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Abstract:

This study examines the process of one mission agency working through the transition to modern social computing to create and share knowledge between its home office, missionaries, donors, and churches. Because these organizations tend to be closed to those outside of their theological and religious perspective, they are not normally accessible to external researchers.

This study provides a unique glimpse into the process of one mission as it has worked through this transition. The goal was to investigate the use of Web 2.0 technologies, social media, learning management system (LMS), and customer relationship management systems (CRM) type personnel systems within a globally distributed modern mission agency. This is done from a unique theoretical perspective that combines three constructivist epistemologies.

The theoretical perspectives are Pask's conversation theory, Wenger's communities of practice, and Weick's sensemaking merged to form a multilevel epistemological framework to examine the social construction of knowledge in technical systems. A multiple case study approach was used where each system was its own case. Successes and failures were examined to look for commonalities and best practices. These systems were within a single organization sharing a common cultural and technical context. This context served as a control for these factors creating a natural experiment. Structured interviews were conducted with a wide range of individuals across all levels of the organization to collect data on the implementation and usage of these systems.
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Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the use of social media from the perspective of a modern mission agency. Modern mission agencies typically have a home office in the United States but the majority of their work force is distributed around the world and often works in very remote locations. Data was gathered through a series of interviews with almost 30 employees over a two week period with follow up discussions for clarification on specific issues. Seven systems were identified and interviews were conducted about each system, treating each system as its own case. The intention of this paper is not to provide the details of each case and each system but rather to provide a high level overview of such systems in the context of a mission agency. In essence this paper provides an overview of this research project in terms of context, theory, and history. Subsequent publications will examine the findings in greater detail.

There are a growing number of studies on religion in the digital world including special editions of various journals focusing on this theme: *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* (2007-2008), *Communication Research Trends* 25:1(2006), *Cybersociology* 7 (1999), and *The Information Society* 21:4 (2005). There is also one journal dedicated solely to the topic of religion and the Internet, *Online – Heidelberg Journal of Religions on the Internet*. However, these tend to focus more on the perspective of religious practice (Cheong, 2012) than on organizational behavior or system architecture. This document intends to survey a single religious organization as it attempts to integrate these technologies into its daily operations.

Since some readers may not understand the nature of a mission agency, I will start with a brief overview. Second, I will give three theoretical perspectives which provide three lenses to explain the behavior within social media. A narrative of the organizational process will then provide an
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overview of one mission’s usage of social media. Finally, I will conclude with insights that can assist other mission agencies or similar organizations.

Context of Modern Missions

General Context

Since the last words of Jesus, “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations…” (Matthew 28:19, all biblical quotes are from the English Standard Version of the Bible) his followers have worked to take his message “to the end of the earth” (Acts 1:8). This process has involved most branches of the church to one degree or another since the first century. The context of this paper is the modern phenomenon of mission agencies within the Protestant branch of the Western church. Modern mission agencies have existed for over 200 years. They began in the late 1700s with the London Mission Society that sent William Carey to work in India. Since then hundreds of organizations have sprung up with the purpose of mobilizing people to continue this mission. As such, mission agencies were some of the first globally distributed organizations of the modern era. During their history they have faced the challenge of sharing information and knowledge across the globe. Their home office was normally in a developed Western country while the field workers were in some of the remotest parts of the world. These locales often lacked communication systems, roads, postal services, and sometimes even a written language. While mission agencies have worked through these issues for 200 years, they have frequently lacked the necessary resources to implement modern information systems. The majority of mission agencies are funded through donations and normally work on very tight budgets. Communication with donors has been key to their financial survival as they make their financial needs known to individuals, churches, and denominations. The “free” technology of social media has been viewed by many mission agencies and missionaries as an “answer to prayer” because of
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its ability to improve communication. However, the adoption of these technologies has not been without difficulty. Agencies often lack the technical savvy to use these tools and sometimes possess a social conservatism which tends to be skeptical of new technologies.

