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ABSTRACT

The Canadian Ski Patrol (CSP) Calgary Zone is one segment of a national volunteer-driven organisation of first-aid providers. In recent years, the number of active patrollers in the CSP Calgary Zone has declined while client expectations of service levels have not. Within the bounds of the Royal Roads University (2011) Research Ethics Policy, and through the use of an online survey and an open space technology session, this action research inquiry determined some of the ways in which the CSP Calgary Zone might enhance its organisational adaptability to ensure its future viability. Study results indicated a high latent potential for organisational adaptability within the CSP Calgary Zone. Overarching recommendations included (a) initiate service model discussions with clients and constituents; (b) examine organisational structures related to policies and processes; and (c) create a volunteer development path, including a performance feedback mechanism.
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CHAPTER ONE: FOCUS AND FRAMING

Few people are aware that the first face they see after they have been injured either on the ski hill or at a sports event is often that of a member of the Canadian Ski Patrol. The Canadian Ski Patrol is a national organisation that educates, certifies, and supplies ski patrollers and advanced first aid personnel to the recreational and amateur sport industry. The organisation has a rich history of community involvement through volunteerism and is reflective of its communities: each member of the Canadian Ski Patrol is a local volunteer.

In recent years, the Canadian Ski Patrol has struggled to maintain relevance in the skiing industry. According to Colin Saravanamuttoo, the national president and chief executive officer (CEO), at the outset of this research the number of new recruits was on the decline and inactive members were on the rise. This has resulted in an overall reduction in membership numbers nationally and also locally in the Calgary Zone, as can be seen in the members-only national database. One potential cause of this trend, as suggested by Saravanamuttoo, was a failure to change with the times and a lingering resistance to change throughout the organisation, an echo of past experiences. The majority of members support change; however, pockets of resistant members still exist and display behaviours such as infighting and politicking (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication1, October 16, 2013).

A key Canadian Ski Patrol initiative in 2013 was a “renewed commitment to be, and to be seen to be, modern, professional, and relevant” (Knott & Saravanamuttoo, 2013, p. 1). In order to attain this goal, the Canadian Ski Patrol must overcome its change-related inertia with regard to new initiatives in staffing, branding, fundraising, recruitment, and leadership. Failure to

1 All personal communications in this document are cited with permission.
do so will result in a continued decline in membership, decreased operational funds, and the eventual extinction of the organisation (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication, October 16, 2013). This manifestation of change across a complex organisation is the biggest challenge with which the national president feels he must contend.

I have been an active ski patroller in the Calgary Zone for over 23 years. In the fall of 1990, I passed the Canadian Ski Patrol first aid, skiing, and toboggan handling tests. Shortly thereafter, in the spring of 1991, I passed the Lake Louise Ski Patrol ski and toboggan handling tests. I have volunteered within the CSP Calgary Zone, including a stint as a first aid instructor, ever since.

Traditional business models create organisational systems that resist change (Kramer, 1999). Over the past two decades, and as compared to other volunteer options, I have observed an ebb in the popularity of the ski patrol as a volunteer pursuit. In the 1990s, the Canadian Ski Patrol turned away new recruits because certification classes were at full capacity, with approximately 80 people per annual class. In the past decade, despite an active advertising campaign and the offer of free job-shadow ski days, interest in the ski patrol appears to have declined. In the 2012-2013 rookie class, there were a total of 17 graduates. From this marked reduction, one can see that new members are more difficult to recruit than before. One explanation may be that the organisation has not adapted to current realities and neither appeals to potential new volunteers nor fulfils the evolving demands of existing volunteers.

The shrinking membership roster has increased the strain on the extant members, as the Canadian Ski Patrol’s commitment to clients has remained the same and/or grown (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication, July 5, 2013). The CSP Calgary Zone depends on its members for the provision of monies in the form of annual dues and registration fees as well as
for patrol duties. Each year, the Canadian Ski Patrol negotiates the number of patrol days it will provide that season to the ski resort. Based on this number, the resorts recruit their paid staff. Thus, a decline in Canadian Ski Patrol membership means that the remaining members must provide a greater number of patrol days per capita than previously. The additional time, energy, and funds requested of members create stress and dissatisfaction within the volunteer ranks. This trend cannot continue without risk of organisational extinction.

In addition to the national issue of Canadian Ski Patrol modernity and relevance, there are additional intra-organisational challenges within the Calgary Zone. At in-town meetings and in written communication, I have observed a demonstrable lack of cohesion between the member ski area patrols. Despite a genuine desire to do the best job possible, various ski area patrol members are sometimes quick to criticise other patrols, and non-productive discussions abound. This results in reduced member cohesion and wasted energy, as focus is diverted away from behaviours that drive positive change and towards behaviours that trap the organisation into stagnation (Argyris, 2010). For the purposes of this study, engagement has been defined as the “experience of the work activity, rather than a behavior driven by the connection with the work role” (Vecina, Chacón, Marzana, & Marta, 2013, p. 293).

As an inquirer within the context of this action research project, I was a catalyst for organisational self-knowing and assisted the Canadian Ski Patrol in the discovery of ways in which it might enhance its organisational adaptability. Colin Saravanamutto stated that transparency is one of his operational strategies as he works to move the organisation forward (personal communication, May 18, 2013). As “communication has direct effects on feelings of wellbeing and can enhance or detract from the efficacy of individual’s work” (Stringer, 2007,
my secondary role during this action research inquiry was to act as a model of transparent communication, with the intent to improve intra-zone engagement and cohesion.

The following inquiry question was explored during this study: How can the Canadian Ski Patrol (CSP) Calgary Zone enhance its organisational adaptability to support future viability? The following subquestions also aided in gaining an understanding into this research inquiry:

1. How do members of the CSP Calgary Zone describe the current adaptability of their organisation?
2. What factors do members believe support organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?
3. What factors do members believe hinder organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?

Significance of the Inquiry

In his role as CEO of the CSP, Colin Saravanamuttoo pinpointed the change inhibitive behaviours of small pockets of individuals as the single most frustrating aspect of the past year in his new role (personal communication, October 16, 2013). It appears that this change-resistant aspect of the CSP culture has contributed to the situation in which the organisation finds itself—a persistence of the status quo (i.e., maintenance of the old way of doing things). Membership, engagement, cohesion, and sponsorship funding have all been in decline. According to the CEO, this situation cannot continue without serious threat to the long-term viability of the organisation (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication, May 18, 2013).

The key stakeholders for this action research inquiry were the Calgary Zone ski patrol members, the various ski areas in the Calgary Zone, volunteer member-leaders of the mountain division patrols, the elected Calgary Zone executive group, and the national executive.
Additionally, but not key, stakeholders included other CSP members across the country, the ski areas and sporting events across the nation that use the CSP service, and ultimately, all public citizens who frequent these same ski areas and sporting events.

There were three ultimate goals for this action research inquiry. Firstly, as is often an objective in action research inquiries, it was hoped that the CSP would develop a better understanding of the Calgary Zone operations and its members (Stringer, 2007, p. 10). Secondly, it was intended that the research process would serve to deepen participants’ and stakeholders’ understanding of the particularities of change management within the not-for-profit sector as the paradigms associated with a not-for-profit venture were new for a significant portion of the membership (C. Saravanamutto, personal communication, July 12, 2013). Finally, it was expected that the CSP Calgary Zone would develop a plan with which to begin to overcome change inertia and adeptly navigate the seas of change. The ways in which these goals were addressed are displayed throughout this thesis: in particular, specific recommendations to enhance organisational adaptability are outlined in the recommendations section of Chapter 5.

Should the CSP miss the opportunity to foster change in the Calgary Zone, there exist both short-term and long-term consequences for its ongoing viability. In the short-term, CSP membership would continue to shrink along with traditional funding sources. This would place increased pressure on existing members to meet the service provision expectations of the resort, and in the long-term, it is possible that this would cause the entire organisation to collapse. The CSP is its members; without them, there is no organisation.

Organisational Context

An osteopath, Dr. Douglas Firth, founded the CSP in response to a request from the Canadian Amateur Ski Association to form an “aid and rescue group to assist injured skiers”
In the ensuing three quarters of a century, the not-for-profit charitable organisation has expanded across the country and currently consists of over 4,500 highly trained volunteer first responders organised into 9 divisions and 59 Zones (Knott & Saravanamuttoo, 2013, p. 3). The CSP organisation has patrols in every province and the Yukon, with a national head office located in Ottawa, Ontario (Canadian Ski Patrol, 2013).

Over the first year of his employment with the CSP, the national president worked to modernise and increase the appeal of the organisation to potential volunteers (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication, May 18, 2013). Not only did the name of the organisation change from the Canadian Ski Patrol System to simply the Canadian Ski Patrol, but also the vision and mission of the organisation changed. In 2012, the CSP vision statement warranted that the CSP would be “Canada’s leader in certifying ski patrollers and advanced first aid personnel to our on-snow resort partners” (Canadian Ski Patrol, 2012, para. 1). In 2013, the CSP vision statement broadened; now, “you will find us wherever Canadians play outdoors” (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication, June 6, 2013).

The mission statement continued to evolve as the CSP Board of Directors worked to further develop and refine the CSP strategic plan. In 2012, the CSP Mission Statement read: “To promote safety and injury prevention and to provide the highest possible standards of education, certification, and delivery in first aid and rescue services to the snow industry” (Canadian Ski Patrol System, 2012, p. 1). In 2013, in an effort to recognize both the organisation’s history and the need to modernize, the CSP amended its mission statement to read as follows:

The Canadian Ski Patrol delivers advanced first aid, injury prevention, and rescue services through a volunteer network educated and certified to the highest standards. While proud of our ski patrol heritage, it is our passion for public safety in outdoor sport and recreation that will keep us adaptable and relevant. (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication, June 6, 2013)
This change in the focus of the mission statement emphasized the importance of the need for the entire organisation to embrace a culture of change capability and necessitated engaged, committed volunteers on all levels.

The commitment of the CSP volunteers has been significant. Cumulatively, in 2012, members invested over 1,000,000 volunteer hours training, certifying, developing training materials, teaching first aid, fundraising, and patrolling (Knott & Saravanamuttoo, 2013). This equated to an average annual contribution of over 232 hours per person, or roughly 30 days per year as opposed to the Canadian national average for volunteerism of 55 hours per person, per annum (Statistics Canada, 2013). Thus, it is evident that CSP ski patrollers are dedicated and passionate.

Over the past several years, the traditional methods of recruiting, marketing, branding, and fundraising faltered and resulted in reduced funding and membership numbers (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication, May 29, 2013). In order to bring about change, the national executive group developed a number of new initiatives in each of the aforementioned areas; however, within the Calgary Zone, as within other zones across the country, some members resisted the proposed changes (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication, October 16, 2013). Saravanamuttoo recognised that to effect change in the CSP in a timely manner, he needed to unite a geographically and, potentially philosophically, diverse membership around proposed change initiatives.

The Calgary Zone consists of approximately 171 active volunteers organised into patrols based at Canada Olympic Park, Lake Louise, Nakiska, and Norquay, as well as the Nordic and special events patrol teams (Canadian Ski Patrol, 2013). The Calgary Zone has an eight-person executive team consisting of a president, secretary, vice-president administration, vice-president
finance, vice-president operations, vice-president education, vice-president communications, and vice-president risk management and injury prevention (Canadian Ski Patrol System Calgary Zone, 2013). Each of the resort patrol leaders participates in the executive zone meetings, which ensures all resorts have representation at the zone meetings. Of the many zones across the country, the Calgary Zone is of particular interest to the CEO, as it hosts a broad spectrum of member opinions related to change. Moreover, the CSP Calgary Zone is a microcosm of the larger CSP organisation, so its well-being affects the organisation as a whole, and the results of this inquiry may prove useful elsewhere in the CSP (C. Saravanamutto, personal communication, October 16, 2013). This action research process helped the organisation determine the inhibitive and facilitative factors for the creation of a culture of change capability within the Calgary Zone.

**Systems Analysis of the Inquiry**

Since its humble origins at one Ontario ski hill in 1941, the Canadian Ski Patrol organisation has grown exponentially. It is now a nation-wide organisation that serves over 230 ski hills (Knott & Saravanamutto, 2013, p. 3). Comprised of close to 4,500 members, CSP has a national office that oversees nine divisions across the country. Within each division, there are a number of zones. Within each zone, there are a number of CSP patrols. The Calgary Zone, which resides within the mountain division, encompasses six area patrols, five of which are based at specific ski-related locations as shown in Appendix A.

Members of CSP are formal and direct volunteers (Hartenian, 2007). Membership works directly with paid staff and interacts with the public through the provision of first aid, snow safety, and general customer service duties.
Just as “leadership challenges in building learning organisations are a microcosm of the leadership challenge of our time” (Senge, 2006, p. 2), the leadership challenges within the CSP Calgary Zone are a microcosm of the CSP leadership challenge. Thus, the causal loop diagram depicted in Figure 1, which indicates the effect change resistance has on the CSP Calgary Zone. The relationships between key variables that influence behaviours, not people, in the CSP Calgary Zone system are depicted in Figure 1. These behaviours keep the CSP entity stuck in an organisational trap (Argyris, 2010) and are equally applicable to any other zone within the CSP organisation and the national entity itself.

![Causal loop diagram of change resistance within the Canadian Ski Patrol Calgary Zone](image)

**Figure 1.** Causal loop diagram of change resistance within the Canadian Ski Patrol Calgary Zone

As shown in Figure 1, stagnation of the organisational culture drives an increase in membership decline, with the contributing factors of declines in levels of engagement and recruitment. Reduced membership causes increased stress on volunteers. As mentioned previously, the same number of annual patrol days must be provided to the ski areas as in prior
years, however, now with fewer volunteers to do so. Fewer members also translate to lower financial support derived from membership fees, donations, and sponsorship. This puts pressure on the extant members, which manifests in reduced cooperative behaviours between the various CSP Calgary Zone patrols, between members of the CSP Calgary Zone executive, and between the CSP Calgary Zone and the CSP national office (C. Saravanamutto, personal communication, June 9, 2013). These behaviours increase the change resistance from the Calgary Zone membership, which leads to continued stagnation, and effectively, “nothing changes” (Dover & Lawrence, 2012, p. 1004).

**Chapter Summary**

The Canadian Ski Patrol and the challenges that lie ahead for its continued success as a national, not-for-profit, volunteer-driven organisation were introduced in this chapter. CSP has experienced a decline in membership numbers and anticipates that this trend may continue, which will seriously threaten its viability.

This chapter represents the first stage of an action research inquiry, which will be explained in greater detail in Chapter 3. As such, CSP has yet to reach its full potential as “modern, professional, and relevant” (Knott & Saravanamutto, 2013, p. 1). In the following chapter, I will provide an overview of literature as it relates to elements of organisational adaptability, not-for-profit organisations, and diversity. These topics will provide context for leadership and management of a not-for-profit organisation in symbiosis with the for-profit recreational sport industry.

Throughout the rest of this document, I will describe the action research inquiry approach, participants, and methodology, as well as review the study findings, conclusions, and
recommendations. Finally, I will summarize the implications for future research, both for the organisation and also, for the field of leadership within the Canadian not-for-profit sector.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I provide a review of the literature pertinent to the areas of organisational adaptability, not-for-profit organisations, and diversity, to illustrate the ways in which these areas of study provide context for this action research inquiry. Notably, the reviewed literature will illuminate facets of research that support the CSP Calgary Zone’s efforts to understand appropriate strategies to enhance its organisational adaptability and ensure its future viability.

Research studies related to organisational adaptability within not-for-profit organisations are scant: The majority of research has pertained to for-profit organisations. However, there are a multitude of factors looming on the horizon that make research in this area compelling. Firstly, there is a greater demand for not-for-profit organisations to comply with legislation designed to regulate for-profit entities (e.g., generally accepted accounting principles, privacy law, and police checks). Secondly, the current economic climate supports symbiotic relationships between not-for-profit and for-profit organisations as a viable business model. Thirdly, with the life expectancy higher than ever before, people have a longer post-retirement life-stage. This creates a new potential source of volunteers. Finally, as volunteers age and retire from all sorts of organisations, there is a need to determine effective ways to fill the productivity gap. This list is by no means exhaustive; it is merely indicative of a dearth of research into organisational adaptability in not-for-profit organisations. Legislation, economic factors, age, and productivity; each of these considerations requires organisational adaptability on the part of not-for-profit organisations.

I begin the literature review with an exploration of organisational adaptability, specifically as it relates to researchers’ understanding of a learning organisation, types of organisational change, and resistance to change. From there, I delve into the ways in which
sustainability, structure, shared vision, and leadership in not-for-profit organisations can affect efficacy. Finally, I examine the literature that pertained to diversity, in particular, generation and sex, as it can be argued that the more diverse an organisation’s constituents, the more amenable the organisation will be to change (Von Bergen, Soper, & Parnell, 2005).

**Organisational Adaptability**

Since its inception in 1940, CSP has demonstrated its organisational adaptability as it adjusted to the burgeoning growth of the recreational ski industry and the changing demands of its clients. The ski industry was embryonic in 1941 when Dr. Douglas Firth founded the ski patrol. Just five years earlier, in 1935, the Canadian Amateur Ski Association membership totalled 51 ski clubs nationwide. By 2014, the Canadian Ski Council reported 275 recreational ski areas across Canada (Canadian Ski Council, 2014), of which, the CSP services 230 (Knott & Saravanamuttoo, 2013).

As noted by Oshry (2007), organisational adaptability is fostered by a robust system [that] grows and changes; it values learning; it takes in information from its environment; it changes form and function in response to changing environmental conditions in order to continuously protect itself from danger and prospect among opportunities; it discards forms, processes, and beliefs that no longer connect with the current environment; and it experiments with new forms, processes, and beliefs. (p. 428)

In order “to survive in turbulent competitive markets, [organisations] need to focus on establishing and maintaining close customer relationships” (Tuominen, Rajala, & Moller, 2004). To maintain close customer relationships, organisations must not stagnate, but instead engage in an on-going process of learning. In short, “leadership is inextricably connected with the process of innovation, of bringing new ideas, methods, or solutions into use” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 266).
Denison (as cited in Schein, 2010) used a survey-based method to profile organisational culture, in which he defined organisational adaptability as “creating change, customer focus, and organisational learning” (p. 328). More recently, Herman (2012) defined organisational adaptability as the “capacity of an organisation to change its strategies, structures, procedures or other core attributes, in anticipation of, or in response to, a change in its environment” (p. 16). Arguably, this capacity is dependent upon the organisation and its constituents; however, Argyris (2010) believed that while leadership, culture, and organisational design are crucial in effecting organisational change, growth, and learning, our best efforts to improve in these areas actually backfire and keep us “staid, small, and stupid” (p. 19). Thus, it is important to determine what defines a new type of organisation: one that is capable of learning and organic growth such that the CSP can optimize its evolutionary efforts and propel itself toward a sustainable future.

**Learning organisation**

Organisational learning has been extensively studied in the for-profit sector; however, it has received less attention in not-for-profit and community-based settings as evidenced by numerous researchers in the third sector (e.g., Ebrahim, 2005; Ebrahim & Ortolano, 2001; McHargue, 2003). The capacity to learn is a vital contributing factor for not-for-profit survival (Bess, Perkins, Cooper, & Jones, 2011, p. 237), and it builds on the “discipline of developing a shared vision” (Senge, 2006, p. 461).

Leaders foster organisational learning as an adaptive process when they ask questions, rather than provide answers, to thorny organisational issues (Heifetz & Laurie, 2011). Ideally, this leadership process enhances, rather than impedes (Argyris, 2010), organisational adaptability. Kouzes and Posner (2012) supported the perspective of Heifetz and Laurie (2011) that leaders foster organisational adaptability through tough questions. However, contrary to a
methodical and calculated approach, Kouzes and Posner (2012) suggested that organisational learning is the trickle-down result of effective leadership behaviours, as the leaders help the organisation “envision the future” (p. 210). Senge (2006) concurred that it is leaders’ mastery of “certain basic disciplines” (p. 28) and “systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building a shared vision, and team learning” (p. 38) that differentiates learning organisations from more traditional organisations. In the opinion of Senge (2006), an effective leader acts as a catalyst to aggregate learning to encompass an entire organisation, not just individuals, and ultimately forms “learning organisations” (p. 375).

The mantle of organisational learning does not rest solely upon the shoulders of executive leadership. Argyris and Schon (2009) insisted “that a theory of organisational learning must take account of the interplay between the actions and interactions of individuals and the actions and interactions of higher-level organisational entities such as departments, divisions, or groups of managers” (p. 945). In essence, Argyris and Schon proclaimed that organisational learning at the individual and the aggregate level are inseparable.

Nor should the term organisational learning imply automatic beneficence (Argyris & Schon, 2009). Indeed, organisations can learn bad habits as easily, if not more so, as good ones. Good organisational hygiene takes discipline and effort. In research conducted organisational traps, Argyris (2010) delved deeper into the behaviours of the organisation and suggested that traditional behaviour patterns create “traps [that] are anti-learning and anti-corrective . . . [that] facilitate blaming others” (p. 16). Seemingly, the way out of an organisational trap is to learn new behaviours through double-loop and potentially triple-loop learning cycles as shown in Figure 2.
As shown in Figure 2, single-loop learning involves a cycle of action and consequence followed by a determination of a match or mismatch to the desired outcome (Argyris, 2005) before beginning the cycle anew. Double-loop learning involves a further step: the examination of mismatched consequences in the context of governing values and organisational assumptions (Argyris, 2005). Triple-loop learning is a concept that suggests an increased depth of learning beyond double-loop learning (Romme & Van Witteloostuijn, 1999; Yuthas, Dillard, & Rogers, 2004).

Figure 2. Single-, double-, and triple-loop learning in organisations.


Kayes and Ameli (2011) posited that this incremental learning involves an “additional level of learning that considers an external partner’s values and strategies” (p. 176). Tosey, Visser, and Saunders (2011) agreed that the term triple-loop learning implies a deeper level of knowledge, but maintained that the diverse conceptual field related to trip-loop learning lacks
empirical research support. As such, Tosey et al. cautioned against an “uncritical preference” for

As an external partner to the core paid staff, the CSP Calgary Zone volunteer group is a
member of the larger organisation. Thus, there was value in investigating this group’s values and
strategies in order to foster organisational learning, whether that was single-, double-, or triple-
loop learning. To learn, organisations must grow and develop—and that means change.

**Change readiness**

Armenakis, Harris, and Mossholder (1993) defined change readiness as an individual’s
“beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the extent to which changes are needed and the
organisation’s capacity to successfully undertake those changes” (p. 681). Within this definition,
the authors placed emphasis on the individual, while the organisation assumed an auxiliary role.
Weiner (2009), in his definition of change readiness, shifted the emphasis from the individual to
a communal commitment to implement organisational change (p. 68). This shift in focus begs the
question: What about change readiness in the organisation?

The organisational entity, replete with policies and procedures, hierarchies, and
hegemony over constituents, influences change readiness. In their theoretical review of change
readiness literature, Jimmieson, Armenakis, and Rafferty (2013) advocated for a multi-level
perspective of change readiness in an organisation, suggesting that the influence comes down
from the organisation to impact individual change readiness through policies, procedures, and the
like (p. 130). Thus, onus for change readiness is the mutual responsibility of both the individual
and organisation. Fair enough, but how does change readiness materialise in an organisation?

