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1. Introduction

“Is [leadership] ... serving to advance our civilization in a way that is sustainable to ourselves and to our offspring?” (Raelin, 2010)

1.1 Background

1.1.1 A Landscape of Social Change and Sustainability

The world today is shaped by complexity, uncertainty and hyper-paced change. With the proliferation of technology, we have entered an age of acceleration, interconnectivity and exponential growth. According to Kurzweil (2003), "the 21st century will be equivalent to 20,000 years of progress at [current] rate of progress”.

The urbanisation and growth of an increasingly connected global population is straining the environment, polarising inequalities, creating cultural pressures and changing the economic landscape (Ghai, 1997). Problems like climate change, migration, food security and poverty can no longer be looked at in isolation (Beddow et al., 2009):

“No part of the human race is separate either from other human beings or from the global ecosystem. It will not be possible in this integrated world for your heart to succeed if your lungs fail, or for your company to succeed if your workers fail, or for the rich in Los Angeles to succeed if the poor in Los Angeles fail, or for Europe to succeed if Africa fails, or for the global economy to succeed if the global environment fails.” (Meadows, 2009)

Acknowledgment of their interconnectivity makes these environmental and socio-economic challenges systemic and increasingly complex. This has disrupted economic life characterised by repetition, routine and production.

Figure 1: Risk – Trends Interconnections Map 2016 – WEF
1.1.2 Economic and Organizational Change

Human life has been governed for centuries by an elite minority whose power has been entrenched through rigid hierarchies, monolithic institutions with centralised decision-making, and an international taxation system that is not fit for purpose (Dorling, 2015). The knowledge era is gradually breaking down these boundaries, whereby people are more knowledgeable, connected and interconnected than ever before (Raelin, 2002).

The global economy is characterised by an increasingly networked, fluid and flattened organisational context. With user-generated content or services that power businesses like Facebook, Snapchat, Airbnb, Uber and Zipcar, organisations need employees and partners who take the lead, make decisions, and solve problems:

“Where once, companies succeeded by inducing scarcity and raising barriers through patents, trademarks, copyrights, and certifications, today, the most value is created by opening assets up and maximizing the participation of individuals – to experiment, to localise, to adapt, to innovate.” Robin Chase, Founder and CEO of Zipcar (2016)

Customers and citizens are demanding transparency, autonomy and self-expression. This reflects a shift from a world with a minority of leaders and decision makers, to a world where everyone wants to be active and creative participants in their work and community life (Raelin, 2014).

1.1.3 Leadership

This has called for a reframing of leadership, as we know it. Leadership has traditionally been seen as a set of individual, consistent and unique traits or behaviours. This has resulted in a vast typology of leader profiles from executive and charismatic to transformational and authentic (Day et al., 2014).

Leadership is a puzzle (Bennis, 2007; Sashkin, 2006). After more than a century of research, rather than getting closer to finding the answers, the ever-changing complex world around us is creating new questions and, in some cases, even questioning whether leadership is needed at all (Lakomski, 2005).

More recently however, there has been an alternative focus on to researching leadership as a shared and collaborative process that can be diffused across many actors, rather than as personality type with authority or charisma to delegate or inspire action by followers (Spillane et al., 2004). A similar proposition is being made by researchers, whereby leadership is seen from a practice perspective, whereby leadership unfolds as a continual and
collective process, through the everyday activities and interactions within organisations (Crevani & Endrissat, 2016).

The importance of leadership as inter-subjective agency is also increasingly acknowledged as crucial for organisational performance and collective participation in social change (Raelin, 2014).

1.1.4 Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurs drive system-changing solutions to social and environmental problems. This is the industry definition given by Ashoka, one of the leading organisations in the field of social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs are looking to create systemic impact that goes beyond its organisational impact. This requires engaging beneficiaries, employees and partners as active participants that co-construct solutions for change (Ashoka UK, 2015).

This study will focus on exploring the notion of leadership as a practice of a collective, with particular focus on the field of social entrepreneurship – a field where all these issues intersect.
2. Literature Survey

2.1 A shift from individual to collectivistic leadership

Leadership has become a prolific and dynamic area of research, with entire books (Yuki, 2009) and journals (such as Leadership Quarterly) dedicated solely to this research. It is mainly characterized by attempts at definition and normative description, but not necessarily coherence (Raelin, 2014). Dinh et al (2014) attempt to take stock of the diverse developed and developing leadership theories of the new millennium. They provide a key first step for any attempt towards more integrative perspectives of the field. The authors note how significant attention is invested on the individualistic qualities, behaviors and styles of leaders, which have resulted in numerous lists of skills and tools for leaders to ‘master’.

However, a look at recent leadership theories reveals a shift from the properties or leadership style of a single individual with charisma or authority to a focus on leadership that is decentralized from a formal leader. It is shared, distributed or collective process of leadership that diffuse over various actors (Spillane et al., 2004).

This movement is still emerging and does not yet seem to have a set of conceptual identifiers (Raelin, 2014). Authors such as Bolden (2011) are however paving the way to creating such a framework. Definition of this ‘collectivistic form’ (as referred to in Spillane et al., 2004) of leadership is dispersed and framed in various ways: empowering leadership (Vecchio et al., 2010), network-based leadership (Balkundi and Kilduff, 2005), shared leadership (Pearce and Conger, 2003), stewardship (Block, 1993), distributed leadership (Gronn, 2002; Spillane, 2006), collective leadership (Bolden et al., 2008), integrative leadership (Ospina and Foldy, 2009), discursive leadership (Fairhurst, 2007), and relational leadership (Murrell, 1997).

However, these forms of leadership all seem to refer to a process that is dynamic, highly contextual, relational and collaborative. They also reveal a system-wide perspective that is multi-temporal, multi-level and that transcends organisational boundaries. However, so far these theories still shed more light on the ‘what’ and ‘why’, rather than the ‘how’ of leadership (Carroll et al, 2008).

2.2 The Decentralization of Leadership

These concepts of collectivistic leadership address the need for a new perspective, in a context where the problems organisations face are increasingly complex, too complex for a
single stakeholder to resolve (Bligh et al, 2006) and where the environment is dynamic and hypercompetitive (Crossan et al, 2008). They therefore have to deal with and make sense of extensive amounts of information. Work has also become less repetitive, routinized and more discretionary for many organisations (Raelin, 2014).

Vertical leadership (with a formal leader at the centre) is not necessarily invalid, but rather it is considered incomplete (Day et al., 2004) in the context of the 21st Century.

Team, project-based and self-organizing structures with flexible decision-making processes have emerged as a more adaptive, flat and faster means to transfer knowledge across a wide value chain of stakeholders (Swan et al, 2010). Self-managing teams are an increasingly more prevalent and have become a “driving force of organisational effectiveness” (Millikin et al 2010). These teams are made up of members with a high level of control and agency as well as more responsibility and self-awareness (Pearce and Manz, 2005).

Control and sense-making is more distributed, it is a dynamic process that flows according to the vested interest for the decision at hand (Crevani et al., 2010). This makes organisations better equipped to sense, innovate and respond to the environment around them. However, as organizations become more fluid, their boundaries also become ambiguous (Hackman, 2003; Mathieu & Chen, 2011) once looked at within a larger network of activity. Consequently, traditional organizational level studies may not necessarily be appropriate for such multi-level leadership research (Day et al, 2014).

According to Woods (2014), research on collectivistic forms of leadership suggests that where it works well it creates a ‘holarchic’ environment. This involves, inter alia, social relationships in which people are valued individually as persons and for their contribution to the co-creation of a greater whole. Holarchy is an expression of “organic belonging” (Woods 2005) - a social structure in which the whole and the parts are equally valued. This ties in with the emergent notion therefore is the theory of self-leadership, which extends the concept of self-management (Manz and Sims, 1980) to the individual’s self-regulation and future-oriented self-direction (Neck and Houghton, 2006).

So far, I have not found research with specific focus on the context of social entrepreneurship, an area that has grown in practice where people and organisations look to change systemic social problems through entrepreneurship, innovation and creativity and where the above observations seem to be exemplified.
2.3 Leadership-as-Practice

Crevani and Endrissat (2016) highlight an increasing recognition in the field of leadership research of “the value of theorizing about and studying leadership from a practice perspective”. Practice is a social construct that “directs our attention to the ongoing social nature of organizing and its holistic character.” This means that leadership is no longer necessarily a question of a specific mental capacity or approach of one person, and rather is a social process and intrinsically collective activity as a "meaningful, unfolding totality". (Sandberg & Tsoukas, 2011)

Carroll (2016) makes reference to the fact that attention to practice of social and organizational constructions is driven by the gap between research of social realities and the lived experience of them. Practice theory begins by looking at the lived experience (Weick, 2003).

The concept of leadership-as-practice provides a lens through which to interpret social reality. It allows for the appreciation of the 'organic flow of courses of action that change as people interact with each other and the structures in their environment, where these courses of action are constantly under construction through collective activity. It is thus concerned with how leadership emerges through day-to-day individual, social and organizational experience. (Raelin, 2016) Leadership is a consequence of collective action, not one of its causes. (Sergi, 2016)

Through this lens, Raelin (2014) defines leadership as ‘collaborative agency’, where social and organisational structures, under dialogic conditions, release an inter-subjective agency. Therefore, through their collaborative agency, individuals shape courses of action towards a co-evolving direction (Crevani and Endrissat, 2016). Raelin (2014) argues that leadership and agency are inseparable. In inter-subjectivity, the shared experience between individuals transcends and includes individual experience. This implies a relational interdependence (Billet, 2008).

This captures the relationship between structure and human agency when seeking to understand social reality. Schwandt (2007) explains that; "when individual agents interact with each other, or with objects in their environment, each action potentially alters both the context and nature of the proceeding actions. These actions, over time, create collective
structural patterns". These structural patterns are the building blocks of organizing. Agents constitute but also are constituted by the discursive and inter-subjective practices of agents within a nexus of activity (Davies, 1991).

This "duality of structure" (Giddens, 1979) means recognizing that inter-subjective agency and structure interact in an ongoing flow of social life and that the elements of organizational, cultural and social structure emerge from this process (Woods, 2016).

For the sake of analysis, Woods (2016) recommends framing leadership as a ‘trialectic’ process; whereby the inner workings of persons interact with the structural features of their organisational context. These structural features are institutional (distribution of roles), social (patterns of relationships) and cultural. Leadership emerges from these day-to-day individual and collective actions, whereby their effects influence and shape the direction and nature of the organization, as well as the efficiency and quality of organizational services and outcomes.

There is a stronger call for practice research of “richer versions of leadership” coming from more intimate and contextual studies of socially constructed organisational and social orders (Carroll et al, 2008). Caroll (2016) also acknowledges the theoretical challenges related to the situational, temporal and processual nature of practice. Nonetheless, Kempster et al, (2016) make the plea for a stronger commitment to empirical research despite it’s “time-consuming, expensive and uncertain nature” rather than adding to the many “conceptual critiques and polemic propositions”.

This research aims to contribute to attempts to address the uncertainty around the practice of leadership by paying specific attention to the themes that emerge from an empirical study of leadership activity as a social process, particularly in an area of practice where collectivistic forms of leadership are increasingly prevalent and also contributing to creating a more sustainable world – social entrepreneurship.
3. Research Area

3.1 Aim
To explore how leadership is enacted as a collective process in the practice of social entrepreneurship and the manner in which this shifts or replaces the role of formal leadership.

3.2 Objectives
- To investigate the practice or workings of leadership in organizations within the field of social entrepreneurship, particularly the conditions through which leadership is enacted as a collective social process
- To evaluate the role, if any, of formal leaders as organisations transition into more collectivistic forms of leadership

4. Methodology

“Leadership is defined by what you do, not who you are” - Bill Gore

4.1 Rationale for Research Method

“We need to get over the expansive “critique, potential and promise” phase of a new research approach [leadership-as-practice] and settle down to the “real” and considerably less exciting but critical task of working out how we are actually going to conduct empirical research that will be robust, insightful [and] compelling.” (Kempster et al., 2016)

A leadership-as-practice perspective provides a lens through which to examine leadership as a social reality. (Kempster et al., 2016) However, it is theoretical research in this area has been most prolific. An empirical approach to the study “illuminat[es] the empirical details of organizational life on the ground” (Orlikowski, 2010) and puts practice theory ‘into practice’. In an attempt to utilise a more holistic methodology, this research will take the form of qualitative semi-structured interviews (SSI) and participant observation in an attempt to explore the themes that emerge when empirically investigating leadership through a practice lens.

Kempster et al., (2016) stress the importance of in-depth approaches such as observation as necessary to understanding leadership as a practice and situated activity. Participant observation of leadership in its contextual and collaborative reality is so far an underutilised research method for leadership. It allows for insight into contexts and relationships. Data
obtained through this method serve as a against the interviewee’s subjective expression. This helps shift focus from the reporting of leadership to the experience of leadership. (Raelin, 2016)

It is however time-consuming and causes concern around reliable documentation of observations that are inherently subjective. It requires acknowledgment of potential bias, strong memory and personal discipline and diligence on the side of the researcher. (Klenke, 2008) Keeping a journal of the researcher’s account of the process and observations will help encourage a reflexive approach to such issues.

In SSI, questions are designed around the topic and issues of focus but allows for more flexibility and depth than structured interviews (Creswell, 2007). It seeks to probe deeper into certain issues but is not as time-consuming. It leaves potential for important issues to be uncovered while still gathering relevant factual information (Mack et al, 2011). It also allows for more systematic and comprehensive findings (Klenke, 2008). According to Klenke (2008), it is a method that is; “sensitive to and reflects the nature of the phenomenon under investigation [and] the context in which the interviewer and interviewee interact”.

Together, participant observation and SSI attempt to gather a more in-depth study that focuses more on the everyday detail, practices and context of leadership as a social process.

4.2 Participant Recruitment

4.2.1 Sampling

One organization was to be observed for the purpose of the study to ensure an in-depth and contextual analysis of leadership. The number of participants for the interview was limited to three participants. This is because looking at leadership from a practice theory necessary implies looking into the context and details of every day practice, and the more participants involved the less detail can be analysed for the study. When considering data saturation the researcher considered the depth and richness of the data as opposed to its size or quantity (Burmeister, & Aitken, 2012; Dibley, 2011)

The participants in this study were carefully selected social entrepreneurs. The selection of the appropriate respondents was crucial considering the size of the sample (Creswell, 2007). Therefore considerable effort was taken in choosing the participants for the study.
All participants were selected from the Ashoka Fellowship network of around 3,300 social entrepreneurs. The social entrepreneurs within this network are selected after a rigorous process that looks for a systems-changing idea and its impact, as well as the innovation, entrepreneurial skills and ethical fibre of the social entrepreneur. Due to the calibre of the social entrepreneurs in the network as well as the fact that I was a consultant within the network, the Ashoka Fellowship network seemed like the appropriate pool through which to select participants.

The final participants were narrowed through snowball sampling and desk-research. This is ideal for sampling populations that are usually inaccessible as builds populations through referrals (O’Leary, 2004). The initial criteria for potential participants were (i) founders of the organisation [as representation of the history and design of the organisation]; (ii) having an organisation that functions through decentralised leadership; and (iii) English is the language of the organisation (Appendix 1). The criteria were kept broad intentionally in order to initially eliminate only those with a more traditional leadership structure. This study could not be a longitudinal study; therefore priority was given to social entrepreneurs being at considerably different stages of their organisational and leadership journey.

4.2.2 Process

Each participant was sent an initial introduction to the study and invite to participate through the researcher’s student account. This was done to ensure that participants were aware of the study being academic and associated with their Ashoka Fellowship. Each participant was given a Participants Information Form (Appendix 2) and was also required to sign a consent form, both on the Anglia Ruskin headed paper (Appendix 3).

4.3 Interview Protocol – Method 1

4.3.1 Process

The data was collected over a two-week period from 18th August to 2nd September. Participants were given the same semi-structured interview. The interviews were an hour or an hour and fifteen minutes long. The questions were organized into four categories; (i) background questions on the organization and leadership; (ii) questions on the organization structure; (iii) questions on self-and team leadership (agency); and (iv) questions on processes and practices in the organization (Appendix 4).
To ensure that the questions were appropriate, they were reviewed and tested on another social entrepreneur outside of the Ashoka Fellowship network. This helped provide a sense of the kind of information that could emerge through the interview.

All interviews except one were carried out online through skype – one interview was carried out face-to-face at a location in London chosen by the participant. All interviews were conducted in English and were voice-recorded with the consent of the participant, and then transcribed verbatim. A thematic analysis approach was used to analyse data collected. Attention was directed to the dynamic relationship between organisational and social structures as enablers for collective leadership practice. Participants were provided with a briefing document prior to the interview to allow time for reflection on the topic and ensure relevant issues were discussed in the time allocated for the interview. Participants were assured on the anonymity of the interview and confidentiality of the data.

4.4 Participant Observation Protocol – Method 2

4.4.1 Case Selection

The data was collected over a four-day period from 30\textsuperscript{th} August to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} September. This involved two full days and two half days of observation. The primary research site was an office setting located in London, which allowed for rich qualitative data collection in the organization’s natural setting. (Creswell, 2009) The participants of the study were full-time employees of the organization and were members of what the organization’s ‘Core Team’. The Core Team contributes to the overall strategy and its coordination, with each member contributing their own expertise to the organization. At the time of observation, the Core Team was also recruiting for two additional members to lead in key parts of the organization’s strategy. This was part of an overall strategic review and restructuring of the organization, which was the goal for the month of September.

