

Appendices to “Beyond Command and Control: Tensions Arising From Empowerment Initiatives” (by Van Baarle et al., forthcoming in: *Organization Studies*, 2018)

Appendix A: *Comprehensive explanation of the methods*

To answer the research question previously introduced, we draw on an in-depth case study in a large military organization. A case study approach serves to refine or develop theory on complex social phenomena such as power (Locke, 2001; Yin, 2013). Moreover, the research design employs both insider and outsider roles (Bartunek & Louis, 1996; Evered & Louis, 1981), allowing us to move beyond conceptual representations to explore how power practices co-exist, and how their dynamics give rise to tensions within organizations. A military setting is particularly appropriate for studying organizational power, as we argued in the Introduction. The insider-researcher has been employed in the organization for a long time and, in the context of this study, was thus able to work closely together with the informants, which resulted in many open interviews, talks and discussions.

The case organization

The empirical setting of this study is a large military organization, part of the Dutch Armed Forces, employing over 5,000 people. Since 2011 the highest ranking actors in this organization have stressed the need for empowering military personnel in order to face the complex challenges the organization is facing. This military organization needs to respond adequately to uncertain events as well as to continually changing priorities of the Dutch government and international bodies, while collaborating with many different partners in highly different and dynamic settings. The highest ranking Generals believe that these challenges require changes in established practices of decision-making and getting things done. Traditionally, decisions are made in the top of the hierarchy, both within the organization as a whole and within subunits. Also, many people in this organization consider operating in different collaborative settings (e.g. networks) across the organization’s boundaries as rather difficult and challenging. To better address these challenges, the Generals leading this military organization tasked the leaders of key projects to empower and engage many employees in their projects.

We selected two specific projects to collect narrative and other data. This focus on specific projects served to avoid that informants solely speak about what they *thought they did* in a rather abstract manner (cf. espoused theory), rather than what they *actually did* (cf. theory-in-use) (Argyris & Schön, 1974). Both projects took place in the same period. The first project, NEWOPS, aims at developing and implementing a more advanced operational concept. The second project, CONNECT, aims at improving the agility of the organization, making better use of the potential of its personnel, and improving the connectivity between people in the organization as well as between the organization and its surroundings. Appendix A provides

more detailed information about the two projects. In the next section, we will refer to three groups of employees: senior executives, project members, and other organizational members. The *senior executives* (Generals) are principals, sponsors or initiators of the two projects. The *project members* (mainly Officers) are responsible for running the projects; as such, they do not operate in isolation, because both projects aim to engage many *other members of the organization* (in total, involving about 5000 people). We will often use the term (key) ‘actor’ which either refers to an individual project member or senior executive or to a group.

Data sources and collection

We collected data regarding both projects in three stages, covering a four-year period. In this period, both projects raised a lot of discussion and dynamics. Deadlines were not met, collaboration between project members broke down, and personnel changes were frequent. We set out to develop an in-depth understanding of the power dynamics involved, by focusing on the interactions between senior executives and project members. The sources and uses of data are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Description of the data

Data types and dates	Amount and location	Use in analysis
<i>Participant observation</i>		
Change case NEWOPS (August 23, 2011 – June 4, 2013, 22 months)	33 pages of thick descriptions of critical incidents and reflections	Exploring dynamics in projects, developing themes, codes and concepts
Change case CONNECT (July 17, 2013 –January 2015, 19 months)	12 notebooks with field notes	
<i>Semi-structured interviews</i>		
15 interviews lasting between 43 and 123 minutes	326 pages (transcriptions of digital recordings)	Exploring dynamics in projects, developing themes, codes and concepts
2 focus group meetings	47 pages (transcriptions of digital recordings)	Triangulation of interview data and testing the credibility and plausibility of the findings
<i>Archival documents and reports</i>		
A variety of reports, speeches, vision statements and other documents	12 documents	Coded for insight into perspective of various actors, arguments, and strategies utilized to promote their views
<i>Focus groups and periodical meetings</i>		
Participation in focus groups and other meetings of facilitators, change professionals, and senior executives in the organization (May, 2014 – Feb, 2018)	Approximately 55 meetings, captured in field notes, thick descriptions, and a reflective journal	Triangulation of interview data and testing the credibility and plausibility of the findings

A primary source of data involves an extensive period of participatory observation (41 months in total), which we used to gain insight into the dynamics and power practices within and around the two projects. In later stages, the participant-observational data was also used for triangulation. In addition, we employed semi-structured interviews to enrich and triangulate our primary data by means of reflections from informants. In particular, the interviews focused on power-over and transformative power as our main theme. We also attended meetings periodically, in which we consulted participants to discuss and validate preliminary findings. Finally, we utilized archival documents such as project papers, speeches and presentations for triangulation purposes; some of these documents were used to explore whether the patterns and dynamics observed extend beyond the period of data collection.

