Study of influence of the sense making on organizational performance using ANP phase
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Abstract  
The sense making of the organizational a is process that helps managers to achieve a good understanding about members of the organization that how are their thoughts about changes and finally what they choose among the different sense makings and maintain them. This study explores and explains the sense making model. This research community is considered staff and faculty of 44 Center Payam Noor University Isfahan province that 280 people from the community were selected as sample according to Morgan table. Since collecting information from experts and employees regarding to the dimensions of the indicators of semanticization is done by using a questionnaire, this research is a descriptive study. Model analysis was carried out by using two important and efficient tool phase ANP and structural equation which using SPSS software and Expert Choice Smart Pls3. And finally it was determined that sense making have influence on organizational performance with impact factor of 0.912 and it’s estimated the coefficient of determination of sense making 0.926 and determining factor of performance 0.831.
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Introduction

Sense making can create a clear vision of the environment and changes in managers and guide the organization in order to steer in the direction of vision and specified mission. So that the management of organization creates a feeling and common empathy in this area with related sense makings and positive feeling about the prospects and mission of the organization (Brakman, 2011: 27). In a nutshell, sense making is the answer of this question that how we got to this point and according to environmental opportunities how are we going to achieve our goals that's mean how can we overcome the environmental challenges and guide organizations to success by using human resources committed (Moore, 2013: 43). It has been shown in organizational studies has that cooperation and collective effort are the basis for creating and producing knowledge that based on this knowledge sense making forms (Simard and Labrg, 2014). Typically three content perspectives can be considered in terms of sense making of the organizations. These three views include descriptive, conceptually and futurist views. Briefly, descriptive perspective implies on identifying of the sense making level of the organization and its distribution it in the organization, focus of conceptual view is on the conceptual and operational definitions of sense making and finally futurist view discusses about the future and the development of this concept in the literature management (Christensen et al, 2015). The main functional purpose of this research is to design, explain and corporate model of sense making in the course of organizational changes. And in particular, partial goals of this study is to identify the impact of identity, reviewing sense makings, rules, environment, social communication, focusing on the symptoms, sensible move and cultural indicators on sense making of the organizations.

Conceptual background

Carl Weik (1969) introduced the sense making in the literature of organization and management for the first time. He raised discussions about the sense making and its impact on the performance of the organization in his book entitled "Social Psychology" in 1969. His discussion was mainly about organizational environment changing. He stated that organization performance will be a function of subjective sense makings of people by changing the organization's environment which in turn could affect their performance. After Weik theory in the 1960s and 1970s, various research and studies was conducted about the organization that one of the most important of them was research of Berger and Luckman (1967) about evaluating the effect social relationships on the sense making of organizational with variable-national study. Sikorel (1974) and Hipp (1967) performed the study of identification methods and techniques that can create specific sense makings in people. Some studies of this period also focused on studying and exploring the organizational conflict sense making. Bagental and Tanenbaum, 1968, Manis, 1978, Stuo and Ruos, in 1978 Weik in 1967 and Salansik (1977) studied the role of beliefs about the creation of sense making and select various means. In the 1980s, with the boom in studies of organizational behavior and strategic management of sense making discussions was done mainly in these two areas. (Walsh, 1995) and Louise (1980) studied the method and impact of cognitive.
of the organization and its goals on method of sensemaking. Kiesler and Sproull (1982) studied the impact of the organization's environment on sense making method. They introduced changes in conditions and environmental factors as an influencing factor in sensemaking. Daft and Wiek (1984) studied the role of taking into consideration for people in the sense making process. Proce and Thomas (1989) studies tried to introduce activities in their studies which be able to change perceived environment in people's minds. In the 1990s, sense making studies were continued seriously and sense making as a research subject was studied in with more intensity. One of the most important studies in the 1990s was studies of Karl Weck (1995). He organized hid previous studies and provided a conceptual framework to understand the sense making in his book released in 1995 as sense making in the organizations. He was trying to offer influential corporate events of the sense making and explain its process in this book. Boyce (1990) studied the role of linguistic misunderstandings in the organizational sense making in his studies He noted that a lot of formed sense makings in the minds of other persons is due to lack of proper understanding of speech in communication. Drazyn (1999) studied the role of culture in creating sense makings and stated that cultural values are very effective in creating sense making of organization. Bar (1988) study, the effect of strategic changes in the organizational sense making. From 2000 onwards sense making research have been more emphasized on the social aspects. Weik (2005) mentioned the sense making as an organization certain power in organizational management in his studies and also studied the way to create power in the organization by sense making process. Anand and Pitson (2000) and Cal Will and Carter (2013), Lascheroloiz (2008) studied organizational sense making as a tool in the hands of managers to coordinate and steer the organization. Vebrogelinn (2006) analyzed the levels of organizational sense making. Kahn Leaf and Copeland (2012) studied cognitive process of sense making too. Also other studies have been carried out in the recent years, especially 2015 which are presented in detail in the background. Soon Shin (2014) sense making includes a review of individual people's thinking that they can adapt their behavior with environmental conditions. Crenlissen (2015) sense making the process of creating sense makings in the minds of people towards the subject and organizational phenomena and life. And as these phenomena be new and unique, the strength of sense making and its impact on people's behavior will increase.