The Core Team included the co-founder (M), who had been with the organization for seven years; his partner (K), lead in research, who had also been in the organization for around the same time; the Press and Public Relations lead, who had been in the organization for six months and the Executive Assistant to the co-Founder (S), who had only been in the organization for two months. Partially involved in the study was a part-time intern (C) who spent three months with the organization. The co-Founder and CEO of the organization is also a social entrepreneur within the Ashoka Fellowship network.
4.4.2 Researcher’s Role and Site Access

Qualitative research methods recognize that the subjectivity of the researcher is integral to the research inquiry (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006).

My involvement in the Ashoka network helped provide the ‘insider’s view’ and overcome the challenge of identifying organisations that have decentralized leadership. My job prior to the data collection for the study was that of a consultant in the Ashoka network, whereby the researcher was part of a team coordinating various ‘Globalizer Accelerator Programs’ that support social entrepreneurs to build a strategy to scale their impact more broadly and efficiently. The social entrepreneur participating in the observation of the study was going through the program during the observation period, however I was in no way involved in his specific cohort. This meant the extent of our professional relationship was very limited. Sampling and selection of the organization came from referrals within the network and initial research and document review of the organization.

4.4.3 Process

The social entrepreneur was first interviewed with the same semi-structured interview as the other interview participants. We then discussed the nature and design of the observation, which the participant then discussed with the rest of the organization to ensure they were fully informed before giving any consent or otherwise. The organization all consented to the observation prior to the researcher finalizing plans for the observation.

Data was collected through interviews, document review, direct observation, field notes and conversations with staff, as well as reflections noted during the observation period. The documents included strategy documents, project plans, employee handbooks and the information from the organizations’ intranet. This provided certain contextual insight into the workings of the organization. To the extent possible, this was also done for the other organizations in the study.

As a researcher, I was aware of the inherent subjectivity in my research (Yin, 2003). In order to limit the impact on the dynamics of the team or actions of its members I took any action available to limit my influence. During direct observation, I kept myself separate and out of the immediate eye contact of anyone in the team to make it easier for them to ignore my presence. I did not speak in actual meetings however I did engage in general conversation
with some team members during lunch time, as a way to build trust and rapport. I believe my involvement with Ashoka helped build a certain rapport with the members as they were familiar with the organization.

When asked to engage, I was a participant observer in two separate accounts: (i) a one-on-one interaction with one of the organization members for feedback on a document she created and (ii) a strategy session with the Core Team. This meant segregating the field notes taken during the observation and the notes and reflections of the active participation. This was done to ensure clarity and coherence of the kind of data collected.

4.5 Rationale behind data analysis method

The holistic approach to qualitative research relies heavily on an in-depth analysis of the practice being studied. The purpose of this research was to identify the themes, patterns and meanings that emerge when studying leadership as a practice. I aimed to capture a detailed and in-depth interpretation of what emerges. For this purpose, data was analysed through thematic analysis (TA) of the data collected as the paradigm of choice for the study. TA is theoretically flexible, described by Braun and Clarke (2006):

“An essentialist or realist method, which reports experiences, meanings and the reality of participants, or it can be a constructionist method, which examines the ways in which events, realities, meanings, experiences and so on are the effects of a range of discourses operating within society”

The main aims of TA are focused towards the exploration of an issue or idea (Attride-Stirling, 2001). Data was analysed through the identification of themes (Creswell, 2009) that emerged through the various data collection methods. My goal remained that of making meaning of the data, therefore data collection and analysis continued simultaneously (Creswell 2007).

My approach to data collection and analysis was exploratory. I used deductive qualitative techniques to analyse the data (Creswell, 2009). The unit of analysis in these considerations was the social practice of leadership, defined as a dynamic, collective, situational and dialectic action engaged in by members of a community (Raelin, 2016). These practices are therefore individual, relational and institutional (involving both structural and cultural norms).

4.6 Validity and Reliability
Throughout the study, I kept a reflexive journal during the interview and observation process to help ensure that I remained aware of my personal responses, beliefs and perspectives. Consequently, I was able to witness the inter-subjective dynamics between my personal reflections and the data analysis. Moreover, acknowledging leadership as a social construct implies being aware of the worldviews, perspectives and experiences that influence my personal construction of leadership. The journaling process allowed for a reflexive exploration into leadership and other constructs of human nature that cannot but come with it. It also allowed me to witness that this study was based on and motivated by a strong belief in the vision of humanity and organizations expressed on paper. This was important to remain aware of throughout the research project.

The interviews were transcribed verbatim and sent for approval to interviewers. Field notes were taken during the direct observation and expanded on immediately after to ensure their reliability. Finally, the use of multiple sources of data was a way to triangulate data and ensure its credibility.
5. Results – Analysis and Interpretation

5.1 Background

The organizations researched in this study have all brought significant impact in their respective fields. They are not just working to solve social or environmental problems; they are working to shift systems by changing the underlying patterns that are causing these problems in the first place. They are working across social, cultural and geographic boundaries, among a diverse range of stakeholders that include the ‘beneficiaries’ themselves. They are building movements that are breaking silos, shifting mindsets and creating self-sustaining change.

While considerable attention is given to their success in social change, minimal focus has been given to how they organize for such extensive impact. Here I explore the extent to which leadership is grounded in the interactions of the organization, its members and context as ‘an organic whole’, emerging according to the strengths and resources within the organization in response to the situation. We can begin to understand this aspect of ‘leading’ by examining the everyday practices of these organizations as they enact ways of dealing that seek to navigate across boundaries, information saturation, complexity and hyper-paced change.

Through the data analysis, I identified a repertoire of practices that can be seen to enact a more ‘collectivistic form’ leadership where focus is on creating a facilitative environment. Although this ‘collectivistic form’ of leadership has been given various descriptions within leadership theory, I did not look to attach to any specific model, and rather focus on the practices of leadership that emerge through the study.

A thematic analysis of all data collected yielded four broad practices that enable collectivistic leadership. The first practice - contributing to a shared purpose – defines the individual and collective boundaries of the organization. The articulation of, engagement with and redefinition of these boundaries help the members navigate their agency. The second practice - leadership through a shared culture, information and networks – signifies the resources, relationships and context needed for inter-subjective agency to emerge. The last two practices - leadership through the individual learner and leadership through collective participation – represent the patterns of interaction that constitute and reconstitute everyday leadership.
In examining whether, in this social environment, formal leadership still existed and if so to what extent and for what purpose, a few themes emerged. These included the theme of the role of prior formal leaders in catalysing the process to enact a space for collective leadership, particularly in light of the participants’ roles as founders of the organization. The other themes related to the practice of maintaining the space for collective leadership wither through support or coordination and supporting members in self-determination of their contribution. Otherwise, formal leadership transitioned into participating in the organization in the same manner as any other member.

The findings from the interviews and observation for Observation C yielded a more detailed analysis of the everyday interactions involved in the practice of setting a shared vision and the tensions associated with the everyday actions that enable leadership that is both individual and collective, particularly the practice of leadership through the individual learner and leadership through collective participation. They also shed a more in-depth light into the transition from formal leadership as a process. Such findings are thus consolidated and presented separately, to the extent possible, into a short case study.

Creating this repertoire of practices is an attempt to analyse a processual social construction. They seek to be comprehensive of the study however they are not exhaustive. They are not mutually exclusive practices either, but rather are a transaction of practices that are in constant flow over time (Pickering, 1995). Moreover, they are expressed through different activities or patterns of action across the organizations observed. This means that although patterns are observed across all organisations¹, the most illustrative data will be included in the results and therefore each organization and its practices may not be included equally. Their discussion below as ‘standalone’ and separate practices is for analytic purposes only, and it is important to remain cognizant of the recursive and cyclical nature of the practices discussed.

The length limitations of this study also contributed to a more selective use of the data and limited the ability to be both integrative and in-depth in this study. Although the same thematic analysis was used for examining the findings from the study, the nature of data collection for Organization C differed to that for Organizations A, B and D and thus required a different presentation and interpretation of their analysis. For this reason, analysis and interpretation of findings are presented according to research method; interviews and case study. A short summary is then given at the end to ensure coherence. Lastly, Appendix 5

¹The names of the Organizations and Participants to the study where changed for the sake of anonymity.
includes some information on the organization’s structure, just in case it is helpful to the picture of the organization.

5.2 Table with Thematic Analysis

Table 1 - List of Emerging Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENACTING COLLECTIVISTIC LEADERSHIP – A PROCESS OF INTER-SUBJECTIVE AGENCY DRIVEN TOWARDS A SHARED PURPOSE</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-as-Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Shaping and enacting a shared purpose</strong></td>
<td>1.1 Use of purpose to define boundaries of the organization and shape its work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Individual identification with the organization and alignment with its purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Acts as the glue and context that helps shape relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Agency facilitated by a shared culture, information and networks</strong></td>
<td>2.1. Use of technology to build a shared database of information, resources and people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Engage in common training and socialization to build a shared identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Setting shared culture and values that shape the way members work and use technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Use guidelines of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Build social capital (virtual and physical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Agency through the individual learner</strong></td>
<td>3.1 Individual autonomy over decisions and discretion over tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Learning by doing and inquiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Learning for personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Agency through collective participation</strong></td>
<td>4.1 Communication to collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Interactions are supportive, helpful and collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Collective Reflection and collective wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Weave web of interactions between external and internal members of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSITION OUT OF FORMAL LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Shift out formal leadership</strong></td>
<td>5.1 Catalyzing the process to enact a space for collective leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Maintain space through support and coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Supporting members in their self-determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Participate in organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Interviews – Results 1

5.3.1 Contribution to a shared purpose

A consistent challenge within a space for decentralized leadership is the tension of providing enough freedom for actors to have the autonomy to take action and discretion to make decisions, while at the same time ensuring there is enough structure to ensure a certain
coherence and coordination as a collective and enough support for individual members to be the best they can be. This balance of ‘structure’ and ‘freedom’ has the effect of either enabling or constraining actions of leadership. Structure emerges through various practices; the most foundational is the set purpose of the organization.

For the organisations in this study, the purpose of the organisation is extremely clear and easily articulated. Moreover, the organisational purpose is a shared purpose that acts as the fundamental driver and direction for members as they navigate through the various decisions, strategies and daily choices made within the organisation. As stated by Raelin (2002), when people participate in shaping a change they want to see, their self-identity becomes tied to the successful implementation of the change. The practice of shaping this change can be seen in the process of setting or aligning to the vision of change and in acting towards it.

Table 2 – Contribution to a shared purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-as-Practice</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Contribution to a shared purpose</td>
<td>1.1 Use of purpose to define boundaries of the organization and shape its work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Individual identification with the organization and alignment with its purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Acts as the glue and context that helps shape relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Laloux (2014) explains the purpose of the organization is not just a statement in its’ annual report, but “an energy that inspires and gives direction”. The purpose of the organisation referred to here is not a purpose of creating profit rather it signifies its reason for existence, and therefore the positive influence or change to the world around it that it wants to create. As organizations within the field of social entrepreneurship, this concept emerges particularly strongly throughout the study.

The organizations deal with this from recruitment stage and across the trajectory of each organisation member. Manuel from Organisation A (OA) explains that:

"Not everybody gets [what we stand for] and if they don't, they won't get beyond the application form. The ones who do usually say: 'I've been thinking this my whole life and I finally found somebody who is doing it. So they are very passionate by the time they get to the interview process."
They positively screen for people who align with the purpose of the organisation and more generally, with the assumptions and values on which such a vision is based. This ensures that the foundation that drives their work and orients their choices is ultimately internal motivation and is not based on external incentives. Kogut and Zander (1996) note that strong identification with an organization drives additional effort towards tasks that contribute to the organization and its purpose:

"Everybody passionately believes in [the organization's purpose] - that's why they come to work every day." [Manuel from OA]

"The people who gravitate towards it are the people most likely to 'serve' and want to be part of it. It's a self-fulfilling prophecy that works very very well." [Peter from Organization D (OD)]

This shared vision and identity also helps ensure that the organisation's members see the world through a similar lens. It therefore has a dual nature – it is both a model of reality and a model for reality (Geertz, 1973).

Manuel brings out how the vision and purpose of the organisation then orients the OA's members' work and daily choices. The action of navigating the boundaries of their work as they make the everyday decisions with potential partners, customers and their product are what guide and reinforce the mission. It builds a sense of shared ownership, which drives the individual and collective motivation, sense of responsibility and accountability.

"What we then talk about is how [to] make [our vision] happen on the ground. [We] do certain things that look commercially stupid - we tell customers [health care providers] we won't do [something if] it's [not aligned] - we've lost contracts because of it. The flip side is we have many imperfections ourselves. So for example we don't always deliver what we want to deliver, we are stretched thin and so on. But we ... keep on fixing it. So every week we keep going... the intention is to keep fixing the problem so that everybody gets this technology across the world and its living through that that reinforces what the mission is and what the practice of it actually means." [Manuel from OA]

For Organization B (OB), an organization that Christoph defines as a 'collective of entrepreneurs with no CEO', the mission is then also the driving force for innovation and entrepreneurship and allows for individual and collective development of that mission and expansion of its scope. People do not join the organization because there is a specific position they want, in fact they rarely put out job offers. People join because they want to contribute to the organization and it's purpose. This distinction is embedded in OB's manifesto: "We don't work for OB, we contribute to the OB mission." Working in this context activates an inter-subjective agency, whereby members or the broader community are active 'thinking contributors' (Fairholm, 1998) to the organization's purpose through their decisions, action, innovation and entrepreneurship.
If the starting point for the organization members is an internal and individual alignment it lays the foundation for trust and respect of each person’s autonomy over their decisions in the organization and discretion over their work, as it ensures a certain coherence and consistency. This then facilitates entrepreneurship and innovation as well as gravitates it towards a common end.

“Some of the volunteers decided to join full-time and entrepreneur new spin-offs connected to the [OB] vision. So the organization’s first group of employees was made up of volunteers who wanted to entrepreneur their own projects in order to mobilize businesses, academia, funders, and the world of art and culture towards our vision” [Christoph from OB]

In the case of Organization D (OD), leadership is analyzed at an organizational level, as it is decentralized across the nine hundred self-managed volunteer teams and twelve local offices that make up the OD brand. OD has built a shared identity and movement around the vision itself, so that the organization only exists as a vehicle to support and sustain the movement and its expansion. The identity of the brand and its purpose is clearly established and defined through its principles. These principles are listed within OD’s ‘Event Charter’, a document that is signed by every new volunteering team or local office that joins the organization.

One of OD’s principles is that they only bring their ‘product’ (a free community run and social gathering event once a week every week) to communities that want one. This intention is finally established once the new team of volunteers signs the ‘Event Charter’ as a signal of their alignment with the mission, as well as a commitment to practicing its identity. These principles set the broad boundary within which the teams work, and builds the shared identity that ensures a coherent and coordinated movement. They are the only rules within the organization – the most important checks and balance system - that generate a common ground on which work is structured, and is a means of "local and global identification within their daily activities". (Orlikowski, 2002)

5.3.2 Leadership grounded in a shared culture, shared information and networks

Enacting a space of freedom, autonomy and opportunity that allows for leadership to happen at any level, means that while an organizational and social structure does exist it is there to create an environment that acts as a foundation or ‘launchpad’ for autonomy and collaboration. These structures ensure that access to information, networks and resources is

---

2 Helpful to look at the context box to understand organization structure
shared, so that each person has a base for making decisions, responding to situations, solving problems and actualizing goals that contribute to the mission they subscribe to. Moreover, instead of rules that direct members, organization enact a shared culture, values and ‘way of working’ that guide their approach to taking action, organizing and collaborating. The practice that develops is one of application and innovation as opposed to compliance – their contribution to the organization becomes a conscious and active contribution.

It is significant to mention that although common themes emerge in this context, each practice listed below is expressed differently, to a large extent influenced by the context of the design, culture and stage of development of the organization.

**Table 3 – Agency facilitated by a shared culture, information and networks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-as-Practice</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Agency facilitated by a shared culture, information and networks</td>
<td>2.1. Use of technology to build a shared database of information, resources and people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Engage in common training and socialization to build a shared identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Setting shared culture and values that shape the way members work and use technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Enact guidelines of practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OA for instance is an organization that is fully remote, where each member of the organization uses his or her home as a physical office. However, the organization still functions through nested teams, which are divided according to the main scope of activities within the organization; (i) developing the solution (technology); (ii) engaging other health professionals into the solution; and (iii) supporting patients to transition and take control of the solution:

"Each team has to be very entrepreneurial because they are working by themselves on the front lines and they have to make lots of decisions while getting lots of support from their colleagues."

Technology is a key enabler in this context (Orlikowski, 2000). It is used to support each member of the organization as they work independently and through virtual teams by providing a structure for storing the activities and ‘learnings’ of the group as well as providing strong communication pathways that facilitate coordination and collaboration.

Firstly, the organization has an internal wiki to store all information about the organization. This is a content management platform that provides for collaborative modification of its
structure and content. It holds record of every internal and external meeting of the
organization as well as all information and guidelines needed for members to be able to make
decisions.

However, the culture of the organization, in terms of the ‘way they work’, sheds strongest
light on how OA creates an environment that fosters coordinated and collaborative agency.
Manuel explained that he wanted to instill a culture of “being present all the time
remotely”. This is practiced through the use of communication and collaboration tools such as
‘Slack’ and Skype as well as through the work tools such as ‘Work-life’ that allow for notes to
be taken and shared real-time so that anyone can see what is being said in a meeting:

“So often if there is two of us in a meeting we’re writing on the same notes together which
others can see and comment on; or the team are asking questions to each other on ‘Slack’ while
the customer is talking [such as] ‘the customer asked about this I don’t know about this feature
do you have any ideas?’ or the developers are trying to bug fix together while talking to the
customer.”