Armenakis, Bernerth, Pitts, and Walker (2007) identified five beliefs that must exist for
change readiness to be present in an organisation. First, the individual must believe that change
is necessary. Second, the individual must hold the conviction that the proposed change will improve the current situation. Third, people must believe they are qualified to implement the change. Fourth, the constituent must have faith that the organisation will provide tangible support for the change (i.e., information, financing, and human resources). Finally, individuals must assess the costs and benefits of the change in regard to the impact on their position. If, in the final calculation, the balance does not tip towards benefit, it is unlikely people will determine they are ready for change. Jimmieson et al. (2013) argued that in addition to Armenakis et al.’s five cognitive change readiness beliefs, the emotions (or affect) associated with the anticipated change also impacted change readiness and, therefore, merit consideration (p. 114).

It is not just the emotions attached to change that impact change readiness and subsequent change implementation success. Jones, Jimmieson, and Griffiths (2005) maintained that “employees who perceived strong human relations values in their division reported higher levels of readiness for change prior to the implementation” (p. 380). They also indicated that strong human relations in an organisation support change readiness which, in turn, positively influences the outcome of change initiatives (p. 380). Strong teams mean successful change.

The ability of an organisation to evolve, or morph into a new form, through the implementation of “organisational [capabilities] relevant to the management of change” is termed reshaping (Jones et al., 2005, p. 380). These capabilities are grounded in aspects of human relations; engagement, performance management, and employee development (p. 381). If these reshaping capabilities are present in an organisation, Turner and Crawford (1998) alleged that organisational change occurred as a natural course of business life. Change-supportive behaviours are the individual equivalents of organisational reshaping behaviours. Rousseau, Kim, and Hornung (2011) defined change-supportive behaviours as “actions employees engage
in to actively participate in, facilitate, and contribute to a planned change initiated by the organisation” (p. 1665).

Organisations directly impact the actions of their constituents through the engenderment of perceptions and feelings (Lewin, 1951). Once again, we see the interplay between individual and organisation with regard to change readiness where processes such as attraction, selection, attrition (Schneider, 1987), and organisational socialization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) act as catalysts for the development of communal beliefs about change. These communal beliefs can surface in more subtle ways—through an organisationally unconscious bias in recruitment and retention activities. This bias creates an organisational persona that attracts people with similarly aligned characteristics and attributes as that of the organisation and perpetuates the culture, processes, and structure of an organisation (Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995).

Change is anathema to individuals and organisations that place a priority on tradition. To change is to let go of the past and perhaps acknowledge that there is a better way to do things. The first reaction of most people—and organisations—is to push back and resist the new direction.

**Resistance to change**

What impedes an organisation’s ability to implement change successfully? As Smith (2002) determined, there may be a multitude of reasons why change initiatives fail, but one recurrent factor is the loss of support from key constituents of the change initiative. Brehm (2009) suggested that a personal resistance to change is one cause of this loss of support. The need for autonomy (i.e., self-determination), competence (i.e., efficacy), and relatedness (i.e., strength of one’s association with others) form a psychological need triumvirate of self-determination theory, as defined by Ryan and Deci (as cited in Brehm, 2009), such that “if a
person’s behavioural freedom is reduced or threatened with reduction, the person will become motivationally aroused” (p. 378) and will act to prevent any further loss of independence.

Another key reason that people resist change is that their mental models (Senge, 2006), or unconscious assumptions, get in the way. It is possible that these mental models arise from an organisational culture that hinders change implementation. Detert, Schroeder, and Mauriel (2000) examined the existing literature on total quality management and determined that consideration for organisational culture was not only a key factor in the success of a change initiative, but that culture was also largely ignored in theory and in practice. To address this shortcoming, Detert et al. presented a framework of “descriptive culture dimensions for use in studies of culture . . . [and demonstrably] linked culture dimensions to a set of comprehensive values and beliefs that . . . represent the cultural backbone of successful total quality management (TQM) adoption” (p. 851). If culture can act as a lever for change in an organisation, it stands to reason that culture can also restrict change (Brehm, 2009; Jaskyte, 2004).

Constituents resist threats to the organisational status quo. This resistance then evolves into organisational norms that are “woven into the fabric of [the] established power relationships” and their purpose is to keep the overall system in balance (Senge, 2006, p. 196). Nesterkin (2013) viewed the systemic landscape of change resistance through the lens of individual participants; he maintained that organisational change threatens constituents’ sense of independence and freedom such that it provokes a resistance response. In earlier writing, Argyris (2010) had also examined change resistance at the individual level and posited that resistance to change arises from the difference between an individual’s espoused theory and theory-in-use. In other words, the difference between what people say they do (i.e., espoused theory) and what
they actually do (i.e., theory-in-use). People are often unaware there is a discrepancy between what they say they do and what they actually do: in particular, the challenges their behaviours can create when working with other people in organisations.

Oshry (2007) looked at organisational systems through a lens of positional power: the “Tops” call the shots, the “Bottoms” follow directions, and the “Middles” occupy ground between the two groups. All of the groups are involved in interactive patterns, or dances, in which the Tops become increasingly responsible to the point of feeling overburdened, the Middles become increasingly torn between the Tops and Bottoms until they feel alienated, and the Bottoms become increasingly irresponsible until they feel oppressed. The tendency of the Middles to disintegrate under the pressure between the Tops and the Bottoms (p. 340) is a major impediment to organisational adaptability. However, Oshry demonstrated that Middles possess the ability to integrate themselves and wrest power over their future even in complex organisational systems.

Higgs and Rowland (2005) determined that approaches that take into account and integrate complexity and allow latitude for an emergent, as opposed to directed, change process, appear to be more effective than change initiatives that take a linear approach (p. 146). Additionally, the literature review by Higgs and Rowland (2005) aligned with the general trend of literature that supported “a move from leader-centric, directive behaviours to more facilitating and enabling styles” (p. 147), which suggested success directly correlated to these behaviours (Gill, 2002; Higgs, 2003; Kouzes & Posner, 2012)

Not all resistance to change is bad. In fact, in some situations, it can be beneficial. Watson (2009) posited that resistance can promote necessary periodic stability within a system.
He observed that the cyclical nature of change resistance necessitates continual observation to determine appropriate change initiative actions to facilitate the change process (p. 365).

Change consumes the valuable resources of an organisation: time, effort, and money. A key reason for an organisation to invest in change or in building the capacity to change is to sustain itself into the future. Having reviewed the literature related to organizational adaptability, I turn now to explore adaptability in not-for-profit organisations.

**Not-for-Profit Organisations**

Change within a not-for-profit entity can be a significant organisational challenge, as most not-for-profit organisations are “either so focused on maintaining existing systems [that] they lacked creativity, or were able to generate ideas but then struggled to implement them” (Grant & Crutchfield, as cited in Dover & Lawrence, 2012, p. 992). Apart from an inability to use remuneration as a workforce incentive, sector differences between for-profit and not-for-profit organisational leadership competencies include “goals, structure, accountability, budgets, and ownership” (Thach & Thompson, 2007, p. #) and are contributing factors to the success, or failure, of an organisation to achieve change and to ensure its on-going viability.

Volunteerism is alive and well in Canada, with over 47% of the country’s population donating their time to non-paid work in 2010 (Cnaan & Amrofell, 1994; Statistics Canada, 2012). As is the case with the Canadian Ski Patrol, “community-based grassroots organizations . . . typically emerge in response to local need and rely on the participation of volunteer members” (Bess et al., 2011, p. 240). The survival of not-for-profit organisations that rely solely on the efforts of dedicated volunteers is a delicate balance; it requires enough predictability to ensure the members feel a sense of belonging and enough change to ensure the organisation maintains relevancy. There exist a multitude of factors that influence the survival of not-for-
profit organisations; however, in this segment, sustainability—specifically the elements of structure and culture, collaboration, shared vision, and leadership will be examined.

**Sustainability**

An essential challenge to any organisation’s on-going survival is the ability to attract and retain people. In a not-for-profit organisation, the collaboration between the entity and its volunteers is especially crucial, as “volunteers are their lifeblood, their sustaining force” (Tomkovick, Lester, Flunker, & Wells, 2008, p. 3) and requires a “climate of trust [to] facilitate effective long-term relationships among your constituents” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 384).

Sustainability for a not-for-profit organisation can arguably be divided into two parts: (a) the structure that consists of the reporting hierarchy, policies, and procedures; and (b) the culture of the organisation. These two parts exist in a symbiotic relationship. Each influences, and is influenced by, the other.

**Structure of a not-for-profit organisation**

The formalization and implementation of rules and regulations can act as either a starting block or a speed bump for an organisation’s ability to innovate and adapt. Hager and Brudney (2004) demonstrated that formal recognition activities, training, professional volunteer development, screening volunteers, matching volunteers to assignments, and volunteers recruiting other volunteers all have statistically significant positive effects on the retention of volunteers. However, in a study of not-for-profits that entailed both questionnaires and interviews, Jaskyte (2011) found that bureaucratization repressed creativity, discouraged idea sharing, and limited internal communication. As a result, innovation plummeted. Similarly, Warwick (2007) determined that not-for-profit organisations that are typically hierarchical lead to siloed thinking, an excessive focus on rules, and a blindness to mental models, all of which
hobble individual initiative as constituents attempt to “[solve] problems in isolation” (Waldman, 2007, p. 279).

As an alternative to a formalized organisational structure with clearly defined roles, a hierarchy, and rules for membership (Smith 2000), there is a burgeoning field of study that has supported a differentiated view of volunteer organisations—a perspective that fosters non-traditional, value-based, and non-formalised volunteer management (Howlett, 2010; Machin & Paine, 2008; Rochester, Paine, Howlett, & Zimmek, 2010; Smith, 1996). Barnes and Sharp (2009) emphasized that “lifestyle integration, organisational informality and flexibility, and volunteer-agency collaboration” (p. 169) is an effective way to ramp up the efficacy of volunteer organisations. The authors advanced the notion that “traditional volunteer management structures may actually be hindering engagement” (p. 169) and suggested that a more flexible and collaborative approach will result in greater efficacy through not only greater volunteer autonomy, but also greater power equitability between the agency and the volunteers. Waters and Bortree (2012) showed that the perceived power balance between the organisation and volunteers influenced the amount of volunteers’ time spent productively, such that the more equitable the volunteers perceived the power balance, the higher the proportion of productive time.

Not-for-profit organisations are unique in that they must attract and retain their workforce without the benefit of organisational constructs like lucrative compensation plans, stock options, or fabulously complex learning opportunities. Without these magnets, not-for-profit organisations must rely on more subtle influencing factors, including the structure of the organisation itself.

Structure can directly impact culture, or it can be more circumspect. In Roos and Gatta’s (2009) study of the ways in which non-conscious attitudes and beliefs influence subjective
policies and procedures to produce “subtle sex biases” (p. 177), they found that “policies that are not discriminatory in intent can nonetheless operate to reproduce the [sex] status quo” (p. 186). As Roos and Gatta found, “subtle inequities that arise from non-conscious attitudes and beliefs or organisationally based policies and procedures” (p. 196). These subtle biases can produce “micro advantages” and “micro inequities” (DiTomaso, Post, Smith, Farris, & Cordero, 2007, p. 201) that can make a significant difference to organisational constituents over time. This can then perpetuate and amplify existing organisational norms and biases, entrenching the organisation in its current state and thwarting both change and the organisational potential for change.

Indeed, it appears that the most impactful factors in fomenting change and efficacy in an organisation are “organisational and leadership factors” (Andrews, Ganz, Baggetta, Han, & Lim, 2010, p. 1193) and specifically “committed activists . . . organizational capacity . . . strong programmatic activity, and whose leaders work independently” (p. 1191). Thus, as Peter Drucker reportedly said in a 2006 meeting, “culture eats strategy for breakfast” and, according to numerous internet business sites, “culture eats structure for lunch.” Apparently, culture trumps many other organisational factors in change.

**Culture of not-for-profit organisations**

Volunteer-based organisations may seem to consist of leaders who may not view themselves as such and followers who resist being led. This dynamic hints at the complexity of not-for-profit organisational culture. A key asset of CSP includes the many different perspectives and viewpoints grounded in a wealth of different experiences. It is the melding of these different perspectives into shared basic assumptions that define culture (Detert et al., 2000; Schein, 2010; Senge, 2006). This melding process occurs as the group solves “problems of external adaptation
and internal integration” effectively enough that it warrants being “taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 2010, p. 1).

One of the benefits of a diverse base of volunteers is the breadth of experience. Volunteers within a not-for-profit will bring their for-profit knowledge and apply it to the not-for-profit realm. In this manner, not-for-profit organisations often not only adopt the hierarchical structure of their for-profit brethren, but they also frequently adopt their human resources processes as well (i.e., recruitment and retention policies and procedures). If the majority of the volunteer base has experiential learning in a traditional organisation, then that is the tone the organisation will adopt. Even though Hall, Lasby, Gummulka, and Tyron (2006) determined that traditional methods (e.g., limited social media, no referral programme, etc.) often result in a limited number of individuals doing the majority of the work—a not-uncommon challenge faced by many not-for-profit organisations.

Bess et al. (2011) found that “organizational form, energy, and culture each had a differential impact on participation in decision making within [community based organisations]” (p. 236). Decisions made by volunteers can be difficult to understand, as individual motives appear to be multidimensional. Volunteers tend to blend altruistic as well as egoistic elements, all of which can be measured by the “Volunteer Function Inventory” (Clary et al., 1998; Goldberg-Glen & Cnaan, 1991; Snyder, Clary, & Stukas, 2000). On the managerial side of the volunteer equation, Cuskelley, Taylor, Hoye, and Darcy (2006) developed a “Volunteer Management Inventory” to determine retention factors for volunteers and concluded that factor planning had a significant effect on perceived volunteer retention problems (p. 156).

Studer and von Schnurbein (2013) conducted a literature review to determine how organisational factors affect volunteers. The authors’ work added a mid-level viewpoint to the
body of knowledge on volunteers: a perspective halfway between the micro-level of volunteer personality traits and motivations, and the macro-level of societal norms and governmental policies. Argyris and Schon (2009) supported this concept that organisational learning takes place not only on the individual level, but also on an aggregate level with constituents from all parts of the organisational system. This was particularly relevant to this action research inquiry as the relationship of the volunteers to the ski hills appeared to be that of substitute paid staff, even though this is not a typical perspective of volunteers. Typically, volunteers are seen as complements rather than replacements (Bowman, 2009; Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013). If, instead, volunteers are substitutes for paid staff, it makes sense then that CSP establish a formal collaborative relationship with the for-profit ski hills.

“In organisations, which is the more important influence on behavior—the system or the individual” (Wheatley, 2006, p. 35)? Both are important, but it may be argued that the more essential influence is that of “relationship created between two or more elements . . . [as] it is the relationship that evokes the present reality” (p. 36). For CSP, nothing is more important than its constituents and the relationships they foster with primary clients: the ski areas.

**Collaboration with for-profit organisations**

CSP has a unique relationship with its clients, as it is a not-for-profit organisation that supports the for-profit business goals of its partners. This juncture between profit and passion creates an environment rife with opportunity for both types of organisations to engage in learning, to overcome resistance to change, and to foster new ways to ensure on-going viability (Weisbord, as cited in Bess et al., 2011). Effective collaboration depends upon strong relationships between partners (Elstub, 2010; Kouzes & Posner, 2012; Schein, 2010; Senge, 2006; Wheatley, 2006), as the ability to build “relationships across boundaries between very
different types of organisations is becoming a key strategy for influencing larger systems” (Senge, 2006, p. 653).

Kouzes and Posner (2012) asserted that “collaboration is a critical competency for achieving and sustaining high performance . . . [as] collaborative skills are essential to [navigate] the conflicting interests and natural tensions” (p. 356). According to Van Til (2007), the true power of volunteer organisations lies in their human capital:

For the non-profit leader and manager, recognition that the third sector’s essential power lies in relationships is an important lesson to learn. Corporations have most of the money, and governments hang onto whatever power they are able to muster, but voluntary and non-profit organisations build their effect from relationships (Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013, p. 371). In speaking of not-for-profit and for-profit relationships, Wheatley (2006) stated,

Thus, it is reasonable to assume that a collaboration of not-for-profit and for-profit organisations would be of benefit to both parties, albeit only if the not-for-profit partner is able to “leave behind the imaginary organisation we design and learn to work with the real organisation . . . a dense network of interdependent relationships.” (p. 144)

The potential exists for both trials and tribulations in the partnership of not-for-profit alliances with for-profit businesses. Powell and Steinberg (2006) noted that variegated “missions and cultures” (p. 6) raise the potential that the not-for-profits will “lose sight of their core mission” and, conversely, the for-profit business will “alienate their customers” (p. 6).

However, according to Ross and Tries (as cited in Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013), effective collaboration between not-for-profit and for-profit organisations trounced sophisticated recruitment strategies when it came to successful volunteer coordination. Thus, it is vital that organisations attempt such partnerships and also ensure they have a clear shared vision of the future, otherwise constituents in either organisation may get caught in the midst of competing goals and objectives, benefiting neither organisation.
The potential upside of collaboration with for-profit organisations is offset by an associated risk: that of having the CSP Calgary Zone on the macro-level, the area patrols on the mid-level (Studer & Schnurbein, 2013), and the individuals on the micro-level caught between competing demands of becoming “torn Middles” (Oshry, 2007, p. 170) between CSP and the client organisations. In this role, Oshry (2007) posited that Middles feel “torn by the system—they feel weak, confused, and powerless” (p. 171). Furthermore, a danger of an organisation that identifies as “torn Middles” . . . [is that its constituents may] seek their identity by aligning themselves with “Tops” . . . [or] . . . “Bottoms” . . . [or] . . . bureaucratize themselves . . . [or] . . . burn out . . . [in the effort to remain] fair, responsive, and even-handed with both Tops and Bottoms. (pp. 171-172)

However, despite this risk, Kouzes and Posner (2012) maintained that “exemplary leaders” (p. 355) will be able to facilitate collaboration as they demonstrate to member constituents and clients alike that the “payoffs for interdependent efforts are greater than those associated with working independently” (p. 378). Wheatley (2006) was equally confident in the triumph of human collaboration, as “when individuals discover a common interest or passion, they organize themselves and figure out how to make things happen” (p. 60). Such behaviour at all levels within CSP would minimize discrepant internal loyalties and maximize optimal organisational adaptability.

Collaboration with for-profit organisations can help assure the future viability of not-for-profit organisations; however, how does the not-for-profit partner avoid being subsumed by the culture of the for-profit organisation? One way to avoid bipartisanship within the volunteer ranks (i.e., torn between the goals of CSP and those of the ski areas) is to raise awareness of a shared vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2012), so that constituents can avoid the pitfalls of getting caught between the not-for-profit organisation and its for-profit client.
Shared vision

Not-for-profit leaders must create a workplace environment whereby volunteers possess clarity around “purpose, objectives, and priorities” (Yukl, 2010, p. 141; see also Dimock & Kass, 2007). Volunteer workforces also require a general “sense of belonging” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 202) and connectivity, as “one of the deepest desires underlying shared vision is the desire to be connected, to a larger purpose and to one another” (Senge, 2006, p. 452). The foundation upon which a shared vision is formed is the set of organisational values.

“Values form the guidebook for personal and organisational behaviour and, in turn, these values shape the culture of the organisation” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 100). Strong values and emotions can either help or hinder change implementation (Yukl, 2010). Bolman and Deal (2008) noted that change will affect the relationship dynamics within a workplace, and they cautioned that the best way with which to manage the altered relationship dynamics resulting from this organisational change is to emphasise the human resources frame, which “focuses on needs and skills” (p. 320). The adoption of the human resources frame will help to ameliorate the impact of change on a group in which “prevailing myths” (p. 239), concomitant with the rich history of the CSP, define collective worth and legitimacy.

The creation of a shared vision, a common battle-cry, is not as much about leaders pushing their own viewpoint on constituents as it is about “finding common ground among those people who have to implement the vision” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 194) and engaging those individuals in the development process. Senge (2006) agreed with this viewpoint and stipulated that “individuals do not sacrifice their personal interests to the larger team vision; rather, the shared vision becomes an extension of their personal visions” (p. 460). The process of the creation of a shared vision engenders engagement and is a key element to the future viability of
any organisation, even if, as may be the case with generation or sex disparity in the CSP Calgary Zone, there are varying degrees of desire for involvement based on generation, or sex, or other elements of diversity.

Kouzes and Posner (2012) asserted that when “leaders clearly communicate a shared vision of an organisation, they ennoble those who work on its behalf” (p. 200). This ennoblement of purpose not only serves to unify the volunteer workforce, but also facilitates organisational adaptability, as “in the presence of a genuinely shared vision, defensive routines become just another aspect of current reality” (Senge, 2006, p. 505). Thus, resistance to change is reduced.

Within the realm of the shared vision it is important to hold time and space for the dissenting voice. In the process of learning, it is the role of the organisational leader to ensure that learning is primary, and outcomes are secondary (Coghlan & Brannick, 2010; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2004).

**Leadership**

Argyris (2010) and Jaskyte (2004) both suggested that organisational leaders are minor players in the efficacy of change initiatives. Argyris (2010) further posited that it is each person’s inability, including that of an organisation’s leaders, to act in accordance with their values and those of the organisation that impedes organisational adaptability through the development of “organisational traps” (p. 25). In contrast to Argyris and Jaskyte, Kouzes and Posner (2012) contended that leaders are major influencers of organisational change, as their primary function is to “continually improve, to grow, and to innovate” (p. 337). In short, a leader’s role is to “challenge the process” (p. 53).

A successful not-for-profit leader must meld for-profit business acumen with traditional not-for-profit attributes (Crawford, 2010). This seemingly impossible task is one that faces many
not-for-profit, volunteer-driven organisations and one that may create a crucible from which true innovation for CSP may emerge. Senge (2006) raised the potential for another leadership incongruity; he maintained that leaders need to hold the paradox of conservation and change: In essence, leaders are called upon to both safeguard the organisation’s resources and simultaneously “bring about a different order of things” (p. 703). Crawford (2010) theorised that a combination of managerial and leadership competencies, traits, and attributes enables leaders to manage the dichotomy of these challenges and proposed a “manager-leader model” (para. 5) as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Manager-Leader Model Essential Competencies, Traits, and Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Personality Traits</th>
<th>Knowledge/Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic thinker</td>
<td>High integrity</td>
<td>Financial acumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship builder</td>
<td>Adaptable/Agile</td>
<td>Deep sector-specific knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative decision-maker</td>
<td>Perseverant/Patient</td>
<td>Understanding and valuing diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial achiever</td>
<td>Interpersonal sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change leader</td>
<td>Passionate about the mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring motivator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although Crawford (2010) suggested that it is a blend of for-profit skills and not-for-profit attributes that contributes to the overall success of a leader in a not-for-profit organisation, Thach and Thompson (2007) disagreed. The skills and attributes of not-for-profit versus for-profit leaders differ significantly in the attempt to implement culture change in an organisation.
Transformational leaders are critical for the not-for-profit sector (Jaskyte, 2011; McMurray, Islam, Sarros, & Pirola-Merlo, 2012; Sarros, Cooper, & Santora, 2011), as they can provide clear vision and a workplace environment in which individuals can “understand the purpose, objectives, and priorities for the organisation” (Yukl, 2010, p. 141). This style of leadership resonates with the typical volunteer follower (Boezeman & Ellemers, 2007; Collinson, 2006), especially if the transformational leader elevates constituents’ awareness around ethical issues and appeals to their moral values (Yukl, 2010, p. 119).