Research model and hypotheses

According the studies made and dimensions of case study in ideas and past researches, conceptual model of research was designed. That the effects of seven independent variable of the sense making is specified in this model and continuing outcomes and results of sense making is provided. Which the components of conceptual model are presented in detail in Figure 1.

The impact of occupational identity on the sense making

Structure of identity is a frame of mind that people explained in various fields such as nationality, education, religion and other factors affecting this mental framework. Organizational experiences are formed from the beginning of arrival person to the organization and even from their previous
experiences in the organizations and have some effects on creation of sense makings in staff (Tarlo Mills, 2011: 71). So hypothesis "corporate identity leads to the effectiveness of the sense making" is selected.

Effect of logical function on sense making

Weik (2005) states about logical move in the organization that human resources are always sensitive to changes in regulatory environment and time. Organization staff accept wise and reasonable move and as usual they are looking for accuracy of activities of individuals and managers. So reasonable and correct activities or moves that are reasonable in mind of organization staff, can lead to significant and positive sense making(Watson, 2009: 20). Therefore, the hypothesis «Logical function causes effectiveness of sense making" is selected.

Effect of regulatory environment on sense making

Regulatory environment of organization can be effective in effectiveness of sense making of organization and help organizations in order to improve its performance. (Mantz, 2000) Norms and rules governing the organizational environment can create a special environment that this environment according to the norms governing it, be generator of sense and sense making to people. Obviously regulated environments affected the performance of organization employees and reduce their deviation (Aboulafilla, 2010: 42) Therefore the hypothesis "Regulatory environment causes effectiveness of sense making" is selected.

Effect of focus on signs on sense making

Signs in sense making are expressing certain reference points that affect sense making. For example hour of presence of the managers in the organization, treatment, dressing manner and ... can create its own sense making in the minds of employees (Weik, 2005: 45). Therefore the hypothesis "Focus on signs causes effectiveness of sense making" is selected.

Effect of social Communication on sense making

Since the organization is a social system and it is associated with individual social interactions, social relations governing the organization are effective on the creation of sense making and organizational sense. So social sense making in other words, means created in particular social conditions governs the organization (Currie and Brown, 2003) Therefore the hypothesis "Social Communication causes effectiveness of sense making" is selected.

Effect of cultural factors on sense making

Organizational culture is a collection of values based on organization that was very influential in creation and development of process of sense making and new research have emphasized on this role. (Caren Lissen, 2012).Each of investigations have pointed to an aspect of corporate culture.
In this research, basis of evaluation of cultural indicators is Globe organizational culture pattern that has been studied organizational culture in nine dimensions. (House et al., 2002) Therefore the hypothesis "effect of cultural factors causes effectiveness of sense making" is selected.

**Effect of reload sense makings on sense making**

Reload mean, in fact, is equivalent to feedback of management literature and means that sense making created in the people minds, has been reviewed and analyzed in individual and group mode to be amended in case of deviation and error (Dunford, 2012: 21) Therefore the hypothesis " effect of reload causes effectiveness of sense making" is selected.

**Effect of sense making on operation**

Obviously creating positive and negative or good and bad sense makings in people can have positive and negative repercussions on organizational performance that this result is impressive in both individual performance and organizational performance (Weik, 2005: 26). Therefore, the hypothesis "sense making causes effectiveness of operation" is selected.
**Research method**

**Sampling method**

Type of this research since the purpose is traits recognition, preferences, characteristics and behavior of individuals in society by referring to them, and describes the relationship between the variables, can be said that this study based on the nature and method of research is descriptive. And research data has been collected from 44 academic center of Payam Noor University of Isfahan province. To analyze the data methods of structural equation and ANP phase are used which two software SMART PLS 3 and EXPERT CHOICE are used.

**Validity and reliability**

To evaluate the reliability of structure three indicators composite reliability, average variance extracted and load factor are used (Fornell and Larker, 1981). The condition of establishment of structures reliability is that composite reliability amount (CR) be greater than 0.7 and the average variance extracted amount AVE) be greater than 0.5 (Fornell and Larker, 1981). Of course, McKenzie et al (1996) considered enough the amount of 0.4 and above for AVE. AVE amount shows how much of the variance of the observed variables is explained by made latent variable. Due to being high of compound reliability amount that it is top of 6/0 for all indicators, there will not be any problem in continuing to work. To assess the structure validity, two types of validity, convergent validity and divergent validity, will be examined. The purpose of convergent validity is that are the items exactly measure the same concept that is desired. Divergent validity also check that statements related to a specific latent variable, how much is measured latent variables. The condition of establishment of convergent validity is that compound reliability amount for each structure be larger than the average variance extracted (CR>AVE). As shown in validity table, reliability amount of common variables is greater than the value of AVE of the variables.