Participatory observation. One of the authors contributed to this study as an insider-researcher. He first participated for 22 months in the NEWOPS project, and subsequently joined the CONNECT project for 19 months. This insider-researcher was employed as an internal advisor in the organization, where he was asked to participate in the team with an explicit focus on the organizational development aspects of the projects. As an insider-researcher, he participated in the day-to-day activities of projects, allowing him to keep notes, discover relevant themes and patterns, and to build relationships with senior executives, project members and other actors involved. This insider-perspective proved very helpful in obtaining rich interview data at a later stage of the study. The other authors contributed to this study in outsider roles. Following Bartunek and Louis (1996, p. 62), the insider and outsiders in this type of study “keep each other honest – or at least more conscious than a single party working alone may easily achieve.” The insider kept field notes (12 notebooks in total) and developed thick descriptions (33 pages) to describe and interpret critical incidents in and around both the projects (cf. Ponterotto, 2006).

Semi-structured interviews. We also draw on the detailed accounts of key actors, obtained from 15 in-depth interviews with 11 informants. Three informants are senior executives: the highest ranked officers including a Lieutenant-General and two Major-Generals, holding final responsibility for the entire organization. These informants were acting as either sponsor or principal of (one of) the two projects. Five other informants were high ranking officers, from Major-General to Major, who served in one of the two project teams. The three remaining informants, also project team members, are civilian employees acting as specialist internal consultants responsible for the development and execution of the project. All informants have substantial power-over based on their position in the organization and their assignment to increase the power-to of others. Table 2 provides more background information on the informants.

Table 2: Background of informants in this study

Informant	Background
<i>Senior executives:</i>	
Generals #1, #2, #3 (One Lieutenant-General, Two Major-Generals)	Generals are the highest ranking officers in the military. One of the generals in this study was the Commander-in-Chief of the entire military organization. His role can be compared with that of a CEO in a large corporation. He initiated and sponsored both projects. Two other Generals were, at the time of the interview, Second-in-Command of the military organization. Each of them acted as the principal for one of the two projects.
<i>Project members:</i>	
General #4 Officers #1, #2, #3, #4 Civilian employee #1, #2, #3, #4	The project members operated in two teams, each consisting of military as well civilian personnel. In the NEWOPS team, a project manager was appointed. The civilian employees are professionals with different backgrounds (e.g. law, policymaking, change management, management consultancy). The insider-researcher is also a civilian employee in the organization. He first worked as a member of the NEWOPS project team for 22 months, and subsequently for the CONNECT project team for 19 months.

Through participatory observation, we were able to identify different and sometimes opposing voices within each team regarding key decisions and challenges. We included these different perspectives in the selection of the above informants. The majority of the interviews were conducted in 2015. During these semi-structured interviews, individual informants were first invited to tell their story regarding the project they were involved in. They were asked to tell their own version of the processes they were or had been part of (Rouleau, 2010). Where necessary, the interviewer would ask follow-up questions for clarification. Interviews were conducted until they did not provide us with any new insights compared to previous interviews and the information obtained from other data sources. The duration of the interviews varied between 43 and 123 minutes. Every interview was recorded and transcribed.

Focus group meetings and attendance in periodical meetings. In the second half of the participatory observation period, the insider-researcher frequently attended meetings of a network of (team) coaches and change professionals in the organization. We also conducted two focus group meetings with a similar group of professionals to validate and discuss our preliminary findings. These meetings provided additional opportunities to validate the themes, dynamics and patterns emerging from our initial analysis—from the perspective of practitioners that were (or had been) involved in a large number of other projects in the same organization.

Data analysis

The data analysis consists of several steps, drawing on coding procedures developed by Miles and Huberman (1994). First, we analyzed the field notes, thick descriptions and interview transcripts, using (first-level) open coding to explore power practices and dynamics in the two projects. Second, we used second-level codes to label power-over and transformative power

acts and practices. The resulting patterns suggest that organizational actors typically have an individual power stance. This represents their inclination (i.e. relative position) toward power-over or transformative power, as displayed by how organizational actors typically act or how they talk about what type of power they deem appropriate. Further analysis revealed that specific tensions emerge from the co-existence of, or shifting between, both power practices. Such tensions manifest themselves between and within actors, and were coded accordingly. The two focus group meetings served to further refine the coding scheme. Table 3 provides the final coding scheme, including definitions and representative quotes.

