap, and I therefor see this as relevant to the counseling field. The participants experience different nuances and ways of leading change that will highlight the response to my research question; *"How do leaders experience navigating change and influencing their organization to become more adaptive?"*

The participants experience navigating change through technical fixes, and controlling behaviors through rewards and clear instructions. This seems to illustrate difficulties approaching complexity and letting go of control. I interpret that this makes it challenging to adapt to the change processes in a complex way and therefore having a need to simplify the complexity as their way of navigating change.

Some of the participants experience to communicate through telling people what is right in a non-democratic way, similar to "advocacy". Others invite their employees to talk freely about their needs, more similar to "inquiry". Seen in relation to the complexity gap, learning helping skills can contribute to move the participants to communicate more through inquiry, listen actively, meeting others' needs, seek others perspectives, improving the helping relationship and empowering others through involvement. Through learning such skills one can become more present, accepting and congruent, and lead with a good balance of support and challenge. I believe helping skills can increase awareness of how one relates to people, which is necessary to enable people to grow. I see this as an important contribution to become more adaptive as a leader and see more opportunities in ways of navigating change.

The participants describe adaptability as something important but they found it difficult to make the whole organization change. They had difficulties answering how they have experienced inner change that can illustrate a need for more self-exploration. I believe that lack of self-inquiry is one factor that makes it difficult to be an adaptive leader because off little conscious about how one relates to others, take multiple perspectives, and influence the navigation and the change processes. The gap is illustrated through the participants not having the adaptive skills the literature points to be required.

The participants experience having different amounts of influence, and several express that they want more influence. This seems to be an illustration of the participants wanting more control, and I see this as obliviousness to letting go of control to influence the organization to become more adaptive. I believe that mobilizing the employees to increased influence and empowerment in the change processes instead of controlling them, is an important discovery towards becoming a more adaptive leader and navigate change through a more complex mindset.

6.1 Practical implications and limitations of the study

Based on the evidence I have presented it seems like helping skills within the counseling field are transferable to close this complexity gap. The knowledge that I have gained from this thesis can also have implications in practice for me as a counselor. Examples of this is for example when I meet people resisting to change or having the need for control, I can approach this person through the counseling skills highlighted in this thesis and I can contribute to moving others mindset towards being more complex. I believe this will require continuing exploring and developing my own mindset to increase my own level of complexity. This is to find out who people really are, underneath what is presented, and be able to meet them there. The counseling study and this thesis had inspired me wanting to look more into awareness-processes in the leadership field because I believe this can be well connected. It would be interesting to do this research on leaders with different mindsets to look at similarities and differences that can be used to learn from each other.

As mentioned in chapter 3.8 my limited knowledge on this complex field can be a weakness in the study. I have learned process skills through writing this thesis, and there are several things I see now that I could have done differently, but I accept that this is part of the process. I might have interpreted too much in the role as a researcher, but I have done my best based on the skills I have, and the timeframe of one semester. Only four participants can be seen as a limitation, since other participants maybe would have represented the organization in another way with different mindsets and action logics. Being an outsider, a limitation can be that I don`t know the culture in the organization. This can have led to there being important things that I have not caught on to. I also see this as a strength since I might have seen something different than the participants already know. Despite of the study`s limitations, I hope that I have highlighted some interesting aspects, made the reader curious about this field, and contributed to some new perspectives on the complexity of leading change.

6.2 Reflections about my own learning process

The journey of writing this master thesis has come to an end, as well as being a student at the counseling program. I have a broad range of feelings, being both happy about what I have achieved, but also sad about having to say goodbye to at these incredible people I have met. The last weeks got very intense, working hard with pulling every part of the master thesis together and find the deeper meaning in the findings. Similar to the participants, I have had the need to work with small parts of the complexity to be able to cope with the thesis. Because of the complexity in the research being a bit beyond my knowledge at the present time, I have been willing to stretch far, trusted the process and believed that things would be clearer along the way. This made me more open for exploring the unknown, wanting to learn and grow in my own thinking. I have had many aha-moments, especially in the analyzing process. While analyzing I saw new meaning, nuances and links in the data, and reflecting about this with my supervisor has been a big part of the learning.