However, Manuel explains that key to this is building an open and transparent culture, where
people practice recording each external and internal meeting real-time in notes and where
members are present and supportive by responding and interacting online. The result being:

“So there is a constant real-time communication going on even though to the external observer it
looks like you’re by yourself independent on the road actually we are constantly communicating
what the latest technology.”

This starts from the recruitment phase where they screen for people that are strong
communicators. However, certain routines still require a shift in behavior and assimilating to
the way the organization works. This is in fact an important part of the onboarding process
where new organization members spend significant time in training for and adapting their
way of working:

“These are habit changes and they’re not used to being so transparent. A lot of people ... don’t
like writing something or other people seeing it until its perfect but I have to tell them ‘it won’t
be perfect till they’ve seen it’. These are your colleagues - they want to help you - they are not
going to pick wholes but fill wholes for you. It takes a while for them to understand that you can
trust us ... but once they discover it they see how beneficial it is for them and the organization
benefits from that approach”

This creates a pattern of action where everything is shared online and is accessible to anyone
in the organization so that employees have the information they need to take action and
engage others:

"The company from day one was very open. Anyone who’s done anything has it recorded and
available to everyone else. Everyone can see my calendar and everyone else’s so it’s all built
around: if you want to work with someone on something everything is there for you to see - its
completely transparent what everyone has done so you can just get on with it and do it"
Another key factor in dealing with the challenge of working in such a distributed organization is by still prioritizing social interaction. Recurrent physical interaction helps develop meaningful relationships with the shifting set of members within the organization.

This starts with onboarding whereby each new recruit spends at least one week physically shadowing another member in the organization. This helps build a relational foundation to working in the organization: “You build relationships face-to-face in the beginning so just be very intensive about it in the first week”. That person then becomes their mentor for the first six months. This helps deepen the relationships between members, to the extent that they continue it unofficially throughout their employment: “it turns out they carry on talking to each other every week”. It now became an official process, that was created through their recurrent practice.

The whole organization meets once a month in person in London and each of the three teams also meet together once a month:

“Officially there is an agenda - a series of talks to go through - but its an excuse to [connect] afterwards - that’s where the real work gets done - the different members of the different teams sitting down and having a [chat] together.”

These physical meetings also help ensure that all information is shared and that it is heard from different perspectives, so that it is not just heard from members who focus on having an oversight of the whole organization, but its also heard from the people involved. This builds credibility and trust; and builds more coordination in distributed authority. The costs of travel for organizing these ‘in person’ meetings seem to still not outweigh the value they brings as according to Manuel “it is a critical condition for the way we operate”.

OB is a global organization and open community where each member joins to contribute their expertise and passion to its mission. The organization has its headquarters in Paris however its members are generally dispersed. They work across temporal, geographical, political, cultural and social boundaries within teams that are within a continual flow across the organization according to projects, problems and commitment that arises within the community. As a collective of entrepreneurs within a global ecosystem and with no CEO, Christoph explained the right use of technology, a collaborative way of working and a globally connected community where essential.
While each member within the community has certain roles to play, the rest of the work is distributed across the organization and emerges through OB's mandate process. Teams form according to their willingness to commit to a specific goal or project, they then prepare a 'mandate' proposal which includes their aim and how they plan to work. This is then pitched to the community through 'Slack' and it must be approved by at least a third of the members for that team to have their mandate to work. It allows the leadership of the team to emerge, they have the autonomy to make decisions and take action within the framework they set for themselves and with the commitment to report on key activities to the community through a 'Pulse Report' on 'Slack'.

Another significant tool is 'Loomio' which is a tool that enables remote collaborative decision-making and is used by the OB's revolving board, made up of members across the organization and volunteering community of OB. It is used for communication, discussions and for voting on proposals, which are all recorded for the organization. The board also reports its decisions to the whole OB community every few months to ensure transparency, coherence and accountability.

In order to help foster relationships within the community and a coherent and collaborative way of working, OB organize a three-day onboarding process in the Paris office for groups of new recruits. Here the focus is on firstly on giving new recruits an understanding of the big picture within the organization; OB's mission, their community and activities. However this is an interactive process where recruits develop this understanding through games and collaborative activities to help foster both a shared identity and a stronger bond with other members. They also focus on training for the way they organize, where the main focus is practices of collaboration. Recruits do training on how to give and receive feedback; on non-violent communication, which develops self-awareness, active listening and empathic communication; and on how to relate with each other and work best as a team. A key element of the onboarding also involves training on how to facilitate a community problem-solving session, which is the key 'product' that brought about OB's existence. This helps foster a shared identity within the organization, where members are connected through a shared and personal purpose, a shared culture of collaboration, a shared methodology and a personal bond.

For OD, the core of the movement is at the level of the volunteer teams and the 'community run' events that they organize:
“The organization is almost invisible and the people in the organization are strong personalities but I don’t see anyone trying to be the personality of the movement. The personality of the movement exists at the event level.”

The volunteer teams self-organize and take full ownership of managing and operating the events. Peter explains that the role of headquarters is simply there to support them by providing a framework through principles, guidelines and enabling technology as well as learnings from the community, which then enacts and enables their autonomy and helps navigate their decisions as they do so:

“With guidelines, local teams do as much as they can and we provide best practice… For the most part [the organisation] is a facilitator and enabler that allows them to serve their community and get benefits out of it for themselves. Its almost as if headquarters is there for them to be the best they can be and protect them from problems community has already learnt from.”

To “make sure that the whole organizations march in the same step”, Peter also explains that the various guides shared on OD’s intranet but little rules “so that you get boundaries with freedom”. This enables a certain accountability without constraining their initiative and individualization but rather “softly encloses” on it. He continues to say that they try to do this “in the most kind and respectful way that we possibly can”. The result is that the community built around each event is: “a complete self-sufficient community - and that is what we are creating - no sorry enhancing”.

When setting up the organization, significant effort was placed in ensuring they had the right technology for organizing and coordinating efforts. An important strength of Peter is technology and he built a web-based field management tool that enables the volunteer teams to self-organize. He explains that: “This is one of our most important tools and a key differentiator for an organisation like us”. They use it to manage their work, organize schedules, track the people involved, record all participants and results as well as communicate. Everything is recorded in the same system. All data is collated at headquarters level and accessible to all.

A key role of headquarters and local offices is that of supporting volunteer teams as they use the technology and manage their work. Use of the ‘Zendesk’ tool allows them to handle, organize and record queries and support at scale. It also supports the culture of ‘learning by doing’ and self-organisation, where the teams have a framework and the space for their autonomy with a clear and strong channel of support in place.
New volunteer teams all have a common orientation and onboarding process. An important aspect of their orientation is joining existing teams on two separate occasions while they are actually managing a ‘community run’ event. The first occasion they observe and support and in the second they are the team operating the event. This is a crucial step in both building bonds across the community and enabling global coherence that still allows for local adaptation.

Organizing and using channels and social media forums helps OD members to connect with the larger communities. There are forums for each local team but also forums for the different levels of volunteers and staff. Forums according to different identities continue constructing and reconstructing that identity as it becomes their shared bond. This is important for an organization at such scale to build meaningful relationships across the community as face-to-face interaction is more localized between the local organizations and the local core volunteering community.

5.3.3 Leadership through the individual learner

Organizations that support collective leadership are designed for learning (Edmonson, 1999). Heifetz (1994) asserts that a leader cannot emerge in a space that expects neat and quick solutions where accomplishment may only be illusory. The complex and interrelated problems faced daily requires examination beyond the surface that only comes from learning behavior (Heifetz, 1994). This requires a kind of ‘real-time learning’ that comes from acting with a reflective, curious and inquisitive mind. It also requires a willingness to experiment, learn from others and synthesize knowledge (Raelin, 2003).

The organizations in this study create an environment that nurtures learners to grow in their potential as individuals as well in their contributions to the co-created whole.

Due to the inter-subjective nature of an individual’s actions the separation of theme 3 and 4 is purely for analytical purposes as it is an inherently relational and circular process that is difficult to look at as a standalone practice.

Table 4 – Agency through the individual learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-as-Practice</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Agency through the individual learner</td>
<td>3.1 Individual autonomy over decisions and discretion over tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the nature of OA as a remote and flexible workplace, where employees have to build their own structure, agenda and solutions, implies that each employee has to be very active in their contribution to the organization:

"you have to be very entrepreneurial, very self-motivated, be able to learn a lot very quickly both from the company and the customer and [have to] learn [how to use] technology to support you in doing that."

The drive and direction has to come from the employee and not the organization as they make sense of the information around them and apply their resources to accomplish their goals. In fact, people looking for structure and direction to be given to them struggle within the organization, resulting in a constrained as opposed to enabled agency:

"We've had situations where people join and expect more structure... and those counting on structure get quite disoriented and tend to leave - but others love the lack of structure and love that they can create their agenda and be very flexible within a supportive team" [Manuel from OA]

The organization leaves space for people to get involved in projects and activities that they are interested in. Consistent communication on activities and changes within and outside of the organization allows members to quickly hear about opportunities or spaces for involvement: "They are all self-starters right - they are not people who can be quiet when they see something interesting."

Some do it in addition to the role; otherwise the rest of the team has to then simply agree they are the right person for taking it on. This allows for members to learn through trying new things in a supportive environment. It also helps them self-determine their contribution to the organization. Here, it seems like Manuel still plays an active role in sensing and co-creating these spaces for them. Scenarios like the below example then emerge:

“I noticed the last couple of months that Beth enjoyed anything to do with informatics - eg data dictionaries around prescriptions etc.. We hired her because she was very gregarious and a people person but I didn’t think she was techy. Well she is incredibly techy around medical informatics. We’re now creating a position for her around all the laboratory tests and new data dictionaries which will now be going through her.”

A supportive environment is also created through practices such as mentorship and mutual support. The organization enacts an “ask for forgiveness instead of permission” culture whereby the organization and its members value effort, action and learning, and that places expectations on teams working together to find solutions as opposed to asking for solutions.
Manuel distinguishes OA from other organizations that say that this approach is important but it is not put in practice. Therefore they focus on enacting a space of trust where people feel safe and confident to 'learn by doing': "You need to have a few cycles of them seeing we’re serious about it. They need to experience it”

It is more important that teams record and communicate decisions than taking decisions and failing. This enacts more rigorous individual and collective examinations both before and after, as they require communication:

“So if there is a problem we can come back and revisit why it became a problem but other than that the intention is that you figure out the decision among yourselves and then get on with it and then we can fix problems or repeat successes after you’ve gotten on with it.”

There still might be people that are not entrepreneurial and do not take the lead in this environment; where the lack of structure disorients rather than enacts them. However, due to the transparent and collaborative nature of the environment, it does not take long for the team to sense there is an issue. Manuel explains that sometimes this is simply because “they are usually not used to genuinely being freed up to be entrepreneurial”. The example of Sasha’s employment exemplifies this:

"she was so enthusiastic about PKB that half way through her interview process she quit her job - ‘I want PKB so much I’m just leaving and if they don’t hire me I learnt enough to know that I want to do something different.’ And all the references were fantastic, the interviews were great - everything was really promising. The first month she was watching, coming to all meetings shadowing her colleagues, learning from them and taking notes. The second month when [it was time for her to try] and do things she was not doing anything... it turned out she was worried about taking over from her colleague and treading on her toes. [My reaction was:] 'No, your colleague needs you to step forward so that you can take over'. The next day she was like a machine, she took over and did everything and transformed one of our biggest employments. Because she is so methodical and systematic. Some of the customers were so argumentative and she tamed them all and she gave them a process that made them happy. She’s also extremely efficient and she knows everything inside out about PKB. But all she needed was us saying we’re expecting you to do this by yourself and then she did.”

As a collective of entrepreneurs, OB fosters an environment where members of the organization feel safe, confident and inspired to take action; to innovate, entrepreneur solutions and mobilize others to contribute. They seek to build a learning community where: “We never fail, we learn. We are creative in everything we do.” This also starts from a recruitment process that screens for entrepreneurial spirit, an ability to take initiative and responsibility, as well as thrive in autonomous work.

Their ‘learning by doing approach’ emerges through a culture that values testing, experimentation and learning. Everyone at OB is encouraged to be proactive and prototype their ideas:
“the rule is that if you don’t know or don’t agree you need to show what is best through prototyping – so that the debate is not on just an idea but a prototype. And then the decision is made according to which prototype or solution creates the biggest leverage on impact”

They consider themselves as a community that loves to ‘test and learn’, innovating both inside and outside the organization. It is crystallised as one of their values. They practice a culture of extracting learnings and then sharing them. One example of how they do this is through their monthly global ‘Sense Meetings’ where the members join to share learnings from their respective activities, successes and failures. This also enacts a culture of individually recording and reflecting on learnings first.

Such practices foster creativity and entrepreneurial activity. They promote a more proactive attitude to work. This is then reinforced by other practices within the organisation where they can propose or contribute to new strategies and projects through a mandate process. This provides a space of opportunity for any member to drive their own contribute in leadership.

Moreover, the fact that such practices foster a prototyping and testing culture helps normalise ‘failure’ in such a context. This contributes to building a safer space for experimentation. However, Christoph then clarifies that there is still an expectation to meet team goals and objectives. This expectation enacts a learning and proactive attitude towards building solutions, projects and strategies to achieve their goals. As referred to by the team, it becomes a “do-it-yourself space”.

The OB has developed to include various revenue generating spin-offs such as a social business incubator, social innovation programs for universities and social innovation and community engagement programs for businesses so that they can engage in creating social change. This reinforces the vision and entrepreneurial culture within the organisation.

This also aligns with how Christoph defines leadership. In the interview he defined it as a jazz ensemble, where music emerges through a collective ‘sensing’ process and not with a conductor. It also reinforces his view that “leadership is never done”:

“Just because I started the organization [it does not mean] I have constant leadership. Being the founder is not enough. You need to do things all the time to show leadership – you need to show you are still committed. So you are a leader if you are always one, through your actions”.
5.3.4 Leadership through collective participation

The environment organizations operate in is increasingly complex and interconnected, and cannot be navigated through without a more collective effort. In the organizations researched, member share responsibilities as the situation warrants, in accordance with their respective abilities and motivation (Raelin, 2002). For this manner of working to be effective and efficient, it requires communication, coordination and collaboration. Woods (2016) also acknowledges the collective aspect of individual development, whereby individuals are positively or negatively shaped through a continual process of interactions with other actors.

Table 5 – Agency through collective participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-as-Practice</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Agency through collective participation</td>
<td>4.1 Communication to collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Interactions are supportive, helpful and collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Collective Reflection and collective wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Weave web of interactions between external and internal members of the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OA places a strong focus on having clear communication pathways and enabling interactions that are supportive and helpful. This emerges through various processes, cultures and conditions. For instance, the practice of constant and responsive online presence helps ensure that teams feel connected and supported:

“They felt more connected to [their colleagues] than any other organizations they worked with because they are constantly on lots of tools together - slack, wiki, skype, screen sharing and so on - there is always someone awake 24/7 on [OB] and they are always interested, willing and helpful.”

Moreover, the culture of transparency and the practice of honest and frequent communication help ensure genuine and collaborative relationships emerge. A practice of communication enacts collaboration. Members actively seek out for help from the community and leverage its collective wisdom. An example of this practice emerges through a ‘rule of practice’ for the developer team, whereby:

“Once a day they have to come back to their colleagues with problems they are stuck on... Normally an engineer would be saying; ‘for me to be a good engineer I need to fix it myself’. And I’m saying if you're not working with your colleagues you're a [not a good] engineer.”
This builds a practice of collaboration and communication, where the more support they receive from others, the more active they are in both seeking support and supporting others:

“...your colleagues who want to help and they are surprised by how much they want to help. And you have a couple of experiences like that and you become one of those helpful people and you also begin to constantly seek help.”

Another essential practice to collaboration is that of diversity and the various perspectives, experiences and approaches it brings. This fosters learning, communication and innovation as members negotiate between them in deciding the best approach or solution to take:

“you don't always know the answer... so the constant debate is really important and that is carried on through the company. Its the people we hire... they are not argumentative but if they say you do something wrong they tell you”

The practice of sharing divergent opinions and disagreements is highly valued within OA, where the people that are most honest about their views and flag or challenge certain issues are often promoted. This also requires and builds a sense of trust within the organization where people feel safe to express their views honestly and challenge others views respectfully:

“You have to have iterations of people seeing conflict leading to promotions... the new employees [also] hear it from existing employees - they get told look its ok to speak up - the discussion is useful when you see something wrong.

In order to leverage the strengths and expertise within the OB ecosystem, all work is distributed and emerges from the motivation and abilities of its members. Teams are dynamic and situational, driven by the willingness and commitment of the organization's members. Any employee in the community can take a new strategy or project forward by pitching the project or strategy to the community, engaging at least seven other employees into their team and getting a vote of approval by at least a third of the rest of the community. This allows for significant activity to emerge from the community and mobilizes other players within the ecosystem towards a specific goal. The mandate process is a key practice for distributing authority and fostering both self and team leadership. It places collaboration at the centre of how OB organizes.

Moreover, in line with the mission of the organization as global community that mobilizes communities to lead change, OB have developed a 'revolving board' with the purpose of distributing the strategic activities involved in leadership: "The purpose is to open the organisation's strategy to the active members of the community and strengthen international cooperation.” The board consists of seventeen seats, assigned for a one year term: eight seats
are filled by the global volunteer community, one seat for each revenue-generating project, one seat for one co-founder and the remaining seats for full-timers in the OB community. The community share their decisions with the global community. Therefore strategy emerges as a practice of the community and is not restricted to a position in the organization.