Table 3: Final coding scheme, definitions and representative quotes

<i>Concepts</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Illustrative quote</i>
Power-over	Expressions or actions that imply that one (small group of) actor(s) has more power than others. Often one or a few 'active' actors(s) describe(s) what more or less 'passive' others (i.e. recipients) should have done or should be doing. (Adapted from: Dahl, 1957)	<p>“And that’s what I find sad about the work, the endless facilitating that we don’t gain anything from and we don’t learn from. And truly, I’m wholeheartedly convinced that you need to educate that [group of actors].” (Officer #1)</p> <p>“Look, you can nitpick all you want, but when a certain rank asks something of a lower rank, that’s the same as a kind yet urgent request to do so.” (Officer #2)</p>
Transformative power	Expressions or actions that enable others to participate, share ideas, or influence decision making (i.e. stimulate or seduce employees, other than management or just the few at the top, to participate). (Adapted from: Hosking & Pluut, 2010; Wartenberg, 1990)	<p>“And particularly things where you have to create moments in organizations from which you can indeed share a happening, an experience, take a next step and make choices.” (General #3)</p> <p>“If you all agree to discuss the work, what your joint responsibilities are and what you can contribute, this will result in a different kind of conversation.” (General #1)</p>
Tensions within	<p>Inconsistencies between an actor’s power cognition (expression) and action. Cognitions refer to the way actors describe their beliefs about what is ‘real’ to them. Actions refer to (i) how the actor X describes what his actions were in a specific situation or (ii) what another actor Y testifies regarding the actions of actor X.</p> <p>Inconsistencies also emerge (iii) inside individual cognition, for example when an actor expresses an interest in transformative power (enabling power-to), yet creates a passive/active binary between active agents and passive recipients (reflecting a power-over stance).</p>	<p>(i) An actor believes (cognition) he is approaching a project in a transformative manner: “The method of change is to work in an organically incremental way and what that means is that you try things, discuss with others the lessons that you learn and also make sure there’s enough room for reflection from the shop floor, from among the people affected, where you want to implement change. That they can reflect on what is happening to them or how they feel about it and that you then factor their views into your final view of what the organization should look like.” (General #4)</p> <p>Yet when he describes what he is doing (action), a power-over image emerges, resulting in a tension within: “Just get that movement started and if you let your people dangle a little bit they will soon start to do all sorts</p>

<i>Concepts</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Illustrative quote</i>
		<p>themselves, all sorts of dodgy constructs will appear” (General #4)</p> <p>(ii) An actor believes he is balancing between giving direction and leaving space for others (cognition): “And, what I usually consider a normal way of changing things is to get people on board and involve them, and discuss things with them and as a result come to a suggestion together. Of course you direct this process but it is definitely something that for a large part comes from the people themselves.” (General #2)</p> <p>Yet, his actions are (perceived as) not giving direction at all: “‘It was like a wheelbarrow filled with frogs all wanting to go in their own direction. And there was nobody at the helm. Everybody could do as they pleased.’ [General #2 was in charge of this team] (Officer #3)</p> <p>(iii) “And, what I usually consider a normal way of changing things is to get people on board and involve them ...” (General #2)</p>
Tensions between	Relational tensions that emerge between actors who represent different power stances.	<p>I didn’t feel the need whatsoever to speak to anyone here or from management about this. There was no point, because they weren’t even on the same page. Internally it was clear that we weren’t on the same page either, and also that that was no longer achievable. Two individuals had taken a clear stance: ‘I do what I want. End of discussion.’ That’s when I thought: that’s it, I’m done. I chose the law of energy preservation, in the sense that I attempt to prevent myself from going crazy in this place and see how I can do at least something useful. Because we were supposed to write an evaluation at the end of the year, which left us with two, three months to get something down on paper. Or so it seemed at that moment in time. (Officer #3)</p> <p>[...] but that has led to countless clashes in which the directorate’s policy advisor that had to take it on was like ‘what the hell has now been dumped on my desk?’ [...] yeah, while we actually brought them something they hadn’t asked for. So they saw it as extra work that had been forced upon them all of a sudden. (Civil #1)</p>

Appendix B: Background on the projects NEWOPS and CONNECT

Project NEWOPS

The NEWOPS project aims at developing and implementing an advanced operational method. In this respect, the Royal Netherlands Marechaussee (RNLM) had to make a transformation from “bound by territory to governed by intelligence led policing”. The RNLM was organized geographically consisting of five large units (each ranging between 600 and 1500 employees), a central support staff, and an education and training unit. Each of the commanders (colonels) of these units worked relatively autonomously. Each commander was believed to do what was right in his specific geographical region, yet prioritizing and doing what was right on a national level was perceived as rather complex, and collaboration beyond the borders of these units was thus an enormous struggle.

To resolve these issues, highest ranking generals embarked on a large project, with a lot of management/executive attention, and with outcomes that targeted the whole of the organization. More specifically, the NEWOPS project team had to coordinate activities that led to:

- develop better intelligence to improve the operational effectiveness of the RNLM; and
- restructure the organization, dissolve the large geographical units, and create a new national tactical command that can directly task smaller subunits and teams.

Besides these project goals targeting the structure of the organization, senior executives continuously stressed that this was (also) an organizational development initiative. Employee empowerment was considered to be key. Thus guidelines were formulated (a leaflet named ‘The RNLM method’) about the way the content in these projects had to be delivered. Employee involvement, interaction and dialogue were seen as essential ways to transform the organization. This approach had to result in, or include, experimenting with novel practices and ‘playfully’ discovering new ways to get things done. These guidelines must be regarded as a ‘visionary statement’ about the way projects and other forms of organizing and change performed, and thus were applicable to both of the projects.