I have increased my understanding of the complexity of leadership and change processes and how this is relevant for the counseling field. I see how I can use this knowledge in other contexts through becoming more aware of my own mindset and ways of navigating my own life. I am also sure of that a lot of the learning will make even more sense in some time. I have gotten an increased awareness about the unique value of thinking in complex ways and using this as a skill when approaching and helping people. I will actively work on increasing my own complexity thinking to be able to understand people in more complex ways, and create more meaning in situations. I believe a good way to continue this growth is to never stop questioning things, and use all types of experiences as something I can reflect and learn from. Most of all, I will accept a life allowing to fail, learn and grow. I believe that will be good conditions for a meaningful life.

REFERENCELIST

Atkins, S. & Katcher, A. (2002). LIFO. *Personal Style Resource book. Maintaining and developing personal strengths.* UK: Life Orientations Ltd.

Berg, M. E. & Ribe, E. (2013). *Coaching- å hjelpe ledere og medarbeidere til å lykkes.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Bolman, L. G. (2009). *Nytt perspektiv på organisasjon og ledelse.* Oslo: Gyldendal akademiske.

Brown, B. C. (2012). Leading complex change with post-conventional consciousness. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 25(4),* 560-575.

Carnal, C. (2007). *Managing Change In Organizations.* 5th ed. Edinburgh: Prentice-Hall International.

De nasjonale forskningsetiske komiteene. (2006). Forskingsetiske retningslinjer for samfunnsvitenskap, humaniora, juss og teologi. Henta 22. november, 2015, frå https://www.etikkom.no/globalassets/documents/publikasjoner-som-pdf/forskningsetiske-retningslinjer-for-samfunnsvitenskap-humaniora-juss-og-teologi-2006.pdf

Dezin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). Introduction. Entering the field of qualitative research. I N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Red.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (s. 1-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dinwoodie, D., Pasmore, W., Quinn, L. & Rabin, R. (2015). Navigating Change: A Leaders Role. Henta 01. februar, 2016, frå http://insights.ccl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/navigating-change-white-paper.pdf

Edwards, M. G. (2010). *Organisational Transformation for Sustainability.* New York: Routledge.

Fikse, C. (2015). Fra selvaktualisering til samaktualisering og samskaping. I R. Kvalsund & C. Fikse, *Rådgivningsvitenskap. Helhetlige Rådgivningsprosesser; Relasjonsdynamikk, Vekst, Utvikling og Mangfold (167-196).* Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Gadamer, H-G. (2012). *Sannhet og metode.* Oslo: Pax Forlag A/S.

Gallwey, W. T. (2001). *The inner game of work.* New York: Random house trade paperbacks.

Giorgi, A. (2009). *The Descriptive Phenomenological Method in Psychology: A Modified Husserlian Approach*. Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press.

Hawkins, J. & Dulewicz, V. (2009). Relationships between Leadership Style, the Degree of Change Experienced, Performance and Follower Commitment in Policing. *Journal of Change Management, 9(3),* 251-270.

Heifetz, R. A. & Laurie, D. L. (1997). The work of leadership. *Harvard business review,* 124-134.

Heifetz, R. A., Linsky, M. & Grashow, A. (2009). *The Practice of Adaptive leadership: Tools and Tactics for Changing Your Organization and the World.* Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Howitt, D. (2010). *Introduction to qualitative methods in psychology.* Harlow: Loughborough University.

Johannessen, L. B. (2010). Sammenslåing av sykehus gir store utfordringer. Henta 01. februar, 2016, frå http://tidsskriftet.no/article/1971500/

Joiner, B. & Josephs, S. (2007). *Leadership Agility. Five levels of mastery for anticipating and initiating change.* San Fransico: Jossey-Bass.

Jordan, T. (2011). Skillful Engagement with Wicked Issues. A Framework for Analysing the Meaning-making Structures of Societal Change Agents. *INTEGRAL REVIEW, 7(2),* 47-91.