Their onboarding process places significant focus on collaboration and the individual and interpersonal skills required. However, a focus on supporting members to develop these skills continues across the organization. They organize non-violent communication training sessions for members frequently and work to develop spaces for co-development. An example of this is ‘the bubble’, a meeting where one member brings a personal or professional problem to the group and the focus of the session is to support them as they reflect on and seek to integrate the issue. This fosters a culture of active listeners that support each other in their reflections and learnings.

Members continue to influence each other through practices such as ‘peer-to-peer’ training where members are encouraged to organize training sessions on different skills or specialized knowledge that they may have.

OD is assessed at an organizational level as the scale of the organization implied significant difficulty in getting both a macro and micro view of the organization. For OD, providing support is fundamental to the existence of the organization. Its very ethos is to support the self-managing volunteer teams: “It’s almost as if [headquarters] is there for [the volunteer teams] to be the best they can be and protect them from problems community has already learnt from.”

After receiving training as part of the onboarding process, teams move straight into organizing and coordinating ‘community run’ events. They have the guidelines and best practices shared through the organization’s intranet, however localization is according to the discretion of the team. Interactions between the organizations (both headquarters and the local organization) are frequent, supportive and collaborative. Although a hierarchy exists on the organizational level, it works not as a hierarchy of authority but a hierarchy of support. The core volunteer teams are at the 'lowest' level yet they represent the identity and movement of the organization. As you go up each level from core volunteer teams, to ambassadors, to local organizations to headquarters, the higher the level the greater the responsibility for providing support and therefore the more structure and complexity in the way it functions and organizes.
5.3.5 Transition out of formal leadership

In the context of such organizations, where leadership becomes a collective property, where authority is distributed in teams and everyone can contribute to actualizing the purpose of the organization and where the community or organization itself becomes the checks and balance of their activity, the need for a formal leader is brought into question.

Table 6 – Shift out from formal leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITION OUT OF FORMAL LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Shift out formal leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Catalyzing the process to enact a space for collective leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Maintain space through support and coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Supporting members in their self-determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Participate in organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formal leader may be a significant catalyst to the organization’s structure, particularly where the formal leader is a founder. Indeed the founder is the initial ‘embodiment’ of the shared purpose of the organization whereby their self-identity is largely attached to the organization. Particularly where the organization is founded to solve an issue that they personally experience, which is common in the context of social entrepreneurship. Indeed, the interviewees referred to the difficulty of ‘letting go’. This implies ‘letting go’ of the control they had previously in shaping the contribution of the organization in actualizing its purpose but it also implies ‘letting go’ of attachment to their identity within that purpose. Mark, who is earlier than other participants in his journey of letting go, represented the personal process involved in de-centering leadership and the tension it creates between wanting to ‘let go’ and acting to create a space where others can lead, while struggling to trust the process and its value, fearing it may impact the ability of the organization to reach its purpose: “it’s very precious to me... I care about the outcome”.

Figure 2: Organization D
Peter defined the process of transitioning out of the organization as a 'massive wrench'. He had transitioning out of formal leadership completely and was only on the Board of the organization. Peter explained that the he always wanted the identity and energy of the movement to be at the level of the ‘community run’ events, embodied by the self-managing volunteer teams and the runners. The organization therefore functions from the place of supporting the movement to co-develop and thrive. Peter felt comfortable with the decision to extract himself once he saw that the people in the organization owned that purpose more than he did and that they were collaborative in how they worked together to bring it about:

"What I wanted to do was build something that other people could replicate for free. The only way I could control that is if I had good technology and good processes and good ability for people to receive those guidelines so that I could squeeze the organization to the smallest I could get away with and at the same time I could hold people accountable for doing the right thing by putting in place the right processes, rules and guidelines"

The above quote reveals how formal leaders may act as the initial intention and make initial decisions in terms of how to create a structure for distributed leadership, and in enacting the technology and culture that allow such a process to emerge and through their practice create and recreate the environment that fosters collective leadership.

Formal leaders may also play a role in maintaining a space for collective leadership. This may be enacted in different forms, depending on the context and factors such as the strengths of the individual and the context of the organization. For instance, Christoph considers himself as a participant in the organization, he is involved in teams through the mandate process and has one of seventeen seats in the revolving board (which he alternates with his co-Founder).

Christoph also holds the role of developing global fundraising partnerships to facilitate the expansion of the OB community [this is a separate to the income generated from the business spin-offs], and therefore still has a certain public-facing role. However this role comes from his strengths and contribution, not his position as leader. This includes being involved in speaker and conference events. For this reason, he also ensures that he is aware of and supports the latest innovations emerging from the community. This links to his response that ‘money’ is essential for creating the environment that OB has worked to create. By ensuring that the organization is in financial health, the rest of the team is not driven only by generating revenue and “has the time and less stress to makes things work - security and peace of mind so that they can creatively test, prototype and collaborate.”

Maintaining a space of collective leadership to emerge may also take the form of coordination. This function can be taken on by anyone with the skills and resources to do so.
In the context of OA for instance, due to the extensive communication taking place constantly throughout the organization, Manuel and other employees within the organization take on the role of overseeing all communication: "Now my role is being company mascot - sharing information amongst parties and motivating them...It is really information-sharing is what I’m doing”. He explains that he spends his time ensuring that he uses his experience, expertise and oversight to facilitate the work of others.

Manuel explains how by modeling a helpful and supportive attitude, he hopes he is a positive influence in fostering a similar culture across the organization:

"I think it’s about setting an example about doing that every day. I found that when I do things that are helpful on the ground level, so like taking notes in meetings - I take notes because I type quickly but also because I discovered that for everybody else that is a big deal - I stay quite in the meeting because its more important that they talk to each other rather than me telling them what to do and that feeds through every other interaction that they have with each other”

Where vertical leadership is not fully removed and formal leaders still play a role in recruitment and promotion, an important manner in which they contribute to a space for leadership may be that of supporting others in their own journey of self-determination. Peter explained his approach to leadership of OD as one that included “finding people that are more people capable than you, [and that] really understand the principles [of the organization, and then just empower them”. It involves “embracing the best that people have and letting them take it but also [ensure that we there are] ... some checks and balances.” He gives an example of this process:

"In 2010 I was running the whole organization, the whole of UK and all other organizations [were] reporting to me. I decided to give Tim the role of looking after the UK [organization] and he had a huge amount to offer that I wasn’t doing... And as soon as he came in he started to look at the local organization. Things we had done were great but weren’t perfect and he quickly picked up on it and started to work on it. The operational processes in the UK are a huge way forward from when I was in charge in 2010. And now he’s created processes and procedures that are best practice for the rest of the world and is now focused of bringing countries up to the same level.”

5.4 Case Study – Results 2

5.4.1 Context

OC was at a significant stage of transition where they had recently shifted their strategy to focusing on longer-term systemic impact in a manner that prevents the problem they wanted to solve and thereby makes them redundant in the next five to ten years. This bold goal involved shifting their focus to education and ensuring that along their educational journey,
children are set up with the values, skills, confidence and information needed to lead change in their societies.

While they planned to continue with their digital engagement strategy, as well as their advocacy work in shifting policies, they closed ‘operations’ on their community engagement work. This involved a recent decision to let go of the seven members within that team, and keeping the organization leaner while investing in an education and digital lead. This meant reducing the Core Team from eleven to six. It also involved a shift in approach in the way the Core Team works, interacts and engages others.

At the time of the observation, OC was in a period of strategic review, a practice they undertake annually for a few weeks. This involved focus on articulating a clear purpose and vision that encapsulates their new strategy, collectively setting the broad goals for the next four years, developing a broad strategy for the year as well as setting a stronger culture and new routines in terms of how they work together. This organization was thus undergoing a period significant change with bold ambitions.

This brought considerable internal ambiguity, where even its structural elements (the institutional, cultural and social) were in flux as the Core Team worked together to adapt, respond and actively contribute in their new environment.

The fact that, during the observation period, OC were in such a state of transition and a bit earlier in their leadership journey when compared to the other organizations, helped bring out the everyday tensions in collectively enacting such a space, and contributed to understanding the practices of formal leaders as they look to facilitate the transition.

The below interpretations for each theme should be considered in the context of the interpretations for the corresponding theme in Section 5.3 and are only kept separate to be able to give a more integrate, in-depth and holistic interpretation of the findings.

5.4.2 Process of setting shared vision

A key process within the week of observation was that of articulating a vision that was more reflective of the systemic approach the organization is taking to solve the problem of disengaged youth. Mark (M) gave this priority within the strategic review period as the foundation for the rest of the decisions they needed to make.
This also came from an external pressure, as it was required as part of the accelerator program M was part of. M made it clear that he wanted to prepare the vision and broad five-year strategy as a whole team so that everyone was clear and can then run with it. He repeated on various occasions that he wanted everyone to feel the same confidence to take the vision forward in the way they see best. However, by working together on shaping the vision and key milestones to getting there, they are empowered with the same narrative and are therefore still working independently.

M displayed a strong intention for the process to be collective. He gave this priority and set up the meeting for the morning of Day 3. He then set the agenda for the four-hour meeting, which was designed in a way to first give the team the context and information on the accelerator program and the theory behind why setting a systemic vision matters to the organization. He then took a step back and focused on facilitating the process of articulating the vision. He had already started the articulation process the day before where he and I scoped out the systemic landscape of OC and he tried to define the change he wants to see. He did not update them and left the space open for the team to collectively reflect on the change they want to see. When asked, he said he wanted this to be a collective product in hopes that its ownership and responsibility is shared.

Although a participant observer to the meeting, my involvement was limited to asking questions in an attempt to facilitate the focus on systemic change. It was an open discussion where everyone shared their views in terms of the ultimate goal they feel they are working towards. Everyone within the team contributed. There was no hesitation in showing disagreement - this actually helped towards refining the articulation of their vision. They very much fed off each other. There was a respect towards each other’s views and what drove any resolution was always the idea of getting towards a shared understanding of what it is they ultimately want to achieve.

The vision was written and re-written quite a few times, to the extent that the words could no longer be attributed to a single member. They all agreed on the following mission: OC empower young citizens to engage and lead change in society.

The same observations were made for the process of setting out their five-year strategy and more detailed strategy for the upcoming year. The collective negotiation of what that strategy entailed, helped foster a shared understanding and ownership of the product. It was also a
recursive process where defining the strategy for the upcoming year helped them redefine and clarify their overall five year strategy.

When asked M said he was really happy with the fact that everyone contributed to the session and was present and focused. He hoped this was an important step in having a more shared and distributed sense of ownership and responsibility. In the face of uncertainty, where the organization members did not agree on the action to take for decisions that came up, it was often reference to the option that most aligned with their vision that helped navigate through that uncertainty and reach an agreement on the best way forward.

Nonetheless, collective articulation of the strategy is not necessarily sufficient. It still requires continuous interaction with it for it to become more institutionalised within the practice of the organisation. For instance, the next day one of the members still needed support from the rest of the team to articulate the shift in strategy for an award application. This reflects the process involved in the de-centering of leadership. However, it shows that each interaction reinforces and reconstructs the vision, as well as builds confidence in each member to act towards actualising it.

As a participant in the process, albeit limited, a reflection worth noting is that in the act of contributing to the process of shaping the vision, I recorded an emotional attachment to that vision and found myself gravitating towards wanting to make the vision happen. As a participant researcher, I tried to remain a witness to the process as opposed to feeling the need to act on it in any way. However, the idea that if you share in the shaping of a vision you share ownership of it and activate a sense of agency to actualize it, suddenly became a visceral experience for me.

The emotional attachment that comes from individually aligning with or shaping the vision and purpose of the organization, as M stated ‘the reason for OC’s existence’, then attracts people that align with that vision, both internally and externally. As discussed in the interview, it helps build partnerships that transcend a transaction and form deeper, more genuine and longer-term relationships.

Kogut and Zander (1996) also note that strong identification with an organization increases cooperation between those contributing to it. This then contributes to the sense of building a shared identity. This however does not seem to be limited to a bond that builds between co-workers only. Mark and other members of Organisation C (OC) explain that what they define
as their team extends beyond the boundary of the organisation and includes partners that align on their vision. Mark noted; ‘that's where the difference lies with more transactional partnerships’.

S described how the shared purpose is the glue that connects their efforts and that inspires and sustains coordination and commitment:

“They are part of the journey. They want you to succeed in achieving your mission - your big mission - not just [a specific] project .. It’s a lot more encompassing... you have all these different people that are part of your team - connected through the vision and the mission. We [all] align on the ‘why’ [we do what we do – our purpose] ... and that’s very clear ... that ‘why’ solidifies everyone in this... that ‘why’ is everything we do”.

5.4.3 Leadership through the individual learner

Learning by Doing

Structure for employees is set through their respective strategy and goals for the year, as well as the budget allocated accordingly. Setting this structure is the priority of the strategic review period however M explains to the potential new education lead that “that framework may need reviewing which she would contribute in”. Within that boundary employees then have the freedom and space for their individualised contribution to emerge. The lack of rules and direction leaves an empty space for them to shape by determining how best to implement and further goals. Members are also given the flexibility to plan their schedules and work hours as long as they are still actively contributing to and participating in the organizations' processes and goals.

To foster the safety and confidence to take risks, the organization practice celebrating effort and the learning extracted from failure:

“We’re not afraid to fail...we celebrate learning how not to do it ... we celebrate whatever stopped us from getting there so that when we get to planning we’ve learnt better how to get there” [M]

As spurred by M, they also plan to implement a new practice that involves journaling for each employee: “they write a little bit about where they are - little snapshots” of their ideas, decisions and emotions:

“So when we come to the shared space they can demonstrate ... progress or [a] problem is getting worse - so we’ve got foundations to work with and a structure to break apart challenges and pick apart [processes] rather than just say ‘this isn’t working’ and there’s no sort of journey [to how or] why it got there”
Therefore, as part of the monthly 'blue sky meetings', they create a space for co-development where members actively listen and collectively reflect on personal or work issues. They can then share these individual reflections and support each other in processing and learning from them. However, this was still an intention and its influence depends on whether it develops into an activity that contributes to the practice of individual and collective reflection within the organization. Although an intention in itself can also be acknowledged for its influence.

**Holistic Development**

OC takes a strong advocacy stance in the work they do. Mark explains the challenges that come with this work and the consequent importance of allowing the ‘whole person’ to come to work as opposed to masking any parts of themselves in order to give an illusion of productivity:

“Campaigning for whatever issue is hard. Especially when coincided with lack of financing [and other] pressures that come in - if we're an organization that can completely be ourselves trust each other, [we can be honest] and carry a load if people need a little help. But equally recognize that [this brings more] opportunities for growth for all of us.”

As explored by Laloux (2014), "when we show up behind a mask only showing what feels safe and acceptable we only show a small part of our energy, creativity and passion". Therefore, when the ‘whole person’ shows up, this then gives an opportunity for energy, creativity and passion in their work as well as an opportunity for more holistic growth. For this reason personal development was being given more explicit focus with OC. They implemented a process where each member builds a personal development plan that focuses on their personal goals for individual growth, as well as supporting them to define their own purpose by stating; "I exist to.....". This was a process lead by S with the intention of bringing personal development into the organization, so that they can acknowledge, support and encourage each other as well as build shared experiences that allow for individual growth and deeper connections to emerge. As stated in her interview:

“if you build someone and help them succeed in themselves they are going to help you succeed in your business because they want to be there because its helping them succeed in fulfilling their purpose their existence .. its a win-win”

**5.4.4 Leadership through collective participation**

**Co-development**

The Core Team also seem to have made a commitment to each other in terms of taking care of their own wellbeing and checking in on each other. They all set different personal
commitments that they have shared with each other and they check in on each other about these commitments.

This focus on a more holistic development also helps members develop a stronger self-awareness as a foundation to both self and team leadership (Raelin, 2002):

“If you say yes to [a project or role] then its expected that you think you can do it and then equally it comes down to the individual to [deliver].” [M]

Opportunities for growth thus emerge as members seek to define their contribution within the organization. For instance, although S’ role was that of executive assistant, she was clear that her passion is people and operational excellence, acknowledging that you cannot have one without the other. In the two months of her employment she developed several operational processes, including the personal development process mentioned above as an example. During her review, she proposed that she is given a new title to her role to ‘COO’ to better reflect her scope of work as well as give her more confidence when dealing with external partners.

Also, J took the opportunity to develop a partnership lead himself, as an opportunity to learn how he can develop his contribution to the organization. As this was a completely new experience to him, M took on the role of providing guidance. M explained that he wanted J to feel like he was in 'the deep end' to a certain extent\. He attempted to put ‘sensors’ in place to help employees navigate through the various conflicting information emerging through the complexity of the environment they work in:

“we need to try be more critical with potential partnerships ... knowing when to pull out if negotiations aren’t going anywhere. I want us to acknowledge our value and be more direct in our approach.. the transaction is an exchange, we are not giving to a partner without receiving much in return.”