Specific Context

The specific context for this study is WorldVenture (www.worldventure.com), a Protestant mission agency headquartered in Littleton, Colorado. WorldVenture’s home office oversees approximately 500 workers in dozens of countries across 6 continents. Although their missionaries use social media extensively, this study will concentrate on the organizational headquarters and its use of social media. WorldVenture uses social media for three main purposes: 1) recruiting future missionaries, 2) communicating with existing missionaries, 3) developing relationships with current and potential sponsors. Between approximately 2005 and 2011, WorldVenture attempted to deploy well over 20 examples of social media. Some were useful and have remained but the majority were never full adopted and were subsequently abandoned. The goal of this paper is provide deeper understanding of these systems by developing a theoretical framework, a more accurate definition of these systems, a narrative of usage, and suggestions for improved usage moving forward.

Theoretical Construct

When examining social media, the most common approach is to start with a specific website or set of websites in which people interact. For example, “How do people do X on website Y.” Over time, frameworks have developed. However, the focus of these frameworks still tends toward description of narrow phenomenon rather than deep theory which could have predictive value. There remains an emphasis on tautology over theory. Without some explanatory theory, there is the danger of research simply following fads without making a
lasting contribution. This section describes a theoretical construct which has the potential to provide not only descriptive but also prescriptive power. A full description of each theory is beyond the scope of this paper so only the conceptual highlights of each theory are presented. After a survey of each of the three theories, I will demonstrate the significance of their perspective for the usage context. Discussion will move from the general to the specific, looking at the organizational level, the group level, and finally the individual level. The approach used here is based on constructivist ontology and epistemology as reflected in sensemaking (Weick, 1995; Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005), communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1999, 2001, 2005a, 2005b; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002; Wenger & Snyder, 2000; Wenger, White, Smith, & Rowe, 2005), and conversation theory (Pask, 1973, 1975a, 1975b, 1976a, 1976b). Each theoretical perspective will be expounded separately and then synthesized and applied to the organizational context.

Sensemaking - The Organization

A mission agency is an organization with all the typical components: employees, a board, executive leadership, policies, etc. This provides the broad context for system usage. As such, it is a bounded context with a specific purpose and defined borders. There are insiders and outsiders and a broad array of stakeholders. From the perspective of sensemaking, individuals within an organization are attempting to work together to “make sense” of their environment, their situation, and each other. This form of sensemaking should not be confused with “Sense-Making” as described by Brenda Dervin (Dervin & Nilan, 1986). “Sense-Making” in her approach focuses on an individual attempting to make sense of a situation. The “sensemaking” I am referring to is a group activity as described by Karl Weick (Weick, 1995). He conceptualizes
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the activity of multiple people trying to make sense in a participatory fashion which involves both the individual and the group.

As the individual and the group interact in an organizational setting, Weick identifies seven distinguishing characteristics of the sensemaking process:

1. Grounded in identity construction
2. Retrospective
3. Enactive of sensible environments
4. Social
5. Ongoing
6. Focused on and by extracted cues
7. Driven by plausibility rather than accuracy (Weick, 1995, p. 17)

For sensemaking, the iconic question is “How can I know what I think until I see what I say” (1995)? This is the start of the process for creating identity and making sense. There is both a speaker and a listener, the self and the others. No one makes sense alone even when listening to oneself speak. The retrospective aspect “involves the ongoing retrospective development of plausible images that rationalized what people are doing” (Weick et al., 2005). Weick (2006) says “Many people resonate to Kierkegaard’s statement that ‘It is perfectly true, as philosophers say, that life must be understood backwards. But they forget the other proposition, that it must be lived forward’ (Gardiner, 1988, p. 10)” (p. 1732). In this process the context or “sensible environment” is not something that is static, but participatory. The sensemaker makes the environment and the environment makes the sensemaker. Because this is a social activity, “the social context is crucial … because it binds people to actions that they then must justify, it affects the saliency of information, and it provides norms and expectations that constrain explanations” (Weick, 1995, p. 53). The activity is not something that starts and stops, it is always in process and always ongoing. “Sensemaking never starts. The reason it never starts is that pure duration never stops” (Weick, 2006, p. 43). As people move through time and space in these
environments, they cannot help but try to make sense. “Once people begin to act (enactment), they generate tangible outcomes (cues), in some context (social), and this helps them discover (retrospect) what is occurring (ongoing), what needs to be explained (plausibility), and what should be done next (identity enhancement)” (Weick, 1995, pp. 54-55). Finally, as individuals seek to make sense they are not looking for perfection and accuracy, rather they are looking for plausibility. While sensemaking, people “read into things the meanings they wish to see; they vest objects, utterances, actions and so forth with subjective meaning which helps make their world intelligible to themselves” (Frost & Morgan, 1983).