In particular, when a not-for-profit organisation requires change, the transformational leader must be an exemplary leader who continually demonstrates the behaviours expected of followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). The not-for-profit leader must “pull” (Senge, 2006, p. 412) his or her followers along the path of change to minimize resistance that is “compounded by system dynamics” (Yukl, 2010, p. 153) within the not-for-profit culture. Attracting a constituency of diverse followers will enhance organisational adaptability (Collinson, 2006; McCallum, 2013), as it will support innovative problem-solving and engagement (Cox, 1994).

**Diversity**

The whole in volunteer organisations is usually greater than the sum of its parts. Every organisation has unique characteristics that result from their collective constituents. Contrary to the typical profile of a Canadian volunteer at large: that is, female and under 44 (Statistics Canada, 2012). A typical volunteer in the CSP Calgary Zone is male and middle-aged. This was initially identified during an Inquiry Team conference call September 18, 2013, and subsequently supported by survey data from this inquiry. Organisational diversity strengthens organisational adaptability because a multiplicity of perspectives fosters group cognitive flexibility (Cox, 1994) through higher levels of critical analysis and lower levels of groupthink. Thus, for the CSP
Calgary Zone to enhance organisational adaptability, an understanding of the best methods to attract and retain a diverse population of volunteers is essential. Senge (2006) underscored the importance of fostering diversity as:

Many of the most important leaders in the coming decades will not be those we have been assuming they would be. A new order of things must be brought forward by a new order of leaders . . . leaders [will emerge] from the periphery—people who do not come from the traditional centres of power but from the cultural, economic and demographic periphery: women, the poor, and the young. (p. 772)

One facet of organisational survival in the future, regardless of profit orientation, is an ability to cast a wide net for constituents and adapt internal structures to ensure a supply of leaders with diverse backgrounds (author, date).

Fostering diversity in an organisation requires change on an individual, group, and organisational level, but all three types of change need to start from the “inside-out” (Short, 1998). In particular, changing from the inside out “means to observe and describe the motives, intentions, feelings, judgments, and attributions that drive your responses to the other. It is to be in touch with your internal experience” (p. 25). In essence, this was the nature of this action research inquiry—to discover the motives, intentions, feelings, judgements, and attributions of the CSP Calgary Zone, including the impact two elements of diversity (i.e., generation and sex) have on an organisation’s capacity to change from the inside-out.

**Generation**

As defined by Howe and Strauss (2000), a “generation is a society-wide peer group, born over a period roughly the same length of time . . . [that possesses] three attributes: perceived membership in a common generation; common beliefs and behaviors; and a common location in history” (pp. 40-41). In essence, the political, social, and economic climate in which a generation lives moulds a “generational identity” (Martin & Tulgan, 2006, p. xxxvi).
There was overwhelming agreement amongst academia and industry that multiple
generations translate to multiple challenges in the work— and volunteer— environments.
However, there has been a growing body of criticism of both the generalisations made (Costanza,
Badger, Fraser, Severt, & Gade, 2012; Lester, Standifer, Schultz, & Windsor, 2012; Parry &
Urwin, 2010; Trzesniewski & Donnellan, 2010) and the research methodologies used (Costanza
et al., 2012; Lyons & Kuron, 2014). Lyons and Kuron (2014) made an argument that the
generational differences body of research is “overly descriptive and ignored key tenets of
generation theory” (p. S140). Lyons and Kuron outlined significant challenges with generational
research and summarized their review of the literature by stating,

Despite a number of similarities, the generations in today’s workplace differ in aspects of their personalities, work values and attitudes, leadership and teamwork preferences, leader behaviors, and career experiences. . . . An over-arching theme is a clear increase in individualism across generations . . . greater extroversion and conscientiousness and self-esteem, but also greater neuroticism and narcissism. The importance of material rewards and leisure appear to be increasing, whereas work ethic and the centrality of work in people’s lives are decreasing. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment appear lower among younger generations, but [intention to quit] and career mobility higher. The desire for individual-focused leadership, competitiveness and self-reliance appears greater in younger generations, whereas the appeal of teamwork is lower. (p. S149)

Thus, despite objections to generalisations and methodologies, overwhelming anecdotal and
academic support existed for the concept that there is variation between the ways in which the
different generations approach work (Twenge, 2010; Von Bergen et al., 2005). There was also
general agreement that organisations need to adjust for generational differences to get the best
results from all constituents.

Generational diversity benefits organisational adaptability (Cox, 1994). Youth can be a
“formidable force for change” (Senge, 2006, p. 779) precisely because they have so little
invested in the past and so much at stake in the future. A better understanding of the generational
cohort perspectives makes an organisation more current and relevant as well as better able to withstand adverse events (Argyris, 2010). Thus, the organisation is more appealing to prospective new recruits, has improved constituent relationships, and has the capacity to provide better services to its clients than homogeneous organisations.

Contrary to popular belief, for Millennials, “managing performance” was the most frequent engagement driver identified by Gilbert (2011, p. 2). Millennials want frequent, immediate, and specific feedback about their performance (Tulgan, 2009), unlike the GenXers, who are much more individualized and prefer a greater degree of autonomy (Lyons & Kuron, 2014). Tulgan (2009) supported this approach with Millennials and suggested it is possible for managers to trade off Millennials’ desire for engaging work against demands they meet organisational standards. Specifically, Millennials “want to learn, to be challenged, and to understand the relationship between their work and the overall mission of the organization. They want . . . some flexibility in where, when, and how they work” (p. 13), thus managers who are attentive and hands-on “every step of the way” will garner excellent performance in return (p. 13).

Diversity in the workplace includes, but is not limited to, similarities and differences in “race; religious belief; colour; [sex]; physical disability; mental disability; marital status; ancestry; age; place of origin; family status; source of income; and sexual orientation” (Alberta Human Rights Act, 2000, §3(1)(b)). As the final segment to this literature review, I will briefly look at how sex impacts diversity which in turn enhances organisational adaptability.

**Sex**

Senge (2006) believed that women bring a leadership skill set that fosters organisational adaptability, as they are generally less interested in corporate politics and more interested in the
end goal; less concerned with positional power and more concerned with knowledge acquisition and integrity (p. 774). Billing and Alvesson (2000) cautioned against this type of stereotyping of sex-related traits and asserted that non-traditional leadership traits are not necessarily “feminine” and that such language serves to “reinforce stereotypical views on women” (p. 150).

MacPhail and Bowles (2009) studied corporate support for the volunteer behaviours of employees and discovered that while employer support is associated with higher levels of volunteer activity for both sexes, men received more support from their employers than women in terms of flexible hours and time off. In a study that investigated sex differences with respect to type and frequency of volunteer behaviours, Wymer (2011) found there were statistically significant differences between the two sexes, as displayed in Table 2. Wymer deduced from his results that “if a non-profit organisation’s volunteers are predominately male or female, then there may be volunteer preferences for leadership/supervision style, decision-making style, and ways in which volunteer tasks are organized” (p. 845).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Volunteer Preferences Include</th>
<th>Male Volunteer Preferences Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help people or people in distress</td>
<td>Dangerous or risky situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work closely with infants, young children, or teenagers</td>
<td>Confrontation and conflict with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus-building and participatory decision-making leadership</td>
<td>Positions of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community building and collaborative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop relational ties with others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Wymer (2011, pp. 844–845)
In regard to behavioural differences between the sexes, Argyris (2010) contended that his espoused theories and theories-in-use are the “same in all cultures, organisations, or communities as well as gender, race, wealth and education” (p. 140). Waters and Bortree (2012) disagreed and contended that differences existed between the sexes when it came to volunteerism:

Social group inclusion and overall participation in organisational events were the strongest predictors of female volunteers’ future intentions to volunteer whereas event participation, being included in the organisation’s information network, and participating in decision making were the strongest predictors for male volunteers. (p. 92)

For the full value of diversity to be realised, organisations should treat people as though they were individual fruits in a fruit salad, each with their own distinct flavour, rather than boil them all together into an amorphous marmalade.

Chapter Summary

This overview of literature in this chapter illustrated there is no easy solution for the challenges associated with enhancement of organisational adaptability; rather, there is a plethora of influential factors and a multitude of levels of complexity to consider. I identified some common themes with regard to the organisational elements that hinder, or help, in the quest for adaptability and one motif ran through all of the literature: learning.

Whether the literature topic entailed how to ready the organisation for change; reduce change resistance; structure policies, procedures, and reporting relationships; uncover our shared vision (Senge, 2006); work collaboratively; increase diversity; or lead purposively, it all rested upon a foundation of learning. The methodology used to learn about the ways in which the CSP Calgary Zone can enhance its organisational adaptability is outlined in the following chapter.
CHAPTER THREE: INQUIRY APPROACH AND PARTICIPANTS

This action research inquiry used an appreciative stance to determine the ways in which the CSP Calgary Zone can enhance its organisational adaptability, specifically with a view to ensure the future viability of the organisation. Subquestions included the following:

1. How do members of the CSP Calgary Zone describe the current adaptability of their organisation?

2. What factors do members believe support organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?

3. What factors do members believe hinder organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?

In this chapter, I include a description of the inquiry approach, project participants, inquiry methods, and ethical issues. I also provide greater demographic detail on the proportional representation of inquiry participants.

Inquiry Approach

A definition of an organisational adaptability, an explanation of action research, and a description of the research questions are presented in this section. Through this inquiry, I aimed to explore the ways in which one segment of a volunteer-based, not-for-profit organisation might enhance its ability to embrace change. For the purpose of this inquiry, I adopted the definition of organisational adaptability used by Herman (2012) as the “capacity of an organisation to change its strategies, structures, procedures or other core attributes, in anticipation of, or in response to, a change in its environment” (p. 16).

The methodology for this inquiry was action research. Action research involves experiential learning (Kolb, 1984) in iterative cycles, the purpose of which is to “find an
appropriate solution for the particular dynamics at work in a local situation” (Stringer, 2007, p. 5). Iterative cycles of observation, reflection, and action maximize the learning potential of action research participants and the organisation (Coghlan & Brannick, 2010). Single-loop learning, wherein people observe, reflect, and act, enables people to detect and correct errors within the existing context of values, goals, and frameworks (Argyris & Schon, 1978, pp. 2-3). As such, single-loop learning facilitates the perpetuation of the current organisational state. In double-loop learning and beyond, a second iterative cycle follows the first. The intent of this second loop is to dig below the surface problem and solve organisational issues through modifications to the contextual organisational framework (Argyris, 1991, p. 100). As described in Chapter 2, in triple-loop learning, theorists posited that the learning extends beyond the organisational bounds and incorporates external partners (Kayes & Ameli, 2011). Action research was an effective means to facilitate double-loop, and potentially triple-loop, learning within CSP.

As CSP constituents engaged in the process of reconnaissance, intervention, and evaluation (Piggot-Irvine, 2013), they began to make meaning of their life experiences because the action research process itself was an intervention that fostered change (Schein, 2009). As such, action research is particularly well-suited for the messy problems of human beings.

As will be described in greater depth, the inquiry employed both qualitative and quantitative methods through the use of an initial survey followed by an Open Space Technology session. These methods were employed to help the CSP Calgary Zone determine the ways in which adaptability could be enhanced to support on-going viability.

Data from the survey, including generation, sex, geographic location, and CSP participation type, were collected, coded, and analysed to determine if there was any correlation
between demographic data and the various survey responses. Quantitative analysis of the coded survey qualitative data elucidated themes and provided an opportunity to refine the Open Space Technology (OST) stage of the action research inquiry process.

**Participants**

The participants included both self-selected and a purposive targeted sample from a potential pool of approximately 171 active and 710 inactive volunteers within the Calgary Zone of CSP as determined from the CSP national database. There was a male to female response ratio of 3:1 for a total of 52 male respondents and 17 female respondents out of a total of 69 completed surveys. In addition, it appeared that CSP has been increasingly attracting proportionately more millennial women than millennial men. Through their inclusion in the potential participant pool, inactive members’ perspectives were included in the data set. The intent was to give this group the opportunity to provide insight into levers for change within the CSP Calgary Zone system.

Self-selection was beneficial to this inquiry, as it enhanced the quality of engagement. In addition, and although outside the scope of this initial iterative loop of action research, the intent of anonymous participation was for these individuals to act as informal change liaisons within the rest of the CSP Calgary Zone populace in future iterative loops of action research. The self-selected sample included both active and recently retired CSP members who voluntarily responded to an emailed survey link (see Appendix B). In addition, respondents to the survey were given the option at the end of the online survey to indicate that they were interested in participating in an OST session.

As per the CSP CEO, the purposive targeted sample consisted of a minimum of the patrol leader and one assistant patrol leader from each of the active patrols in the Calgary Zone, for a
minimum of 12 people. This group received an emailed invitation to participate in the research from the Calgary Zone president (see Appendix B), as well as a follow-up phone call from me to invite participation in the OST session. The intent was to ensure that every patrol within the CSP Calgary Zone had meaningful representation in the action research inquiry.

Of the 69 online survey respondents, 45% were Lake Louise patrollers, 25% were Nakiska patrollers, 15% were Norquay patrollers, 8% were Nordic patrollers, 5% were special events patrollers, and 3% were Canada Olympic Park patrollers. Although these participation rates are reflective of the relative sizes of the different ski patrols within the Zone, the national database is in the process of being updated and thus accurate patrol-counts were not available.

Forty percent of online survey respondents indicated they participated in another patrol in addition to their primary patrol.

As expected, 75% of the 69 survey participants (i.e., those who completed a minimum of one third of the survey questions) resided in Calgary, and 91% of all participants resided in Alberta. The survey respondents were evenly distributed between the three generations. Of the respondents who indicated their age, the generational distribution of completed surveys between the Millennials (19-33 years old), GenXers (34-49 years old), and Boomers (50-68 years old) was virtually even at 34%, 34%, and 32% respectively. However, taken as a whole, this meant that two thirds of the entire volunteer populace were over 34 years old.

The online survey respondents’ length of volunteer service ranged from less than one year to 37 years, with an average of 10.1 years. Based on the survey data obtained, the average length of service for the survey respondents in the Calgary Zone was 8.8 years, and the average length of service at their current ski area was 6.5 years. This indicated that not only did patrollers move between divisions and zones, they moved between ski areas within the Calgary Zone itself.
Twenty of the 69 respondents who completed or partially completed surveys indicated interest in the OST session, for a total potential participation rate of 29%. Of this pool of respondents, nine people attended the session.

**Inquiry Team**

At the outset of this study, a team of people were invited to serve on an inquiry team to help guide the study. The project inquiry team included the following individuals:

- Glenn Bonsall, the CSP Calgary Zone president and Lake Louise patrol member, who was selected because he has direct influence and control over the timing and implementation of the action research inquiry recommendation;
- Caroline Conway, a Royal Roads University Master of Arts, Leadership (MAL) cohort member, who agreed to participate in order to give perspective on the process from a fellow academic learner perspective;
- Elizabeth Oldfield, a life member of CSP, member of the Norquay patrol, and decorated patroller, who has earned over 20 awards, including life member designation at Zone, division, and national levels;
- Geoff Scotton, the CSP national vice-president communications, Nakiska patrol member, and past president Calgary Zone, who was selected to provide both historical and national context;
- Marielle Flottat, Calgary Zone vice-president public affairs and a Lake Louise patrol member, who was selected as a female representative of the Millennial generation and was currently engaged in a recruitment and retention initiative with the CSP Calgary Zone; and
Chris Oliver, CSP Calgary Zone past president and Nakiska patrol member, who was selected as the most recent past-president of the CSP Zone to provide historical context participated in the first conference call to help frame the study.

All but the Royal Roads University cohort member and I were major stakeholders in future of CSP. Each CSP member of the inquiry team was purposively selected. Within their ranks, there existed representation of both sexes and all three generations (i.e., Millennials, GenXers, and Boomers), as well as all three levels of the CSP organisation (i.e., patrol, zone, and national).

The role of the inquiry team was to assist with the electronic survey design, data interpretation, ethical consideration amelioration, and eventual recommendation implementation. Each member was provided with the research letter (see Appendix C) and an individualized opportunity to discuss roles, responsibilities, questions, and concerns in person with me. Each inquiry team member signed an Inquiry Team Member Letter of Agreement (see Appendix D).

As described in Chapter 1, Colin Saravanamuttoo, CSP national president and CEO, was the project sponsor and wielded the authority to implement any proposed changes. However, there was a distributed leadership model in place, whereby the CSP CEO determined what initiatives would be implemented, and the CSP Calgary Zone president would decide, within reason, implementation strategies.

Inquiry Methods

In this action research inquiry, I employed my journal, a literature review, an electronic online survey (see Appendix E), an OST session, and both quantitative as well as qualitative data analysis. Each process successively narrowed the focus of the action research inquiry. The specific inquiry methods used for this study consisted of an online survey and an OST session. All active and inactive members of the CSP Calgary Zone were invited via email to participate in
this inquiry via a global email invitation (see Appendix B). The email invitation stipulated that online survey participants needed to opt into the open space technology session through the provision of their email address in the final question of the online survey.

**Data collection tools**

A multi-method approach to data collection provided academic rigour and ensured a rich pool of data for analysis. Data collection tools in support of the research questions included an online survey and an open space technology session.

**Online survey**

Surveys, and in particular online surveys, are an efficient means of data collection from a large group of busy and dispersed participants. Some of the advantages of an online survey over the more traditional interview-style survey include: lower costs; convenience for respondents; ease of survey design and deployment; automatic data compilation; minimal observer bias; and increased confidentiality, as there is no face-to-face interaction with an interviewer. Some of the disadvantages of an online survey entail decreased ability to probe and clarify responses, limited suitability for sensitive topics, lower participation rates due to erroneous email addresses, rigid survey design, and survey saturation whereby potential participants ignore requests to participate. Whether in-person or online, it is important to remember that the survey process instils expectations in participants. Viteles (as cited in Hartley, 2001) stated, a “survey is like a hand grenade. Once you pull the pin out you have to do something with it. Otherwise it may harm you rather than help you” (p. 188). This point will be revisited in Chapter 5.

The use of an online survey was deemed appropriate for the purposes of this inquiry for three reasons. Firstly, it was convenient for the patrollers. The CSP Calgary Zone patrollers typically work full-time in addition to their volunteer commitment. A survey was an easily
accessible, minimally intrusive method of engagement that enabled constituents to respond when and where it was appropriate for them. Secondly, it was convenient for the organisation. The CSP Calgary Zone already had a members-only database of email addresses. Thus, once the invitation was drafted, it was straightforward to quickly distribute it to the entire Calgary Zone database, and thus reached “a [broad] range of participants” (Stringer, 2007, p. 79). This eliminated the logistical challenges of organising an in-town meeting solely for the purposes of this research. Finally, there was an egalitarian element to the online survey. The Canadian survey company used, FluidSurveys (http://fluidsurveys.com/), enabled me to turn on a survey filter such that each survey response required a unique internet protocol address. Thus, each individual was only able to complete the survey once, which ensured each respondent completed no more than one survey each.

Typical response rates for short, direct-emailed surveys with follow-up are approximately 40-70% (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). I anticipated that the response rate for this survey would be on the higher end of this range, as the target participant pool was a group of dedicated volunteers, many of whom had a long-term commitment to the organisation. Seventy-nine people clicked on the link to the survey, and 69 surveys were started. Of these 69 surveys, the surveys deemed complete were those with at least one set of questions completed in addition to the completed demographic section ($n = 60$). Surveys with only demographic questions completed were deemed partially complete ($n = 9$), and those surveys without any questions answered were deemed blank ($n = 10$). Only complete and partially complete surveys ($n = 69$) were eligible for data analysis. None of the incomplete surveys ($n = 10$) were included in the analysis. As such, 69 people of a potential 171 active patrollers responded to the survey for a participation rate of 40%
of the active patrol population or 9% of the entire email distribution list of 734 emails (i.e., the emails that did not bounce back as undelivered).

**Open spaces technology session**

As a process of inquiry by which participants collectively determined the discussion themes and the meeting agenda, the OST session enabled participants to not only decide priorities, but also collectively design action plans. This method is a highly participative and flexible process grounded in respect for participants’ perspectives. As such, it was an efficient method to unite diverse, polarized groups around contentious issues (Owen, 2008). The OST method ensured participants had the opportunity to raise, prioritise, document, and address key issues, which resulted in a high level of process engagement (Owen, 2008): such was the experience of the participants in this action research inquiry.

At the conclusion of the OST session, and as a means to conclude the session, participants were asked to provide their feedback on their experience of OST. Their comments were excluded from the formal dataset, as they were not part of the formal data collection process. However, the comments made included a general consensus that the process was worthwhile and that it not only helped to generate ideas, but also fostered a sense of fellowship between the different patrol areas within the CSP Calgary Zone. In keeping with Vitele’s observation mentioned earlier (Hartley, 2001), the group stated they wanted to see action arise from the information gathered during this inquiry process as well as future opportunities to interact with patrollers from other areas within the CSP Calgary Zone.

**Study conduct**

As a preliminary step in the data collection process, I engaged the inquiry team in the design of the online survey. The same team piloted the survey and ensured alignment between
the inquiry questions and the survey question themes. The data from the pilot process were not included in the final data set for analysis. Final revisions to the survey were made before it was distributed to the 881 potential active and inactive patroller participants in the CSP Calgary Zone members-only database.

In phase one of this action research project, an invitation to participate in an online survey was sent out via email to CSP Calgary Zone members. The Calgary Zone President accessed the national database system to create a distribution list of all email addresses for active and inactive CSP Calgary Zone members. In order to generate the population for this action research project, the CSP Calgary Zone president distributed via email the invitation to participate in the action research inquiry (see Appendix B). Eight hundred and eighty-one emails containing links to an online survey were sent to 171 active and 710 inactive patrollers. Of these, 147 emails bounced back, resulting in a final total distribution of 734 emails. The survey consisted of dichotomous, nominal, ordinal, and interval questions as an efficient means of data collection from the potentially large population of patrollers (see Appendix E).

Next, I accessed recent CSP Calgary Zone documents (i.e., the I.C.E. bulletin) and generated a list of the purposive sample participants. A purposive sample is a group of participants identifiable by a specific characteristic. In this study, members of the executive from each of the Calgary Zone patrols were selected. I then accessed the national database system and obtained contact information for the purposive targeted sample group and attempted to contact each member of the purposive sample group via email and telephone.

The online survey remained open and active from November 17, 2013, until January 22, 2014, and the OST session was held on January 23, 2014. As OST allows for extreme flexibility with regard to group size (Owen, 2008), all participants who indicated an interest in the OST
session \( n = 20 \) were invited to attend and were sent the research consent form (see Appendix F) in advance of the session; they were provided with a hard copy of the research consent form for signature upon arrival at the OST session.

Of the original 20 individuals who had indicated an interest in the OST session, nine attended. Collectively, this group represented each of the various ski areas: special events (one person); Nakiska (three people), Nordic (one person), Canada Olympic Park (one person), Norquay (one person), and Lake Louise (two people).

**Data analysis**

Action research depends upon “systemic and rigorous processes . . . [to] ensure veracity, truthfulness, or validity” (Stringer, 2007, p. 57). In this inquiry, I used a mixed-method approach with both quantitative and qualitative data analysis to provide rigour.

To establish trustworthiness, I engaged in prolonged engagement with participants and the data through both the online survey and the OST session. The design of this inquiry was deliberate. An initial online survey followed by the OST session ensured that participants had an opportunity to provide additional input and clarification if they chose to do so. Personally, I reflected at length on the meaning of the information gleaned from the inquiry (Glesne, 2011) and its import for the CSP organisation, in an effort to fully understand what participants had said about organisational adaptability within the Calgary Zone.