M shared that he did not want to 'teach' too much, allowing them to navigate through information and decisions for themselves. However, his approach below shows the fine line and difficulty in supporting in a manner that is not instructive and therefore enabling compliance:

“Are there any steps we can take to avoid doing work for nothing? [Pause for response] I want you to explore this J but I also want you to feel confident with [putting forward] an ‘ask’. A way we could do this is email them asking what they need exactly [from us] for the conference and that can then set us up up to say ‘yes but we also need ‘ABC’. I have made the mistake in the past of giving away too much for nothing in return. If anyone approached them for their expertise they definitely won’t be giving it for free.”

\[This was then stated by J in his check-in meeting with S whereby he described that he was feeling “like I am in the deep end but I’m not drowning, if that makes sense”\].
The daily interactions between members, as they strive to develop and contribute, also have clear influence. For instance, S explained the influence other members have on her sense of agency:

“The behaviour of everyone around you: They are very motivating people, they are very inspirational; they are go-getters, they [are] driven. And being around those kind of individuals makes that side of you come to life a lot more. [Also t]he behaviour of the team [in terms of] how they see you. If you are doing good, they respond and they acknowledge”

This enacts a more constructive environment for growth as individuals work to become more genuine in their behavior and contribution to the organization. S acts as a line-manager to other employees, however she explained that her approach is not one of ‘management’ but support, helping them find the resources they need to implement their tasks or take decisions, acting as a sounding board to their questions as opposed to giving them answers. She identified much more with the term ‘accountability partner’ – whereby you support others become more accountable to their growth.

**Collaboration**

Further to the forms of collaboration explained above, OC also collaborate in furthering their goals. The manner in which M and S discuss the nature of work to the potential new education lead encapsulates the manner in which the organization approaches collaboration:

“The team is currently setting the strategy and will then allocate budget accordingly, however the strategy for education is then hers to take ownership of and lead. That being said we work very collaboratively and so the team will contribute to the implementation and furthering of the goals. We support each other accordingly. The parameters are to a certain extent set but how she gets there is up to her, keeping in mind that this is a fully collaborative effort - both in terms of internal and external work. The earlier she starts the more involved she is in setting the framework [as they are in strategic review period]. Also, that framework may need reviewing which she would contribute in. She will also help define the group to work with”.

As the Core Team had downsized to a much smaller team a significant amount of their work implied collaboration. OC also took the approach to building their ‘team’ across organizational boundaries by partnering with organizations or people for certain services. As S explained:

“[I] don’t feel like [we] have 4 people in our team which [we] currently do, I feel like I have the [research] team too who I saw just yesterday and Mary who does design and [the creative advisor] who does the digital side also”

This requires a creative and collaborative approach that connects others into a broader network of activity and genuine relationships gravitated towards the same outcome, and broadening the collective process of leadership.
Members also had to be creative in how their leverage resources available within their broader network. M’s approach was to:

“keep the organisation ... lean and call on other people for their expertise. In the same, way we have R to help build a business plan or the G team organised by Ashoka to help with our long-term strategy or FEST organised by Ashoka to help with the corporate re-structuring. Then it comes to how to make sure to leverage the passion and contribution of these people towards achieving OC’s mission.”

5.4.5 Transition from formal leadership

OC was a small team and therefore highly collaborative both internally and externally. However, being in a stage of significant change, where the team where in the process of reflecting on their existence as an organization and their purpose, creating new routines, and recruit new members to their team and therefore building new relationships and new ways of interacting, meant there were high levels of ambiguity internally in the organization. This starts as an unsettling procedure, where ambiguity is heightened by the fact that M wanted to keep the organization as flexible as possible and therefore with limited organizational structure. The members of the organization therefore had to filter through extensive information to prioritize which issues to action and what decisions to make within a space that was still too unsettling to be stable and supportive enough considering the amount of internal change they are experiencing in the organization. The following were notes taken from my reflections:

Things felt hectic and distracting in the sense that they are trying to do a million things at once so it is easy to get lost in the chaos and sometimes hard to understand priorities. There is such limited structure that sometimes things feel a bit chaotic. This is not necessarily a bad thing as creativity and innovation come from this – but at the same time the organisation does not feel as efficient and effective as it could be and it feels like the team could benefit from a bit more structure or guidance.

M therefore saw his role in creating the space and providing the information needed for others to be able to lead without him. Indeed he spent significant time working to create this supportive environment. However, M appeared to express this need for support in terms of his direction, instruction and mentorship, and making sure to pass on his expertise and experience if and when required. This may tie in with why he felt like “the biggest pressure is that too much is reliant on me” as he feels the responsibility of ensuring that everyone has his support to be able to thrive and therefore provides significant direction as they try to learn to navigate their autonomy and learn how best to contribute.
Therefore while freedom is implied in collective leadership, freedom on its own may have the reverse effect and constrain leadership. Enacting a supportive environment and safe base through processes, a culture and guidelines is important to enable and not constrain members to navigate through that freedom. This would help hold the space in transition, and work with the uncertainty and resistance, as the organization slowly settles into a new way of working. This transition phase cannot be taken lightly and observations reflect the challenges and uncertainty associated with change.

The following reflections a small snapshot into the tension of prioritizing between issues that feel important to members, trusting the discretion of each member and handling disagreements:

“M was really hesitant to go to a seminar where J organized for him to be a panelist, as he did not see it worth it. He wanted to continue working on the strategy and thinking things out and this was a distraction. However you can also tell M wanted to respect J’s effort. M went anyway. He looked angry at the time wasted for going to the event, and for making the wrong decision. He told S that going forward J needs to screen events better. S answered saying that they discussed it and M agreed to going. M said he wanted to trust J’s recommendation. He also said that next year strategy review week is out of the country or out of the office so that the team aren’t overwhelmed with too many things going on at the same time and can prioritize.”

5.6 Summary

The organizations in this study have a clear mission and purpose that was shared across the organisation. This mission was one that signified the positive change the organization exists to carry out. Indeed, the individual alignment to this mission or purpose was the gravitation force that attracted members to the organization. This seems to have the effect of activating a sense of agency that is driven by internal motivation and commitment, where the organization represents their collective effort to actualise that mission. Members then contribute to shaping this purpose through their agency. It therefore sets the broad boundary within which agency, with the autonomy and freedom associated with it, is distributed and directed. It also helps to ensure certain coherence and coordination in the organization’s distributed action. It is the driving force behind the manner in which members organize, set goals, make decisions and take action. It is also the foundation of a shared identity; building a narrative that is shared throughout the organization.

The above organizations reveal that collaborative agency does not simply imply freedom and flexibility to act. Structure still exists within the organization in order to create an
environment of shared opportunity to lead. This involves processes and practices that ensure all members have access to the organization’s information, activities, resources and networks to take decisions, respond to situations and actualize goals that contribute to the mission they subscribe to. Leadership then becomes a dynamic and shared process that can happen through any person in the organization. Moreover, organizations focus less on rules and more on co-creating a shared culture, values and framework to guide members in their actions and interactions.

Each organization is also designed for learning. They look to create a space that allows for each member to learn about themselves as individuals and about their ability and potential to contribute to the organization. This allows for effective collaboration, as members know their strengths, capabilities and limitations, helping them determine when to contribute and when to engage others. It also fosters a sense of responsibility and accountability in the contribution they take ownership for. This involves creating opportunities for members to learn by doing as well as creating spaces for reflection and co-development. Through their communication, collaboration and mutual support, members build meaningful relationships and influence each other as they grow and contribute.

In this context, formal leadership was expressed in various forms depending on the context and stage of the organization. It took the form of catalyzing the transition towards collective leadership, particularly in this context where prior formal leaders were founders of the organization. Organizations still in the early stages of de-centering leadership may be unsettled with the process and the uncertainty it brings and therefore leadership may be practiced through unstructured and extensive support. They bring out the tensions, resistance and chaos involved in the process, and the need to hold and trust the space during transition. Where more set in structures and processes for collective leadership, the prior formal leader is no longer looked at as a position but an individual with his or her own strengths and ability to contribute. Leadership may take the form of coordination and sharing expertise, or in partnerships and fundraising. Prior formal leaders also seemed to have a certain public-facing role however this could have also been connected to the fact that they were founders. Otherwise, prior formal leaders transition into participating as active contributors within the collective activity of leadership.
6. Conclusion

6.1 Limitations

It is acknowledged that there were a number of key limitations to this study that could be addressed in further research.

The interview period was limited to two weeks in August. This restricted the amount of interviews that could be carried out as August is a difficult month to plan in and limited time implied limited flexibility to organize interviews. Moreover, there is probability of volunteer bias, for reasons such as availability or inclination to take part (Whitlock & Schluter, 2009). For instance, due to the limited time and issues of availability, I could not ensure gender diversity in the sample pool for interviews, a perspective that would have made the study more integrative.

The short period for the study implied a longitudinal study of leadership was not possible. Moreover, the limited length (word count) of the study also meant managing the sample pool to ensure that collection and analysis of data was realistic and manageable. The limited length (word count) also made it difficult to include the depth needed for a processual analysis of leadership. Thus a key limitation was the type and size of the sample pool as well as the depth of analysis. Repetition of the study on a larger or wider scale will therefore be of significant value to further investigate the insights developed in this small study. This might allow more common themes to emerge and might help give a more in-depth and integrative analysis.

There also may be limitations of self-reported data to a certain extent. Participants may edit their answers during interviews to questions in order to pose a more favorable light onto the organization. Even where questions asked for examples, routines and everyday practices, participants may have shared the most favorable examples that are not necessarily representative of the organization. I tried to also counter this through integrative questions that would then point out any contradictions. Including observation in the research method helped provide a more experiential perspective of the data.

6.2 Recommendations for future research

Due to the extensive data collected through the interviews and observation, there was a prioritization of findings that were analyzed in accordance with the study's aims and objectives. However, the findings suggest some themes for further research
1. Future studies on leadership-as-practice that explore this theme from the perspective of different employees within the organization as opposed to founders may give a more direct insight into the forms of self and team leadership that emerge as well as the potential transformative power for individuals within an organization where everyone has the potential to lead.

2. This study hints at the importance of the practice of coordination in supporting collective leadership to emerge. However, an empirical study through participant observation and in-depth interviews may provide insights into the extent to which coordination plays a crucial role in enabling collective leadership to flourish and be successful means.

3. This study hinted at the possibility that the interviewees worldview, assumptions and framing of leadership and human behavior, may have an influence on the environment or space for collective leadership they sought to create. Further research into this potential influence may provide helpful insights on the process of 'de-centering' leadership within organizations.

6.3 Conclusion

This research project was motivated by the perceived need to re-examine leadership as a social collective process. The focus was on exploring the manner in which the organizational, cultural and social structures are put in place to enable leadership as collaborative agency. It is a humble attempt to contribute to recent leadership literature through an empirical examination, by understanding the construction of leadership through the context, practice and processes that allow it to emerge.

By taking the everyday activities, processes and interactions of organizations, leadership emerged as an inter-subjective or collaborative agency driven towards, and by the actualisation of, a co-evolving and shared vision. Examining organizations in the field of social entrepreneurship, highlighted the strength of a shared vision for positive change. The institutional, cultural and social structures within the organization are continually constructed to create a space that enables this form of agency to emerge. Moreover, the interactions with these structures and other actors, enables a social environment where actors are valued individually and as active contributors, and where relationships foster growth and co-development. This context has the effect of de-centering formal leadership
from the attributes of (extraordinary) individuals to the social process and every day practice of the (ordinary) collective as they engage in leadership. The transition into this space involves a process and therefore prior or existing formal leadership exists to catalyse, facilitate and hold the transition, a practice that is both situational and contextual and therefore no specific role may be ascribed.

As organizations are dealing with an increasingly interconnected but geographically dispersed workforce within an economic and social context that requires filtering through information saturation, navigating through complexity and hyper-paced change and engaging an increasingly connected and distracted community of beneficiaries. This requires a collective effort and more distributed way of organizing, which the organizations in this study have dealt with in a broadly similar but contextually different manner.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Participant Observation</th>
<th>Decentralised Leadership</th>
<th>Stage of Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Skype: 18th August</td>
<td>Team is remote therefore observed leadership</td>
<td>Undergoing process of decentralising leadership</td>
<td>Undergoing scale up: 40 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christoph</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Skype: 23rd August</td>
<td>Team is based in France therefore Yes</td>
<td>Broadened strategy; reorganised organisation; 60 employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Skype: 25th August</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Undergoing process of decentralising leadership</td>
<td>Major organisational changes and shift in strategy; 4 employed core staff but broader network of contributors to the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Face-to-face: 31st August</td>
<td>Team is remote therefore observed leadership</td>
<td>Undergoing process of decentralising leadership</td>
<td>Peter now just on the board, organisation at 20 people, but volunteers are around 150K. International expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>No - availability</td>
<td>Skype: 21st September and then postponed</td>
<td>No - too much travelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Major impact but organisation is made up of 10 people only 4 of which are full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>No - transitioned out of the organisation and moved to USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>No - sensitivity of their work made observation difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinna</td>
<td>No - timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>No - timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>No - timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 - Participant Information Sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET GUIDANCE

This document seeks to include all the information required for you to make an informed decision as to whether to take part in the Research Project described below.

Thank you once again for your time in considering whether to participate.

Section A: The Research Project

1. **Title of project** Leadership for sustainable economies – A study on how social entrepreneurs create an organizational setting where everyone can lead

2. **Brief summary of research.** This research is being carried out in order to investigate the ways in which social entrepreneurs foster leadership and identify the factors that contribute to a space where everyone can lead. This piece of work aims to study the practice of collaborative leadership in the context of social entrepreneurship and its implications on leadership development.

3. **Purpose of the study:** Part of Masters degree in Sustainability with the Global Sustainability Institute at Anglia Ruskin University

4. **Name of your Supervisor:** Dr. David Arkell

5. **Why have I been asked to participate?** Due to your approach to leadership and organising internally for social change

6. **How many people will be asked to participate?** 5

7. **What are the likely benefits of taking part?** The main benefit is educational as the dissertation is small in scope and limited in time. It nonetheless has aims to contribute to research within field of new leadership for social change. It is unlikely that there will be any direct benefits beyond an opportunity to reflect on leadership practice.

8. **Can I refuse to take part?** You can refuse to take part without giving a reason. Under no circumstances should participants feel coerced into taking part.

9. **Has the study got ethical approval?** The study has ethical approval from an ethics committee at Anglia Ruskin University.

10. **Has the organisation where you are carrying out the research given permission?** Approval of contact has been given from Co-Director Nadine Freeman. However this constituted general permission to approach participants and it is the decision of each person whether they would like to take part in your research.

11. **If your research falls under specific legislation e.g. the Human Tissue Act (2004), you need to state that your research complies with it.** No

12. **Source of funding for the research, if applicable.** No

13. **What will happen to the results of the study?** The results will be written up for my dissertation.
Section B: Your Participation in the Research Project

1. **Involvement**
   Leadership and leadership development is emerging strongly within leadership theory and research. However, due to the complexity, multi-faceted and multi-level nature of leadership as well as its fast-changing context, a proliferation of studies have emerged about various aspects of the definition, content, process and outcome of leadership and leadership development. However significant gaps remain in terms understanding how leaders foster leadership within others. This requires looking at leadership as a practice and understanding the organisational and relational processes behind it. This study will take an in-depth look at social entrepreneurs and their leadership, particularly the practice of fostering leadership in everyone around them.

Participants will take part in an in-depth interview that may take place in one or two sessions where participants will be asked to answer a series of questions on their leadership approach and practice. The interviews will happen electronically with one session of an hour or two sessions of an hour each, depending on their availability.

In the case of participant observation, the participant will be observed at their organisation for 20 to 40 work hours (3 to 5 days). This will include observing the participant their organisational context, observing how they set up teams, the culture they create in the organisation, how they work with their team and how this translates within team practice.

2. **Participation in the study kept confidential**
   All information disclosed during the study will be kept strictly confidential. Participants’ personal data or sensitive personal data will not be included in dissemination. My Supervisor, Dr. David Arkell and Nadine Freeman, my boss and Co-Director of Ashoka Globalizer will have access to participant data, however where possible such data will be anonymously stored.

   All results will be written up in anonymised format. While every attempt will be made to ensure anonymity, it may not be possible to guarantee complete anonymity. It is possible that participants may be identified by their colleagues or peers if not by the general public.

3. **Use of quotes.**
   I may use quotes to help support argument. However any quotes will be sent to you for approval before including them in the dissertation.

4. **Use of recording equipment.**
   I will be recording the interview to ensure essence of interview data is captured and not misinterpreted in the field. The recorded data will be transcribed and kept secure and stored in electronic format on an external drive. Data will then be securely deleted in accordance with point 8 below.

5. **Possible disadvantages or risks to taking part**
   Risks for the study are minimal and mainly include includes risk of distress, physical harm or risk to confidentiality.

   **Distress:**
   - Questions will be mindfully set and sensitively asked to interviewees. Interviewer will be sensitive to cues given by Interviewee during interview.
   - Interviewees will be made aware that they may leave at any point during the interview should they feel any distress.
   - Interviewees will receive the contact details and references of local services that provide psychological support should they need.

   **Physical Harm:**
• Observation will happen in the organisation of participants – a space that they know and are comfortable with.
• The interviewer will have a list of emergency contacts within easy reach at all times and will share them with the interviewee.

Confidentiality:
• The researcher will avoid disclosing any identifying factors for both the participant and their organisation.

Agreement to participate in the study does not affect participant’s legal rights.

6. Withdrawal from the Study
Participants do not have to answer any questionnaire or interview questions they do not wish to. Participants can withdraw from being observed or from the study in general at any time and without giving a reason. This may be done through email. Participants may also require that their data be removed or confirm whether any anonymised data that you have collected up to that point. This may be done until August 15th 2016, as once research is written up for degree it will be difficult to retract. Any data collected may be used by participants if proven useful.

7. Special precautions before, during or after taking part in the study
If participants disclose any information which the researcher has a legal, ethical or moral duty to disclose to any relevant authorities, then the researcher will heavily consider the circumstances, strength and nature of the information obtained and the consequences (e.g. if researcher feels participants are at risk or if participants reveal anything of an illegal nature) on relevant parties before making any decision to disclose.