To examine the divergent validity Fornell and Larker method used. They state that: divergent validity is at an acceptable level when the AVE for each structure be more than common variance between that structure and other structures (i.e. square of the correlation coefficients between structures) in the model. In PLS, examining this, is done by a matrix that houses of the matrix contains the correlation coefficient between structural and the elements on its diagonal are the square root of AVE values of each structure. The model has acceptable divergent validity if the numbers in the main diagonal are equal or greater than their under values.

**Results**

According to Table 1 that identified average scores of experts regarding the impact of examined couple factors on sense making. That reload sense making with reasonable performance factor assigned the largest triangular numbers of the table to itself. That by interpretation of this event can be concluded that reload sense making formed in the human resources can help to stabilize...
or changing sense makings primarily and secondly it is two identified key factors that performance and rational decision are in this regard. Specifically, the results of this table show that can impress formed sense making by using logic:

Table 1. Mean pairwise comparisons relative to sense making
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</tr>
</thead>
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Table 2 – Matrix of Benchmarks final weight relative to sense making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Factors</th>
<th>definitive weight</th>
<th>final phase weight</th>
<th>component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth place</strong></td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>(0.071,0.099,0.148)</td>
<td>Structure identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seventh place</strong></td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>(0.045,0.059,0.097)</td>
<td>Reload sense making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>(0.084,0.125,0.197)</td>
<td>Legitimacy of organization environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>(0.074,0.099,0.16)</td>
<td>Staff Community Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>(0.064,0.083,0.122)</td>
<td>Focus on signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>(0.101,0.147,0.243)</td>
<td>reasonable and probable Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>(0.098,0.142,0.229)</td>
<td>Staff indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the main and functional objectives in AHP, AHP is factors ranking that this ratings are achieved according to the weights obtained by the comparison of the relative importance of factors. As can be seen in Table 2reasonable and probable motion is in the first place and reload sense makings is in the seventh place and other factors have also been identified in the second place to sixth.
Figure 2. The results of the analysis of SMART PLS software path
Discussion and conclusions

According to hypothesis testing conducted by software smart PLS which presented in the fourth chapter table tests even of the nine hypotheses was confirmed and two hypotheses were not confirmed. All hypotheses tested with significance level of less than five percent and the results show that reasonable motion with impact factor of 0.148, structure identity with impact factor 0.169 legitimacy of environment with impact factor 0.517, social connections with impact factor 0.198 and cultural factors with impact factor 0.215 reload sense makings with impact factor 0.141 and focus on signs with impact factor 0.066 have a significant effect on organizational sense making. Also sense making with impact factor 0.912 has had an impact on individual and organizational performance. AHP phase analysis results according to analysis conducted in paired comparisons of factors and the impact these factors have on each other the relative weight of these factors is that reasonable and probable motion weighing 0.211 is in the first place, staff cultural indices weighing 0.191 second, legitimacy of environment weighing 0.154 in third, staff community connections weighing 0.139 in fourth, Structure identity weighing 0.131 in Fifth place, focus on signs weighing 0.099 in sixth place and reload sense makings weighing 0.075 in seventh. According to surveys conducted specified that between feeling and sense makings or specifically between feeling creation and sense making, there is a certain and functional differences in sense making so that feelings are derived through the five senses and are created due to physiological changes in the human body and called primary or essential feelings while sense making returns to the people's secondary feelings and the emphasis is on creating sense makings in people which usually facing with change in living or job conditions. According to research results basically the rules are adopted and implemented based on the human needs to balance and maintain security. In organization's rules and regulations and organizational regulations are so important in two phases developing and implementing and organization manager should attempt for development and implementation of effective laws. Therefore, to create a regulatory environment requires make a commitment to rules in all human resources of organization including managers and employees. Also human societies have always been in Organization Human Resource Exchange and it is transmitted data in the form of working elements, specialized knowledge, personal behavior and communication exchanges in this communications. In this process, misperceptions and lack of ability to interpret data correctly can lead to effective communication and make negative and bad connotations in human resources. On the other hand, transparent and effective communication creates positive sense makings and leads positive sense making process. And finally the rationality is the gift of God to human and the tendency towards rationality and acceptance of reasonable behavior is in nature and organization human beings. Therefore, since organizations are a human group acceptance of rational behavior in the organization creates positive connotations in human sources.
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