Kegan, R. & Lahey L. L. (2009). *Immunity to Change. How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization.* Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Kotter, J. P. (2002). *The Heart of Change. Real-Life Stories of How People Change Their Organizations.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2012). *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju* (2. utg.). Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS.

Kvalsund, R. (2005). *Coaching: Metode, prosess, relasjon.* Tønsberg: Synergy Publishing.

Kvalsund, R. (2006). *Oppmerksomhet og påvirking i hjelperelasjoner. Viktige ferdigheter for coacher, rådgivere, veiledere og terapeuter.* Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.

Larkin, M., Watts, S. & Clifton, E. (2006). Giving voice and making sense in interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 3(2), 102-120.

Letens, G., Farris, J. A. & Van Aken, E. M. (2011). A Multilevel Framework for Lean Product Developmement System Design. *Engeneering Management Journal,* 23 (1), 69-85.

Malterud, K. (2011). *Kvalitative metoder i medisinsk forskning* (3. utg.). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Mezirow, J. (1990). *How Critical Reflection Triggers Transformative Learning in Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nilssen, V. (2012). *Analyse i kvalitative studier. Den skrivende forskeren*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

NTB. (2015). Ledigheten fortsetter å stige- oljekrisen får skylden. Henta den 01. februar, 2016, frå http://sysla.no/2015/07/29/oljeenergi/ledigheten-fortsetter-a-stige-oljekrisen-far-skylden_55900/

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice* (3. utg.). California: SAGE Publications Inc.

Reams, J. (2005). What`s Integral about leadership? A Reflection on Leadership and Integral Theory. *Integral Review 1,* 118-132.

Reams, J. (2015). Development and Self-Understanding. How Understanding Developmental Theory Can Help us Grow. I R. Kvalsund & C. Fikse, *Rådgivningsvitenskap. Helhetlige Rådgivningsprosesser; Relasjonsdynamikk, Vekst, Utvikling og Mangfold (197-222).* Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Reams, J. & Caspari, A. (2012). Integral leadership: Generating space for emergence through quality of presence. *Wirtschaftspsychologie, 3,* 34-45.

Reams, J., Gunnlaugson, O. & Reams, J. (2014). Cultivating Leadership through Deep Presencing and Awareness Based Practices. I K. G. Schuyer, *Leading with Spirit, Precense and Authenticity (39-58).* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reams, J & Reams J. (2015). Awareness based technologies for leadership development: utilizing Immunity to Change coaching. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring. 13(2),* 14-28.

Regjeringen.no. (2014). 110 kommuner utreder kommunesammenslåing. Henta 01. februar, 2016, frå https://www.regjeringen.no/no/aktuelt/110-kommuner-utreder-kommunesammenslaing/id764443/

Ringdal, K. (2012). *Enhet og mangfold: samfunnsvitenskapelig forskning og kvantitativ metode*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Rooke, D. & Torbert, W. R. (2005). 7 Transformations of Leadership. *Harvard Business Review,* 67-76.

Rooke, D. & Torbert, W. R. (1998). Organizational transformation as a function of ceo`s developmental stage. *Organization development journal, 16(1),* 11-28.

Schein, E. H. (2009). *Helping. How to Offer, Give, and Receive Help. Understanding Effective Dynamics in One-to-One, Group, and Organizational Relationships.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline. The Art & Practice of the Learning Organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Silverman, D. (2014). *Interpreting qualitative data.* Los Angeles: SAGE

Smith, J. A. (2011). Evaluating the contribution of interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Health Psychology Review,* 5(1), 9-27.

Smith, J. A., Flower, P. & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research.* London: Sage.

Starks, H., & Trinidad, S. B. (2007). Choose Your Method: A Comparison of Phenomenology, Discourse Analysis, and Grounded Theory. *Qualitative Health Research, 17(10)*, 1372-1380.

Tang, K. Y., Dai, G. & De Meuse, K. P. (2013). Assessing leadership derailment factors in 360-degree feedback; Differences across position levels and self-other agreement. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34(4),* 326-343.