Project CONNECT

In contrast with the top-down oriented NEWOPS project, CONNECT started as an initiative from employees who felt that the organization would benefit from other ways of working. They thought that the traditional way of working within clear structures and decisions (only) being made by the highest ranking officer inhibited making better use of the potential of large groups of employees. Furthermore, they believed that ‘knowledge’ (in terms of practices, academic insights, societal developments) from outside the RNLM was not adequately picked up and transferred to improve the processes and practices within the RNLM. The Commander in Chief appreciated their initiative and endorsed their activities. Given that the RNLM needs to respond adequately to, for example, terrorism, migration, and natural disasters, it needs to be able to cope with continuous reprioritizing by the Dutch government and international (e.g. UN) bodies as well as collaborate in highly different and dynamic settings, both internally and externally.

Because of these developments, the traditional way of organizing and changing is increasingly being questioned and challenged. The Commander in Chief felt that these challenges require different ways of engaging in decision-making and getting things done. In light of these developments and pressures, he believed that the CONNECT initiative would help developing organizational capabilities instrumental to dealing with the before mentioned challenges. The initiative of two employees became a project team with five employees. They were given full autonomy and only had to adhere to one

guiding principle, their activities needed to be ‘in line with the general development direction of the organization’ (including ‘The RNLM method’ as described above).

Appendix C: Actors' relative positions on the power-over / transformative power continuum: Codes, concepts and representative quotes per actor

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
1. General #3	Mainly transformative power	In contrast with his main power stance, this General does experience a dilemma between giving direction (by setting boundaries) and letting go.	This tension within this informant appears to give rise to tensions between him (as the one in command) and the project members.
Illustrative quotes	<p>What intrigues me is that he, that's what I think, has as one of his central themes that you don't change by writing fat books about it but by doing things together. And particularly things where you have to create moments in organizations from which you can indeed share a happening, an experience, take a next step and make choices.</p> <p>Of course this is incredibly postmodern, but the main point is that together you'll get further, by using that space and that trust and by being connected. And of course in an executive organization like ours, things have to be done together.</p> <p>And if you believe that from a distance I can define your task in such a way that you automatically do the right thing - I consider that to be a dangerous fiction.</p>	<p>Look, if I look at that change to which I just referred, from information-based, from area-based and information-driven, that story still stands. But what you see is that people sometimes take a turn to the right or to the left. And I had expected, perhaps a bit vainly, that that would occur less often than it actually did. At the same time I realize that this is also part of the process that you are in together, to discover what the right and left boundaries of this story are.</p> <p>No it's more about how many people can use that story so to speak, to lead, to be led. [...] you need a course, and over time a course can change, in the beginning it's okay for it not to be set in stone, and it should offer a wide range of openings, but it has to be clear in which direction it is heading. Slowly but surely it shouldn't become narrower as a course, but it does have to gain an increasingly concrete interpretation in order to tell people exactly what is expected of them. And this doesn't have</p>	<p>'He [General #3] is all about space, trust and connection. If that trinity is there, you will have roughly all the space you need because he has complete trust in you. But if you then look at an [General #4] for instance, who time and time again betrays this trust, he isn't the type of person that acts on this and in his view within this space things can go wrong and the person should be allowed to make these mistakes because he has been given the space. If the result then turns out not quite to be as he had expected, you just have to accept that' (Officer #1)</p>

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
		to take place on day one, but it does at some point. And this does require direction.	
2. General #4	Mainly power-over	In contrast with his main power stance, this General values different viewpoints (associated with transformative power). Furthermore, his cognitions show an appreciation for a variety of change interventions based on different power assumptions (blue based on power-over, white on transformative power, and the other colors somewhere in between), yet his actions (perceived by others) display one dominant style: power-over.	Others only describe his dominant power-over style and the resulting rise of relational tensions.
Illustrative quotes	<p>Acceptance of the formal power can only exist on the basis of the fact that it is also respected as the formal power, so you have to do something to achieve this. [...] but the best thing is when people themselves have the impressions that they are at the helm, and that you see them do things that we more or less had meant for them to do.</p> <p>Just get that movement started and if you let your people dangle a bit they will soon start to do all sorts themselves, all sorts of dodgy constructs will appear, with which you will have to rework later</p>	<p>Within Defense we are inclined to use ourselves as examples, and to then, sort of, surround ourselves with clones. Self-awareness, well let's just say that's an area that needs some work. If you don't organize these reflective capabilities around you, then you get caught up in your own web of thoughts and you are always right. [...] Who am I going to win this battle with...how will I get things done? I'm often inclined to arrange a bit of opposition, because I know I need it, somebody to contradict me, that when this isn't the case I just bulldoze over everything.</p> <p>Look, some changes require blue interventions, others green, red, maybe even white. [...] So sometimes, all on my lonesome, I wonder how we get things moving, then I think in terms like that.</p>	<p>And what I find interesting is that I think you can perfectly well shake people up a bit and wake them up [for example] we as this department just sat here listening to the vision and we hadn't even given this any thought ourselves. That's pretty embarrassing that you are a directive department [...] But there is also a group that was sort of like 'Who does this guy think he is?' and who actually pulled out at the idea of it. (Civil employee #2)</p> <p>On another occasion, at Schiphol, he also lost his temper. I said: 'General #4, fine if you have your own ideas about how you want to position a brigade commander, but you should know that before you arrived agreements had been reached and there is a plan in place for what the role of brigade commander should come to look like. If</p>