While this is the briefest of surveys, my hope is that the reader will be able to grasp some feel of Wieck’s description of an interactive process whereby the individual and his or her organization make meaning together in a symbiotic, iterative process. In more recent descriptions, Weick refines this to five aspects of sensemaking: redoing, labeling, discarding, believing, and substantiating. Regardless of the labels, it is a never-ending process where no person operates alone and sensemaking is a cooperative process of constructing meaning.

**Community of Practice - The Group**

Just as sensemaking examines the construction at the organizational or supra-group level, Etienne Wenger examines the construction of meaning at the group level. For Wenger, these groups are more tightknit communities that share three specific dimensions: “mutual engagement,” “a joint enterprise,” and “a shared repertoire” (Wenger, 1999, p. 73). This represents more of a team than simply an organization. This is the subunit within the organization that has already bonded and can more efficiently create and share meaning because of its participation in reification. This duality of participation and reification is seen in the common experiences in context and the shared meaning which has been negotiated (Figure 1).
As communities of practice construct meaning, there is a significant element which has special significance for social media and this has to do with participation. There is a social construct of meaning which is embedded in systems of artifacts, whether physical or digital.

Communities of practice are bounded sets which have four levels of participation, three main levels (peripheral, active, and core group) and outsiders or nonparticipants (Wenger et al., 2002, pp. 55-58). As such, these levels of participation in social media are nothing new and are simply a reflection of normative human behavior. The variance in levels of participation is widely recognized in studies of social media (Preece & Schneiderman, 2009) but Wenger has a fuller, richer description (Figure 2) which describes this phenomenon before it was seen in social media.
From Wenger’s perspective, humans systems always have various levels of participation and it should not be expected that everyone would become an active participant. In actuality, the majority of members will always be peripheral participants and the core group will always be a minority.

For Wenger, communities of practice are about learning. His definition of learning has three dimensions: it consists of continuities and discontinuities, it is an integral part of practice, and it creates emergent structures (Wenger, 1999, pp. 93-97). As community members make sense and negotiate meaning together, they are learning. The practices of the community are not simply rules which the community chooses to obey, the practices “evolve as shared histories of learning” (Wenger, 1999, p. 87). Wenger’s perspective is that “communities of practice can be thought of as shared histories of learning” (Wenger, 1999, p. 86). Wenger would even go so far as to say that without learning, according to his definition, there can be no community of practice. In other words, “[t]o assert that learning is what gives rise to communities of practice is to say that learning is a course of social structure … not an object, which exists in and of itself and can be separated from the process giving rise to it. Rather it is an emergent structure” (Wenger, 1999, p. 96).

Summarizing Wenger, a community of practice is a bounded set of individuals who engage in participation and reification as a means of co-constructing meaning. This activity is essentially a practice of learning resulting from mutual engagement and a shared repertoire in a joint enterprise. The practices of the community serve as a boundary between a community, and its environment, and the other communities in its environment.
Conversation Theory - The Individual

The final theoretical perspective is found in Gordon Pask’s conversation theory. Conversation and conversing in this context are not simply metaphors, as Luppicini pointed out, and should not be confused with interaction or communication (Luppicini, 2008). Conversing is a label used to describe a certain type of interaction between two participants for sharing representations of meaning to the point where they reach an agreement. Agreement here includes: agreeing to disagree, agreeing to cease the conversation, and agreeing to continue the conversation. There are several concepts in conversation theory that are essential to understand; first is the process of conversing and second is the product of conversing, the entailment mesh.