Thagaard, T. (2003). *Systematikk og innlevelse: En innføring i kvalitativ metode* (2. utg.). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Tjora, A. (2012). *Kvalitative forskningsmetoder i praksis* (2. utg.). Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.

Tortorella, G. L., Marodin, G. A., Fettermann, D. C. & Fogliatto, F. S. (2016). Relationships between lean product development enablers and problems. *International Journal of Production Research,* 54 (10), 1-19.

Turak, A. (2013). *Business Secrets of the Trappist Monks: One CEO`s Quest for Meaning and Authenticity.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J. Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S. & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: development and validation of theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34(1),* 89-126.

Appendix 1

Førespurnad om deltaking i forskingsprosjektet
”Refleksjonar rundt organisasjonsendringar frå eit leiarperspektiv”

Bakgrunn og formål
Dette er ein invitasjon til deg om å delta i ein forskingsstudie. Formålet med studien er å finne ut korleis leiarar i store organisasjonar opplever endringsprosessar. Prosjektet er ein masterstudie under Rådgivningsvitenskap på NTNU. Du blir spurt om å delta i studien fordi du er leiar og har erfaring med relevante endringsprosessar.

Kva inneber deltaking i studien?
Deltaking i studien vil innebere å delta på eit intervju som blir gjennomført på arbeidsplassen din. Intervjuet vil maksimalt vare i ein time. Spørsmåla vil omhandle dine erfaringar med endringsprosessane. Intervjuet vil bli tatt opp på digitalt lydopptak.

Kva skjer med informasjonen om deg?
Informasjonen som blir registrert om deg skal berre brukast slik som beskrive i formålet med studien. Alle opplysningane du gir vil bli behandla utan namn og fødselsnummer eller andre direkte attkjennande opplysningar. Det er berre veiledaren min Jonathan Reams og eg som vil ha tilgang til utskrifta frå intervjuet med deg. Prosjektet skal avsluttast den 01.09.2016 og då vil innsamla opplysningar bli anonymisert og lydopptaket sletta. Det vil ikkje vera mogeleg å identifisere deg i resultata av studien når desse blir publisert.

Frivillig deltaking
Det er frivillig å delta i studien. Du kan når som helst og utan å oppgi grunn trekke ditt samtykke til å delta i studien. Informasjonen frå deg vil da bli sletta. Dersom du ønskjer å delta eller har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med prosjektleiar Kristine Målsnes Veum på tlf. 9178966 eller veiledar Jonathan Reams på tlf. 48148900. Studien er meldt til Personvernombodet for forsking, Norsk samfunnsvitskapelig datateneste AS.

Samtykke til deltaking i studien
Eg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og er villig til å delta

----
(Signert av prosjektdeltakar, dato)

Appendix 2

INTERVIEW GUIDE

What does change mean to you?

Examples?

External change “out there” vs. internal change “attitudes and beliefs”

Can you tell me about some specific organizational changes you have gone through in the past months?

How did you feel about that experience, and what have you learned from it?

(Ask this question to each example)

How do you see your role in these change processes?

Examples?

What impact do you have? (victim vs. mobilizing for movements)

What is your leadership style and what competencies do you use in it?

Examples?

How do you lead change?

How does this influence you and the rest of the organization?

How do you help the employees to accept and enact the change? (role modeling, scaffold, motivate, feedback, etc.)

How have these change processes influenced you?

Examples?

Changes in thinking, believes and behavior to become more adaptive?

(In-depth reflections about the stories they have told)

Do you see any patterns in the examples you give?