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
3. General #1	Mainly transformative power	Strikingly when I interviewed him he stated: "I could discover nothing new in this method of dialogue, interaction and participation – we have always worked like that." Yet, when he no longer was part of the project, and in the meantime had been promoted to deputy commander of the organization, we were with some people preparing him for to give to an outside party. He only about this uniqueness of the project he had been responsible for, and how everyone was so engaged because of the dialogue and the interaction. (insider-researcher) In contrast with his main power stance, at times this General creates an active-passive binary between executives and lower ranked personnel who need to be engaged with executives ideas or need to participate (implying he has more power than others)	you want to go changing that, you'll have to go through the [First in command of the entire organization] He nearly exploded. (Officer #1) N/A
Illustrative quotes	If you all agree to discuss the work, what your joint responsibilities are and what you can contribute, this will result in a different kind of conversation. (General #1) What I said just now, is something that is essentially top down. However, just as important is addressing the issues that are raised at the shop floor, which have consequences for the actions of the ones in top of the organization.	We need to step things up a to get people involved from within the brigades and the teams, particularly in this phase, now that it really matters On the other hand, what we are trying to realize with the NEWOPS project is to have this concept find its way down to shop floor level.	

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
4. General #2	Mainly transformative power	In contrast with his main power stance, at times this General creates a passive-active binary. Furthermore, he experiences tensions between giving direction and letting go. Others perceive his actions differently: as giving no direction at all.	The tension between cognition and action also gives rise to tensions between the one in command and the project members. Furthermore, relational tensions arise because the ones with a transformative power preference appreciate other types of behavior (e.g. listening instead of convincing).
Illustrative quotes	<p>To just show that sometimes it can also be achieved by a different approach. There's a small group of people that do things and without you having to direct them or whatnot things still happen in the organization [...] You don't need a load of structures and things like that to get the job done.</p> <p>I'll get members of the NEWOPS project team stood at my desk: 'General #3 has said that... [...] so we have to do what General #3 says'. I said: 'but if all of us think it should be done differently, we could also approach (General #3) and say something like, yeah, you might have said so, but we don't think it is the best idea?' Talks like this happen now and again, and not with the lowest levels either. But it is taken as gospel because <i>the</i> commander has told us what to do and we should do it.</p>	<p>And, what I usually consider a normal way of changing things is to get people on board and involve them.</p> <p>When I would tell him (General #2) that if he didn't do something about the composition of the project team or speak to us as a group about what his expectations were [instead of speaking to me one on one about this], he would scrunch up his face, twist and turn in his chair and say something like I don't want to or I can't do that. (Civilian employee # 4)</p> <p>At the end of the day if you just look, like, well I think that it's like this in every organization, that hierarchy does just play an important role. [...] And what the commander says just goes.</p>	<p>And this was complicated further because the General #2 actually didn't give any direction whatsoever and didn't ask: 'What are you doing? Why are you doing that? And how do you plan to continue?' Or something like that. Or: 'Why are you choosing this topic?' Nothing whatsoever. (Officer #3)</p> <p>Well, listening [...] military personnel aren't very good at listening. In the [highest management team] everybody tells their own story and nobody poses any questions. [...] nobody asks me what do you mean exactly, or you say this, but how do you see that happening?</p>
5. Officer #1	Mainly power-over	N/A	The power-over mentality leads to tensions between actors working in the same project, and undermines collaboration with others willing to

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
Illustrative quotes	<p>He (officer 4#) would at times also talk about it: ‘how flexible are you yourself?’ or ‘does this mean you are also open to other ideas or other approaches to get something done?’. I would reply: ‘I know I am known to be steadfast, I won’t deny that, but what matters at the end of the day is that if you have a different idea, that you’ll have to be able to convince me and that that other idea leads to a result that fits in the picture as we have it planned and if that’ll work, then it’s fine by me, but if you come to me with some bullshit story and I’m expected to believe that, it’s not gonna happen’. That’s who I am, in a nutshell.</p>		<p>contribute to the project, but not in terms of power-over. Yes. Officer #1 regularly used to shout “I am the boss, I am your master.” I told him a dog has a master. I said at the most you can ask me to contribute to something. I told him I have one boss and in this case that is the General #1. I take my orders from him, not from you... this was an incredibly drawn-out battle. (Officer #2) I said: ‘You have a role to fulfil, it’s not your one-man show. You [not a participant in the study] are in this programme and within it you have a role to fulfil, so get doing it straight away.’ He was going to but in the end he didn’t do it. Knowledge of this made its way back to me and I had a man-to-man conversation with him about it. He was so pissed off that he refused to work under me any longer and then he left.</p>
6. Civilian employee #1	<p>Mainly transformative power</p>	<p>The civilian employee reflects on his behavior and is aware that at times his power-over actions were not in line with his transformative power cognitions.</p>	<p>He also reflects on the difficulties of conducting a transformative power project in a context that has a strong tradition in power-over. Because of this contrast, they met a lot of negative judgements of the project when they were starting up. Furthermore, tensions become visible when others act from a power-over stance, and those actions involve him. For example, he feels that new members are added to the team in a power-over style, and start acting in a power-over style, which results in a struggle over who is in control.</p>