Conversing is a process that requires at least two “voices” which can be “psychological” or “mechanical” as Pask calls them. In Pask’s conceptualization, these two voices can be inside one’s head (psychological individuals) or the two voices can represent two physical entities (mechanical individuals) such as two people, two groups, or two nations. Pask refers to this ability to be conversing as the source of consciousness (Luppicini, 2008; Pask, 1979) which reflects an “I-Thou” relationship within a single human being. While one may not think this is obvious, human beings do converse with themselves and have internal interactions between differing viewpoints as they process ideas and construct meaning. Persons sometimes “debate” ideas or courses of action with themselves. They deliberate. They are able to reflect on their own existence, question themselves, congratulate themselves, ask themselves questions and so forth. The conversations between two people, two groups, two companies, or two countries are just a scaling up of the phenomenon. According to Pask, we cannot not be conversing. Humans are processors that are always processing. “This means that learning cannot not occur, that conversation cannot not take place” (Scott, 2008). In the world of social media, the voices are
represented by individuals who are constructing meaning as they converse back and forth in a forum (for example), by sharing and commenting, and through all manner of engaging others online.

The second essential contribution from conversation is the product of the conversation, the entailment mesh. This entailment mesh consists of all the comments on various topics in a conversation. It is the product of the interactions and is essentially emergent or inductive as opposed to deductive. If one saw an entailment mesh in raw form, it would include every utterance in the conversation and depending on the complexity, number of participants, and duration could prove almost unintelligible. Think of this as the semantic network or concept map which lies on top of the social network. This is meaning that is created by the connections between the knowledge and information which are constructed and shared. While this may be difficult to visualize, a simple example is a discussion forum. As members of the forum contribute to ongoing discussions, they are creating a mesh of comments on various topics and relating them to previous comments. The product of this conversation becomes an instantiated memory of sorts which other individuals can use to navigate and follow the conversation (entailment mesh) after the fact. The result is a network of topics and comments. This is the “stuff” that is created by conversing in the social media software.

**Theoretical Synthesis**

Together, the perspectives of Weick, Wenger and Pask represent a constructivist epistemology which provides explanatory power at the organizational, group, and individual levels. It also gives guidance in the understanding of the activity at various levels within a single organization (Figure 3).
In combination, these three present sympathetic perspectives for investigating the organization at three different levels. This is the organization as a whole, the set of communities of practice (participatory networks) within the organization, and the activity (conversing) between the members of those communities. From Weick’s (1993) perspective, group sensemaking “is an ongoing accomplishment that emerges from efforts to create order and make retrospective sense of what occurs” (p. 635). According to Wenger, “a member of a community of practice embodies a long and diverse process of what I will call participation. Similarly … an artifact of certain practices embodies a long and diverse process of what I will call reification” (Wenger, 1999, p. 55). According to Pask, “communication in a meaningful learning environment (i.e., the world we design and/or find ourselves in) can only be by means of conversation (circular, feedback, computing) matching responses, agreement – including the vital agreement to disagree with personal and personality generated meanings and understanding…” (Glanville, 1993, p. 214). These three conceptual frameworks represent three levels or three viewpoints (organizational, group, and individual) which are all relevant perspectives for social media in an organizational context.
These perspectives are especially helpful in the context of WorldVenture because no user uses alone. Whether the systems are internal or external, there is always a context which involves other users. For example, a user may use Facebook, but her personal behavior in Facebook may or may not be related to their involvement with the mission. However, even with a system like Facebook, users tie into a social network. Theoretically, there could be Facebook users without friends, but the whole point of the system is social interaction. Because there is a context for usage in the mission agency situation, one must have a model which addresses the organization and its communities of practice. Otherwise, how could one account for usage that varies from department to department? This was especially evident in the personnel systems, described below, which contained socially constructed knowledge that was used differently by other departments. In such cases, focusing strictly on an individual user fails to reveal the whole situation. As shown in Figure 3 above, conversing is taking place within and between communities of practice. Because of the complexity of usage and the nature of the systems in WorldVenture, it was important to look carefully at the popular conceptions of social media to see if they were appropriate descriptions of the systems that were used for the social construction of knowledge.