8. Retention of Data
Data will be safely and securely stored for 3 years from completion of the dissertation and then securely destroyed. To ensure that data will be stored anonymously, participants will be assigned a code number and any identifying information will be stored separated from the data at the earliest opportunity. Personal data of participants will however be deleted once the dissertation is completed and approved.

9. Summary of research findings I can send participants a summary of research findings by email should they request, after the dissertation is written.

10. Contact details for complaints.
If participants have any complaints about the study, they are encouraged to speak to me or my Supervisor in the first instance. The email of my Supervisor is David.Arkell@anglia.ac.uk.

They can also make use of the Anglia Ruskin University’s complaints procedure.
Email address: complaints@anglia.ac.uk
Postal address: Office of the Secretary and Clerk, Anglia Ruskin University, Bishop Hall Lane, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1SQ.

Version 1 15th June 2016
Appendix 3 – Participant Consent Form

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

This form constitutes your free and informed consent to participate in the Research Project described in the attached Participant Information Sheet.

Thank you for your time in considering this project and your participation.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT:

Title of the project:

Main investigator and contact details: Michela Fenech michelafenech@student.anglia.ac.uk or 0044 (0) 7731355614

1. I agree to take part in the above research. I have read the Participant Information Sheet version 1 15.06.2016 for the study. I understand what my role will be in this research, and all my questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research at any time, without giving a reason.

3. I am free to ask any questions at any time before and during the study.

4. I understand what will happen to the data collected from me for the research.

5. I have been provided with a copy of this form and the Participant Information Sheet.

6. I understand that quotes from me will be used in the dissemination of the research in accordance with my approval.

7. I understand that the interview will be recorded.

Data Protection: I agree to the University’s processing personal data which I have supplied. I agree to the processing of such data for any purposes connected with the Research Project as outlined to me.*

Name of participant (print)…………………………Signed……………………Date………………

Name of person witnessing consent (print)…………………………Signed………………….. Date………………

---

* “The University” includes Anglia Ruskin University and its Associate Colleges.
I WISH TO WITHDRAW FROM THIS STUDY.

If you wish to withdraw from the research, please speak to the researcher or email them at michelafenech@student.anglia.ac.uk stating the title of the research. You do not have to give a reason for why you would like to withdraw. Please let the researcher know whether you are/are not happy for them to use any data from you collected to date in the write up and dissemination of the research.

Date 15.06.2016
Version 1
Appendix 4 – Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Background Questions on the Organisation:

1. What is the vision and intended impact of your organisation?
2. Can you tell me a bit about the history of the organisation? What stage is it at now?
3. What is or has been the intention that has brought your organisation to operate the way it does?
4. Is the idea behind your organisation still dependent on you?
5. Can you help me understand the design of the organisation?

Background Questions on Leadership:

6. How would you define leadership?
7. What reference or role model for leadership do you look to?
8. What is your experience with leadership before the organisation?

Organisational Environment: Values, Shared Purpose and Team Dynamics

1. What are the key assumptions and values of the organisation?
2. How do you develop a sense of shared purpose/shared mission in the organisation?
3. What are the attributes you look for when recruiting? What are the attributes you look to develop in employees/volunteers?
4. Do teams form according to goals/projects? How do you communicate team goals?
5. How do you mobilise teams/employees/volunteers towards that shared purpose?
6. How do you foster individual and collective motivation? Where does that come from?
7. When is the organisation at its most productive? What are the main blocks for productivity? How do you deal with it?

Self-Leadership and Leadership within Teams

8. When do your team/employees/volunteers show leadership?
9. To what extent do employees have autonomy to make decisions?
10. To what extent do employees/volunteers have discretion in developing their skills?

Processes and Practices

11. Trust: To what extent does trust play a part in the organisation's culture? How do you build it?
12. Relationships: How do you foster relationships between employees/volunteers and partners in a virtual working environment?
13. Collaboration: How do you foster spirit and practices of collaboration?
14. Conflict Resolution: How do you approach conflict personally and through teams?
15. Communication: What practices and processes for communication have you built into the organisation?
16. Communication: What is your approach to misunderstanding/miscommunication within the organisation?

17. Failure/Success: How do you deal with failure? What is success? How do you reward it?

18. Sensors: How do you support your team/employees to effectively manage change?

Organisational Design

1. What were the critical conditions, in your opinion, that allowed a different way of operating to emerge in your organisation?

2. Of all processes and practices that set your organisation apart, which are most critical to maintain?

3. How resilient or fragile do you assess your way of operating to be?

4. To what extent does the organisation/org model depend on you as a leader?
Appendix 5 – Organizational Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Interviewee 1</th>
<th>Interviewee 2</th>
<th>Interviewee 3</th>
<th>Interviewee 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>Manuel [Name for the sake of Anonymity]</td>
<td>Christoph [Name for the sake of Anonymity]</td>
<td>Mark [Name for the sake of Anonymity]</td>
<td>Peter [Name for the sake of Anonymity]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Organisation A [OA] [Name for the sake of Anonymity]</td>
<td>Organisation B [OB] [Name for the sake of Anonymity]</td>
<td>Organisation C [OC] [Name for the sake of Anonymity]</td>
<td>Organisation D [OD] [Name for the sake of Anonymity]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Method</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Type</td>
<td>For Profit</td>
<td>Non-Profit with different services separated as projects</td>
<td>Non Profit transitioning to Hybrid</td>
<td>Not for profit [with trading arm separate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Social Innovation</td>
<td>Education/Youth Empowerment</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>40 in 11 countries</td>
<td>60 employees - 4 regional offices</td>
<td>4 Core Team, 3 apprentices and around 10 on SLAs</td>
<td>Around 40 in 12 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Remote Work - No office</td>
<td>One organisation with cross-business engagement into an easy, fun and efficient learning experience, accessible to absolutely everyone at a global scale. Thus, making it possible for individuals all over the world with different backgrounds to act at a local level for a global mission. To enable anyone to help, they constantly create new problem-solving workshop methodologies and train every passionate volunteer.</td>
<td>Organisations that works builds internal and external teams</td>
<td>They approach the organisation's first group of employees and volunteers from the OB community and longer term projects where they then have a support roles of CTO, Partnerships VP, CFO and CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Organisation</td>
<td>Empowering every patient to own, manage and control their healthcare data</td>
<td>Started Organisation B with the intention to mobilise ideas and solve the challenges of social entrepreneurs. Their mission is to accelerate the impact of social entrepreneurs by connecting them with ordinary individuals ready to take up their challenges. They turn social engagement into an easy, fun and efficient learning experience, accessible to absolutely everyone at a global scale. Thus, making it possible for individuals all over the world with different backgrounds to act at a local level for a global mission. To enable anyone to help, they constantly create new problem-solving workshop methodologies and train every passionate volunteer.</td>
<td>Empower and engage young citizens to lead change in society - to take a stake in society, engage with decision-making and make informed choices as active citizens.</td>
<td>Organise free open Community Run events it parks every Saturday, for all 52 weeks of the year. This is a simple, easy and fun way to engage in exercise. The A Community Run event includes the run as well as a socia meeting after the run for all participants (volunteers and runners). The idea is to remove as many barriers as possible from exercise and volunteering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Structure</td>
<td>3 teams: 1. Developer Team - build and improve software 2. Success Team [clinicians or project managers with healthcare experience] - patient support and change management 3. Sales Team [patient passionate clinicians that engage others in the vision of the product rather than just try to sell the product itself] - Partnership and Sales to networks, agos etc as customers. They then have a support roles of CTO, Partnerships VP, CFO and CEO</td>
<td>3 Teams: Research and Advocacy Team; Digital Team; Education Team that are independent and interdependent. Education Team is new - in line with new strategy. It used to be the community engagement team. This team no longer exists [7 people were let go a month before the interview]</td>
<td>Parkrun organisations in 12 countries, with one parent company in the UK - very large volunteer base involved in management Organisational Structure of the parent company as the Group Headquarters (HQ) in UK and country organisations across 12 countries, with around 800 self-managing volunteer teams. Role of HQ is to create technology, implement processes and support other country organisations and volunteer community. “Role of the country organisation is to engage with communities to start events and then to offer them a small amount of support and to keep it sustainable they need some kind of revenue generation”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Community Structure</td>
<td>They have a community of 2010 Gangsters. These are volunteers trained in implement 'Huddles' which a problem solving sessions through the open-sourced OB problem solving methodology. Huddles are the problem solving sessions that mobilize the talent and skills of people to help social entrepreneurs solve a specific problem. This is the heart of community. It has also developed into more coordinated and longer term projects where volunteers from the OB community partner with other NGOs or social entrepreneurs to mobilize communities to solve a specific problem.</td>
<td>Each country has a volunteer structure made up of different layers of 'irregular' volunteers Core Volunteers and Ambassadors. At the core this structure are a self-managing team of volunteers that manage and organise the community runs (CRs). At the time of the interview, this involved over 10 000 volunteers every week. This involves a core volunteer team and irregular volunteers that contribute with less consistency and commitment. A community run in a specific park is run by one core volunteer team of 6 to 15 people. A country then has a network of 40 ambassadors that create new community run events (go and negotiate with land owners and build teams to run events), train team (tech support) - they are also the first line of support for the core volunteer teams. In the UK alone, the organisation has 150 ambassadors. No volunteers are recruited They have a community of 2010 Gangsters. These are volunteers trained in implement 'Huddles' which a problem solving sessions through the open-sourced OB problem solving methodology. Huddles are the problem solving sessions that mobilize the talent and skills of people to help social entrepreneurs solve a specific problem. This is the heart of community. It has also developed into more coordinated and longer term projects where volunteers from the OB community partner with other NGOs or social entrepreneurs to mobilize communities to solve a specific problem.</td>
<td>Yes, there has been a training/continuity plan to get involved. The reason a volunteer ends up as an Ambassador: “a passion for the [OL movement]”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"There was new technology that meant patients can get all their information and I was a patient who wanted all his information - I could see the value of how that would help me but also save the healthcare system money... 2008 became me frustrated enough to say ‘I just wrote a book about this I need to get on with this and do it if I want it.” Starting the organisation after moving back to the UK after 6 years, having to build an organisation with limited resources, capital and network:

There were certain decisions that I had to make early on and I accidentally lead to a very useful culture in the company.”

1. Hiring people remotely. He did that for 2 reasons: 1) his personal and family well-being, as M was about to transition into being a parent “...if I could work from home that would be great and I could fit that around the children.” This lead to a discovery that many people, for similar motivations, were attracted to that. These were people “at the top of their game - highly experienced - learnt a lot and had lots of networks and a high salary. So if we gave them a job where they can work from home then we can recruit them with far less resources than I had at my disposal back then.” Therefore 1B - attracting talent looking for similar work conditions. 2. Increasing access to talent pool by not restricting recruitment by geography. “I wasn’t restricted to people living in [my] small city and customers like the fact that our team is next to the customer not next to me” “We ended up this way accidently but if I was starting again I would absolutely recommend that for everyone”

"To begin with it wasn’t organisation and I resisted making it an organisation for quite some time because my thoughts in the early days were ‘its just so simple and easy’”. A few things I didn’t want: “1. I didn’t want to be a club 2. I didn’t want money to enter hands ever because that would set us up as a competing product for other races 3. I chose Saturday because traditionally clubs run on a Sunday and I didn’t want to disenfranchise clubs” Friendly/Not-competitive · inclusive · an invitation to a community not a competitive product · an addition in your life no matter what else you do. “What I wanted to do was build something that other people could replicate for free. The only way I could control that is if I had good technology and good processes and good ability for people to receive those guidelines so that I could squeeze the organisation to the smallest I could get away with and at the same time I could hold people accountable for doing the right thing by putting in place the right processes, rules and guidelines” "In my mind I always knew that by far the majority of people engaged in CRs would be volunteers. I wanted the organisation itself [includes HQ and the country organisations] to be lean and almost nonexistent. Most [runners] don’t know there is a company behind it. This is by design but its also unique almost.” "This organisation is almost invisible And the people in this organisation are strong personalities but I don’t see anyone trying to be the personality of the movement. The personality of the movement exists at the event level."
### Appendix 6 – Excerpts from Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant:</strong> Manuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation:</strong> Organisation A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remote working environment for flexibility, increased access to talent and proximity to customers.** Organisation started from Manuel’s personal experience as a patient, his concerns as a doctor as well as his research in the medical field. “There was new technology that meant patients can get all their information and I was a patient who wanted all his information - I could see the value of how that would help me but also save the healthcare system money... I soon became frustrated enough to say ‘I just wrote a book about this I need to get on with this and do it if I want it.’” Starting the organisation after moving back to the UK after 6 years, having to build an organisation with limited resources, capital and network: “There were certain decisions that I had to make early on and I accidentally lead to a very useful culture in the company.” 1. Hiring people remotely: He did that for 2 reasons: 1) his personal and family well-being, as M was about to transition into being a parent “...if I could work from home that would be great and I could fit that around the children.” This lead to a discovery that many people, for similar motivations, were attracted to that. These were people “at the top of their game - highly experienced - learnt a lot and had lots of networks and a high salary. So if we gave them a job where they can work from home then we can recruit them with far less resources than I had at my disposal back then.” Therefore 1B - attracting talent looking for similar work conditions. 2. Increasing access to talent pool by not restricting recruitment by geography. “I wasn’t restricted to people living in my small city and customers like the fact that our team is next to the customer not next to me.” "We ended up this way accidentally but if I was starting again I would absolutely recommend that for everyone"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications of Remote Working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrepreneurial/Freedom/Independent in decision-making</strong> WITH support of team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Aspects:** “you have to be very entrepreneurial, very self-motivated, be able to learn a lot very quickly both from the company and the customer and [have to] learn [how to use] technology to support you in doing that.” “Each team has to be very entrepreneurial because they are working by themselves on the front lines and they have to make lots of decisions while getting lots of support from their colleagues.”

**Practice:** Initial Permission for those that don’t initially take action in lack of structure - to decondition previous patterns of working “we tell them go on and they just fly, they are usually not used to genuinely being freed up to be entrepreneurial”

**Collaborative and connected:** “I’ve had lots of people in the company say although they rarely see their colleagues face-to-face but they felt more connected to them than any other organisations they worked with because they are constantly on lots of tools together - slack, wiki, skype, screen sharing and so on - there is always someone awake 24/7 on PKB and they are always interested, willing and helpful.”

**Global context:** “The fact that they are spread across countries and timezones means they’re very good at communicating. They have to be both good at working independently but also know when to come back to the team.”

**ACTIVITIES:** “Once a day they have to come back to colleagues with problems they are stuck on because someone else can unblock what you’re doing.”

**Culture:** “Although they are writing code they have to be very people-focused.”

**Patterns of action:** if you’re not in an office you have to proactively go out and talk to people” - Patterns of action: “if you are proactively talking to people like your colleagues that’s very important and then it generally means that many of our developers talk directly to their customers - they have to be able to talk to them clearly rather than spurring jargon at them”

**Entrepreneurship/motivation screen:** "Careers page was a single line: ‘How can you help PKB?’ …when faced with the application form[most people] froze and didn’t know what to do - we screened out a lot of people who weren’t entrepreneurial and so the ones who made it through that first step were really good”

**Recruitment process:** “We do 4 interviews for each new candidate and do that independently and swap notes.”

**Skills/Capacities:** “We then look for specific skills like ... the success team we look for the ability to teach someone, the ability to understand somebody else’s point of view … and lots of domain expertise, A lot of what we get is how good is..."
| **Onboarding** | **Practice - Culture for onboarding:** "They have a deep relationship and always help each other out and they're always doing checkins with each other. We discovered this accidentally, we thought the mentoring finished after 6 months but it turns out they carry on talking to each other every week." |
| **Relationships** | **Face-to-face interaction:** "We also have one company-wide meeting once a month where we try to bring everyone from the company to London. Officially there is an agenda - a series of talks to go through - but it's an excuse to go to the pub afterwards - that's where the real work gets done - the different members of the different teams sitting down and having a drink together. We also try to have one day a month for the [3 respective] teams to meet up in London." |

**Entrepreneurship/motivation screen:** "Careers page was a single line: 'How can you help PKB?...' when faced with the application form [most people] froze and didn't know what to do - we screened out a lot of people who weren't entrepreneurial and so the ones who made it through that first step were really good." **Recruitment process:** "We do 4 interviews for each new candidate and do that independently and swap notes." **Skills/Capacities:** "We then look for specific skills like ... the success team we look for the ability to teach someone, the ability to understand somebody else's point of view ... and lots of domain expertise. A lot of what we get is how good is the person at communicating and explaining themselves because there is non stop communication going on." **Onboarding Process and pattern of action:** New employees shadow other employees face-to-face for 5 days. This facilitates learning very quickly and building relationships. This person then becomes your 'accountability partner'/mentor for your time as an employee. "Hired several developers from Hungary and flew them to UK for a week and they went frontline with the sales and success team. We hired someone else who will be spending her first week in London with the London team. You build relationships face to face in the beginning so just be very intensive about it in the first week."