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
Illustrative quotes	<p>Well we initially felt like we should get to know the organization better. That's how we started out. Because of course we had been around a while, myself for years and my colleague a bit shorter, but we were in the staff. You rarely get on the shop floor. And if your assignment is then to strengthen the connection internally and with the outside world, well then let's start with getting to know our own organization a bit better. So we started working frequently on the shop floor, regular shifts. Joining the [operational taskforce], you know, [do something]</p> <p>Yeah, as I just mentioned, at one point it started to run its own course, people had heard of us and would approach us asking can you come and see us or how should we approach a certain matter.</p>	<p>Yes, [we gave] a presentation [there], saying well this is what we do, and we're here to help you. Most people had a sense of 'what for, I don't need help from you, what do you mean I don't have a connection with my people and my surroundings? My connection is just fine with my own people and the surroundings.' So that work just fell on deaf ears. And in hindsight perhaps I understand why, you know. Because it is a bit of a strange message, two civvies, telling a management team full of military personnel that they're completed detached from their own organization and the outside world and we can help them with this.</p>	<p>What I found tricky was that on the one hand you have all the space you need, but that on the other the support was very limited. General #3 did say to us 'don't speak about the basis of support; what it's about is your right to exist, yes or no?'</p> <p>It was a very unpleasant conversation, in which he [not a participant in this study] also firmly positioned himself as our boss: it had been fun what we had done up to that point, but it was actually meaningless and we would now start for real. This was also the sense we got from Officer #3, that, hey, it's been fun all that messing around in the margins you've been doing up to now. While we had been doing our best that entire time, and had also endured massive amounts of crap being flung at us. [...] So yeah, that didn't get off to a good start. And it just never improved.</p> <p>Yes, [large organizational entity where they attempted to intervene] was the biggest disaster, but also [other location] and [yet another location] . I didn't leave there with very warm feelings. I thought, well, before everybody loathes us completely, let's just stop this. And let's just start doing things.</p>
7. Officer #2	Mainly power-over	N/A	Relational tensions arise as a result of the power-over style in which the NEWOPS was run.

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
Illustrative quotes	<p>What I think this organization is really lacking is discipline. Personnel are not capable of taking orders, unlike those in the field. When the General #1 gives an order to his [commanders next in line], and this order has to be communicated down the ranks, you'll have him that say, before they've even left the room, that's all well and good what he wants but that's not what we're going to do.</p> <p>See, just to come back to that own kingdom. What I thought was the most striking example, [...] I personally visited all the commanders. In order to, so to speak, spread the message of the [unit] at the time and the ideas we had.</p> <p>'And what would then happen when you're in one of those rooms saying your piece, introducing your plan and trying to discuss it, or discussing it?' (Civil employee #4) Well you'd receive very little response. You don't get any response until you call for a break and start talking to the people out in the hallway. And there you hear yeah, no this won't work that way. And you're bombarded with all sorts of sophisms about why it won't work, and when I explain and show them that it does work because I've done the same in the past, for a different employer, all you hear is yeah, no but that's there, that won't work for us.</p>		<p>And what you notice is that a number of members start to get very frustrated by the choices enforced by us, by the NEWOPS project, that are unworkable and that is now coming forward in that inquiry they are doing.</p> <p>Well, the problem in the intervening period is actually very easily summarized. There was a deadline for certain things to be done. Dates were communicated by the staff without any form of coordination. For instance; when does the inquiry capability, when does it have to be ready? Well, 2013 on 24 July. I was told a week beforehand. And to add to that it would be at least another year before all the devices and equipment we needed would arrive. And this results in mismatches in the expectations management from the higher strategic level. There's the operational people on the ground and then there's us in between, or me, us, I see it as a we thing, we are stuck in between. We're asked, from above, to deliver something, which you can't because you don't have the means and below you they have an expectation because the upper level has communicated this as such and that's when the cogs begin to spin. And that's where you get stuck, ground up between the two sides of expectations. Those intervening years were basically one struggle after the next, going from door to door to, as it were, find support.</p>