Social Media

The terms “social media,” “Web 2.0” (O'Reilly, 2005), and “Web 3.0” (Markoff, 2006) are so common that they have become passé and have been a topic of investigation for almost a decade (Allen, Rosenbaum, & Shachaf, 2007). While these terms do represent a cultural meme, in my opinion these terms are too vague and their definitions are too broad for scientific research. The impact of these technologies has been so far reaching and the adoption has been so broad that it is easy to forget that most of these systems are less than 10 years old. Facebook just
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had its tenth birthday and it took several years to become publicly available: 2004 – Harvard, 2005 – companies, 2006 – public. While most people today would know what one means when someone says “social media”, most would find it harder to get people to define it. While definitions have been proposed (Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy, & Silvestre, 2011), there is still a tendency to focus on categorizing the social phenomenon in select systems instead of constructing a definition and model which has a theoretical framework to help explain the human behavior.

This study looked at networked technologies, including social media. In each case there were definite boundaries to the systems, the users, the groups, and the organization itself. The activity in which people engaged was conversing. This is the core of the acting as defined by the earlier described theories, especially conversation theory (Figure 4).

![Figure 4: Conversation in Web 2.0, adapted from (Solis, 2008)](image)

Even those who take a phenomenological approach, admit that conversation is an essential component of social media (Kietzmann et al., 2011). The technology at WorldVenture included four homegrown systems, professional donor management software, a virtual community site, a learning management system (LMS), and Facebook. The perspective of this paper is that the knowledge that was created in the organization was the entailment mesh. The problem sets then
vary in relationship to the general context of the mission agency and specific contexts of the various communities of practice within the mission agency.

For the sake of discussion, “social media” as used in this paper refers primarily to the popular examples such as Facebook, Twitter, Foursquare, and the like. However, these are just a subset of systems used for the social construction of knowledge. Elsewhere, I have referred to this broader set of systems as “participatory networks” (Lankes & Marshall, 2006; Lankes, Silverstein, Nicholson, & Marshall, 2007; Marshall, 2009, 2011). One could think of “social media” as a popular definition of these open systems and “participatory network” as an attempt at a more precise scientific definition which encompasses systems that are broader in scope. In this sense, social media is a part of the pie which is a participatory network. From this point on, I will use the term “participatory network” instead of “social media” for this larger set of systems.

A participatory network is a network where each member has the potential to converse with other members through technology which creates an entailment mesh to address problems within a given context. There are nine components to this definition: 1) a network topology, 2) people, 3) membership, 4) potential to participate, 5) conversing, 6) intermediating technology, 7) an entailment mesh, 8) a problem set, and 9) a specific context. This definition involves three networks which are stacked on top of each other in a given context (Figure 4).

![Figure 4: Constituent Parts of a Participatory Network](image-url)
In the WorldVenture context these networks crossed the boundaries of communities of practice within the organization as each department, defined below, worked on its own problems as well as larger organizational problems (Figure 5).

The result is an information network which can be described as an entailment mesh or semantic network. That is, a set of connected facts, data, information, and knowledge. The second network is the social network. This is the network of people and their relationships which may cross the boundaries of several communities of practice. Finally, these networks rest on the technical network which includes the software and hardware that enable the process. These three networks are distinct and should not be conflated as too often happens in discussions of social media.