In terms of process, the online survey data were exported into an Excel spread sheet from the collection system, Fluid Surveys, which facilitated the coding process and helped “make the bulk less intimidating” (Glesne, 2011, p. 193). OST session participants entered data directly into my laptop as part of the OST process. Before I conducted any specific quantitative or qualitative analysis, all data from both the online survey and the OST session were collated, reviewed, and
I proceeded to analyse the data quantitatively and qualitatively as appropriate.

**Quantitative analysis**

Descriptive statistical analysis, a method of data analysis used to describe or summarize data, was used to identify patterns in the closed-ended responses in the online survey data. Specifically, analysis was completed on these questions to determine the demographic profile of the overall survey respondent group (e.g., average age, patrol composition of the zone, length of service, and sex proportions). Data from the survey were also parsed and graphed to determine if there were any appreciable differences in responses between respondents’ generation, sex, or local patrol affiliation. Once I had exhausted all possible means of quantitative data analysis, I turned to qualitative analysis of the data.

**Qualitative analysis**

As “qualitative data deal with meanings” (Ruona, 2005, p. 234), the entire data set (i.e., online survey and OST session) was analysed using a recursive qualitative data analysis process that involved reading, coding, categorising, and theming. I printed all narrative data responses and OST session notes, cut them into individual bits of data and grouped, regrouped, and regrouped again the slips of paper as I searched for themes.

Thematic analysis and coding were used to make sense of the open-response online survey data questions, where respondents were asked to write out their responses, and the OST session data (Glesne, 2011, p. 187). The OST data were comprised of prioritised recommendations generated by participants (Owen, 2008).
Trustworthiness of data analysis

The use of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis in addition to the ongoing process of reflection, observation, and engagement with inquiry team members and patrollers served to ensure the authenticity and trustworthiness of the data. I verified the themes that emerged from the data in three ways: through a grounding in the literature, through dialogue with my inquiry team members, and through informal discussions with CSP Calgary Zone patrollers. I conducted member checking with my inquiry team and with individual patrollers to ensure I had “adequately represented their perspectives and experiences” (Stringer, 2007, p. 58). To that end, I ensured that I directly quoted the words of the participants to reduce any potential bias entering the data. Each strategy led to a deeper understanding of the inquiry and the organisation.

I kept a record of the development of my research through a personal journal and through emails to my faculty advisor and inquiry team members. In addition, I participated in confidential weekly meetings with other MA Leadership candidates, where we discussed our progress and supported one another with the trials and tribulations of the action research process.

I reinforced the authenticity of the data, as I have reported a full range of responses. This further supported the rigour of the inquiry as it provided “referential adequacy [such that the] concepts and ideas . . . [were] drawn from and reflect the experiences and perspective of participating stakeholders” (Stringer, 2007, pp. 58-59).

Triangulation, or the “practise of relying on multiple methods” (Glesne, 2011, p. 47), served to establish data validity and trustworthiness throughout research activities, data analysis and the final report compilation. In this action research inquiry, I used “persistent observation” (Stinger, 2007, p. 57) throughout research activities, data analysis, and the thesis compilation.
Stringer (2007) posited that the “credibility of research is enhanced when participants consciously observe events, activities and the context over a period of time” (p. 58).

Finally, once I had marinated in the data for some time, I engaged members of my inquiry team in discourse about the raw data from the OST session in order to validate (or refute) the theming process. I sent the inquiry team the raw data from OST session to validate the themes emerging from the data and asked for their thoughts, observations, and opinions as to emergent themes. I then checked their feedback against my themes for validation. Two of the team sent lengthy responses that confirmed my identified themes and provided additional perspective on the inquiry. Upon final validation of my themes, I conducted one final check with a member of the inquiry team, who was academically knowledgeable, but contextually ignorant, and reviewed categories and themes. The measures undertaken to ensure this inquiry rigorously adhered to the action research tenets to ensure trustworthiness also ensured I had support to address ethical considerations of the study.

**Ethical Issues**

In the course of this inquiry, I created “a context in which individuals and groups with divergent perceptions and interpretations can formulate a construction of their situation that makes sense to them all” (Stringer, 2007, p. 41). In so doing, this action research inquiry ensured “respect for persons, concern for welfare . . . [and] justice” (Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada [Tri-Council], 2010, p. 8). In addition, in all aspects of the inquiry, I upheld the obligations of the Royal Roads University (2011) *Research Ethics Policy* and the Royal Roads University (2010) *Academic Integrity and Misconduct in Research and Scholarship Policy*. 
All participants, including the inquiry team, were clearly informed as to the purpose of the action research inquiry and the potential uses and distribution of the final report (see Appendices B, C, D, and E). The introductory email with the survey link included a statement that indicated participation was voluntary and that the participant provided his or her informed consent by election to complete the survey (see Appendix B).

**Confidentiality**

Participant confidentiality was paramount in both the electronic survey and the OST session. The majority of data collected from the electronic survey were anonymous as no identifying information was included in the surveys (see Appendix E); however, those individuals interested in the OST session were asked to submit their email addresses. In some cases, but not all, email addresses contained part, or all, of an individual’s name. In these cases, once the email addresses were collected, the addresses were deleted from the main datasheet to remove the association.

**Ethical considerations**

Ethical considerations extended to the inquiry team, with the same considerations given to informed consent, privacy, respect, and confidentiality. A letter that explained the nature of the research, inquiry team member role, and procedures in the event of a conflict of interest on the part of the researcher was sent to each member of the inquiry team (see Appendix D).

**Conflict of interest**

There was no overt indication of any conflict of interest with respect to this action research inquiry. As the primary researcher, I did not hold a position of authority in the sponsor organisation, nor was there a working relationship or position of influence with any of the
potential participants in the CSP Calgary Zone. However, it was acknowledged that I might
benefit from the attainment of a master’s degree.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I have provided details on the action research methodology and all aspects
of the data collection, analysis methods, and process. With this in-depth understanding of how
the research was conducted, I turn now to reviewing the study findings and conclusions that
resulted from this process.
CHAPTER FOUR: ACTION INQUIRY PROJECT RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

This action research inquiry delved into the experiences of CSP Calgary Zone members to uncover the ways in which the organisation might enhance its organisational adaptability to ensure its future viability. Organisational adaptability is defined as the organisation’s ability to react to, and accept, internal and external change. The subquestions in support of this overarching research question included the following:

1. How do members of the CSP Calgary Zone describe the current adaptability of their organisation?
2. What factors do members believe support organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?
3. What factors do members believe hinder organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?

In this chapter, I emerge from the pool of data with five overarching findings. These findings run the gamut from the meaning of the patrol as individual patrollers to the optimistic outlook of the patrol as a collective. I then form conclusions as I view the gathered data through the lenses introduced in Chapter 2, which included organisational adaptability, learning organisations, the not-for-profit sector, and diversity. Finally, I acknowledge both the scope and some of the limitations of this action research inquiry project.

Study Findings

The findings presented in this chapter reflect the views and opinions of a diverse group of CSP Calgary Zone members, active and inactive, experienced and inexperienced. The narrative data from both the online survey (see Appendix G for response frequency) and the OST sessions
have been coalesced into one unified dataset wherever possible. This ensured that the broadest range of CSP Calgary Zone voices possible rang clearly throughout.

All narrative data from the online survey was coded as (SR) for survey respondent, followed by an identifying number that corresponded with the line number in the respondent data spread sheet. This ensured there was an opportunity to reconfirm data if necessary during the analysis stage. All OST session data were anonymous and, therefore, are denoted with (OPEN) following the quote from the session notes. The topics for the OST session itself provide additional inquiry data. Participants elected to discuss “operating assumptions” (OPEN), “vision of the CSP in the future” (OPEN), “ski hill integration” (OPEN), “bad attitudes—correct or filter” (OPEN), “elimination stagnation” (OPEN), and “patroller retention” (OPEN).

Findings from the online survey, in combination with the OST session, supported the overarching conclusion that the CSP Calgary Zone—a dedicated, passionate, and supportive team—is poised for change. A recursive process of reading, coding, and categorising the data resulted in the following thematic findings:

1. Participants report a full spectrum of meaning.
2. Within the bounds of the CSP allegiance, loyalties are individualised.
3. The Calgary Zone is in flux.
4. Culture, structure, and demographics affect organisational adaptability.
5. Participants are cautiously optimistic about change.

**Finding 1: Participants report a full spectrum of meaning**

Demands on CSP Calgary Zone patrollers are significant in terms of time, effort, and resources. Patrollers are expected to pay for their equipment, annual fees, and transportation as well as dedicate a significant amount of time to requalification efforts. All this is expected before
they even buckle up their boots for one of an expected 18 patrol days between November and March each year. CSP Calgary Zone patrollers are a committed and passionate group, as reflected in this inquiry’s data. The expression of what patrolling meant to members ranged from profound to pragmatic and had three common contextual foci, in descending order of prevalence: ski patrol, society, and self.

The import of patrolling was profound for some members and replete with “fond memories” (OPEN) of “what kept our volunteers patrolling for as long as they did” (OPEN). One inactive patroller found the transition to non-patrolling life notably difficult as “not being able to give back to society and to be part of a team I respect and whose respect I value has been psychologically difficult” (SR2). For others, the potential of the loss of opportunity to patrol ranged from sentiments that it would be “too hard to imagine” (SR32) to “I would feel a sense of loss, but that gap would be filled in through more focus on my participation in [other volunteer activities]” (SR11). A congruity between each of these comments was an anticipation of a significant void the loss of patrolling would leave in respondents’ lives. In the following three sections, I explore what resonated most about patrolling for the CSP Calgary Zone membership.

**Ski patrol**

Within the context of the meaning of patrolling, six themes emerged from questions related to the meaning of patrolling to the patroller. The most prevalent was the deep sense of connection to, and pride in, CSP team membership. Overwhelmingly, the most prevalent comments were those that reflected pride in the CSP team and the value of the CSP community.

There existed three definitions of the CSP team to which respondents referred. One view focused on the resort operational team, as did the respondent who appreciated the “behind the scenes activities that are part of running a ski resort” (SR8). Another view considered the CSP
team as a whole as “part of an internationally recognised group that is known for doing good” (SR34). Finally, a subset of this latter CSP perspective was a focus on the local area CSP team, in that it was “a team . . . cohesive in its role and highly supportive of each other working in a relatively harsh, unforgiving, environment” (SR4).

Irrespective of team perspective, an underlying value for the connection and camaraderie the patrol experience provides was pervasive. One respondent felt that within the CSP, “you have a group of people who understand your problems instantly” (SR52), and the value of the team extended beyond problems to celebration. Recognition that “CSP needs to be socially satisfying” (OPEN) affirmed survey data that indicated “socializing with fellow patrollers” (SR17) and the creation of “lifelong memories” (SR31) were attractive elements of patrolling.

A sense of belonging with “people who share my values and sensitivities” (SR2) was just as important as being “part of an identifiable group held to high standards” (SR35) that showed “competency in crises” (SR31). The importance of “belonging to a team of people who care about something other than themselves” (SR28) spoke to a second element of the meaning theme, that of being willing and able to provide a valuable service to society.

**Society**

There was a very strong reverberation throughout the data of the desire to help others. In response to the survey question that asked respondents what patrolling meant to them, one individual stated, “Everything. It is an opportunity to be that person who can help at a time that feels like the end of the world for someone” (SR32). “Helping people”, “providing first aid services,” and “making a difference”, or direct variations thereof, appeared 66 times in the data. However, it was not just traditional ski patrol duties that called patrollers; pride existed in a
broader interpretation of the patrol function that ranged from “public relations to maintaining a safe environment for the skiing public” (SR3).

The concept of “being an ambassador to people who are skiing” (SR7) meant that service was about more than the provision of first aid and a “volunteer spirit” (SR60). Several respondents noted that “contributing to the sport of skiing” (SR58) was an important part of their patrol experience. To be “able to help people and give something back to a sport I love” (SR5) explained part of the motivation for why people choose ski patrolling above other, less time and energy demanding, volunteer opportunities.

**Self**

In second place after the societal benefits of patrolling, “I love skiing” (SR4) rang clearly throughout the data in various formats. First and foremost, skiing was viewed as a foundational benefit of the ski patrol experience in the Calgary Zone. The patrol not only enabled people to “afford to ski” (SR52), but also provided patrollers “someone to ski with” (SR16, SR60). Another “major benefit” (SR9) to patrolling was the opportunity “get ski tips and lessons” (SR9) and to “experience different aspects of the sport you don’t as a member of the public” (SR6).

Loving the sport was clearly viewed as a benefit of ski patrolling; however, there were additional adjunct benefits. One of these was the opportunity “to train and work alongside industry professionals” (SR26), which developed “advanced first aid . . . CPR” (SR25) and “emergency scenario skills” (SR48) that made it possible to have the “confidence to take charge of a situation and help people in need” (SR17).

Another personal benefit of patrolling was the non-skiing aspect, including “professional career networking [and] benefits to personal life outside of patrolling” (SR25). These types of benefits included the development of “credible leadership experience” (SR54), the opportunity to
act in “leadership roles” (SR8), as well as the development of “situational management” (SR48) and “decision-making skills” (SR31, SR54) by “navigating complex situations” (SR48). In addition to having “friends and co-workers look to you for leadership and opinions more often” (SR52), there was a sentiment expressed that “volunteer work looks good on the CV” (SR34).

One somewhat concerning minor theme arose around the opportunity to “intimidate” (SR38) the public as an “authority figure” (SR52). Admittedly, one respondent missed “the status that came with it when I told people I patrolled [as s/he liked] the identity part of it” (SR48). This was echoed in comments that people enjoyed confidence-boosting aspects of patrolling, as “people listen to you blindly, obey you without question” (SR52). The same individual stated that this response from the public prompted her/him to push to “prove . . . [that] you deserve that trust” (SR52).

Finally, a significant benefit to patrollers was the complete “change of pace” (SR56) that patrolling provided. As individuals “multi-task limited free time” (SR25), the “complete mental break from my job” (SR29) was perceived as a means to “keep life in balance (and in perspective)” (SR29). A number of respondents used patrolling as a motivational tool: It was viewed as a “good reason to get out of bed on the weekend” (SR37) in order to “get some physical activity and fresh air while helping the public” (SR47). One respondent summed it all up when he/she stated that ski patrolling meant “exercise, opportunity to get outdoors, get away from the computer, do something exciting, [and] opportunity to learn valuable skills” (SR15).

As noted earlier, the concept of team membership held significant meaning for the majority of respondents and was the most prevalent theme that arose from respondent narratives. Given that ski patrolling has different meanings for different people, each of whom have their
own particular values schemata, it stands to reason that these differences may materialise as individualised loyalties.

**Finding 2: Within the bounds of the CSP allegiance, loyalties are individualised**

An interesting comment in the data was one individual’s statement that there was value in the “camaraderie and friendship with most people within the patrol system” (SR11). The word “most” in this sentence prompted a search of the data for evidence of the ways in which loyalties might vary between respondents. This search suggested that one contributing factor to idiomatic loyalties may be variances in the interpretation of the definition of “team.” It appeared the definition of team possessed a degree of fluidity, as people commented about a general “passion for the organisation” (SR29) and yet indicated frustration with the “national patriarchy and directives” (SR16) along with the suggestions that “limitations from national” (SR60) and “politics” (SR11, SR27, SR31, SR32, SR52) hold the organisation back.

Comments about the national organisation were infrequent, appearing six times in total: once in a neutral context (SR12), twice in a positive context (SR7, SR12), and four times in a negative context (SR18, SR60 [two separate comments], SR62). The vast majority of narratives in both the survey and the OST session related to allegiance challenges within the Calgary Zone, either on a generational basis, a patrol basis, or an individual basis. These three subthemes are explored further in this section.

**The generational team**

As suggested by five comments related to the “old boys club,” the concept of team could refer to one’s own particular generation or one’s own particular era of volunteer service. Comments that related to a “bias of old executive regarding the different patrols within Calgary
“Probing the Potential” (SR29) not only described the perception of one generation of the CSP Calgary Zone leadership, but also indicated that a heightened awareness of the need for change existed.

This collective self-awareness also showed up as a perception that there was one segment of the CSP Calgary Zone that was concerned with “history” (SR20, SR31) and “politics” (SR11, SR19, SR27, SR31, SR32, SR39, SR52). For example, SR29 stated that she/he “didn’t agree with the old boys’ club mentality and left.” As a result, it appeared there was general, consistent recognition that “less politics” (SR30) is desirable as is a need to “get rid of the old boys’ club stigma” (SR53).

The CSP area patrol team

Other comments related to intra-patrol issues within the zone. Narratives of this nature implied that team referred to CSP members from one’s own particular ski area, as one individual indicated he/she worked with a patrol team that is “a joy to be around” (SR32). Furthermore, one respondent viewed “mandatory trust in [his/her] on-hill team” (SR52) as an element of a high-performing team.

Strong internal area patrol ties do have their drawbacks. The single most oft-cited issue related to the CSP zone was grounded in a “limited interest outside your hill” (SR52), which could result in a “lack of understanding of the Zone” (SR18). A focus on one’s immediate area team could lead to “disparate patrols” (SR34), as evidenced by “inter-patrol rivalries” (SR7), “territorialism” (SR31), and competition “between patrols for resources including new recruits” (SR29). The comment “too many clicks [sic] between hills” (SR37) was further clarified by one respondent who stated, “COP vs Nakiska vs Norquay vs Lake Louise patrols in one Zone” (SR57). Although SR7 qualified his/her comment regarding “inter-patrol rivalries” by stating that “this is less now than when I started with the CSP,” which was three years ago.
It is possible that respondents contrasted the disparity between the consonance of their own area patrol with the perceived discordance of the Calgary Zone—and potentially national level; however, remedies were also suggested. Membership indicated a desire for “more of a Calgary Zone feel instead of individual patrols” (SR7) through CSP Calgary Zone events that promote interaction between patrol members from different hills (e.g., world cup, Calgary marathon, the K100 road race). Given the prevalence of commentary on inter-patrol discord, this was one issue on many CSP Calgary zone patrol members’ minds.

Relationships with the paid operations staff, with whom CSP patrollers most frequently interact, is worthy of comment. According to more than one respondent, there was a “bond that is built between the pro patrollers and [CSP]” (SR27) that made him/her feel “part of a close-knit team that is integrated into the paid patrol staff” (SR5). Apparently “new uniforms” (SR27) were indicative of organisational adaptability for one area, where “having a uniform that matches the hill [made] CSP patrollers feel like ‘part of the team’” (OPEN). However, as noted earlier, “different policies from different hills like uniforms and police checks” (SR57) can segment loyalties within the CSP Calgary zone, and these two disparate viewpoints were evidence of that potential.

The data showed that patrollers aligned with other patrollers of a similar generation or length of service, or they aligned with the volunteer and paid staff at their particular area. Although rather unexpected in a volunteer not-for-profit organisation was the comment that it would be beneficial to “reduce [the] competitive spirit among patrollers and within organisation” (SR14), which indicated there was one other type of allegiance that emerged from the data: that of allegiance to oneself.
**Thine own team**

Finally, comments surfaced repeatedly that indicated there was a perception that some “people [play] politics for their own careers” (SR17) within the CSP Calgary Zone, and “time [was] wasted on ‘stroking egos’” (SR18). Others went on to state that “personal agendas of the leadership” (SR68) had impeded progress in the past, as had “empire building by some members of the executive” (SR28), and that there appeared to be an “inverse relationship between interest in the sport and [CSP] politics” (SR37). Historically, there has been the impression that there have been “members within the Zone who [were] not willing to keep their ego in check” (SR11), and this was reflected in narrative that referred to “personalities” (SR3) and “big egos” (SR14) as challenges for the CSP Calgary Zone. This knowledge will be advantageous on a go-forward basis for the CSP Calgary Zone and will be discussed further as part of the recommendations in Chapter 5.

**Finding 3: The Calgary Zone is in flux**

The CSP Calgary zone is a microcosm of the national organisation that, in turn, is a microcosm of the not-for-profit sector, which is ultimately a reflection of society as a whole. The data suggested that patrollers perceived the past as “simpler . . . [and so was] the patroller scope of knowledge and competencies required” (OPEN). Yet, as the world external to the CSP changed, so too did the CSP Calgary Zone. As such, over the past year, the CSP Calgary Zone has experienced changes in leadership, in patroller expectations, and in client expectations like never before.

**Leadership in transition**

The frequent changes mean constant change on all levels of an organisation. New leadership was seen as a benefit to the organisational adaptability (SR9), and there was a genuine
desire for better training and skills development opportunities for up-and-coming leaders, especially as it pertains to human resources and hill-relations issues, including negotiation skills (OPEN). There was appetite for “strong leaders as presidents” (SR6), presumably at the helm of each patrol, zone, and nationally, which was an indication that “the leadership of the [Calgary] zone with new people there now” (SR9) would support organisational adaptability. The respondents voiced support for the organisation to develop leaders from within (SR50, SR56). This was also discussed during the open space event, where participants wanted the opportunity to create CSP leaders through “feedback loops . . . [geared towards] mentoring and developing future generations” (OPEN). In the context of the OST session, participants interpreted feedback loops as methods by which patrollers were given information about their performance by patients, on-hill staff, medical staff (i.e., by paramedics, trauma nurses, and ER doctors), and/or fellow CSP patrollers.

As a general trend, membership supported the “change in the leadership of the Zone” and felt they had “open access to the executive patrol leadership” (SR7). “Leadership” (referenced 15 times in the survey data), whether “new” (SR29), “flexible” (SR47), “good” (SR60), or “strong” (SR4), was a recurrent theme in response to the survey question about factors that support organisational adaptability. Inquiry data suggested that membership saw the annual elections of the CSP Calgary Zone leaders as both beneficial and detrimental. New executives brought new ideas and experiences (SR53), whereas the constant change meant little traction on larger issues (SR7).

One area for improvement concerned leadership training, skills, and/or experience. Respondents cited a “lack of managerial experience in volunteers with key positions” (SR14) and a “lack of trained” (SR32) individuals as barriers to organisational adaptability. These
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Deficits led to “disorganisation” (SR54) and “inefficiencies in the executive (i.e., time spent during meetings)” (SR61), as well as made it a “painful task being part of the leadership team” (SR51). However, “key members who are outgoing and willing to engage in discussions about change” (SR56) enriched the CSP Calgary Zone leadership. This matter will be revisited in the recommendations contained in Chapter 5.

**Patroller expectations**

As evidenced by the demographic data detailed in Chapter 3, the CSP Calgary Zone is a well-educated and experienced group of people. As such, respondents possessed expectations about the conditions in which they volunteered, and these expectations changed for a multitude of reasons.

Changing expectations made it hard for the organisation to gauge, or gain clarity on, patroller expectations on a number of fronts. Inquiry participants understood this, and they stated that the “CSP needs to do a better job of managing patroller expectations” (OPEN). Patrollers were aware that the “demands of the industry are increasing” (SR68) and that “industry is changing forcing the Zone to change” (SR20). One survey respondent indicated a potential stratagem was to learn from “some of the most challenging patrolling areas [that] allow for innovation” (SR8).

**Patroller expectations of flexibility**

Membership would like to see the organisation increase its flexibility on a number of fronts. Flexibility for respondents included an increased use of “social media and technology” (SR35) and “new protocols from on-hill management” (SR25). In addition, less rigidity in the rookie course was suggested, as “first aid instructors who quoted chapter and verse of the manual
and would accept no deviation” (SR10) hindered the effective delivery of the first aid course content.