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
8. Officer #3	Between power-over and transformative power	N/A	This informant talked about how (extreme) positions of power-over lead to relational tensions, as well as how (extreme) positions of transformative power have a similar effect. Furthermore, the collaboration attempts between members of the two different projects applying two completely different power styles resulted in strong tensions between actors, and as a result collaboration broke down.
Illustrative quotes	<p>This applied to me and to a certain extent to a colleague [not an informant in this study]: we made contact with the chain. We were somewhat service- or demand-oriented. And we had our own ideas within our field of expertise which we were willing and able to work with, for instance with those instruments. We wouldn't bother the entire organization with this.</p> <p>A different aspect that arose had to do with those who were with the NEWOPS project that had a programme office at the time. The fear was that the programme office would tie down everything so securely that we would simply not create any room for employees and managers to really use their knowledge of the context and the personnel to make decisions.</p> <p>So I had my doubts about it and on the other hand I was sort of intrigued that so much</p>		<p>The other three preferred to do mostly their own things. One of those things was a sort of growth diagram that I made based on what was being brought forward. I then emailed it to everyone and at a certain point put it into practice with a customer. After that I took the flak from almost everybody for doing that. Well that was the end of it as far as I was concerned. Because it had taken me a lot of effort to go ahead and get that group together anyway, knowing that it was near impossible: it was like a wheelbarrow filled with frogs all wanting to go in their own direction. And there was nobody at the helm. Everybody could do as they pleased.</p> <p>I remember that Officer #3 and I as members of the project attempted to make contact with the NEWOPS project, which the rest of CONNECT wanted to steer clear of; contact with them would be too risky. Officer #3 and I had various conversations with people from CONNECT. The mood only got darker. There came a point when I</p>

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
	freedom was given to one group within the organization. And as a result I want in on these types of things.		quit. Officer #3 was the POC and spoke with them regularly. Officer #3 became increasingly disillusioned. 'NEWOPS only sees us as an extra pair of hands, switch on switch off, do as I say now, I'll have a job for you.' (Civil employee #4)
9. Civilian employee #2	Between power-over and transformative power (E.g. the informant first creates a passive/active binary (power-over), yet at the same time relativizing it)	N/A	This employee reflects on how the development of the organization in the direction of transformative power collides with existing organizational arrangements, resulting in relational tensions between actors. Another type of tension arises when a move into the direction transformative power results in actors wondering what the relational and individual consequences may be, if you were to really open up.
Illustrative quotes	<p>Because, see, a change, most people don't want to change. It's that sense of reservedness a bit, and letting go of things that are familiar. It's a hurdle people that people need to take. So at the beginning we thought, right, we're going to have to keep explaining why we're doing things and guiding people through the process. And it's only logical for there to be a bit of resistance and that's not a bad thing, because it's better to have a bit of resistance than that people just, well actually throw in the towel, because then you've lost them entirely.</p> <p>But you do in fact need a good manager who will talk to people if they are not performing well or who will coach them to help them</p>		<p>We want a more inventive organization, more space for the employee. And that conflicts a little with the current hierarchy.</p> <p>Well, I think that what we're arguing for is indeed a certain type of vulnerability in people. You just want people to... I think to empower yourself and to be able to achieve something as a team, you have to be able to do something to create a team. But to truly be a team, you have to be able to trust each other. And it's obvious that there's more to that; yeah, wait a minute, to what extent.... how far does that reach? How safe am I really? And to what extent can this be used against me in the future? See that's already an interesting paradox if you ask me.</p>

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
	<p>progress, who does have a vision and can plot a course. This means leadership is still incredibly important, just not in the sense of ‘I am some sort of control freak-type manager’. [The essence of that true ambition is] to break free from hierarchy some more. Let’s just summarize it that way. Empowerment.</p>		
<p>10. Civilian employee #3</p> <p>Illustrative quotes</p>	<p>Mainly power-over (e.g. the informant displays a strong need to close down variety by unifying and modeling in contrast with openness for different perspectives, implying power-over). While if you ask me, just make a simple model out of it. Just one group that has responsibility over all those HR points and that can initiate the actions. So you’d have one forum that you manage and they would forward the actions to the people who can actually work on them.</p> <p>How do you then make sure that even though you have these dreams of things being worked out better to the various levels and... you still have the question of, how do you transfer this?</p> <p>Well, it starts with convincing them that all three have to take a seat at the table. [...] From within the [unit] we’d like to see things dealt with integrally. This, however, does mean that we are often sort of the initiator of these kinds of things.</p>	<p>In contrast with his main power stance, he is struggling with the balance between giving direction and leaving room to others.</p> <p>Is that the direction theme, and I mean direction not in the sense of Command & Control, but rather direction of what we are doing and what has always been a central theme and if you ask me remains one till this day. Claiming you want to give people space, while at the same time expecting some sort of scheduled change. Because that’s just how it is: you have to stick to the schedule, whether it’s about the timeline or money or any other framework you could possibly think of.</p> <p>There’s a sense of tension. You see, if you let children play outside and there’s no fence around the playing field they’ll probably stay within a very small area. And if you were to indicate some rough boundaries, then they’ll at least try to find their space and creativity a lot more within those boundaries then if you were to say ‘there are no boundaries’. We’d then be</p>	<p>Yet, the way others perceive his actions support his main power stance, and show how this attitude results in tensions between the two projects, and hindering collaboration within the organization.</p> <p>When we had that really strange session with Civilian Employee #3 who out of the blue started ranting about all the assignments she would be giving us. We would practically be working for her. It turns out she does this more often, so perhaps that has more to do with her as a person. It got me thinking, I’m not going to do anything for you. [...] I thought that NEWOPS project, we need to get rid of it as soon as possible. (Civilian employee #1)</p>