Appendix 3

Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS
NORWEGIAN SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA SERVICES

Harald Hårfagres gate 29
N-5007 Bergen
Norway
Tel: +47-55 58 21 17
Fax: +47-55 58 96 50
nsd@nsd.uib.no
www.nsd.uib.no
Org.nr. 985 321 884

Jonathan Reams
Institutt for voksnes læring og rådgivningsvitenskap NTNU

7491 TRONDHEIM

Vår dato: 06.01.2016	Vår ref: 46092 / 3 / ABS	Deres dato:	Deres ref:

TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 11.12.2015. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet:

46092	*Refleksjonar rundt organisasjonsendringar frå eit leiarperpektiv*
Behandlingsansvarlig	*NTNU, ved institusjonens øverste leder*
Daglig ansvarlig	*Jonathan Reams*
Student	*Kristine Målsnes Veum*

Personvernombudet har vurdert prosjektet og finner at behandlingen av personopplysninger er meldepliktig i henhold til personopplysningsloven § 31. Behandlingen tilfredsstiller kravene i personopplysningsloven.

Personvernombudets vurdering forutsetter at prosjektet gjennomføres i tråd med opplysningene gitt i meldeskjemaet, korrespondanse med ombudet, ombudets kommentarer samt personopplysningsloven og helseregisterloven med forskrifter. Behandlingen av personopplysninger kan settes i gang.

Det gjøres oppmerksom på at det skal gis ny melding dersom behandlingen endres i forhold til de opplysninger som ligger til grunn for personvernombudets vurdering. Endringsmeldinger gis via et eget skjema, http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvern/meldeplikt/skjema.html. Det skal også gis melding etter tre år dersom prosjektet fortsatt pågår. Meldinger skal skje skriftlig til ombudet.

Personvernombudet har lagt ut opplysninger om prosjektet i en offentlig database, http://pvo.nsd.no/prosjekt.

Personvernombudet vil ved prosjektets avslutning, 15.08.2016, rette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Katrine Utaaker Segadal

Andreas Bratshaug Stenersen

Kontaktperson: Andreas Bratshaug Stenersen tlf: 55 58 30 19
Vedlegg: Prosjektvurdering

Dokumentet er elektronisk produsert og godkjent ved NSDs rutiner for elektronisk godkjenning.

Avdelingskontorer / *District Offices:*
OSLO: NSD. Universitetet i Oslo, Postboks 1055 Blindern, 0316 Oslo. Tel: +47-22 85 52 11. nsd@uio.no
TRONDHEIM: NSD. Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, 7491 Trondheim. Tel: +47-73 59 19 07. kyrre.svarva@svt.ntnu.no
TROMSØ: NSD. SVF, Universitetet i Tromsø, 9037 Tromsø. Tel: +47-77 64 43 36. nsdmaa@sv.uit.no

Personvernombudet for forskning

Prosjektvurdering - Kommentar

Prosjektnr: 46092

Formålet med prosjektet er å undersøke endringsprosesser blant ledere i store organisasjoner.

Utvalget består av ledere i utvalgte organisasjoner. Student vil sende e-post til overordnede i organisasjoner for å få tillatelse til å sende informasjonsskriv til relevante informanter.

Utvalget informeres skriftlig og muntlig om prosjektet og samtykker til deltakelse. Informasjonsskrivet er godt utformet.

Personvernombudet legger til grunn at forsker etterfølger NTNU sine interne rutiner for datasikkerhet. Dersom personopplysninger skal lagres på privat datamaskin, bør opplysningene krypteres tilstrekkelig.

Det oppgis at personopplysninger skal publiseres. Personvernombudet legger til grunn at det foreligger eksplisitt samtykke fra den enkelte til dette. Vi anbefaler at deltakerne gis anledning til å lese igjennom egne opplysninger og godkjenne disse før publisering.

Forventet prosjektslutt er 15.08.2016. Ifølge prosjektmeldingen skal innsamlede opplysninger da anonymiseres.

Anonymisering innebærer å bearbeide datamaterialet slik at ingen enkeltpersoner kan gjenkjennes. Det gjøres ved å:
- slette direkte personopplysninger (som navn/koblingsnøkkel)
- slette/omskrive indirekte personopplysninger (identifiserende sammenstilling av bakgrunnsopplysninger som f.eks. bosted/arbeidssted, alder og kjønn)
- slette digitale lyd-/bilde- og videoopptak