*Patroller expectations of breadth of engagement*

Participants viewed themselves as a “diverse membership [with] varied skill-sets” (SR31) that could be of benefit to the patrol; however, a “failure to get involved” (SR3) was cited as an impediment to organisational adaptability. Participants desired an opportunity to contribute beyond their first-aid or on-snow duties. As a “wide network of people that can be accessed back in the city” (SR31), respondents wanted the CSP Calgary Zone to take “advantage of the members’ professional experience to drive decision-making” (SR54). Interestingly, membership’s willingness to offer additional skills and experience to the CSP Calgary Zone appeared to contradict comments related to the time commitment needed to patrol.

*Patroller expectations of time commitment*

The time commitment involved in ski patrolling is significant, both on an annual basis and a lifetime basis. Ski areas in the Calgary Zone currently require a minimum commitment from each patroller of three weekend days per month. Respondents voiced the opinion that the current commitment was excessive, especially in light of other life commitments. A number of patrollers suggested a relaxation of the “monthly on-hill commitment roster days” (SR25) as well as “shorter days” and the option of patrolling on “weekdays” (SR7). Greater “rostering flexibility [with the] ability to roster closer to the patrol day” made sense to the participants of the OST session.

As far as the bigger picture, participants noted “pressure on volunteer’s time is increasing” (SR68), especially with “other activities competing for discretionary time” (SR37). Participants in the OST session suggested that this issue could be addressed through the
consideration of “leaves of absences . . . [that would] better accommodate patrollers who need to leave for a short time” (OPEN) to manage life events.

Respondents felt the afore-mentioned suggestions would render other commitments, such as those of “a small business, family life, church commitments, and trying to maintain a social life” (SR50) more manageable. For some former patrollers, the time commitment was onerous enough that “this year it came as a relief not to patrol. I was beginning to resent skiing when the rest of my commitments were being neglected” (SR50).

In addition to the physical time spent in uniform, there was an additional time commitment related to transportation en route to and from the patrol commitment. As evidenced by the individual who suggested the CSP Calgary Zone investigate a “reasonably priced bus to/from Lake Louise for patrol members [that includes] a safe place to park their personal vehicles at the NW edge of Calgary near COP” (SR52). It should be noted that respondents focused on solutions.

Other participants focussed on a human resources solution to ease time demands. One respondent thought that “if we could recruit and retain more people, it would be easier for some to be able to commit to two weekend days per month instead of 3” (SR49). “Recruiting more to lighten the load somewhat” (SR70) was a sentiment echoed by a number of other patrollers (SR29, SR31, SR37, SR50), as was the importance of retention (SR37, SR39, SR53). Another individual suggested that one way to lessen the individual time burden was to “include weekdays, thus allowing people the opportunity to mix and match” (SR7). One of the ways in which patrollers balanced the costs of patrolling was with the benefits in terms of rewards and recognition.
Patroller expectations of recognition and rewards

While the data yielded a strong theme of intrinsic benefits for participants (i.e., those comments related to the camaraderie, team membership, and social benefits), a subtheme emerged related to a yen for greater recognition from “the public for the work and role we perform” (SR6), the CSP, and the area operational staff. Indeed, “professional recognition is a huge motivator . . . [such as] when a paid patroller compliments your skills or hard work” (OPEN). Requests were made for the creation of “a positive feedback loop, where hard work and performance is recognised and rewarded” (SR56).

Recognition in the form of more complex assignments and less stressful testing processes surfaced in the data set. OST participants acknowledged that “no, you don’t get to do avalanche control your first day out. You must earn the privilege” (OPEN). One patroller felt that greater experience should lessen the need for scrutiny in the tri-annual on-snow evaluation process:

Eliminate the ski test recertification every three years. If you’re a fully active/qualified patroller (regularly skiing all the terrain and operating loaded and unloaded toboggans on a regular basis . . . not running around and hiding from calls), there shouldn’t be a requirement to be tested every three years. It’s stressful, and most people hate being watched and judged. It also puts a lot of stress on the training team (which I would like to see changed as well). (SR13)

As illuminated by the comment above, there is a burgeoning desire for on-going, in-the-moment training opportunities in the form of “learning feedback loops/constant learning” (OPEN) to replace the traditional current methods.

Comments from the OST data indicated that “material benefits for patrollers have degraded over the years . . . benefits have gotten worse” (OPEN) and that the “ski patrol/hill needs to maintain or increase material benefits” (OPEN). Suggestions to address this perception ranged from the invocation of a “flexible voucher programme” (SR39) to some sort of “club
house/accommodation . . . [as] retention of old seemed to be because everyone camped together and [their] families grew up together” (SR53).

As with most people, finances were a factor in the life of a CSP Calgary Zone volunteer patroller. A number of members echoed the sentiment of one volunteer who indicated that patrolling was “the only way I can afford to ski” (SR54). There were a number of comments about the costs associated with patrolling. The comment “eliminate dues for a volunteer organisation” (SR38) suggested that it is not typical to have a cost associated with the donation of one’s time. Another individual felt that it was “[prohibitive] for a lot of people to join, [because of] membership dues, jackets, number of days required, etc.” (SR60). Finally, there was a suggestion that CSP might be able to organize a discount for other hills in the zone: “Something like 10% (or more) off at any hill we patrol. I’ve never skied at a lot of hill[s] and the cost is quite prohibitive for me” (SR54).

Long days, early mornings, and the like were commented on, but appeared to be an accepted part of patrol life, despite one patroller’s comical request to “bring the mountain closer to my front door”(SR33). Fortunately, the same individual did recognise that the physics involved would be problematic.

Patroller expectations of communication

CSP Calgary Zone patrollers expected timely, accurate, and concise information provided in a transparent manner. Data revealed that there is not only a “lack of” (SR20), but also “poor communication” (SR10, SR25, SR36). Respondents believed there was a “lack of transparency” (SR19), such that “if you know someone, you get asked first or have the first right of refusal” (SR34). This sentiment carried over into the most basic necessities of patrol life. As an example, one patroller described his or her efforts to obtain a uniform jacket. Apparently this person had
“no idea there was a ski patrol store until I asked about where I get my jacket. I still have no idea where it is located because no map is available” (SR56). The same individual coined the term “information gems” and stated that these were “only known by select patrollers [and] passed down by oral tradition.”

Even for experienced patrollers, there existed an opportunity for improvement with regard to communication in the CSP Calgary Zone. Amongst participants, there was a perception that patrollers “are not advised about changing procedures . . . [and] planned courses are cancelled since the word is not getting out to all patrollers” (SR10). One individual suggested the placement of the “patrol leaders . . . [and] Calgary Zone executive meeting minutes on the website” (SR9) as a means address the perceived dearth of effective communication.

*Patroller expectations of knowledge and skills*

Membership reported that “more opportunity to hone skills would be really valuable” (OPEN), both on and off-snow. Specifically, “more advanced medical training” (SR4) and “more mentoring opportunities to younger or less skilled skiers” (SR11) would be appreciated, as would specific training for patrol leaders and assistant patrol leaders “on how to maintain relationships with the ski hills” (OPEN). It was felt that this type of training would help to “[establish] trust with the professional hill staff [as this] must be earned. You cannot mandate trust. CSP needs to help patrollers understand this reality” (OPEN).

Participants observed that time they invested in skill development led to greater confidence in the patrol function, especially as it pertained to “skiing ability and strength” (SR12) and in ancillary patrol duties. In addition, patrollers stated, “Standardization across hills and patrols—radio calls, equipment carried, and packing, etc.” (SR36) would further augment confidence and serve to diminish intra-zone conflict. In recognition of the need to ensure
technical expertise, OST participants suggested the CSP Calgary Zone “create specializations for skill development [such as] a skill class on toboggan handling [or] specialize in a specific area of first aid” (OPEN).

The various ski areas set operational protocols for the provision of first aid, toboggan handling, and uniforms and their hill. As such, ski area operations also define the expectations of the CSP members at their hill.

**Client expectations**

Some participants recognized that although the “CSP is a single season organisation” (SR32), there is a “huge range of scope of practice across different hills” (SR54). The “complexity of our tasks” (SR39) ranges from the popular skiing and first aid to the less popular safety prevention responsibilities. Requests appeared among the survey responses for “no more slow patrol duties” (SR59) and “no more speed control [or] other duties that involve ‘police’ work” (SR15). Although this type of work is expected of patrollers by clients, it is not popular and may contribute to dissatisfaction.

OST participants noted that some “CSP members are so demoralized/stagnant, they avoid emergency calls on the hill and end up having weak skills and limited confidence, which creates a ‘negative feedback loop’ reinforcing bad behaviours.” They further noted it is possible that “stagnation with CSP seems to be caused by passionate people not having opportunities to continuously develop skills.” One solution may be related to CSP services that “have [a] broader demand to a variety of environments” (OPEN). The CSP Calgary Zone must manage the expectations of clients, national office, area patrols, and individual members, who, as will be seen next, are a diverse group.
Finding 4: Organisational structure and constituent demographics affect organisational adaptability

Survey and OST participants were asked about the various elements of patrolling commonly associated with high-performance organisations (de Waal, 2012). Inquiry participants indicated which elements were important to them and, subsequently, how satisfied they were with each element. In the following sections, I outline key themes that emerged related to the organisational structure and constituent demographics.

Organisational structure perceived as restrictive by membership

Comments related to the national CSP organisation indicated a perception that the “National organisation structure” (SR60) hindered the CSP Calgary Zone organisation’s adaptability. This could be due to a perception that the “size of [the] organisation is too small for amount of leadership required” (SR28) along with “out-dated bylaws” (SR27) and “restrictive policies” (SR49). One individual felt that the constant change imposed by a policy that limits CSP Calgary Zone terms to one year hindered organisational adaptability and felt, instead this individual felt that “key executive positions should have a 2-year tenure as a minimum” (SR7). Another hindrance to organisational adaptability was “know-it-all or I-know-best type attitudes resulting in resistance to change” (SR56).

The CSP is a blend of generation, sexes, and viewpoints

Although one respondent stated that a “sense of entitlement” (SR33) hinders the organisation’s ability to embrace change; other participants noted that both “demographic variety” (SR32) and a “huge diversity in backgrounds” (SR54) helped enhance organisational adaptability. One patroller commented that the “demographics of volunteers is changing” (SR70) and felt this supported organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone. However, other
respondents saw “generation gaps” (SR26, SR55) and “gender inequality” (SR16, SR37) as problematic. Participants in the OST session discussed the fact that “motivations can change for patrollers over time” (OPEN) and wondered “does the CSP recognize this” (OPEN)?

As mentioned above, references to the “old boys club”, or a variation thereof, were made 11 times (SR10, SR12, SR13, SR19, SR29, SR32, SR37, SR50, SR55, SR56, SR62). This prompted a look at a comparison of data and demographics related to generation.

**Generation**

There was a relatively even population split between Boomers (34%), GenXers (34%), and Millennials (32%) who responded to the generational question on the survey. This meant that 68% of the respondent members of the CSP Calgary zone were over the age of 34. Although the age of respondents was disparate, responses related to questions of importance, satisfaction, and urgency were relatively cohesive (see Figures 3, 4, and 5).

In Figure 3, generational variance is evident with respect to a number of aspects of patrolling. GenXers felt “my talents put to effective use” is less important than either the Boomers or the Millennials. On “I have opportunity to set future direction,” Millennials felt this was more important than either the Boomers or the GenXers. Finally, on matters related to holding leadership roles at area, zone, or national levels, Millennials felt this was the least important aspect of patrolling for them, GenXers attributed more importance, and Boomers attributed the most importance to leadership opportunities.
Figure 3. Generational differences: Importance.

Note: Chart depicts the differences between generational responses on the question of importance of various elements of ski patrolling.

As indicated in Figure 4, Millennials were less satisfied with the zone and area (or “local”) leadership opportunities available to them and more satisfied that information was being openly shared with them than either the GenXers or Boomers. GenXers appeared less trusting of zone leadership and less satisfied with recognition from the national executive.
Figure 4. Generational differences: Satisfaction.

Note: Chart depicts the differences between generational responses on the question of satisfaction related to various elements of ski patrolling.

The general trend depicted in Figure 5 indicates that Boomers believed that most matters are more urgent than do the GenXers, followed by the Millennials who, based on this data set, appeared to be the same as, or less, concerned than the other two generations with the exception of the urgency of communication of new initiatives to members, where they ranked with the Boomers.
Figure 5. Generational differences: Urgency

Note: Chart depicts the differences between generational responses on the question of urgency related to various elements of ski patrolling.

Questions related to the various valuable aspects of patrolling for respondents created the greatest response variance (see Figure 6). Boomer participants regarded social activities and pro-deal benefits (i.e., discounts on ski equipment) to be of more value to them than did the GenXers or the Millennials, and Boomers placed less value on their relationships with fellow area CSP patrollers and on-hill staff. GenXers differed from the other two generations in that they placed less value on the physicality of patrolling and greater value on the relationships with CSP patrollers within the Calgary Zone. The greatest differences in value for the Millennials were on the aspects of physical activity (more than the GenXers and less than the Boomers) and social
activity, where data indicated they valued this element of patrol life noticeably less than either the Boomers (the highest) or the GenXers.

Figure 6. Generational differences: Valuable aspects.

Note: Chart depicts the differences between generational responses on the question of valuable aspects of ski patrolling.

Despite the differences mentioned above, all three generations concurred that trustworthiness, respect, accountability, and communication are necessary elements for organisational adaptability. Boomers suggested that organisational adaptability is enhanced by “long serving patrollers [who] have seen what works and what doesn’t” (SR10) and believed that “younger membership” (SR13) would further this endeavour because the “age demographics” (SR12) hold the organisation back. GenX respondents concurred with the Boomers, as GenXers suggested that “young membership” (SR32) and “younger patrollers being engaged in running
the Zone” (SR37) would advance the organisational adaptability cause. Paradoxically, the Millennial viewpoint appeared to be divided. One Millennial believed that “generation gaps” (SR55) hindered organisational adaptability, whereas another listed a “large range in age of membership” (SR49) as supportive. Views between the three generations were more disparate with regard to technology, representation on the leadership team, recruitment, and generational politics.

**Views on technology**

Comments on technology in data revealed that one GenX and one Millennial respondent each believed that movement “towards using social media and technology” (SR37–GenXer) and “online learning” (SR51–Millennial) would enhance organisational adaptability. This will be discussed further in Chapter 5 as one possible area for future inquiry.

**Generational politics**

Politics apparently exists not only in the context of strife between different area patrols as shown in Finding 2, but, according to the younger generations, also between the generations within the CSP Calgary Zone, and some Boomers were inclined to agree. One Boomer saw the “number of long-serving members” (SR10) as a hindrance to organisational adaptability, and this was supported by a GenXer who felt “long-standing members’ attitudes and culture” (SR36) were an impediment to change. Curiously, the united perspective of the Boomer and GenXers seemed to be lost in translation when it came to the Millennials. The 33-and-under set noted their perception that they felt excluded by “individuals who still cling to the old boys’ club mentality (i.e., focus on drinking power etc.)” (SR50). There was a definite perception that the older generations “[played] favourites, including ageism, when making decisions or assigning roles and responsibilities” (SR56).
Views on leadership

Interestingly, a schism existed between the Boomer generation and the other two generations with respect to the current state of the CSP Calgary Zone executive. One Boomer respondent indicated that the “enthusiasm of the new people on the Zone executive” (SR9) supported organisational adaptability. The GenXers and Millennials perceived leadership differently, as from their perspective, there had been a “recycling of leadership” (SR37–Millennial) that resulted in “older members at the top” (SR32–GenXer), and overall “no new people in the management roles” (SR29–GenXer). However, only the GenXer generation specifically called for “newer younger patrollers . . . in leadership roles” (SR37–GenXer).

Recruitment

The GenXers were the most vocal of the three generations on the need for recruitment efforts. As a group, they cited discontent with the “lack of new membership” (SR33) and the “same patrollers year after year” (SR29). The data were clear that GenXers, more than the two other generational groups, wanted “new blood” (SR36) and a renewed effort put into “recruiting new patrollers” (SR37). Although one representative of the Boomer generation had left patrol-life because “didn’t feel [I] had what it took anymore” (SR12), discourse during the OST session clearly identified the desire of the CSP Calgary Zone to “repurpose older patrollers without excluding them” (OPEN) and questioned “What are older patrollers good at? How can we use their skills?” (OPEN). There was recognition of the value of the different generations within the patrol.

Gender

Women and men do differ in their views of the CSP and patrol life; however, as with the analysis of generational data differences, the responses were remarkably homogeneous. On the
whole, data from participants indicated that women were slightly less concerned with recognition and holding leadership positions and slightly less satisfied overall than were men as shown in Figures 7 and 8.

![Figure 7. Sex differences: Importance.](image)

*Note:* Chart depicts the differences between sexes on responses to the question of the importance of various elements of ski patrolling.
**Figure 8.** Sex differences: Satisfaction.

*Note:* Chart depicts the differences between sexes on responses to the question of satisfaction from various elements of ski patrolling.

In terms of urgency, female respondents placed a higher priority on the matter of transparency than did men. However, females indicated that communication issues between the zone and national and generational issues were less pressing (see Figure 9).
Finally, on the matter of what mattered, men placed higher value on the technical knowledge gained through the annual CPR recertification process than did women, and men valued relationships with fellow area CSP patrollers slightly less as well. On matters of valuable aspects of being a patroller, all other aspects were remarkably similar between the sexes as shown in Figure 10.
Figure 10. Gender differences: Valuable aspects.

*Note:* Chart depicting the differences between sexes on responses to the questions related to the most valuable aspects of ski patrolling.

Despite comments about “gender inequality” (SR16) and “gender disparity” (SR37), the data revealed no obvious element of patrolling that was particularly disparate between the sexes. Potential reasons for this will be explored in Chapter 5.

**Finding 5: Participants are cautiously optimistic about change**

Respondents to the survey, along with OST participants, were forthcoming about which factors they believe help and which factors they believe hinder organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary zone. Overall, inquiry constituents are encouraged by recent changes and prepared to help the organisation evolve. Organisational “recognition that there are issues which need addressing” (SR17) in conjunction with a “willingness to try new approaches to solving problems” (SR56) bode well for future change within the organisation by “inventive members”
(SR62) with “renegade attitude[s]” (SR18). The “desire to succeed and or continue” (SR36) along with a “focus on keeping the patrol sustainable” (SR50) were seen as being effective for change implementation. As a generalisation, respondents characterised CSP Calgary Zone members with terms such as: “openness” (SR11), “honesty” (SR26), and “flexibility” (SR5, SR38). The behaviours that respondents believed support change initiatives included “new zone emails that are positive” (SR50), “openness in addressing the issues” (SR11), “vision, team orientation, dedication” (SR4), “members being vocal about changes they wish to see” (SR63), leadership that “solicits feedback such as this survey” (SR28), and one individual’s assertion that the CSP Calgary Zone is “ready to accept new changes from national” (SR7).

Despite the optimism, patrollers cautioned that organisational adaptability is “leadership dependent as some leaders can lead change better than others” and that there are still issues to be overcome as the organisation moves forward. These issues include “apathy” (SR11), “protocols” (SR38), “politics” (SR11, SR31, SR32, SR52), “history” (SR 20, SR31), “dissatisfaction” (SR30), “bureaucracy” (SR38), “members who are not willing to embrace change” (SR13, and five iterations of the same theme by SR10, SR25, SR56, SR58, SR 70), an “overall sense that we are already so excellent we cannot be improved upon” (SR37), and “that was tried before and failed” (SR54). The latter two comments may be interpreted as a “lack of creativity (i.e., we have always done things this way)” (SR20). Contrary to my experience, respondents commented that there was a general “difficulty getting membership participation in a timely way” (SR6).

**Findings Summary**

In this chapter, I identified key findings from the online survey and from the OST session. Specifically, inquiry data revealed that the CSP Calgary Zone membership is comprised
of a highly dedicated and well-trained group of individuals of both sexes and all generations with a wide variety of backgrounds.

This hodgepodge of education, skills, experience, sex, and age presents both challenge and opportunity for the CSP Calgary Zone. It is a challenge to determine how to best tap into the collective mental and physical resources of a large volunteer organisation, in which each member possesses slightly different values (see Finding 1), loyalties (see Finding 2), expectations (see Finding 3), and contexts (see Finding 4).

In the conclusion section, I ground these findings in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 in order to draw conclusions about this action research inquiry. In so doing, I demonstrate the presence of change levers, the need for a review of the service delivery model, and finally, that while organisational structure and divided loyalties fetter organisational adaptability, effective relationships facilitate it.

**Study Conclusions**

All organisations, not-for-profit and for-profit alike, strive to perform at a high level. Based on the findings discussed above, and grounded within the relevant literature reviewed, I reached the following conclusions:

1. Powerful change levers are present.
2. The CSP Calgary Zone is caught in the middle of conflicting demands.
3. External and internal forces keep the CSP Calgary Zone stuck.

For Senge (2006), “the hallmark of a learning organisation is not lovely visions floating in space, but a relentless willingness to examine ‘what is’ in light of our vision” (p. 444).

Through the data gleaned from the online survey and the OST session, CSP Calgary Zone participants indicated they were patently aware of the need for change. The contraction of the
membership roster in combination with the expansion of volunteer responsibilities is unsustainable.

The CSP Calgary Zone is a well-educated group willing to examine itself. This was evidenced by the rich discussion in the OST small group discussion titled “are our operating assumptions still valid?” (OPEN). This will be discussed in more detail in Conclusion 2; however, the very fact the group members were eager to examine assumptions is key for organisational adaptability and evidence that there are specific levers within the organisation that will facilitate organisational adaptability.

**Conclusion 1: Powerful change levers are present**

A lever is a mechanism that exponentially increases the impact of one element of a system. Identification of key change levers within the CSP Calgary Zone will enable the organisation to garner the greatest benefits from its efforts to effect meaningful change, as “to change the behaviour of the system, you must identify and change the limiting factor” (Senge, 2006, pp. 157-158). Weisbord (1976) maintained there were six key elements for the determination of organisational readiness for change: purposes, structure, rewards, helpful mechanisms, relationships, and leadership (p. 261). Presumably, these same elements might be used as a guidepost to leverage change. Tichy (as cited in Burke, Lake, & Paine, 2009) expanded upon Weisbord’s six-element model and stated that there are nine change levers within organisations: external environment, mission, strategy, engagement of interest groups, tasks, organisational structure, organisational processes, people, and the informal organisation (p. 268).

In subsequent work, Burke and Litwin (as cited in Burke et al., 2009) identified 12 potential change levers in their model of organisational performance and change . . . [and] external environment, mission and strategy, leadership, organisational culture, structure, management practices, systems
(policies and procedures), work unit climate, task and individual skills, motivation, individual needs and values, and individual and organisational performance. (p. 278)

Most recently, Spangenberg and Theron (2013) proposed a revamp of the model proposed by Burke and Litwin, such that there is greater emphasis on strategy and culture as well as the inclusion of human capital and leadership outcomes. Throughout the literature on levers within organisations that affect change, relationships, human capital, and leadership were identified as central to any change effort.

One of the ways to ensure engagement and buy-in in the change management process is to make it about what matters to the participants. Upon review of the online survey data, it was evident that there are a number of elements with a noticeable gap between importance rating and satisfaction. It appeared that the most important elements of patrolling were rated as less satisfactory, and conversely, the least important elements of patrolling were rated as more satisfactory. As such, there is the potential for a significant amount of frustration, as respondents potentially inflated their perception of importance dependent upon their satisfaction with a particular element. This prospect is noted in implications for future research later in Chapter 5.