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
	<p>Yes, I think it's a good thing that if you have that dream to then together try and figure out what that actually means on each level of the organization.</p> <p>[...] that dream and all the organizational proposals that result from it</p>	<p>left with a tiny piece. And they won't go out and network, they won't leave those boundaries. Because who knows what might be out there.</p>	
11. Officer #4	Mainly power-over	However, this officer experiences tensions in finding the right balance between giving direction and leaving room for others.	He perceives senior executives' intention to move beyond power-over to be in conflict with the directions (incl. time pressure) he has been given.
Illustrative quotes	<p>What I'd really wanted was something along the lines of our own communication specialist as part of the program [...] How are we going to change the emphases, how are we going to sell this or how are we going to get this through to the people?</p> <p>The program office's battle doesn't matter, I said no I don't get to decide anything but the..., but the ... was extremely divided on some points. We used the game for this purpose to get them back on track a bit,</p> <p>Yeah, he would say do this, do that. We were supposed to jump into action. We were nagging a bit about it and tried to convince him of other things that were perhaps also important. But he wasn't having any of it. So I suppose how it all went down was mainly interesting. (Officer #3)</p>	<p>It's ok for you to want something, as [managerial role] for instance you'd have ideas and ask yourself but is this the right way to go about it? Should I push on or take a step back?</p> <p>I don't see it as being wrong, it's just that if you say well from my role as [anonymized] I thought that it was actually complicated enough and that enough players were doing things already, it turned out to be very difficult to keep all those frogs in the wheelbarrow because at one point everybody thought that they could just do anything.</p>	<p>Yeah, of course when it comes to this, I've also spoken to General #3 and General #2 about this, you're asking the impossible of this organization because it is of course a 'do as you're told' organization. You say give me an assignment, I'll carry it out and all of a sudden you're asking people to be creative and to come up with solutions themselves. They're not used to that. The idea of giving them space to learn and work out their ideas wasn't in line with the time pressure that was on all this though. It all had to be done quick, quick, quick. If you want something fast you don't have time to allow people to make mistakes and to try things out. For trial and error. That had been the idea. People will discover the truth themselves.</p>

	A. Main power stance	B. Tensions within	C. Tensions between
12. Civilian employee #4 (insider-researcher)	Mainly transformative power	In contrast to his main power stance, this employee struggles with balancing between taking space (power-over) and giving space (transformative power). And, at times he engages in power-over types of behavior.	He has experienced struggles between actors representing different power styles in both projects (within the teams, between the teams, between the teams and other actors, and between the project members and the senior executives).
Illustrative quotes	<p>I'm pretty good at keeping my mouth shut. I like to observe, to listen and to consider my options before I act. What I notice next is that people will use this relative silence to generate all sorts of ideas.</p> <p>I'm not going to waste my time and energy on this, it just drains me. So I had this little personal rule in my head 'I'm willing to brainstorm and participate, but I'm not going to force myself into the process, I'll only work with people who want to work with me'. This mantra was a real game changer for me.</p>	<p>Keeping my mouth shut does have a flipside though. Sometimes I also need to just say something, take a stance. I struggle to find balance there, between arguing and researching, giving space and taking space, particularly in the military context.</p> <p>I do though find myself being very normative at times. It would seem to be something of a moral thing. If the way something is being handled doesn't sit well with me, I'm not getting involved. If you're not even capable of what I consider decent communication, then you can sort it out yourself. Then I don't even want to work together with you.</p>	<p>During my time being involved in both projects I witnessed great amounts of conflict. In the first project it was a conflict about how I as a change professional could contribute something with the knowledge I have of these types of projects in a team full of people who think in terms of blueprints, changing others, managing opposition etc. To add to that the project team was flailing: everybody who had been there voluntarily left over the course of a few months. The situation in which the head of the project entrusted his wishes to me but was not willing to intervene in the project himself didn't make things easier.</p> <p>I took the conflict in the second project less to heart. After a number of failed attempts to work together as a team I drew my conclusions. People were working in coalitions of sorts and everybody just did their own thing. My 'take it or leave it' stance towards the NEWOPS projects meant I wasn't hassled by the conflict going on between those two projects at the time.</p> <p>From tension within General #1, to tension between: In one of my periodical meetings with General #1 he told me that he felt it was time to place</p>

A. Main power stance**B. Tensions within****C. Tensions between**

leadership back on the agenda. I called my colleague from the facilitation network, really into coaching and leadership development, to tell him there was an opportunity for us to connect our activities with the one in Command. I noticed cynicism and holding back. My colleague gave some examples in which he felt that General #1 did not do what he claims to be standing for. This appeared to annoy him in such a way that he would rather not get engaged and find some way to connect our ideas with those in command and work from there.