**Practice:** "The biggest thing is just being present all the time remotely." **Activities:** For example: "When we are in meetings we constantly take notes on a computer both because those notes we put them so any one can read them who wasn't in the meeting [and] so the notes we are writing are available real time to anybody else. So often if there is 2 of us in a meeting they are writing on the same notes together; or they the team are asking questions to each other while the customer is talking and they are also on slack posting questions to their colleague - 'the customer asked about this I don’t know about this feature do you have any ideas?'; or the developers are trying to bug fix while talking to the customer." So there is a constant real time communication going on even though to the external observer it looks like you're by yourself independent on the road actually we are constantly communicating what the latest technology." **Practice - Open/Transparency:** "The company from day 1 is very open. Every meeting that I've been to I write it up on a wiki and everyone [has] access, anyone whose done anything its available to everyone else. Everyone can see my calendar and everyone else's so it's all built around if you want to work with someone on something everything is there for you to see - its completely transparent what everyone has done so you can just get on with it and do it - External meetings, internal - I have notes on everything" **Communication - Explicit Practices:** "There are things that go on implicitly when you are in an office that we have to make explicit about. But the flipside is oce you get those practices in place you cover off the problems around implicit v explicit communication and you get a massive network effect from all the benefits of being remote" - Comment: Pattern of action where everything is shared online and is accessible to anyone in the organisation so that employees have the information they need to take action and engage others. The interaction of taking information, acting on it and sharing that information enables agency. Again it comes down to information is power and freedome - it allows for independence but also collaboration.
<p>| Shared Purpose | <strong>Org Structure - Purpose</strong>: Empowering the patient &quot;Not everybody gets that and if they don’t they won’t get beyond the application form. The ones who do usually say: ‘I’ve been thinking this my whole life and I finally found somebody who is doing it. So they are very passionate by the time they get to the interview process.” Alignment with purpose - strong driver and is the individual and collective boundary that shapes the organisations’ space for action &quot;The mission is very simple - every patient every person in the world will be in control of their data - we want to switch from a paternalistic approach where the doctor knows everything and you ask questions to the patient being in control of everything - and everybody passionately believes - that’s why they come to work every day.” &quot;What we talk about is how do you make that happen on the ground. They see us do certain things that are commercially stupid - we tell customers they are wrong - we tell the customer we won’t do it because its bad for the patient - we’ve lost contracts because of it. The flip side is we have many imperfections ourselves. So for example we don’t always deliver what we want to deliver we are stretched thin and so on. But we discuss that often around - ok so we didn’t have enough resources to do it in this time with this budget but we still keep on fixing it. So every week we keep going on even if we’ve been told off. The intention is to keep fixing the problem so that everybody gets this technology across the world and its living through that that reinforces what the mission is and what the practice means.&quot; |
| Independence - lack of Org Structure | <strong>Org Structure - Culture - Practice</strong>: Independence: &quot;not only because you need to do that on the field but also because we are stretched thin and all have to do things by ourselves.&quot; Limited Org Structure: &quot;We’ve had a situation where people join and expect more structure [which we will eventually do as we scale] and those counting on structure get quite disoriented and tend to leave [on to better things for themselves] - but others love the lack of structure and love that they can create their agenda and be very flexible within a supportive team&quot; |
| Transparency and Dialogue foster collaboration - intersubjective - collective sense making | There’s habit changes and they’re not used to it being so transparent. A lot of people we hire are high standard and perfectionists so they don’t like writing something or other people seeing it until its perfect but I have to tell them ‘It won’t be perfect till they’ve seen it’. These are your colleagues - they want to help you - they are not going to pick wholes but fill wholes for you. It takes a while for them to understand that you can trust us and we’re not there to poke wholes. Once they discover it they can see how beneficial it is for them and the organisation benefits from that approach |
| Org Structure Team Design: &quot;Instead of a hierarchy we try to create cells - small independent teams that are able to make decisions. They know what they are trying to achieve for the customer and they have the tools and resources to get on with it and do it.&quot; Processes: &quot;If there’s a process in place we put it for everyone to see. Increasingly its about them creating the new processes.&quot; |
| Distributed Leadership - Teams self-organise | &quot;...communication around what they did and why they did it rather than them having a meeting and deciding that’s it. So if there is a problem we can come back and revisit why it became a problem but other than that the intention is that you figure out the decision among yourselves and then get on with it and then we can fix problems or repeat successes after you’ve gotten on with it.” |
| Communication for learning | <strong>Person - Recruitment</strong>: &quot;People I select for are those that disagree and argue with me.&quot; Example: Only developer hired from initial pool of consultants was Petra who was the only developer that would nonstop argue with him - Every time he thought he was doing something wrong she would tell him. &quot;because you don’t always know the answer... so the constant debate is really important and that is carried on through the company. Its the people we hire.. they are not argumentative but if they say you do something wrong they tell you&quot; Conflict Resolution seems to still be solved hierarchically: &quot;If we still disagree there is still the process where know as your manager Im asking you to do it even though you disagree with me but it wasn’t for lack of them telling me theres a problem and flogging up and explaining things - and that is really important&quot; <strong>Org structure</strong>: Create a space to communicate/resolve conflict: Meetings and slack |
| Diversity/Communicaton - disagreement |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Support and Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person - Recruitment:</strong> “It starts by we hire people that are likeable and helpful. We screen for that. We hire people we like and are passionate about doing the right thing. So that makes everything easier.” <strong>Patterns of Action - Culture:</strong> “And then I think it’s about setting an example about doing that every day. I found that when I do things that are helpful on the ground level, so like taking notes - I take notes because I type quickly but I discovered that for everybody else that is a big deal from them - I stay quite in the meeting because its more important that they talk to each other rather than me telling them what to do and that feeds through every other interaction that they have with each other” <strong>Modelling helpful and supportive behaviour feeds through the organisation and encourages helpful and supportive behaviour.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice - Transparency - leads to trust, safety, communication, collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person:</strong> Definitely from the profile of the people that we hire they talk they don’t stay quiet if they see something wrong. <strong>Pattern of action. Inter-subjectivity</strong> - <strong>Modelling:</strong> Its reinforced by seeing the fact that the bosses like that and do it themselves. The customers also see that and it makes a big difference to them -- <strong>Practice:</strong> When our employee tells them this is the right way they know they are not being fed BS. The employee honestly believes that and wouldn’t have said it. <strong>Org Structure Culture - values:</strong> So honesty transparency are really important values and comes through the the customer. <strong>Org Structure - Purpose:</strong> The product is all about transparency. The patient can see everything you are doing. The medical profession initially think that this will increase lawsuits, finding blame and punishing people but what they discover and we know already is that transparency reduces lawsuits, it reduces arguments, when there is a problem its flagged and fixed sooner because its much smaller than when you leave it for longer. <strong>We live that in the company and it comes through in the product.</strong> <strong>Practice:</strong> Inner and external alignment - they live the values and vision that they work towards. <strong>Culture -</strong> <strong>Practice:</strong> Trust takes time - you have to have iterations of people seeing conflict leading to promotions - in a public meeting they’ve said im wrong they’ve told me im wrong and a few months later that person gets promoted - and during the conversation you engage with them you talk to them. Then the new employees hear it from existing employees - they get told look its ok to speak up - the discussion is useful when you see something wrong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some form of vertical leadership still exists however energy points downwards not up - in the sense the focus is on support, catalysing and enabling: <strong>Practices:</strong> Back to back meetings with people sharing information on what is happening and ensuring I use my experience and oversight to facilitate their own work “Now my role is being company mascot - sharing information amongst parties and motivating them...It is really information-sharing is what Im doing” “There are 2 main blockers 1. My expertise and 2. The mandate for getting things done. If there are 2 people with different views, now we have to take a decision, this is the decision, lets get on with it. But there are a lot of people that can take that role in the future.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Conditions for the organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>having the right technology, the right people and using the right tech in the right way. You model it and reinforce it. Entrepreneurism and collaboration, the time to physically connect, and communication</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>My parents always taught me if you see something wrong its your job to fix it. The fact that you spotted it means that you know how to solve it. You have to do so with hard work and getting on with it. What they didnt teach me but I discovered, which they actually knew and just never made explicit; When you step forward to try solve a problem you spotted, it's amazing how many people also want to help. The company is full of people like that, its not that you spotted it so its all on you to fix it, you step foward first but there are so many people who want to help with that and are fully focused on that. So officially I'm the leader but actually each one is blazing a path. [Creating change] - that just goes through every one we have on the team</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reorganisation: linked to their shift in strategy, where they want to focus on how to organise collective action of citizens towards the SDGs.

Right now they are re-organising the organisation to create a more flat structure - *do not have a CEO*. Revolving Executive Board. *The purpose is to open the organisation's strategy to the active members of the community and strengthen international cooperation.*

Concretely, the board is the legal representative of the nonprofit - representing the international community. This includes a large responsibility and a number of rights and duties. It consists of 17 seats, assigned for a one year term. 8 seats are filled by the global volunteer community, 1 seat per revenue-generating project, 1 seat for 1 co-founder and remaining seats for full-timers in the MakeSense ecosystem. We needed to create a governance body that was efficient in the long run and independent from individuals. No strategic decision should indeed be done by one single person and all decisions need to be more transparent. Those topics are related to local and global development of MakeSense, the platform and the tools, strategies to involve people all around the world, global partnerships, funding strategies, etc....The members discuss strategic topics leading to decisions (yes/no) or new frameworks. Typically, when an international organisation is facing a challenging situation, the solutions will be complex and will depend on local context. Frameworks provide some guidelines, historical facts and key constraints to keep in mind when facing a specific situation (Partnering with the public administration of a city/country for example). They help an organisation make the right decisions autonomously while taking into account the specificities of the local context. Publish Report with decisions taken across the term.

**Decentralised Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Technology used to make decisions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loomio. EB is a virtual board. Hangouts for meetings, process in place and Loomio for discussions and decisionmaking. There is a lot of remote work and we have been using digital tools like slack [using it for the last 1.5 years] to keep employees connected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process and interaction:** Teams set up their own objectives – but it needs to be validated by your team that you work with daily – look at objectives get comments and refine. Objectives are then interdependent within the organisation. 3 months assessment of objectives. Teams are made up of several circles. All employees are empowered. *Teams are learning how to work collaboratively and learning how to work with no hierarchy.*

**Team leadership**

**Process - feedback - collaboration - selforganised and directed:** For example if I am working on a digital strategy for a project I have to request a ‘mandate’ from the organisation. This means I have to make a presentation on the idea, post the mandate on the mandate channel – I would need to build a team of 8 people – these nominate themselves if they are interested in driving the project – and they create a channel and work through that channel. Mandate is there to request to take leadership for a specific topic – for it to be validated you need votes from at least 1/3 of org

**Projects-based work**

Then they prepare a Pulse report – once you have been working on the project you submit it to the rest of the organisation to see – if there are big decisions with a big budget

**Communication**

**Person** They test whether the candidates have entrepreneurship skills to take initiative and if they fit in the culture of autonomous work. If they take responsibility and embed the attitudes within the manifesto. They then look for the specific technical skills needed. They also try to ensure that the organisation is more and more international. *The main language for the organisation is now English – now looking for a more diverse and international profile. They try to include cultural and country diversity – programs have a lot of cross-country work so it helps to have representation globally.*

**Recruitment**

**Shared Purpose and onboarding**

2 weeks onboarding process [doesn’t know the process in detail - Ask Caro]. People are then matched with a buddy

**Conflict Resolution - Creativity**

Practice: rule that *“as long as you haven’t prototyped you don’t know”* – so everyone is encouraged to prototype – the rule is that if you don’t know or don’t agree you need to show what is best through prototyping – so that the debate is not on just an idea but a prototype. And then the decision is made according to which prototype/solution creates the biggest leverage on impact
**Leadership**

1. Main role is fundraising and working with external partners. He travels all the time to see the teams and build new partnerships.
2. Make sure that if there is a good innovation I support it - Try to spot new things going on by going through channels and seeing what spreads in the community.
3. Participating in a circle - creating the vision, mission, and objectives of the circles he joins - according to mandates he chooses [participative]
4. Me or co-founder participating in Revolving Board

**Examples of Leadership:** Start SenseSchool – started SenseCamp – Prototyping. They then see what works based on what spreads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Prototyping enables testing and creativity - ok to fail (Freedom) goals still to be reached</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Cultural: Trying and prototyping is part of our culture - failure is fine here. However, failure doesn't mean you fail to reach your objectives – try new stuff fail etc but still have to meet objectives. If it (i) brings impact and (ii) revenues – and (iii) becomes viral in our community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the onboarding process, team building there's also a lot of travel so that get together physically - a lot of retreats. Everyone meets at the sensecamp – This is really important to help build personal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1. Leadership is creative - leadership is like a jazz ensemble whether there is no conductor and the ensemble senses the context, works independently to contribute to the whole? 2. Leadership is never done – not because I started the organization I have constant leadership - Being the founder is not enough - you need to do things all the time to show leadership – you need to show you are still committed. So you are a leader if you are always one - i.e. leadership is in action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for action</td>
<td>Most important condition for them to operate the way they do: Money – so that the team is not focused on money – and has the time and less stress to make things work - security and peace of mind so that they can creatively test prototype and collaborate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>Resources: Global community and Technology for distributed leadership. Culture: Prototyping Processes: Mandate Process for Leadership Practice: Everything is borne out of the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Organisation C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Person/ PD Culture</td>
<td>Person/Culture: everyone who works here needs to understand that from a PD perspective we will all develop, every day week month, we will face challenges together that we didn’t expect, we’ll face hurdles and we’ll also become very conscious of the political landscape and the frustrations of asking ourselves why does it need to be as difficult as it is why do we even exist in the first place, there’s a whole combinations of emotions skills and conversations and lots of things that go into it but at the same time if someone proves not to get it they’ll go. Context: Campaigning for whatever issue is hard. There are no two ways about it. Especially when coincided with lack of financing/pressures that come in - if we’re not an organisation that can completely be ourselves trust each other and carry a load if people need a little help. But equally recognise that there are opps for growth for all of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous work and Communication</td>
<td>Recruitment practice: Video Application to see the personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Right now we’re in a period of strategic review where the one thing we are doing is reflecting on last year and its within those reflections that you demonstrate where to concentrate going forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility and Down Time</td>
<td>Practice: Simple things like I don’t have a holiday chart... I obviously want to know when people plan to go away and have set times when they are off. People have a month off in summer, a 2 week in xmas, week in easter and autumn. Its quite a lot but I want people to have that down time. I want freedom flexibility and trust - we’re not coming together to sell trainers... we’re coming together to change the world. We need life balance, support and trust ppl work more and harder because we’re working towards outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing a culture as a team</td>
<td>Culture: Of course it’s easier when you start small but you have to get it right while you’re small because as you grow, and we will grow again next year there’ll be local elections and other elections but the plan is that everyone gets it now so that we do bring in new people the culture isn’t coming from me it’s coming from everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>the movement relies on each team progressing at the same time. Trust lies in responsibility and everyone understanding not meeting goals or uncover hurdles to tackle together then we’re not moving forward - team-wide each individual understands their roles are equally imp because if I cant do XYZ you cant do ABC. I think its nice actually - that no team can run forward without the other - we are very much interdependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>I need to be kept in check sometimes as we all do I need to make sure I create a space where I can be challenged and equally I can challenge them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record - Communicate - Reflect</td>
<td>I’ve asked everyone to try and write a little bit about where they are - little snapshots so maybe when we come to the shared space that we kick off next week they can demonstrate ‘wow’ im seeing progress or wow this problem is getting worse - 2 weeks ago it started as this now its added to this - so we’ve got foundations to work with and structure to break apart challenge and pick apart rather than just ‘this isn’t working’ and there’s no sort of journey of why it got there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Diversity it essential. When we need a dynamic and a culture that ripples from our team into society then as many view points and perspectives need to be considered. we need to be reflective of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>At BTB all about you as a person - I need people that feel empathy, that have grit and resilience, can find common ground with other communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary/Structure through Goal Setting - Autonomous on defining the path to get there - collaborative</td>
<td>The idea of being flexible is having a core goal for the year - a broad goal - mine is I want to achieve engagement and measure scale of impact. broad goals allow for flexibility and also empower the individual to have a landscape where they can take risk - there are certain parameters where within this and this - this is your world. Want people to take risk - we wouldn’t be where we are if we didn’t take risk. By perceptive the older risk is more tiring for me. If you can allow others to take risk you share the burden that comes with that. Each department is in charge of their role and outcome and we will all agree with them together and the people will get on with it. By making the plans together and setting goals together in an open env where if you say yes to it then its expected that you think you can do it and then equally it comes down to the individual to take us that next milestone by the time we need. Very much about team-wide distribution of plan making and strategy. I know what we want to do and how we get there is decided together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Team across boundaries

Research is run by a separate company that is youth led - they do the research. One of the Core Team employees is also the managing director of this research company. *In reality its like we're one big team. she is our in-house designer, but she runs her own company. Partnership is very much connected through a shared purpose - thats where the difference lies with more transactional partnerships. The guys that make the verto tool and design our website - we are basically partners - they are passionate about our cause.*

One of the Core Team employees is also the managing director of this research company. In reality its like we're one big team. she is our in-house designer, but she runs her own company. Partnership is very much connected through a shared purpose - thats where the difference lies with more transactional partnerships. The guys that make the verto tool and design our website - we are basically partners - they are passionate about our cause.

### Respond to changes

What we need to do is understand the system as it currently is and be willing and flexible enough to jump on things as and when.

### Distribution of coordination/processes

We’re not afraid to change things - *each year we define how we are going to work as a team - the process we stick to - the culture we want - its created each year as a team wide agreement - everyone brings the reflections and sets out what we want to do the next year and how we’re going to do - you get an element of everyone.*

We’re not afraid to change things - *each year we define how we are going to work as a team - the process we stick to - the culture we want - its created each year as a team wide agreement - everyone brings the reflections and sets out what we want to do the next year and how we’re going to do - you get an element of everyone.*

### Firing CE Team

7 employees - The team was running at a loss as it didn’t have a purpose outside of election time. Difficult to keep the team going. M is still in conversation with them. Two of them are applying for the new education lead the org is looking for.