It is possible that the disparity in importance and satisfaction ratings may reflect a heightened importance attributed to items that are frustrating. As such, I conclude that it is in these areas that the greatest potential for change exists because the individuals would be willing to exert the effort necessary to change in order to reduce their frustration. In other words, change will work because, based on the data from this study, membership wants it.

As shown in Figure 11, CSP Calgary Zone patrollers are most concerned with transparency, accountability, communication, and trustworthiness and least concerned with personal recognition and holding leadership roles. Based on the differential between importance
and satisfaction scores, it appears that a good place to begin change initiatives would be with those issues related to transparency, accountability, communication, and trustworthiness.

So, if the levers and the desire for change are present, what is the problem?

Figure 11. Difference between importance and satisfaction.

*Note:* Disparity between the importance scores and the satisfaction scores respondents attributed to various elements of patrolling. Negative values indicate elements for which the importance score was lower than
Conclusion 2: The CSP Calgary Zone is caught in the middle of conflicting demands

Just as Oshry (2007) described the role of “Middles . . . [as being] torn and confused between . . . conflicting demands and priorities” (p. 23), there are a multitude of demands that are placed on the CSP Calgary Zone. Ski areas want a guaranteed supply of well-trained, physically adept patrollers. The CSP ski area patrols want guidance and direction from their zone such that they are confident their views are being relayed to national and vice versa. The CSP national organisation wants to be assured that the CSP Calgary Zone is fully participating in the organisation and accurately relaying national guidelines, procedures, protocols, and first aid training to the zone members. Finally, the patrollers themselves want an organisation that stays current with the changing demands of modern life (e.g., flexibility with rostering and training as well as keeping up with technology) and is clear and concise in its communication. All of these demands require change and the ability to change.

In the OST session, participants did not question whether or not the CSP Calgary Zone needed to evolve; instead, participants accepted the need to enhance organisational adaptability and tabled a discussion to examine “our operating assumptions” (OPEN). In the ensuing discussion, the OST group dialogued about “understandings [and] recollections [of the] qualities of the people we have attracted previously . . . what kept our volunteers patrolling for as long as they did . . . [the] patroller scope of knowledge and competencies required” (OPEN) and extended to “what our customers wanted [which] includes our past promises for service delivery and our service delivery model” (OPEN). A key focus of the OST discussion was the sentiment that “we must create value for the ski hills” (OPEN). These comments helped me to illuminate a dilemma for the CSP Calgary Zone: How does the CSP Calgary Zone “create value for the ski hills” (OPEN), adhere to CSP national policies and procedures, and evolve in order to retain
current, and attract new, patrollers? It became apparent the CSP Calgary Zone is caught in the middle of sometimes competing demands from different system constituents.

Based on comments from both the online survey and the OST session, I concluded that the CSP Calgary Zone is a Middle (Oshry, 2007) being pulled in not just two or three, but four different directions by national, area patrols, clients, and patrollers, in the attempt to provide volunteer ski patrol services. Furthermore, each of these parties acts as Middles in other systems, as shown in a very simplistic diagram in Figure 12.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 12.** Canadian Ski Patrol Calgary Zone as Middles.

*Note:* Depiction of the directions in which the CSP Calgary Zone, along with other members of the system, are “torn in the middle” (Oshry, 2007, p. 22).

This system of Middles, each being pulled in several directions, results in system constituents that spend a significant amount of time and energy trying to sort out conflicting demands and priorities coming at them from both directions (Oshry, 2007, p. 22). These behaviours keep the organisation stuck in a trap (Argyris, 2010) and result in “stress, relationship breakdowns, and severe limitations in the system’s capacity” (Oshry, 2007, p. 23). One of the
ways to resolve this middle (Oshry, 2007) dilemma is to break the mental models (Senge, 2006) associated with the current service delivery model.

**Conclusion 3: External and internal forces keep the CSP Calgary Zone stuck**

Within the CSP Calgary Zone, factors exist that either facilitate or frustrate organisational adaptability. Factors that facilitate organisational adaptability include demands from ski areas and potential new patrollers for increased scope of practice and flexibility. Factors that frustrate organisational adaptability include the deep meaning the patrol holds for many of the members and the traditional hierarchical structure in addition to organisational and individual attitudes towards change.

While “PDM [participative decision-making] can be linked to both the positive internal organisational outcomes and to the fulfilment of the organisation’s external change goals” (Bess et al., 2011, p. 237), the hierarchical and traditional structure of the CSP organisation impedes participative decision-making and thus organisational adaptability. It is a challenge for the national CSP to implement one set of rules for every unique division and zone across the nation. This same challenge exists for the CSP Calgary Zone in its attempt to apply nationally developed policies and procedures to the local area patrols. Individual zones—and potentially area patrols—resist what they perceive are directives from national and are sceptical that their voices will be heard through the layers of leadership as indicated by an observation that the “size of [the] organisation is too small for the amount of leadership required” (SR28). One challenge with the application of broad rules and regulations across disparate divisions and zones is the challenge of meeting differing expectations.

Different members cope with varied expectations in different ways. In some cases, members adapt their allegiances in order to better align with their expectations of others and vice
versa. Allegiances are critical to the enhancement of organisational adaptability because without a clear sense of team, people and patrols will work at cross-purposes with one another. This wastes time, effort, and resources as well as frustrates the change process. Within an organisation, “subcultures may conflict with each other, making the managerial process inside organizations comparable to what it might be like to managing in the United Nations” (Schein, 2006, p. 296).

In the past, patrollers perceived individuals within the CSP Calgary Zone as Tops and witnessed apparent “turf wars” (Oshry, 2007, p. 286), hence the numerous comments from both survey respondents and the OST participants related to “politics” and the “old boys club.” Other symptoms identified by Oshry (2007) as indicative of issues with the Tops included a perceived lack of support, resentment, control battles, relationship breakdowns, and limited cooperation (pp. 286-287).

A number of excellent suggestions arose from the OST session that addressed the perception of the CSP Calgary Zone as the Tops in the zone system. These included recruitment efforts that target prospects with emotional intelligence as well as technical skill and the initiation of approved sabbaticals as part of the lifecycle of a patroller. As one inquiry team member stated, “We are still a paternalistic benevolent dictatorship. Until the organisation, at all levels, adopts a system where everyone participates and votes, it’s all just words.” Clearly, as do others, this patroller expects involvement and influence in the future of the organisation.

Conclusions summary

In this segment of this chapter, I illuminated the change potential of the CSP Calgary Zone as evidenced by the willingness of the organisation to assess their current reality and formulate initiatives designed to improve future viability. One of the current realities is the
middle (Oshry, 2007) position held, at one time or another, by each of the CSP Calgary Zone entity, the individual CSP area patrols, and the patrollers themselves, within the system of volunteer ski patrol service provision. I inspected some factors that induced or inhibited organisational adaptability to determine the ways in which these factors might influence the recommendations outlined in Chapter 5.

The design of the action research endeavour has bound the recommendations that arose from this inquiry. In the next section, I will discuss the scope and limitations of this inquiry and disclose a realisation that emerged partway through my research.

**Scope and Limitations of the Inquiry**

In retrospect, the overarching question for this inquiry contained an unintended bias. Although developed in conjunction with the sponsor organisation, in asking “how can the CSP Calgary Zone enhance its organizational adaptability to ensure its future viability,” it was assumed that the organisation needs to improve its organisational adaptability. Instead, based on the findings and the conclusions developed in this chapter, I suggest that high potential for organizational adaptability currently exists in the organisation. Apparent change resistance within the Calgary Zone could be frustration derived from a desire for change in combination with a perceived lack of appropriate avenues to affect change. The recommendations outlined in Chapter 5 suggest a number of ways to begin to resolve this incongruency.

While it was an efficient format for data collection, there were three limitations for the online survey. Firstly, the currency of the email addresses in the national database system proved to be problematic. As mentioned in Chapter 3, a significant number of emails bounced back, which resulted in a reduction of the potential participant pool by 147 participants, or 17%. Secondly, the survey did not ask participants if their patrol status was active or inactive. As a
result, it was not possible to definitively ascertain the participation rate of active versus inactive respondents to the survey. Finally, there were no follow-up questions built into open-response sections (i.e., questions that required a written response from participants). As an example, it would have been useful to understand the ways in which participants defined words such as “communication,” as this would have enabled me to put their ratings into context. There exists the potential to rectify this in the recommendations.

Two limitations came to light in regards to the OST session. Firstly, one OST session may not have been enough to get the highest participation, and scheduling the session was challenging. Of the original 20 survey respondents who indicated an interest in the OST session 12 attended the evening session, three were unavailable, three were no-shows, and two did not respond to the follow-up invitation emails, nor did they have a contact phone number on the national database. A greater number of participants may have been garnered with the addition of a day-time session. Finally, one inquiry team member raised a concern that with 12 participants in the OST session, individual political agendas might be over-represented (i.e., the uniform push from one area patrol). However, this concern was mitigated somewhat, as within the OST session, each patrol within the CSP Calgary Zone was represented.

Chapter Summary

Participants in this study understood the organisation needs to evolve in order to survive. In some respects, their comments demanded it. The findings and conclusions of this chapter indicated a willingness to support and get involved in significant organisational change efforts.

The findings identified in this chapter noted the broad range of ski patrol meaning for respondents that ranged from profound (more common) to superficial (less common) and ran the contextual gamut from individual benefit to societal benefits. One of the reasons for the wide
range of meanings appeared to be the variability in loyalty to generational peers, to area patrol members, or to self. A common theme throughout the dataset was acknowledgement that change is afoot in the CSP Calgary Zone as a result of changing external and internal demands.

The demand for change is both helped and hindered by the organisation and its constituents. The most pressing needs for the CSP Calgary Zone relate to communication, transparency, engagement, and especially the recruitment of new members. On the whole, respondents appeared to be optimistic about the organisation’s ability to develop enough organisational adaptability to meet the challenges of the future.

Thus far, this action research inquiry followed the process for building a shared vision as defined by Kouzes and Posner (2012), such that it began “with reflecting on the past” (p. 206) through the reflective input of participants before “attending to the present” (p. 206) through analysis of findings and conclusions. This was an invaluable process for the CSP Calgary Zone, as the organisation is at a juncture whereby “we need to understand what the ski hills need and want from us” (OPEN). In the next chapter, I will begin to go “prospecting into the future” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 206), as recommendations and suggestions for both future research and future action, or perhaps future action research, are presented.
CHAPTER FIVE: INQUIRY IMPLICATIONS

Over the course of this inquiry, I investigated the ways in which the Canadian Ski Patrol, Calgary Zone, can enhance its organisational adaptability to ensure its future viability. The following sub-questions also aided in gaining an understanding into the research inquiry:

1. How do members of the CSP Calgary Zone describe the current adaptability of their organisation?
2. What factors do members believe support organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?
3. What factors do members believe hinder organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?

In this, the final chapter, I explore three specific recommendations that, based on the results of this inquiry, I believe will advance the CSP Calgary Zone’s quest for greater organisational adaptability. These include initiate a service model summit, evolve the process, and mark the trail. These recommendations are made with the full acknowledgement that they are but the first step on a longer journey of successive iterative loops in the action research process. Thus, they culminate in one final overarching recommendation—encouragement to continue the process. After all, this is just the first loop of an iterative action research process in the evolutionary process of the CSP Calgary Zone. Finally, I address some potential organisational implications of the recommendations made, and I raise potential avenues for future inquiry initiatives specific to the CSP Calgary Zone, and on a larger scale, to the not-for-profit sector.
Study Recommendations

According to Senge (2006), “it has always been clear that there are no magic bullets for building learning organisations: no formulas, no three steps, no seven ways” (p. 593). Action research is a cyclical process that involves observation, reflection, planning, and action implementation in repetitive, iterative cycles intended to improve practice. For best results, action research is undertaken by a group of people with a common purpose willing to work in a participative and collaborative manner. Recommendations that are contextually relevant, timely, realistic, and well-supported by constituents are the result of action research (Coghlan & Brannick, 2010; Glesne, 2011; Stringer, 2007). This was the goal of this study—the development of practical recommendations that will form the platform for a second action research cycle.

The following recommendations represent a starting point in the CSP Calgary Zone’s quest to improve their ability to adapt to their ever-changing internal and external environments. Each recommendation has been grounded in the literature presented in Chapter 2 as well as the findings and conclusions that surfaced in Chapter 4.

Recommendation 1: Initiate a Service Model Summit

At the outset of this inquiry, the CSP embarked on a learning journey. It is not enough for the CSP Calgary Zone to look inward to determine what change needs to be wrought to be ready for the future. In order to learn, grow, and develop its organisational adaptability, CSP needs to involve both patrollers (i.e., internal constituents) and clients (i.e., external constituents) in a process of dialogue about the CSP’s role at the client ski areas and outdoor events. In light of the mutual benefits of cooperation for the three main constituent groups in the CSP Calgary Zone system (i.e., the clients, the CSP, and the patrollers), it makes sense for all three to work cooperatively for mutual benefit.
There is a need for information exchange between the key actors in the CSP Calgary Zone system as was evidenced by the comments related to politics and competition between patrols within the CSP Calgary Zone, as well as indications of frustration around expectations the CSP and clients have of patrollers. Open dialogue may help to clarify the service model expectations of all participants, break down potential cultural islands (Schein, 2010), and foster a shared vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) for the mutual benefit of all parties.

The intended outcome of the service model summit would be to re-envision the role of the volunteer patrol such that it becomes more modern, relevant, attractive to new potential patrollers, and meets the needs of its clients. Ideally, the service model summit would consist of at least one representative from each of the client areas (i.e., Canada Olympic Park, Lake Louise, Nakiska, Nordic, and Norquay), the national president of CSP, as well as the president of the CSP Calgary Zone and the leader of each of the area patrols. Consideration should be given to volunteer participation from the rank-and-file of the patrol to a maximum of three individuals, in order to keep the group size manageable.

This recommendation has three main leadership implications for individual patrollers within the CSP Calgary zone. Firstly, it supports future patroller engagement. Individuals may see the service model summit as a direct outcome of their involvement in this action research inquiry. Participants expressed a desire to feel listened to and better understood by the organisation. Enactment of this recommendation may serve as a tangible demonstration that patrollers’ concerns have been heard. Secondly, the summit would give individuals a direct opportunity to create their future, the future of their area patrol, and the future of the CSP, including the Calgary Zone. Participation in decision-making encourages buy-in and improves the post-implementation success of change initiatives (Elstub, 2010) by fostering a personal
sense of responsibility for outcomes. Visioning the future in collaboration with client organisations could foster a personal sense of responsibility for outcomes. Finally, this meeting may reinforce the image of the CSP Calgary Zone as a unified team that works for the betterment of all members, thus countermanding some of the political concerns of inquiry participants.

The CSP Calgary Zone as a unified team is a notion that would not only resound through the patroller ranks, but also project to the client constituents. This may result in ancillary benefits (i.e., stronger negotiating position for benefits) for CSP. Through the process of meaningful dialogue (Short, 1998), a service model summit would foster better relationships between the three constituent groups, act as a catalyst for improved inter-patrol relations within the Calgary Zone, and support engagement of the CSP Calgary Zone within the national CSP organisation.

The information gleaned from this process of dialogue may have significant and far-reaching implications. Participants, in particular the CSP Calgary Zone, may need to adjust their perspective of the role they play within the system of first aid and rescue service provision with clients. This may require a significant amount of courage on the behalf of the CSP Calgary Zone, as change can be intimidating, especially when there is the potential that past performance might be identified as failure (Argyris, 1991). This is, however, a great opportunity to learn, and as demonstrated by Bess et al. (2011), the ability of a not-for-profit organisation to learn is critical to its future viability (p. 237).

Learning and growth through participation in dialogue will help “to work out shared expectations” (Dimock & Kass, 2007, p. 16) and yield clarity of purpose. The shared vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) that arises from the service model summit would support constituent engagement and, in so doing, help to eliminate the “torn Middle” (Oshry, 2007, p. 170) situation that has developed within the CSP Calgary Zone (see Figure 12). Within the system of
Probing the Potential

first aid and rescue service provision, higher levels of constituent satisfaction and lower levels of frustration would likely be the outcome if members operating in top, middle, and bottom or frontline positions are aligned around a shared vision.

Cooperation between the CSP, patrollers, and clients in a review of service model expectations would help to ensure that the direction CSP chooses for the future is one that meets the needs of its clients. In this manner, the CSP Calgary Zone would engage in a triple-loop learning process (Romme & Van Witteloostuijn, 1999; Yuthas et al., 2004; Kayes & Ameli, 2011) with external constituents (see Figure 2) to discover what works and what does not in the current service model and begin to collaboratively develop solutions to bridge the gap. This would support a collaborative relationship between for-profit and not-for-profit organisations as a potential means to future viability (Powell & Steinberg, 2006; Studer & von Schnurbein, 2013), and would likely require an evolutionary process at a number of levels within the organisation.

**Recommendation 2: Evolve the process**

It is suggested that CSP Calgary Zone engage its patrollers in a review, and potentially an evolution, of processes and procedures. This initiative may achieve two goals, both supportive of organisational adaptability. Firstly, the review process may heighten participants’ understanding and acceptance of the need for structural pieces within a national volunteer organisation. Secondly, the process may create an ideal testing zone for new ways of being for the organisation as a whole. The mere process of member engagement encourages buy-in, fosters trust, and builds relationships that support organisational change readiness (Bess et al., 2011; Elstub, 2010). As part of this recommendation, I discuss some of the rationale, and suggestions in support of, an evolution of the CSP Calgary Zone, which include: organisational structure,
engagement process, technological process, recruitment process, and finally, the transition process.

**Organisational structure**

Traditional hierarchical structures have been shown to restrict creativity (Howlett, 2010; Machin & Paine, 2008; Rochester et al., 2010; Smith, 1996; Zimmeck, 2001), whereas a more informal structure has been shown to improve the efficacy of not-for-profit organisations (Barnes & Sharp, 2009; Bolman & Deal, 2008). A review of the organisational structure of CSP may yield different ways to organise and coordinate the human capital of the entity.

A revision of the current CSP Calgary Zone structure may open new pathways for non-traditional constituents to engage in leadership roles within the CSP Calgary Zone. By way of illustration, some patrollers feel that the qualification requirements to teach the first aid course are outdated (SR12, SR34) and question the need for an instructor to be an active on-snow patroller (OPEN). Modifications to instructional qualifications may engage new and retain existing CSP Calgary Zone volunteer patrollers.

**Engagement process**

One discussion point that weaved its way through a number of the OST topics was the need to provide options for patrollers with regards to flexibility around time commitments or the nature of their engagement with the organisation. Participants felt retention would be enhanced if there was more flexibility for people to come and go from year-to-year as the needs of their lives dictated.

As an example of a way to evolve the engagement process, a suggestion arose in the OST session to provide patrollers with the opportunity to take up to a one-year sabbatical. This would enable people to have a greater degree of flexibility to address familial needs (e.g., the birth of a
child or the caring for an elderly family member) or personal needs (e.g., a year to travel or write a thesis), without feeling as though they had abandoned their team.

Similar to a maternity leave from the workplace, it is suggested that this process be formalised to ensure people understand its purpose and to provide consistency. Ongoing communication with patrollers on sabbatical would be important to ensure ongoing engagement. One means to ensure ongoing communication would be through the effective use of technology.

**Technological processes**

Technology is another area whereby the CSP Calgary Zone might evolve the process. There is an excellent opportunity to leverage the use of technology to reach new potential patrollers and to communicate more effectively with existing patrollers. The organisation has already taken steps in this direction with the implementation of a newly formatted electronic newsletter, the *CSP Calgary Zone Internal Communication Exposure* (otherwise known as ICE).

Inquiry participants felt that there were more technological opportunities to be realised, including, but not limited to, posting meeting minutes online by using Facebook, twitter, and Instagram. In addition, the use of technology could be (a) leveraged with existing constituents through the provision of online learning modules for the rookie and refresher courses, such as though Skype sessions or video modules (OPEN); (b) used to attract potential new patrollers and clients; and (c) even to provide education to the public on injury prevention. It may be necessary to create a position specifically to manage leverage of technology within the CPS Calgary Zone, which means internal or external recruitment.

**Recruitment process**

Recruitment consists of three parts: (a) attraction, (b) selection, and (c) orientation. One of the purposes of recruitment is to lessen the per capita workload on extant volunteers. Another
purpose is to infuse the organisation with new perspectives. In the next few paragraphs, I will address attraction as it pertains to diversity and selection as it pertains to organisational fit.

Attraction

New people bring new ideas and new perspectives, provided the CSP Calgary Zone recruitment system values differences and actively seeks diversity. Survey data revealed response uniformity across the sexes and also across generations. In addition, the homogeneity of the CSP Calgary Zone does not reflect the population of the City of Calgary. As discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, populace homogeneity may be a contributing factor to the perceived lack of organisational adaptability. This suggests that the recruitment process appears to facilitate the recruitment of new volunteers in the image of existing volunteers.

An examination of the recruitment process may determine underlying assumptions and biases that influence who the organisation attracts as new patrollers. In this action research inquiry, 75% of respondents were male, and 31% were between 19 and 33 years of age. One hundred percent of the OST participants were male. In comparison, 50% of all Calgarians are male, and 24% are between 20 and 34 years of age (City of Calgary, 2011 civic census). It appears that the CSP Calgary Zone recruitment efforts attract a higher proportion of young males than would be expected given the demographics of the City of Calgary.

Constituent diversity garners organisational flexibility and adaptability. A recruitment campaign that targets non-traditional members (e.g., women, different cultural backgrounds, different levels of physical abilities, etc.) holds potential for increased diversity in the membership. This could drive organisational adaptability and bolster future viability.
Selection

The selection process for the CSP Calgary Zone is currently based solely upon quantitative measures. Candidates must pass written and practical first aid exams, a basic ski test, a toboggan handling test, and finally ski and toboggan tests at the ski hill for which they wish to patrol. Before a candidate has even buckled on their boots, the CSP Calgary Zone has made a significant investment in them. During discussions in the OST session, participants observed that every year a number of people attended first aid training and never actively patrolled in the CSP Calgary Zone system. The addition of a qualitative measure to the recruitment process would enable the organisation to determine if there is a “cultural fit” (OPEN) before any investment in a prospective patroller’s training is made.

Successful recruitment depends on the CSP Calgary Zone’s ability to clearly articulate its values and expectations throughout the attraction, selection, and orientation processes. It is “better to explore early the fit between individuals and [the] organisation than to have members find out at some key juncture that they’re in serious disagreement over matters of principle” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 125). A pre-selection interview prior to the first aid course could enable candidate and organisation alike to determine if the individual would make a good CSP patroller. In addition, dependent upon the depth of the qualitative assessment, there is potential that this may also give some insight as to which particular hill might be the best fit for the individual’s temperament and proclivities.

Much like the sorting hat in the Harry Potter series, the pre-selection interview would serve to match candidates with a hill that would provide them the best chance of success for a long and engaged volunteer term with the CSP Calgary Zone. Ideally, however, the organisation
would like to have a wide variety of potential patrollers from which to draw, for, as discussed earlier, diversity increases an organisation’s organisational adaptability.