Mission Processes

As with all organizations, the mission agency is formed around a problem set that is a process. The general process is that of recruiting applicants, vetting and training applicants, helping applicants raise their financial support, then the sending of applicants to their international field work. For short term workers, six months or less, this process may only take a few months. For a career missionary this process may take several years. This process normally
begins with recruiters visiting churches and college campuses. They would have information sessions and meet potential recruits over coffee or a meal. The information they gleaned about these contacts was very rich but only the most basic contact and demographic information made its way into organizational systems if the contact chose to fill out a paper, or later digital, form. As a result, recruiters had to devise their own systems to remember the details about these contacts. If a contact form was created, this was passed on to the Mobilization Department which had the form but lacked all the surrounding contextual data or metadata. As they worked with applicants they created their own set of data which were not able to be recorded in formal organization systems due to their design. This was the case as the candidates passed through each department. The actual formal organizational databases contained only a thin representation of what employees knew about a candidate. Sometimes this information was vital for decision making but the information existed only in someone’s head, maybe a notebook, or an ad hoc departmental system. Because of the religious nature of the mission the background information about a candidate’s history, family, work, beliefs, church activity, behavior, habits, character and so forth are critical to the mission’s decision about whether or not to accept the applicant and move them on to the next step. One person in the organization who had gone through this process reported that the application process was more thorough than when he received a high security clearance in the military. Such information was difficult to capture in traditional systems. However, participatory networks and social media are ideal for capturing a richer representation of a candidate.

As Figure 6 demonstrates, the process involves multiple communities of practice within the organization and a change in identity for the applicant.
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![Diagram: WorldVenture - Organization Level](image)

**Figure 6: The Organizational Process at WorldVenture**

Within the organization there were five departments: Recruiting which makes initial contact with recruits, Mobilization which vets the applications, the Paraclete Centre which trains the appointees, Church Connections which assists with fund raising, and the International Ministry Department which supervises missionaries on the field. As the potential missionary moves from one community of practice (department) to another they change from recruit, to applicant, to appointee, to missionary. This is a classic example of identity construction through an iterative process which involves conversing between the applicant and the organization and its various communities of practice. As these interactions take place, knowledge is constructed in the minds of the applicant and the home office employees. This involves complex systems of participation and reification involving various technical systems. These systems are critical for the process to function and the organization to fulfill its purpose.

**Mission Systems**

When first looking at WorldVenture’s participatory networks, there were four internal systems, six organizational websites, and eight Facebook groups or fan pages. There were other social networking tools that had been the subject of experimentation but none of them moved
beyond an initial prototype stage. Finally, seven systems were selected for review. Four internal systems, two websites, and Facebook which was treated as a single system (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Systems</th>
<th>WorldVenture Websites</th>
<th>Facebook Group/Fan Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pronotes</td>
<td>• Missions on the Frontline</td>
<td>• Facebook as a single system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ad Hoc Mobilization System</td>
<td>• WorldVenture Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WorldVenture Personnel System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Raiser’s Edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The internal systems were for formal organization personnel and financial purposes. Missions on the Frontline (http://frontline.worldventure.com/) sought to develop an online community and WorldVenture Training used the Moodle learning management system. Facebook was treated as a single system because that was the perspective of the interviewees.

Initially, WorldVenture had a more traditional system architecture that had one primary database which then created reports and populated data to departments. This was a legacy system, BIZAPS, running on an IBM AS400. It was not a participatory network but served as the central data repository for the systems described below. In this system, communities of practice could pull information from a central source but they could not share between departments and sometimes had read only access (Figure 7).
As a result, each department created its own informal and unofficial system to facilitate sharing within its own department: Prosnotes for recruiting (a Microsoft Access database), Ad Hoc “Personal Information Form” system for Mobilization (shared Microsoft Word documents), and WorldVenture Training which was a learning management system (LMS) for the Paraclete Centre (Moodle). While these home grown participatory networks in each departmental silo were necessary measures, they were very cumbersome and there was no connection between these systems, other departments or formal organization databases. The AD Hoc system, a particularly creative solution, used a Microsoft Word document for each recruit. It contained every single email to or from the candidate as well as notes from every phone call with that candidate. These were then stored in a departmental shared drive space. While this did allow the conversing with candidates to be recorded it was not easily navigable or shareable.