### Example of self-organisation

So over the summers the RA team, they met with various partners NGOs stakeholders and just asked them what they needed, what was missing and how we could best work with them. We need resources we need more games. The RA prepared the template - what do we want to know and how do we find out. Find out what do we need to know to work with these big partners big reach and alumni and what would they want from us for us to accredit their young people and the other staff supported with it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Peter – Organisation D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Managing Volunteer Teams</strong></td>
<td>We have no staff members organising the event. We devolve a huge amount of our workload. They are part of a team like a management structure for that particular event. They have a committee, they meet socially, with the guidelines local teams do as much as they can and we provide best practice. Lots of facilitation but some instruction. So for the most part we are a facilitator and enabler that allows them to serve their community and get benefits out of it themselves. <em>Its almost as if all of HQ is there for them to be the best they can be and protect them from problems community has already learnt from.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td><em>&quot;Runners come because its free and easy and they do it once, twice, three times and eventually they start to realise actually this is much more than a physical activity and they start to build a bond and that bond... there is very little that we do to perpetuate that bond - <em>its because of the natural ethos of what we stand for and how we operate. So all our processes and procedures are around respecting people, giving them the right to do what they want to do, never criticise, making it really easy for them to do it and it builds a natural bond.</em> And then people realise that actually this is a wonderful thing how can I give something back? and they become a volunteer.&quot;</em> In terms of starting a CR Event &quot;very seldom do we go and pitch a parkrun, we wait for them to come to us. The principle is <em>we only ever have a parkrun where the community wants one</em> and the community is a factor of a lot of different things: people, land owner, council, running organisations - that community has to say they want one before they action it.&quot; Then as part of the initiation process, there are certain pre-requisites they have to satisfy for example: '(i) permission for using the land (ii) must be free (iii) you have at least 10 people on your team and all of these people need to read and agree to our event charter.&quot; Can't be started unless its community-driven, is organised by a team not an individual and that team aligns with the purpose and values of the organisation. The people who gravitate towards it are the people most likely to serve and want to be part of it. Its a self-fuelling prophecy that works very very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication - Intranet - Information the right tech for management and collab - tools they need to be self-sufficient</strong></td>
<td>When I talk about making sure that the whole organisations march in the same step it is not a very onerous thing but basically everything is published on our Intranet. slack is our current collaborative tool. There is also a lot of social media tools that we use. Within the UK there are 500 events, for every one of them there is a FB and a twitter feed. And then from the UK there is also a number of collaborative FB pages - one for the ambassadors, another for tourists (a community who go from event to event over the world) - there are numerous collaborative tools used in a forum type - we do not take a moderating role here. One more Tool: Web FMX: I originally built a tool called field management system. We re-wrote it around 2 years ago and it is now a web-based tool. These people have full access to everything around volunteers - set up give passwords email them and whole team - create a volunteer schedule identify people who volunteer vs those who don't - everyone gets recorded in the system, <em>one of our most important tools and a key differentiator for an org like us.</em> That tool together with our wiki and fb and staff like that is what allows them to do their jobs. All data is stored at HQ level - analysts and safeguarding and a number of other roles that are not replicated at country level. They call on these specialists to provide local offices with the data they might need. Example we want to write to all woman over 40 that have done at least 5 PR in Australia Data is centralised but accessible reporting is decentralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Event Charter: This is the thing we can hold them to account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility - Freedom - Boundaries</strong></td>
<td>It goes back to the beginning. It goes back to a very slow and methodical thought out process. As a result what we’ve been able to do is a combination of my will and desire to not over manage and allow people to be responsible for what they do and when somebody takes their responsibility too far to deal with it in an immediate and nice and friendly way. Boundaries are created at HQ - each country has some scope to adjust those but the whole ethos and principles come from the centre but then each country will look at their own situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure through shared purpose, ethos that builds a common identity and guidelines</strong></td>
<td>&quot;My view right from the word go was that the only way to do that is to be very clear on the principles and ethos and to be very verbose about the guides. What you’ll find is that there are very few rules but lots of guides. The rules are the ones that they can’t break and here are very few of them.&quot; <em>So that were you get boundaries with freedom. We get accountability and let them use initiative but softly encolse that so they dont overstep the mark.</em> Remember that they are trying to make things easy for teams - volunteers - save them time from learning and best practice.Give them the space to adapt and individualise to the extent they want to. And what we try to do is manage that in the most kind respectful way that we possibly can but not to ignore it because if you <em>don’t have structure things will go in any direction. People want to know what their boundaries are.</em> They will push against the boundaries and we need to understand when to push back and when not to. And thats the complex thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Each CR community is a complete self-sufficient community and that is what we are creating. no sorry, enhancing. Communities exist and we’re adding this new element that allows communities to be better it allows for more cohesion, it allows people to be less lonely, builds friendships and support structures that go on throughout the whole week that we are not even aware of. How does that work? It only works because of the good will of individuals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they get introduced facebook forums, they get access to wiki, they can constantly evolve, ask questions, train themselves and others in the team - this is the day to day stuff that goes on - they bring in new people and members on the team, they have little training sessions themselves, they ask for support from ambassadors they get it. Before they can start they have to go through these prereq and it's not just about how they build a team - they have to be part of an existing PR on 2 occasions and with at least one they have to be the team operating it. In addition there is hands on internal training. Probably the amb does the training - tech training for FMS etc.There is a series of activities that builds up - usually done by the local ambassadors

The staff are very close - specifically in each country but also between CM. There is a country manager for every country. Once a year we get together and have a conference and spend 4-5 days together. That is a close-knit thing so there is a lot of collaboration that goes on privately and officially. The meetings too. Within country the staff has a very close-knit team. Staff and volunteers is normally very collaborative.

Yes. It’s an amazing thing I am now not involved day-to-day and the point I felt I could do that is when people in the team felt like they owned the product, project and movement more than I did.

So the trust is an earned trust. It happens over a period of time. It starts with the fact that the introduction is soft fun engaging and pleasant - almost too true to be real. And then they build a stronger relationship and we help and assist.

Example 1: “In 2010 I was running the whole organisation, the whole of UK and all other orgs reporting to me and then I decided to give Tom Williams the role of looking after the UK and he has a huge amount to offer that I wasn’t doing. I was looking at the big things the strategic things. And as soon as he came in he started to look at the local organisation. Things we had done were great but weren't perfect and he quickly picked up on it and started to work on it. The operational processes in the UK are a huge way forward from when I was in charge in 2010. And now he's created processes and procedures that are now best practice for the rest of the world and is now focused of bringing countries up to the same level.” Example 2: When I hired the CEO I knew there were loads of things that he could do that I couldn’t do or that he could do better than me - sales and marketing etc.” “It is a thing of trust and respect. It is firstly an acknowledgment that everyone has something to give. And that very seldom is there just one way of doing something. That it doesn’t always have to be right. People can make mistakes and you should allow them to make mistakes. There should be a way for us to recover from the mistake, learn from it and that you dont want them repeated. Not everybody can be a leader some are better suited to leadership than others but just because one is good at leadership doesn’t mean that others who are less able shouldn’t also be involved in leadership - people can lead in their own way at their own particular time. I think my view of leadership is also less, not a power thing. I personally object to people who translate leadership into power. I worked in the US a lot and the organisations I worked in they were lots of very charismatic leaders and often it was very powerful and driven by - you must do it my way. I can see how that works and but it also shows that what it does is build teams that just want to follow not lead. I believe that there are so many people in this world that have something to give all we need to do is find a reason and way that they can express that. So thats what I always have tried to do. I also recognise that there are [also] some individuals in this world that are gifted and bring everyone in, let everyone be the best they possibly can. Give them some boundaries parameters and guidance but let people be the best they can be and be innovative. Sometimes innovate and sometimes its not. I've always been aware that there are loads things I do ok and that others do better. Never been concerned with giving that up.

example: CEO might engage in a conversation with an organisation to partner and he can take that quite far but at some point he has to bring it back to the board. Checklist of things we need to agree - these go back to our principles - if you can tick off that he hasn’t changed our principles then he can move ahead, if there are some principles that have been challenged then the board has will have to agree with those challenges - at least they have the conversation. Embracing the best that have and letting them take it but also having some checks and balances. [LDRSHIP]His Role: find people that are more people capable than you, really understand the principles and then just empower them.

But there is 12 years of me thinking I knew best - I built the process, technology, and I was deeply involved in almost every decision along the way and now I've said you take it and you run with it and they don't have to consult with me unless its a principle and then they have to come to the board and we go through it. Letting go was a massive wrench it started in 2010 when I handed over the UK - it took me 18 months to be settled with it. It left me with some difficult things I had to deal with - personal stuff and also working with staff. Now I've done it again and this time I really extracted myself. I was more prepared this time. What I've noticed is that bringing the CEO and see him working COO and the rest of the team - I can see that its not one person its a team - My issue was that an individual might come in and focus on building his own ego rather than focus on what is best for the movement and I see a lot of that has disappeared now and its more collaborative.

Example 1: One big issue with the organisation of our size and it being a mission driven organisation - people get engaged they fall in love and feel they need to make it better. We don’t want them to make it better we want to keep it simple. Example 2: Lets market this new event and drive more demand - no marketing for the first 6 months and let it grow organically and here you learn - you make mistakes but you have a smaller impact in this way. People went behind our back make posters not use brand - the brand is there to show we are kind gentle easy simple wonderfully friendly but when people do it for themselves you cant protect these things. For that we produced brand guidelines and made sure volunteer know that if they use things they can do so appropriately. And they produced an application for them to create posters etc but they are based on templates we prepared.
Appendix 7 – Excerpts from Participant Observation Field Notes

Thursday 1st September 9.15am Duke Street Office

J, S and M were already at the office. J and S were talking on the cushions and M was on his laptop in the co-working room - they were waiting for K. When K arrived S and M were discussing the new structure he drew on the board.

M then introduced the agenda of what he’d like the team to discuss: 1. G program that M was going through with Ashoka 2. Vision and Key changes that need to happen in the system for them to reach their vision 3. Build out a loose 5 year strategy.

M asked if we should do the beginning of the meeting in the park opposite the road. Everyone loved the idea. I introduced the G Accelerator Program that M is part of and on the kind of strategy he needs to prepare as part of the process. The reason why M asked me to do this was to share with the team the thinking behind the process and the strategy he has to create so that they can be part of it. This was mainly me speaking and S, J and K asking questions to clarify. K was listening but had one earphone in his ear. M would always check to make sure K’s attention was still there. We were all sitting on a big bench and J was sitting on the floor in front of the bench. J asked the most questions with the last one being ‘What can we do to help?’ Here M said we’ll start with the plans for today but then there may be other parts of the strategy prep that the team could be involved in and J could especially be available to help him prepare for the event in November.

We then went back into the office to discuss the overall vision of the organisation in terms of systemic change. This was a really collaborative process in which M did not in any way try to define it before they discussed together what it is that they want to achieve. He didn’t update them on what we discussed together on Tuesday and went through the process with them from the beginning. When asked, he said really wanted this to be a collective product in hopes that its ownership/responsibility is shared. It was an open discussion where everyone shared their views in terms of the ultimate goal they feel they are working towards. Everyone within the team contributed - there was no hesitation in showing disagreement - this actually helped towards refining the articulation of their vision. They very much fed off each other. There was a respect towards each other’s views and what drove any decision was always the idea of getting towards a shared understanding of what it is they ultimately want to achieve.

The vision was written and re-written around 7 times before they all agreed: XX empower and engage a generation of young citizens to lead change in society.

They then went on to listing the key steps needed in the system for them to get there - again this was a very similar process. M led both brainstorming sessions in the sense that he was the one standing near the board and trying to write down the ideas. But it was still very much a team discussion. You can also tell that the team didn’t hold back in disagreeing or challenging until everyone was happy with the outcome. For example J didn’t agree with saying the change needed in the media was towards responsible reporting in the sense that it might lead to censorship. K was saying that what he went with responsible is that journalists need to be clear when they are sharing facts or opinions. S also took the role of trying to time keep so that the team stay on track.
S proposed to use a table that split the strategy into different age groups of the young person and then a row for each year. K then proposed adding a last one with the overall learning they plan to achieve that may go across the age groups.

They then went on to discuss their 5 year strategy. They moved space for this and M asked who else wants to lead the discussion. I took the lead and stood up. I could be wrong but my interpretation is that he was sort of looking to them for permission in terms of what he writes. This was also very much a team contribution in terms of what the broader strategy for their 5 years is and very much linked to the previous conversations.

When asked M said he was really happy with the fact that everyone contributed to the session and was present and focused. He said that he felt a weight lift off his shoulders in terms of the fact that the responsibility wasn't just his anymore and that it was a collectively owned vision that very much came from everyone.

The next day he wanted to use the other strategy session to set out the overall objectives for the year [they are just starting year 2] and then the teams can go ahead and take the 'how' forward themselves. They also wanted to set a process in terms of what to record and what to communicate so that if mistakes or successes happen they can understand where things go wrong and fix or celebrate and record successes.

S then took over in terms of writing things out to share with G Advisory teams as she is strongest in terms of putting something clearly and organised on paper.

**Friday 2nd September 10:30am Duke Street Office**

I arrived at the same time as M - we walked in together and found S there in the coworking space. Each worked on their own tasks. M moved to write on the board how to communicate the overall strategy as what S sent M in the morning was too broad. At first he seemed to try question how this can be more easily explained and S said it depends how much you want said at once. Then M said maybe it is more constructive if I try first since I have it in my head and then you can alter and amend and improve.

M then left for meeting with a potential partner. I left for a personal errand at 11.30am and arrived back at 1.30pm just in time for the interview with the potential new digital lead - L. I introduced myself to L and the nature of my presence and told him that I have been observing the team but fully respect if he prefers to not have me observe - he is free to say so without need for any reason. He said he completely didn't mind having me around. M was late so S and K started without him. They all sat round the table in the coworking space and I sat on the floor in the corner so that they can forget I was there.

M and team thought that L will definitely be able to join just not full-time. They were looking for someone to lead the digital strategy with that sort of level of experience. S took the lead for the interview. L straight away told them that he will be working 9-5 with his current job at least till March as there are some projects he is implementing. This caught them by surprise as they were banking on him. S asked questions about his availability and what he sees as a possibility in terms of them still working together. This became the focus of the conversation. When M arrived he was also shocked and expressed he was angry they keep missing L. L said he can be around for light touch advisory work till March. S thanked L for his time and said they need to think about how it can work and get back to him.
When L left, the team were left a bit speechless. They were saying firstly how they shouldn't have banked on him and looked at other options just in case. M said he was angry at himself for not knowing better. S, K and M discussed whether there is anything they can do to work with him still. However even if they did find an arrangement where he could do a few hours a week advisory they still need someone else as digital lead. They have 2 social media apprentices starting on Monday hence the feeling of stress to find someone or a solution quickly. [40] So all of the mood in the room changed. It felt heavy. M seemed angry and consumed in thought.

In the meantime, J walked in from a meeting as the team was meant to have a strategy meeting. M asked if everyone was ready for the meeting. J mentioned that he had to prepare a brief on the 5 year strategy for an award they were pitching M for and he had to send in the brief by 4pm. It was around 3pm. He planned to do it with S and then they can all get onto the Year 2 strategy meeting, M and K wanted to know if they were needed. A conversation then happened where they were trying to understand why it was so last minute. J was told about it on Thursday by B from the PR agency. M said J could have written it first based on the discussion of Thursday were they laid out the 5 year strategy. J said he was right but he also knew he'd manage it with S after a 10 minute discussion. K and M then helped J with some keywords and content and then S and J finished the brief. In the meantime K and M prepared the role specifications to share on Monday, made a list of key targeted platforms to share it on. M started contacting people who may be interested/know people who would be. [41] M seemed like he was in a very bad mood. M went to get a coffee and said he needed some air. In the meantime J left for an event and S finished off some work. K and I got to discussing the strategy for 16-24 year olds as I was not sure I understood their 5 year outcome. This got us discussing that the outcome was actually effective participation based on the fact that formal participation through voting is not enough for youth to be meaningfully engaged in politics. Informal participation needed to be used and then valued by decision makers.

M came back and joined the conversation as K spoke about the ultimate outcome and how the strategy to get there was actually a behaviour change strategy [safe spaces off and online for politics] and one focused on breaking down systematic/policy barriers for effective engagement. This got M distracted and they moved to talking about the strategy for year 2 in more detail. This conversation was based on the outcomes discussed on Thursday. K lead the meeting here as they discussed what needed to happen and who was to lead between the education team, the digital team and the research team. They then also set the key goals of the core team for the year. This was a collaborative process where K took the lead based on his research with the research team. S took notes at the same time while K wrote on the board. The mood was light and friendly but focused. They laughed and joked in between discussions. K and M kept teasing S about how there were no working board markers. Once done M seemed in a much better mood. He said thank you to K and M for continuing with the meeting even though he was in such a foul mood and that he is grateful to have a team that keep him in check and challenge his reactions. [42]

They then moved onto talking about how to best communicate the overall strategy. M said he didn't want to distinguish between a digital and education strategy but instead call it an engagement strategy. I told him that I still called it a 2-pronged strategy in my notes however the 2 strategies were split by education (shift in curriculum) and application (16-24 yr olds) as that's where the strategy seemed different. M agreed and they shifted the approach. Over all the team agreed on the shift and they decided to call the education one 'political/citizenship education' and the second 'rebrand politics' in line with the behaviour change and breaking policy barriers discussed earlier. This
made the strategy clearer and way easier to articulate. It was much easier and quicker now for an external party to understand.

The team then fully relaxed and started talking about their weekend plans. M gave S two hugs and kept thanking her for all her support. S also mentioned how they will improve in terms of what to prioritise and filter out his messages. She referred to this as growing pains as the team redefined itself and how it will work together.