\textit{Diversity}

As discussed in chapter four, the CSP Calgary Zone is a remarkably homogeneous entity. This has implications for the ability of the organisation to embrace change. More diverse organisations appear to have higher levels of organisational adaptability (Cox, 1994). I recommend that the CSP Calgary Zone undertake a review of organisational policies and procedures and, by association, organisational norms (Senge, 2006, p. 196) to determine whether or not there are extant systemic biases present.

As shown by Roos and Gatta (2009), non-conscious attitudes and beliefs that serve to influence policies and procedures have an incremental deleterious effect on an organisation over time. As an example, for the CSP Calgary zone, a significant majority of the CSP Calgary Zone is male, much higher than the local population proportions and much higher than the typical profile of a volunteer organisation. This may indicate that the CSP Calgary Zone recruitment process is unintentionally biased towards males. As Wymer (2011) demonstrated, males are attracted to volunteer roles that promise risk and authority as opposed to women who are attracted to volunteer roles that promise collaboration and community (pp. 844-845). Thus, the marketing of the CSP Calgary Zone may resonate more clearly with males, or perhaps, the attraction of the patrol uniform for males has to do with the physicality of the role, which creates its own issues with an aging volunteer population.

\textit{Transition process}

For many study participants, the CSP volunteer experience was life-altering and physically demanding. This can be a devastating combination, as there is a growing disparity
between what the patroller wants to do and what they are able to do. It is suggested that one way to retain intellectual capital and maintain connection with valued members of the team is to investigate ways to keep the aging cadre of volunteers engaged through the use of a Volunteer Transition Coordinator.

Rather than add another position to the CSP Calgary Zone executive, and as 45% of respondents indicated they were aware there was a CSP Calgary Zone ombudsman, this role could be transitioned to the Volunteer Transition Coordinator. This person would oversee the transition of those individuals with a minimum of 10 years’ active patrol duties into formal mentorship, instructional, or advisory roles. In other words, retain patrollers unable to meet the physical demands of ski patrolling in less physically taxing alternate roles. This could result in a lessening of the burden on the remainder of the volunteer core.

The recommendation to evolve the process can be implemented on its own, independent of the service model summit suggested earlier. However, should the organisation choose to implement the process review after the summit is held, information from the summit may provide a platform upon which to ground the revised policies and procedures and facilitate an emergent change process (Higgs & Rowland, 2005).

A flexible, organic, and ongoing approach to change implementation also provides the impetus for the next iterative loop of action research, as once the changes are made, observations of the result (e.g., measures of organisational diversity and engagement) would lead to reflection and further action-planning by CSP Calgary Zone leaders.

**Recommendation 3: Mark the trail**

Leadership requires followers. Organisational adaptability requires strong leaders who actively grow and develop a diverse group of followers such that they become either the
organisation’s future leaders or a strong core of committed patrollers. Followers will not follow an ineffective leader nor will they stay in an organisation in which the development path is unclear or ambiguous (Collinson, 2006; McCallum, 2013). To mark the trail for new volunteers, I recommend the CSP Calgary Zone map out the leadership path by identifying the critical skills and abilities necessary to be a leader within the organisation. As part of this initiative, and for those patrollers who wish it, it would be necessary to incorporate a feedback tool.

Therefore, the question arises: Performance appraisals in a volunteer organisation? Yes. I recognise that formal performance appraisals in the traditional sense may seem silly in a volunteer organisation; however, this concept is worth consideration, especially in light of the Millennial generation’s predilection for continuous feedback on performance (Tulgan, 2009). Lynch and Smith (2010) demonstrated that a lack of formal performance evaluation feedback and available support resources for volunteers negated the benefits of a strong recruitment and selection process, thus, a feedback mechanism would provide the CSP Calgary Zone with a method of performance correction for well-meaning but perhaps off-course volunteers. Altogether, formalised performance feedback drives personal accountability and supports organisational diversity, and both of these enhance organisational adaptability.

One of the real benefits of volunteering with the CSP, as stated by numerous survey and OST session participants, is the opportunity to develop critical leadership skills such as decision-making, negotiation, and critical incident management. These skills hold intrinsic value for inquiry participants and are transferable to the workaday world. Trail markers for volunteers consist of two parts: (a) a volunteer development path and (b) a performance feedback tool. This begins with the recruitment process (i.e., a selection interview through inclusion of qualitative
aspects in the recruitment process) all the way through to the president of the CSP Calgary Zone role.

**Volunteer development path**

CSP Calgary Zone members clearly value the training they receive. It makes them feel confident and knowledgeable both on and off the hill. The development and communication of a patroller career path would enable new and existing patrollers to understand what is expected of them, provide a ruler by which to measure performance, and also identify training “musts” and “wants” in order to provide some degree of training commitment flexibility. A number of elements may be incorporated into the patroller development path, and these include bona fide job requirements, leadership training, and formalised mentorship.

A re-examination of the prerequisite criteria for the various roles in the CSP Calgary Zone may be warranted as part of the previous recommendation to *evolve the process*. This may yield specific roles that would be natural fits for patrollers in the transition phase to less physically demanding roles. A validation of bona fide role requirements would provide the organisation with an opportunity to be, and be seen as, a modern and relevant organisation. In addition, it would reduce the organisation’s potential liability for employment standards and human rights complaints.

One way to avoid such issues is through formalised leadership training in matters such as negotiation and conflict resolution. Leadership training may take the form of mentorship as mentioned above, formal on-line or in-person courses, or through patrol exchange activities similar to those in place for the paid staff. This last leadership development activity may have an additional benefit, as it may act as a catalyst in the creation of a sense of a CSP Calgary Zone team as well as garner new ideas. Participants in the OST session cautioned against the addition of yet another burden, and they suggested the organisation attempt to create a cachet around course participation and position it as a reward for the participant’s commitment, hard work, and a desire to lead.

My greater than 23 years’ experience in human resources has demonstrated that employee complaints and dissatisfaction often arise through a lack of contextual understanding. One element of the patroller development path is a formalized mentorship program that pairs experienced patrollers with newer patrollers. This may be one way to actively engage interested senior patrollers who are perhaps unable, or unwilling, to continue to meet the physical demands of regular patrol duties. A mentorship program of this type would pair older and younger generations of patrollers and encourage “storytelling [which is] how people pass along lessons from generation to generation, culture to culture” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 512). A program of this type would also work to eliminate inter-generational, whether defined as chronological age or length of service in the patrol, friction.

A clearly marked trail for volunteer development would add an attractive element to bolster recruitment purposes, as potential recruits would be able to see the benefits of a long-term commitment to the organisation. In addition, the development trail may subtract a source of frustration for patrollers. Based on the data collected in this action research inquiry, the
perception existed that politics and cliques influence the rate with which volunteers climb the CSP Calgary Zone leadership ladder. Finally, a clearly marked volunteer development trail in addition to a feedback mechanism for performance would ensure the organisation fairly and consistently identifies promising new leaders and develops them such that the pressure on existing leadership is lessened.

The generation of clarity around the organisation’s expectations of each volunteer and each volunteer’s expectations of the organisation would serve to focus energy more clearly on productive behaviours. Not unlike the process to generate a shared vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2012), the creation of a clear volunteer development path within the CSP Calgary Zone would require the organisation to work collaboratively with members to “envision the future” (p. 65) of its leaders. Using best practices, this should include the determination of specific skillsets and attributes as prerequisites for specific positions to bolster the probability of incumbent success.

Leadership development is largely dependent upon communication. The organisation depends upon people to willingly step into leadership roles; however, often patrollers are not confident and/or aware that they have the skills to do so. It is suggested that the creation of a marked trail that leads to leadership roles also include a formalised feedback loop, as this was identified in both the survey (SR56) and in the course of the OST session. All volunteers, but particularly developing leaders, need to hear how they are doing and what is next on the development plan for the organisation to survive.

**Performance feedback tool**

A formalised feedback loop as part of the marked trail for volunteer development would help to eliminate the “dance of the blind reflex” (Oshry, 2007, p. 170) within the organisation. Specific and timely feedback on performance would help ensure that when a patroller acts as a
Bottom, they would see “how their work fits into the whole” (p. 170), and when they act as a Middle, they would know whether or not they are “doing quite enough” for others (p. 172). In turn, Tops would be able to create a more compelling shared vision with feedback, and customers would feel valued and attended to.

Garner and Garner (2011) recommended that “nonprofit organizations should . . . ensure that volunteers feel supported and have opportunities to connect with other people in their volunteer work, and encourage volunteers to express their ideas” (p. 813). One way to do this is to create a performance communication loop. Participants in this study specifically asked for feedback for a job well done and constructive criticism on performance that needed improvement (SR56, OPEN). Whether the feedback came from fellow patrollers, from paid patrollers, or from leaders on either side of the for-profit/not-for-profit divide, based on this study, patrollers want to know how well they perform. As evidenced by the sponsorship of this study, the organisation also has a desire to obtain information about its performance from CSP constituents.

One way to ensure patrollers and the CSP Calgary Zone are cognizant of their performance is to formalise a performance communication cycle through a performance management tool. While cognizant of the stress this may impart to individuals who are volunteers (e.g., Why should I get judged when I’m a volunteer? I get enough of that at work), the key to an effective process is a focus on shared accountability between patrollers and the organisation, as well as a focus on continued growth, development, and support. Perhaps an appropriate methodology would be a “feedforward” (Goldsmith, 2003, p. 38) process whereby suggestions are given to individuals that focus on future, not past, performance.

Any performance management system needs to be transparent and objective and would help to ensure that leaders are actively providing specific feedback to patrollers at all levels, but
specifically to new patrollers (OPEN). An effective communication loop would also provide a means to deal with issues before they become toxic to other patrollers (e.g., people with bad attitudes who avoid calls, etc.) (OPEN) and would enhance retention of existing patrollers, which would save the organisation money in recruitment efforts. The need for frequent and specific performance feedback is a characteristic of the millennial generation and, as such, will become a more prevalent need in the future for the organisation.

The development of a volunteer development path may also require the establishment of a new role within the CSP Calgary Zone organisation. Such a role would be responsible for the development, tracking, and coordination of development opportunities for new and existing patrollers. This individual would also be responsible for coordinating the transition of patrollers from active on-snow duty to other roles within the organisation or potentially ease the transition out of active duty altogether and into alumni status.

Just as clarity around constituents’ expectations of service is important, so too is clarity around the ways in which volunteers rise from the rank and file to become leaders in the CSP (either at the zone or the national level). It is these individuals who will lead the organisation into the future.

The CSP Calgary Zone future may look very different than the current reality based on the outcomes of the service model summit, the evolution of the process initiative, and the creation of the volunteer development path. Already, the organisation has begun to change. Respondents to the survey lauded the organisation’s “willingness to accommodate” (SR38) and “willingness to try new approaches to solving problems” (SR56) in “recognition there are issues that need addressing” (SR17). This tone continued through the OST session, when in the wrap-
up discussion, participants expressed their desire to see tangible results arise from their efforts. Specifically, they want to see and are willing to support the evolution of the organisation.

**Organisational Implications**

Rather like trying to determine why an engine is not running and then discovering that one need only turn the key in the ignition, an irony came to light during this action research inquiry. I set out to determine the ways in which the CSP Calgary Zone might enhance its organizational adaptability. Together with the CSP Calgary Zone, I wanted to uncover participants’ definitions of the current level of organizational adaptability and to query what helped, or hindered, its development. I found that there appears to be high latent potential for change within the CSP Calgary Zone. The challenge before the organisation now is how to ignite that latent potential and ensure the future viability of the organization.

How does the CSP Calgary Zone resolve the lack of congruence between the potential for organizational adaptability and the outward display of organizational adaptability? I suggest that this may be possible through the implementation of the recommendations outlined in this chapter. Restrictions imposed by an unclear service model, traditional policies and processes, and a fuzzy volunteer development path all thwart the external expression of organisational adaptability. To move forward, leaders within the CSP, and in particular within the CSP Calgary Zone, will need to demonstrably embrace change.

First and foremost, I suggest that the formal leaders within the CSP Calgary Zone tangibly promote change through their behaviours and attitudes. This would require confidence and personal leadership as they model the way (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) for followers through the transparent communication of the results of this inquiry and the implementation of these recommendations.
Next, the organisation will need to recruit the human capital and dedicate the time necessary to engage membership in this process of evolution. As discussed earlier, extant patrollers dedicate a significant amount of time, energy, and money to the patrol each year. It may be difficult to ask patrollers for even more time to execute the service model summit, to examine the existing structure, and to define a volunteer development path; however, as suggested by the literature and supported by the inquiry data, when people are involved in the decision-making process, engagement and commitment to outcomes is strengthened.

In support of the initiative to roll out the inquiry recommendation, the three roles suggested, that of a technology guru, a volunteer transition coordinator, and a vice-president human resources, may be beneficial. These roles can coordinate efforts and keep focus on the end goal, which is the evolution of the organisation “to be, and to be seen to be, modern, professional, and relevant” (Knott & Saravanamutto, 2013, p. 1). In and of themselves, these roles represent another opportunity for members of the CSP Calgary Zone to develop leadership skills, which is something participants in the inquiry indicated was one of the benefits of the CSP volunteer experience. These roles may also formalise a transitional stage on the volunteer development path. Thus, these roles need not be an additional burden to the organisation; rather, they are a means to engage experienced patrollers and, perhaps, those patrollers in need of a transitional role.

This inquiry yielded a number of recommendations that will take some time to implement; however, as with all things, the journey begins with a single step. There is a need for change at a number of different levels, but a fundamental premise of the organisation needs to be investigated—the service model. This is the foundation upon which all other expectations rest. Volunteers and paid staff measure CSP performance against the expectations of clients. Without
a current understanding of how and what the organisation should be doing, there is the potential for a significant amount of wasted time, effort, and energy on the part of constituents, each trying to fulfill their role in the system to the best of their ability, but perhaps failing to fulfill their potential for greatness.

The greatest leverage that the organisation has is the dedication and commitment of the current volunteer force. CSP Calgary Zone constituents recognise change is needed, and they are willing and able to make it happen. Fortunately, the CSP Calgary Zone has a current and past executive team, some of whom participated directly on my inquiry team, who are fully supportive of change.

Leadership Implications

The Canadian Ski Patrol has been an outstanding research partner in this endeavour. At the outset, the national president, Colin Saravanamuttoo, engaged fully in the action research process and demonstrated a keen understanding of the research goals of this inquiry. He provided insights that not only fine-tuned the inquiry questions, but also framed the context of the research. Once this initial phase was complete, the inquiry team helped design and refine survey questions, raised other areas of potential interest, and provided ongoing support throughout the process of data collection and theme generation. Of particular note were Glenn Bonsall, CSP Calgary Zone president, Elizabeth Oldfield, CSP life member, and Caroline Conway, fellow student. All three were invaluable research partners and invariably acted as sounding boards, perspective gauges, and reference libraries right up until the final stages of report development stages. The ad hoc feedback and general interest shown by the general population of CSP Calgary Zone patrollers was indicative of the interest in, and commitment to, change in order to ensure the organisation’s future viability.
The recommendations made in this chapter will require the CSP Calgary Zone to make fundamental changes in their approach to first aid and rescue service provision. No longer should the organisation be willing to accept the status quo because. As one survey respondent put it, “That was tried before and failed” (SR54). The recommendations outlined earlier create an opportunity for the organisation to re-envision its future and shift the paradigm with which constituents view the organisation. Instead of being viewed as merely a volunteer organisation that helps their for-profit partners, the CSP Calgary Zone has an opportunity to jointly create the future with clients. In so doing, the CSP Calgary Zone will become a collaborative business partner; one that has much to offer, including a large contingent of capable, qualified, first aid and rescue professionals.

The largest impact of these recommendations will be on the volunteer workforce itself. A paradigm shift for many volunteers may be necessary, whereby volunteers learn to view themselves and the CSP Calgary Zone as valued business partners to the for-profit clients, rather than volunteers on the periphery of the business model. In addition, enactment of these recommendations may support a greater awareness and appreciation for the CSP Calgary Zone team as a whole. Members of disparate area patrols working together on these initiatives will help to bridge communication difficulties and strengthen ties between the area patrols within the Calgary Zone.

The recommendations made in this report not only signify the culmination of the first iterative loop of the action research process, but also ready the organisation for the second iterative loop. The action research cycle is comprised of repetitive cycles of reconnaissance, intervention, and evaluation (Piggot-Irvine, 2013). As described in the focus and framing discussion of Chapter 1 as well as the literature review of Chapter 2, I took the time to conduct
reconnaissance on the leadership challenges of the CSP Calgary Zone and ground them in current literature. Chapter 3, on the inquiry approach and participants, represents the planning for the intervention stage of action research, and Chapter 4, on results and conclusions, represents the evaluation stage. With Chapter 5, I begin the second iterative loop of the action research process for the CSP Calgary Zone; it represents the beginning of the reconnaissance stage as the organisation takes the recommendations and makes decisions as to an implementation strategy.

As outlined earlier in Chapter 1, Colin Saravanamuttoo, CSP national president and CEO, will have the authority to implement these recommendations. Glen Bonsall, the CSP Calgary Zone president, along with the rest of the executive, will decide specific strategies for implementation within the Calgary Zone.

Implications for Future Inquiry

The implementation process of the recommendations outlined above may, in fact, be considered the premiere implication for future inquiry that arose from this study. The report leaves the organisation at the cusp of the next step, that of intervention, in the second cycle of action research, which will be explained in greater detail in the report summary section. Ongoing evaluation and reconnaissance will ensure that progress of the organisation towards its goal of heightened organisational adaptability does not go unnoticed. Over the course of this inquiry, four areas worthy of future research became apparent.

Although not a formal goal, there was an expectation by CSP that this action research inquiry process might enhance member engagement and organisational change readiness (C. Saravanamuttoo, personal communication, June 6, 2013). As I understand it, a nation-wide engagement survey of the CSP membership is currently underway. This may serve as good baseline data for the CSP Calgary Zone membership. Then, an additional engagement survey
post-implementation of the recommendations contained in this report would enable the organisation to determine if this inquiry affected engagement in the CSP Calgary Zone.

The results of this action research inquiry may serve to inform and transform other zones within the CSP and, ultimately, ensure the continued long-term viability of the “largest group of volunteer first responders in Canada” (Knott & Saravanamutto, 2013, p. 3).

In this report, I raised a few of the processes worthy of examination with regard to the potential for systemic biases. As the CSP is an organisation that is almost 75 years old, I suggest there are other areas that may yield potential opportunity for change in an effort to modernise the entity. This may prove an ideal way to engage membership in the process of change.

Lastly, on a larger scale, not-for-profit, or third-sector, organisations are increasingly held to the same legislative standards as for-profit organisations. They also face similar challenges with regard to attraction, recruitment, and retention of staff. For these reasons, one may surmise that it is sufficient to extrapolate the results of research on organisational adaptability in for-profit companies to the not-for-profit sector. I argue that although this lays a foundation for understanding of the mechanisms of organisational adaptability in not-for-profit organisations, it does these entities a disservice. Not-for-profit organisations have some unique qualities that deserve focussed study. How does one introduce and maintain a change process within an organisation in the absence of the traditional motivators of job security, enhanced compensation, or the promise of positional advancement? This is the corporate climate with which the president of the CSP must contend, and one that warrants additional study.

**Report Summary**

The journey of this action research inquiry is much like the action research cycle. It consisted of repetitive cycles of reconnaissance, intervention, and evaluation. In Chapter 1, as I
began to conduct my reconnaissance of the organisation, I introduced the main challenge ahead for the CSP Calgary zone: namely, a decline in membership numbers amidst an environment of static, if not increasing, service-level demand by clients. The national president’s goal for the organisation is for it to be “modern, professional, and relevant” (Knott & Saravanamutto, 2013, p. 1). His support of this inquiry was indicative of his, and the organisation’s, desire to ensure CSP has a viable future. I concluded Chapter 1 with a systems view of the organisational challenge: specifically, the ways in which the current system works to keep CSP stuck in an organisational trap (Argyris, 2010).

In Chapter 2, the reconnaissance process continued as I turned to the literature to provide context for this inquiry. I discovered that the research into organisational adaptability in not-for-profit sector is rather thin, and so, I expanded my search to the for-profit sector. I then extrapolated the results of seminal for-profit research to the focus areas of this study. I investigated the ways in which learning organisational change readiness and resistance to change contribute to organisational adaptability. I delved into third-sector research related to the ways in which structure and culture affect the long-term sustainability of a not-for-profit organisation. After which, I described the roles collaboration, shared vision, and leadership play on the not-for-profit stage. Finally, I touched on the advantages of diversity: in particular, how diversity of generation and sex can improve an organisation’s ability to maintain internal and external relevance and leads to not only improved organisational adaptability, but also secures ongoing viability. I summed up the chapter thusly—learning, and a willingness to learn, at both the individual and organisational level, is vital to organisational adaptability.

Chapter 3 began the transition from reconnaissance to intervention as I framed the plan for the inquiry data collection within an appreciative stance. I explained the use of action
research for this inquiry as it is an experiential learning (Kolb, 1984) methodology that fosters change and is well-suited to complex and dynamic environments. The participants for the inquiry were active and inactive members of the CSP Calgary Zone, as were all but one of the inquiry team, who was a Royal Roads University colleague. An online survey, open space technology session, email exchanges, ongoing dialogue, and observations recorded in a learning journal served as inquiry methods to gather and validate data. When it came to data analysis, I employed a mixed-method approach that entailed both quantitative and qualitative techniques and provided an opportunity for triangulation to strengthen data credibility. In combination with persistent and prolonged observation, this approach met the criteria for a high level of trustworthiness of the data. At all times during the course of this research, I adhered to the standards stipulated by the Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (Tri-council, 2010) as well as by Royal Roads University’s Research Ethics Policy (2011) and Academic Integrity and Misconduct in Research and Scholarship Policy (2010).

The importance of rigour in my action research approach became apparent in Chapter 4 after I completed the intervention step in the action research and began the evaluation step as I harvested findings from the large field of resultant data. From this data, I found participants reported a full spectrum of meaning with respect to what it meant to them to be part of the ski patrol, their desire to give back to society, and lastly, the meaning the ski patrol held for them in terms of personal benefits. I noted that participants’ loyalties were individualised and context-dependent, such that an individual may feel allegiance to his or her generation, local area CSP patrol, or to themselves. I determined that the CSP Calgary Zone was in flux, with leadership in transition and changing expectations on the part of the patroller, as well as clients, in regard to flexibility, breadth of engagement, time commitment, recognition and rewards, communication,
as well as constituent knowledge and skills. I surfaced participants’ views of the organisation, whereby they viewed the traditional hierarchical structure in addition to the homogeneity of constituents as organisational elements that impeded adaptability. I discovered that participants were cautiously optimistic about the future of the CSP Calgary Zone and its ability to adapt to internal and external forces. With these findings on the table, I completed evaluation and began a second action research cycle with the reconnaissance step. I observed there were powerful change levers extant in the CSP Calgary Zone. It appeared that the organisation, as well as other system constituents, often played the role of Middle (Oshry, 2007) in the system of first aid provision and rescue service, and finally, both external and internal forces worked to keep the organisation stagnant with regard to change.