When faced with this situation, WorldVenture eventually decided to create its own internal system which allowed each community of practice to contribute information to a centralized system in a fashion which allows for the cross sharing of all information that was necessary for that department to address its own problem set. This was accomplished through a customized interface that had appropriate fields and permissions for each user.
The change in this architecture and the resulting benefits are obvious. Rich information about candidates was now storable in a system which facilitated sharing and preserving of important organizational information. These were the participatory networks which served as the foundation for organizational operations and became the sole system for storing personnel information. While these ad hoc systems morphed into a single personnel system, a separate application (Raiser’s Edge – www.blackbaud.com/raisersedge) was brought into the organization to provide a richer picture of the semantic and social networks around donors. Raiser’s Edge is an industry standard application for donor management in the nonprofit world. Although it has the ability to serve as a standalone solution for tracking all aspects of fundraising, it was only being used in a limited capacity - almost as just an interface for the larger accounting systems.

In parallel with the evolution of formal systems, participatory networks arose which were along the lines of popular social media. This was the Missions on the Frontline website which combined photos, videos, blogs, groups, forums, and events. The goal was to engage the larger community of missionaries and donors and engage them in conversations about the work of missions. There has been a struggle to foster engagement and even after several years there are only 18 groups with a total membership count of approximately 120 members, some of whom may be duplicated. Between February 2013 and May 2014, there were no new postings.
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The training of missionaries is the responsibility of the Paraclete Centre and takes place in face to face meetings at the home office, occasional training events around the world, and as needed. An LMS would seem to be an ideal venue for training in such a setting. With that in mind, WorldVenture deployed an instance of the Moodle LMS. However, because of staff changes and a lack of experience with online learning systems, the LMS basically served only as a file repository.

During initial investigation, at least eight Facebook groups or fan pages were identified. As has often been the case, many informal organizational groups and fan pages come to life before an organization adopts a social media strategy and has its own official presence. Some groups were ephemeral, such as “WorldVenture Coffee drinkers” or the “Appointee Class” of a given year. There are a number of current WorldVenture groups revolving around specific countries missionaries work in or ministries associated with the mission. The present (May 10, 2014) WorldVenture group page (https://www.facebook.com/worldventure) has 5,623 likes but only 23 friends. One item that may cause some confusion is that there is a travel company with the name “WorldVentures” and it often appears mixed in with WorldVenture in search engine results. Another issue with Facebook was significant variance in usage from department to department. The recruiters relied on Facebook heavily as they sought to broaden their networks and make connections, especially with students. However, Facebook was not a suitable tool for other departments where the subject matter for communication was too sensitive for a Facebook page. While members of those communities may not have used Facebook at work, they were power users in their personal life. In such cases, the context made all the difference in usage. In any case one would expect such a large organization with a global reach to have a more substantial number of Facebook friends.
Conclusion

As a modern mission agency, WorldVenture has wrestled with the implementation of social media and participatory networks. The approach used in this investigation was to build a theoretical model of group activity in such systems that would have explanatory value at the organizational, group, and individual level. The constructivist epistemology employed by Weick, Wenger, and Pask provide conceptualizations that describe the iterative process of creating identity, participating, creating and sharing knowledge, and describing the resulting knowledge. These theoretical descriptions demonstrate the need for a definition of systems which moves beyond the popularly elastic term of “social media.” The definition of “participatory network,” as described above, provides a framework for investigating the co-construction of knowledge by WorldVenture employees as they work with internal and external communities of practice. As WorldVenture’s needs have evolved, they have increasingly needed systems which facilitate the social construction of knowledge across the organization among various communities of practice. Hopefully, the following points can provide some guidance as other organizations work through this same transition.

1. **Consider the context.** Usage of a given system by a given user will change from context to context even within a single organization.
2. **Communities of practice have defined problems.** The system should match the problem set, not just in general but as it pertains to the needs of that community of practice.
3. **Traditional systems miss the metadata.** Metadata from all members of the community can be only be preserved when systems are designed to capture the conversing.
4. **The entailment mesh has tremendous value.** While the typical facts about candidates and their backgrounds have value, the relationships and interconnectedness between that information is invaluable.
5. **It is easier to create a participatory network than to keep it alive.** Just because you build it does not mean they will come or that they will use it.
6. **System design should match the form of the communities of practice.** It is vital for organizations to understand their own internal business processes and organizational behavior in order to design and deploy systems effectively.
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