In this final chapter, I begin anew planning for intervention. I made three recommendations for the CSP Calgary Zone in light of the CSP desire for professionalism, modernity, and relevance (Knott & Saravanamutto, 2013, p. 1), which included (a) initiate a service model summit, (b) evolve the process, and (c) mark the trail. A service model summit would facilitate information exchange between players in the first aid and rescue services system. This information exchange would serve to clarify expectations, increase goal alignment, foster engagement, and build intra-zone relationships. The recommendation to initiate a service model summit may result in the reinvention of the CSP as a collaborative partner with for-profit clients; this speaks to the need for greater professionalism. The recommendation to evolve the process is a call to action for the CSP Calgary Zone to re-examine the way in which it carries out day-to-day functions in an effort to uncover potential systemic bias and evaluate their efficacy. Specific examples of processes that may warrant closer examination included engagement, technological, recruitment, and transition. Evolve the process speaks to the need for modernity.
Finally, a call to mark the trail elucidated the importance of creating a vision for individuals that illuminated obvious, and not-so-obvious, benefits of patrolling. Mark the trail speaks to the need for relevance with current and potential patrollers.

Woven into the specific recommendations were suggested CSP roles in support of these endeavours, which included (a) a technology guru to maintain social media and technological relevance, (b) a transition coordinator to ensure that we retain intellectual capital when long-service members have willing minds and reluctant physiques, and (c) a human resource designate to steward the development path and performance feedback tool. Although the addition of new roles may add a layer of complexity to the implementation process, “approaches that take account of, and integrate, complexity do appear to be more effective” (Higgs & Rowland, 2005, pp. 146-147).

As Grant and Crutchfield (2007) discovered in their study of 12 exceptionally successful not-for-profit organisations, “high-impact non-profits are exceptionally adaptive, modifying their tactics as needed to increase their success” (p. 38). This is fundamental for the future viability of the CSP and, specifically, for the CSP Calgary Zone. Inherent organisational adaptability will enable the CSP Calgary Zone to not merely weather the storm, but to also carve turns on its snowdrifts of change.
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APPENDIX A: CANADIAN SKI PATROL ORGANISATION STRUCTURE
APPENDIX B: EMAIL INVITATION

Dear Fellow Patroller,

I would like to invite you to be part of a research project that I am conducting. This project is part of the requirement for my Master’s Degree in Leadership, at Royal Roads University.

The objective of my research project is threefold:

1. the CSP will develop a better understanding of the Calgary Zone operations and its members,

2. the research process will serve to deepen participants’ and stakeholders’ understanding of the particularities of change management within the not-for-profit sector, and

3. the organisation will have a concrete plan with which to enhance organisational adaptability.

Your name was chosen as a prospective participant because you are, or have been, an active member of the Canadian ski patrol, Calgary Zone.

The attached document contains further information about the study conduct and will enable you to make a fully informed decision on whether or not you wish to participate. Please review this information before clicking on the link to the online survey.

This phase of my research project will consist of an online survey, and is estimated to take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

I realise that due to our collegial relationship as fellow ski patrollers, you may feel
compelled to participate in this research project. Please be aware that you are not required to participate and, should you choose to participate, your participation would be entirely voluntary. If you do choose to participate, you are free to withdraw without prejudice. If you do not wish to participate, simply do not click the link to the online survey. Your decision to not participate will also be maintained in confidence. Your choice will not affect our relationship or your involvement with the CSP in any way.

Please feel free to contact me at any time should you have additional questions regarding the project and its outcomes.

If you would like to participate in my action research project, please click this link [INSERT LINK TO FLUID SURVEYS ONLINE SURVEY HERE].

Sincerely,

Eleanor Culver
Dear Patroller:

The Calgary Zone of the Canadian Ski Patrol has an opportunity to explore how we can improve your experience and ensure our future viability as an organisation. Colin Saravanamuttoo, national president and chief executive officer of the CSP, has provided me with your name as a potential participant.

The Canadian Ski Patrol: Probing the Potential for Change

Eleanor Culver, an active patroller at the Lake Louise Ski Area, is completing a Master of Arts in Leadership graduate degree programme through Royal Roads University, in Victoria BC. Part of her degree requirement is to conduct an action research study within an organisation. Her credentials with Royal Roads University can be established by contacting Dr. Brigitte Harris, Director, School of Leadership Studies via email at [email address] or via phone at [phone #].

Purpose of the study and sponsoring organisation

Eleanor’s area of research seeks to determine the ways in which the CSP, Calgary Zone can enhance its ability to embrace change and thrive as an organisation going forward. Her study seeks to answer the following questions:

How can the Canadian Ski Patrol (CSP), Calgary Zone enhance its organisational adaptability to support future viability?
1: How do members of the CSP Calgary Zone describe the current adaptability of their organisation?

2: What factors do members believe support organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?

3: What factors do members believe hinder organisational adaptability in the CSP Calgary Zone?
Purpose of the study and sponsoring organisation

Organisational adaptability refers to the ways in which organisations can change in response to, or in anticipation of, a change in its environment. Understanding the ways in which we can work together to develop a strategy to improve our Zone will ensure our future viability as an organisation. I believe this is a worthwhile opportunity for the CSP to improve your experience and the service we provide to the public, as well as better understand our national identity as patrollers.

There are three main objectives for this organisational learning project. Firstly, the CSP will develop a better understanding of the Calgary Zone operations and its members. Secondly, the research process will serve to deepen participants’ and stakeholders’ understanding of the particularities of change management within the not-for-profit sector. Finally, the organisation will have a concrete plan with which to enhance organisational adaptability. Additionally, although not a formal goal, the action research inquiry process will enhance member engagement and organisational change readiness. The results of this action research inquiry may also serve to inform and transform other Zones within the CSP, and ultimately ensure the continued long-term viability of the national organisation.

Your participation and how information will be collected

This action research inquiry will seek to engage active and inactive patrollers of both sexes, all ages, and all patrols (i.e. each ski area, the Nordic and special events patrols). You are being invited to participate in this research study because you are either a current or past member of the Canadian Ski Patrol, Calgary Zone, and your participation is entirely voluntary.

The research will consist of two phases; the first is an online electronic survey that will
take approximately 15 minutes to complete, the second is an approximately three-hour open spaces technology session. If you choose to complete the online survey, you are not obligated to participate in the open spaces technology session; however, you must participate in the online survey in order to be eligible to participate in the open spaces technology session.

**Benefits and risks to participation**

There exists a possibility that, in the process of survey completion and/or participation in the open spaces technology, past practices of the organisation may be illuminated that cast the organisation in a less than positive light. This risk will be mitigated by the use of an appreciative stance in both the design of the survey questions and in the facilitation of the open spaces technology event. This purpose of this research is to learn, not to critique.

It is the intent of the researcher, and of the CSP, to use the knowledge gained from this action research project to enhance both volunteer experience and organisational efficacy.

**Research team**

The project inquiry team will include the following individuals:

- Glenn Bonsall, the CSP Calgary Zone president and Lake Louise patrol member who was selected because he has direct influence and control over the timing and implementation of the action research inquiry recommendation;
- Caroline Conway, a Royal Roads University (RRU) Master of Arts, Leadership (MAL) cohort member who has agreed to participate in order to give perspective on the process from a fellow academic learner perspective;
• Mark Nodwell, the CSP Calgary Zone vice-president operations, was selected as both representative of the CSP Calgary Zone and as a member of the newer generation of patrollers;

• Chris Oliver the CSP Calgary Zone past president and Nakiska patrol member who was selected as the most recent past-president of the CSP Zone to provide historical context;

• Geoff Scotton the CSP national vice-president communications, Nakiska patrol member, and past president Calgary Zone who was selected to provide both historical and national context;

• Marielle Flottat, Calgary Zone vice-president public affairs and a Lake Louise patrol member who was selected as a female representative of the millennial generation and is currently engaged in a recruitment and retention initiative with the CSP Calgary Zone; and

**Real or perceived conflict of interest**

There is no overt indication of any conflict of interest for Eleanor Culver with respect to this action research inquiry. She does not hold a position of authority in the sponsor organisation, nor does she have a working relationship, or position of influence, with any of the potential participants in the CSP Calgary Zone. However, she may benefit from the benefits associated with the attainment of a Master’s degree.

**Confidentiality, security of data, and retention period**

Eleanor will work to protect your privacy throughout this study. All information she collects will be maintained in confidence with hard copies (e.g., consent forms) stored in a locked filing cabinet in my home office. Electronic data (such as online survey data, transcripts,
and digital files) will be stored on a password-protected computer on my home computer.

Information will be recorded on All research information will be summarized, in anonymous format, in the body of the final research report. At no time will any specific comments be attributed to any individual unless your specific agreement has been obtained beforehand.

Please note, group methods, such as the open space technology process, are by their nature not anonymous.

All documentation will be kept strictly confidential and destroyed on or before July 1, 2014.
Sharing results

In early spring of 2014, a copy of the final thesis will be submitted to Royal Roads University. Upon approval, this thesis will be published and retained in the Canadian thesis library as well as distributed to the inquiry team, the CSP national president and CEO, and placed on the CSP website for access by CSP members.

Procedure for withdrawing from the study

Surveys in which the data is aggregated, such as the online survey process for this research project, are by their nature anonymous. As such, once you have submitted your answers online, your data will not be identifiable to the researcher, and therefore cannot be removed from the dataset.

Should you wish to withdraw from the open space technology portion of this action research inquiry you must do so prior to the start of the session. Once the session has commenced, it will not be possible to remove your data as it will be compiled along with other participant’s data thoughts and ideas as part of the open spaces technology process.

Consent

You are not required to participate in this research project. By following the survey link in the email request for participation, you indicate that you have read and understand the information above and give your free and informed consent to participate in this project.

If you have any questions about this research study, please contact Eleanor or myself. Eleanor can be reached by email at [email address]. Please keep a copy of this information letter for your records.
Sincerely,

Glenn Bonsall
APPENDIX D: INQUIRY TEAM MEMBER LETTER OF AGREEMENT

In partial fulfilment of the requirement for a Master of Arts in Leadership Degree at Royal Roads University, Eleanor Culver will be conducting an action research inquiry to address the question “How can the Canadian Ski Patrol (CSP), Calgary Zone, enhance organisational adaptability to support future viability”? The student’s credentials with Royal Roads University can be established by calling Dr. Brigitte Harris, Director, School of Leadership, at [phone #] or email [email address]

Inquiry team member role description

As a volunteer inquiry team member assisting the student with this project, your role may include one or more of the following:

• providing advice on the relevance and wording of questions and letters of invitation,
• supporting the logistics of the data-gathering methods, including observing, assisting, or facilitating an interview or focus group,
• taking notes, transcribing, or analysing data, to assist the student and the CSP’s organisational change process.

In the course of this activity, you may be privy to confidential inquiry data.

Confidentiality of inquiry data

In compliance with the Royal Roads University Research Ethics Policy, under which this inquiry project is being conducted, all personal identifiers and any other confidential information generated or accessed by the inquiry team advisor will only be used in the performance of the functions of this project, and must not be disclosed to anyone other than persons authorized to receive it, both during the inquiry period and beyond it. Recorded information in all formats is
covered by this agreement. Personal identifiers include participant names, contact information, personally identifying turns of phrase or comments, and any other personally identifying information.

**Bridging student’s potential or actual ethical conflict**

In situations where potential participants in a work setting report directly to the student, you, as a neutral third party with no supervisory relationship with either the student or potential participants, may be asked to work closely with the student to bridge this potential or actual conflict of interest in this study. Such requests may include asking the Inquiry Team Advisor to:

- send out the letter of invitation to potential participants,
- receive letters/emails of interest in participation from potential participants,
- independently make a selection of received participant requests based on criteria you and the student will have worked out previously, and/or
- formalize the logistics for the data-gather method, including contacting the participants about the time and location of the open space technology session.

This strategy means that potential participants with a direct reporting relationship will be assured they can confidentially turn down the participation request, as this process conceals from the student which potential participants chose not to participate or simply were not selected by you, the third party, because they were out of the selection criteria range (their participant request may have been received after the number of participants has been met). Inquiry Team members asked to take on such 3rd party duties in this study will be under the direction of the student and will be fully briefed by the student as to how this process will work, including specific expectations, and the methods to be employed, and will be given every support possible by the student, except where such support would reveal the identities of the
actual participants.

Personal information will be collected, recorded, corrected, accessed, altered, used, disclosed, retained, secured and destroyed as directed by the student, under direction of the Royal Roads Academic Supervisor.

Inquiry Team Members who are uncertain whether any information they may wish to share about the project they are working on is personal or confidential will verify this with Eleanor Culver, the student.

**Statement of Informed Consent:**

I have read and understand this agreement.

________________________  ______________________  ____________

Name (Please Print)       Signature           Date
APPENDIX E: ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONS

Canadian Ski Patrol Calgary Zone Research Survey

Thank you for your voluntary participation in this action research online survey. Your input will ensure that the Calgary Zone of the Canadian Ski Patrol is informed of your views, needs, and recommendations regarding the future of the organisation. Appreciation is extended to the members of the Canadian Ski Patrol inquiry team for their support and participation in this research.

Your opinions are important and your responses will be kept confidential. The information received will be presented as aggregate data in the final report.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, or this action research project, please contact me at [email address], with the subject line "CSP RESEARCH".

Please note, by proceeding to the first survey question, you are deemed to have provided your free and informed consent to participate in this action research inquiry project.

1. Are you aware there is a zone ombudperson?
2. With which patrol(s) have you most recently patrolled? | Primary Patrol
3. With which patrol(s) have you most recently patrolled? | Secondary Patrol
4. How many seasons have you: | Patrolled in total?
5. How many seasons have you: | Patrolled in the Calgary Zone?

6. How many seasons have you: | Patrolled at your current ski area?

7. Who are you? | I live in (city):

8. Who are you? | I was born in:

9. Who are you? | Gender:

10. What are your formal educational qualifications?
    a. High School [Started] / High School [Completed]
    b. College (i.e. 2 year diploma) [Started] / College (i.e. 2 year diploma) [Completed]
    c. University Undergraduate Degree (i.e. Bachelor) [Started] / University Undergraduate Degree (i.e. Bachelor) [Completed]
    d. Graduate Degree (i.e. Master's) [Started] / Graduate Degree (i.e. Master's) [Completed]
    e. Post-graduate Degree (i.e. Doctorate) [Started] / Post-graduate Degree (i.e. Doctorate) [Completed]
    f. Trade School [Started] / Trade School [Completed]

11. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being unimportant and 5 being very important, please give us your personal opinion. How important is it that:
    a. My rights and values are respected
    b. National leadership is trustworthy
    c. Calgary Zone leadership is trustworthy
    d. National leadership is going the right direction
    e. Calgary Zone leadership is going the right direction
    f. Important information is openly shared
g. Communication within the Calgary Zone is transparent

h. Communication from national is effective

i. I have the opportunity to participate in setting future direction for the zone

j. People are held accountable for their actions within the zone

k. I hold a formal leadership position in my patrol

l. I hold a formal leadership position in the Calgary Zone

m. I hold a formal leadership position at the National level

n. My skills, knowledge, and abilities are put to effective use

o. I have the necessary training and resources to be an effective patroller

p. I am adequately recognised for my contribution to the zone

q. I am adequately recognised for my contribution to national organisation

12. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied, please give us your personal opinion. How satisfied are you that:

   a. My rights and values are respected

   b. National leadership is trustworthy

   c. Calgary Zone leadership is trustworthy

   d. National leadership is going the right direction

   e. Calgary Zone leadership is going the right direction

   f. Important information is openly shared

   g. Communication within the Calgary Zone is transparent

   h. Communication from national is effective

   i. I have the opportunity to participate in setting future direction for the zone

   j. People are held accountable for their actions within the zone
k. With Patrol leadership opportunities for me
l. With the Calgary Zone leadership opportunities for me
m. With the national level leadership opportunities for me
n. My skills, knowledge, and abilities are put to effective use
o. I have the necessary training and resources to be an effective patroller
p. I am adequately recognised for my contribution to the zone
q. I am adequately recognised for my contribution to national organisation

13. With regards to the Calgary Zone only, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being non-urgent and 5 being very urgent, which of the following do you feel are urgent issues:

   a. Financial health
   b. Recruiting new members
   c. Retaining existing members
   d. Generational differences between members
   e. Issues between the various ski area patrols
   f. Participation levels at in-town zone meetings
   g. Participation levels in zone leadership roles
   h. Communication of new initiatives to members
   i. Communication between the zone and national
   j. Transparency
   k. Membership engagement in zone initiatives

14. What are the most valuable aspects about patrolling for you (drag and drop your choices from the left column to the right):

   a. Annual first-aid training and requalification process
b. Annual CPR training and certification

c. Relationships with own area CSP patrollers

d. Networking opportunities with the public

e. Opportunity for regular physical activity

f. Social activities

g. Relationships with on-hill staff

h. Relationships with other area CSP patrollers

i. Sponsorship partner benefits

j. Access to on-snow skills training (i.e. avalanche training, ski/snowboard improvement)

k. Are there other valuable aspects of patrolling not listed above? If so, please describe:

15. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being very low and 5 being very high, how flexible and adaptable is the CSP Calgary zone?

16. Please describe up to three key attributes that you feel support change initiatives in the Calgary zone.

   a. Attribute 1

   b. Attribute 2

   c. Attribute 3

17. Please describe up to three key attributes that you feel hinder the CSP Calgary Zone's ability to embrace change.

   a. Attribute 1

   b. Attribute 2
c. Attribute 3

18. What does it mean to you to be a patroller?

19. What does it mean to you to patrol at your hill?

20. What would it mean to you if you were unable to patrol?

21. The single best thing about patrolling is:

22. If I could change one thing about patrolling, and assuming it was possible, it would be:

23. Would you be interested in participating in the open space technology session?

24. If you would like to participate in the upcoming open space technology session, please provide your email address here:
APPENDIX F: RESEARCH CONSENT FORM – OPEN SPACE TECHNOLOGY SESSION

By signing this form, you agree that you are over the age of 19 and have read the information letter for this study. Your signature states that you are giving your voluntary and informed consent to participate in this project.

☐ I commit to respect the confidential nature of the open space technology method by not sharing identifying information about the other participants

Name: (Please Print): __________________________________________________

Signed: _____________________________________________________________

Date: ________________
APPENDIX G: RESPONSES FROM ONLINE SURVEY

F.1 Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question Topic</th>
<th>Number Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ombudsperson</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Primary Patrol location</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Secondary patrol location</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total seasons patrolled</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seasons patrolled in Calgary zone</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Seasons patrolled at current area</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Geographical location</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Highest educational level</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Importance – Rights and Values</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Importance – National leadership trustworthy</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Importance – Calgary zone leadership trustworthy</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Importance – National leadership heading in right direction</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Importance – Calgary zone leadership heading in right direction</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Important information is openly shared</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Importance – Calgary zone communication is transparent</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Importance – Communication from national is effective</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Importance – I have opportunity to participate in setting future direction</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Importance – People are held accountable for their actions</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Importance – I hold a formal leadership in my patrol</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Importance – I hold a formal leadership role in Calgary zone</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Importance – I hold a formal leadership role at National level</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Importance – My skills knowledge, and ability are put to use</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Importance – I have the training and resources I need to be effective</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Importance – I am adequately recognised by the Calgary zone</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Importance – I am adequately recognised by national</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question Topic</td>
<td>Number Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Satisfaction – Rights and Values</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Satisfaction – National leadership trustworthy</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Satisfaction – Calgary zone leadership trustworthy</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Satisfaction – National leadership heading in right direction</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Satisfaction – Calgary zone leadership heading in right direction</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Satisfaction – Important information is openly shared</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Satisfaction – Calgary zone communication is transparent</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Satisfaction – Communication from national is effective</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Satisfaction – I have opportunity to participate in setting future direction</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Satisfaction – People are held accountable for their actions</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Satisfaction – I hold a formal leadership in my patrol</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Satisfaction – With leadership opportunities in Calgary zone</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Satisfaction – With leadership opportunities at National level</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Satisfaction – My skills knowledge, and ability are put to use</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Satisfaction – I have the training and resources I need to be effective</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Satisfaction – I am adequately recognised by the Calgary zone</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Satisfaction – I am adequately recognised by national</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Urgency – Retaining existing members</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Urgency – Recruiting new members</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Urgency – Communication of new initiatives</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Urgency – Transparency</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Urgency – Membership Engagement</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Urgency – Participation in zone leadership</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Urgency – Financial health</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Urgency – Generational differences between members</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Urgency – Communication between zone and national levels</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Urgency – Issues between the various ski area patrols</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Urgency – Participation levels at in-town zone meetings</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Value – Annual first-aid training and requalification process</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Value – Annual CPR requalification</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question Topic</td>
<td>Number Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Value – Relationship with own area patrollers</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Value – networking opportunities with public</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Value – Opportunity for physical activity</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Value – Social activities</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Value – Relationships with on-hill staff</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Value – Relationships with other area CSP patrollers</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Value – Sponsorship partner benefits</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Value – Access to on-snow skills training</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Other valuable aspects of patrolling not listed</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>On a scale of 1-5 how flexible and adaptable is the CSP Calgary zone?</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Describe three key attributes that support change – Attribute 1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Attribute 1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Attribute 2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Attribute 3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Describe three key attributes that hinder change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Attribute 1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Attribute 2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Attribute 3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>What does it mean to you to be a patroller</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>What does it mean to you to patrol at your hill</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>What would it mean to you if you were unable to patrol</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>The single best thing about patrolling is</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>If I could change one thing about patrolling it would be</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Would you be interested in participating in the open space</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>If you would like to participate in the OST please provide email</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2 – Primary Patrol Location</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>Proportion of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Louise</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakiska</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norquay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive (i.e. no current patrol, partially complete survey)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question 4 – total years patrolled</th>
<th>Question 5 – Total years patrolled in Calgary Zone</th>
<th>Questions 6 – Total years patrolled at current area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7 - Location</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airdrie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragg Creek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canmore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 7 - Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Alberta</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 8 – Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946-1964 “Boomers”</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1980 “GenExers”</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1995 “Millennials”</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 9 – Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 10 - Highest Level of Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College + Trade</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate + Trade</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate + Trade</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 11-27: Importance

1. I have adequate training and resources to be effective.
2. I am respected.
3. Zone going in right direction.
4. Zone communication transparent.
5. My talents put to effective use.
7. I am recognised for my contribution to the zone.
8. I hold local patrol leadership position.
9. I hold national leadership position.

Questions 28-43: Satisfaction

1. I have adequate training and resources to be effective.
2. Local patrol opportunities are available.
3. My talents put to effective use.
4. I am recognised for my contribution to the zone.
5. Zone going in right direction.
6. Important information openly shared.
7. I have opportunity to set the zone's future.
8. Patrollers held accountable for actions.

Questions 44-54: Urgency

1. Retaining existing members.
2. Transparency.
3. Membership engagement.
5. Communication between zone and national.
6. Participation at in-town zone meetings.
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Questions 55-64: Value

- Training: First Aid
- Area Patrollers
- Training: on-snow skills
- Physical Activity
- Training: CPR
- On-hill Staff
- Zone Patrollers
- Pro-Deal" benefits
- Social Activity
- Networking

Ranking (1=most valuable 10=least valuable)
### Questions 55-64: Value – Distribution of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response #</th>
<th>Networking opportunities with the public</th>
<th>Social activities</th>
<th>Sponsorship benefits</th>
<th>Relationships with other area CSP patrollers</th>
<th>Relationships with on-hill staff</th>
<th>Annual CPR training and certification</th>
<th>Opportunity for regular physical activity</th>
<th>Access to on-snow skills training (i.e. avalanche...)</th>
<th>Relationships with own area CSP patrollers</th>
<th>Training and requalification procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“1”</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“2”</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“3”</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“4”</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“5”</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“6”</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“7”</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“8”</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“9”</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“10”</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated:</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total response and NI:</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>