

## PROJECT APPROACH AS A GENERATOR OF SENSEMAKING

Imoudache Karim

Algiers 3 University- Algeria  
[karim\\_imou@yahoo.fr](mailto:karim_imou@yahoo.fr)

Reçu le : 10/08/2025

Accepté le : 27/11/2025

Publié le : 20/12/2025

**Abstract:**

This study aims to explore the latent potential of the project as both a philosophical and operational lever for a re-foundation of sensemaking within organizations, while analyzing how the project-based approach contributes to reconfiguring organizational action around more dynamic, open, and participatory frameworks in the process of sensemaking.

The study adopts a pragmatic logic that transcends the strictly technical conception of the project, framing it instead as an ontological space permeated by epistemological tensions between objectivity and subjectivity, monism and pluralism.

It highlights the existence of a dynamic inherent to the project context, characterized by the continuous shifting of organizational normativity towards a process of evolving co-construction of sense. The project is thus conceived as a hosting structure for sensemaking, capable of integrating contradictions and regulating the balance between empirical positivism and constructivist–hermeneutic relativism.

**Keywords:** Meaning; Sensemaking; Organization; Project; Philosophy of Meaning.

**Jel Classification Codes :** D83 ; M10; L20 ; O32 ; D83

**ملخص:**

إنَّ قراءة الموجد الفلسفي في ثنائية التنظيم والمعنى تجد مبررا كافيا لها في تراجع فاعلية النماذج التنظيمية الكلاسيكية أمام التعقيد الظاهر وبيئة عدم اليقين، وعليه تحاول الدراسة استكشاف الطاقة الكامنة في المشروع بوصفه رافعة فلسفية وعملية لإعادة تأسيس المعنى داخل التنظيم. وتحديد الكيفية التي تسهم بها مقاربة المشروع في إعادة هيكلة الفعل التنظيمي نحو أطر أكثر ديناميكية وتشركية في صناعة المعنى.

تنتهج الدراسة مقاربة نظامية تستند على فلسفة براغماتية تتجاوز مجرد رؤية تقنية للمشروع، بل تعتبره فضاء وجودي على ضوء التوترات الابدستيمولوجية بين الموضوعية والذاتية، الوحدانية والتعدد.

انتهت الدراسة إلى حقيقة تفيد بعدم إمكانية احتواء الديناميكيات التنظيمية بكل تناقضاتها إلا عبر مقاربة تضاهي في تعقيدها تعقيد الواقع التنظيمي، ليتجلى المشروع كهيكل حاضنة للمعنى، تدمج التناقضات وتضبط التوازنات بين الوضعية التجريبية والنسبية البنائية التأويلية، وتقييم الدليل على وجود ديناميكية في سياق المشروع تنتقل باستمرار من نمطية التنظيم إلى عملية خلق المعنى المشترك.

**الكلمات المفتاح :** المعنى ؛ صناعة المعنى ؛ التنظيم ؛ المشروع ؛ فلسفة المعنى.

**تصنيف JEL :** D83؛O32؛L20؛M10؛D83

## I. Introduction:

The quest for a philosophical–organizational horizon that transcends the deadlock of traditional approaches to organizational management inevitably raises profound challenges for the contemporary researcher—let alone the task of assimilating an intellectual dynamic still seeking to define itself between organizational boundaries and the complexities of reality. These challenges emerge with even greater clarity when immediate meaning fades into the apparent complexity of the organizational process.

This brief introduction immediately leads to the consideration of Weick’s (1988, 1993) concept of *sensemaking*, regarded as an essential tool for assessing decision-making in the aftermath of any critical organizational breakdown. However, it effectively rejects the very notion of a stable truth within the organization, which accounts for its difficulty of application. This also sheds light on the tendency to swiftly remove strategic failures from the organizational cognitive field by constructing irrational justifications for them (Baumard, 2014; Baumard & Starbuck, 2005). Nevertheless, it remains widely acknowledged that *sensemaking* serves as a mechanism for orienting both individual and collective dynamics within the organization, thereby helping to mitigate the negative effects of future uncertainty (Eckstein, G. et al., 2024).

The contemporary intellectual dynamic is reflected in the proliferation of studies devoted to the relationship between organization and meaning. This analytical trend can be approached, on the one hand, within the framework of organizational preparedness, understood as a process of individual sensemaking and social learning (Übellacker, 2025); and, on the other hand, within that of the mechanisms of coordination and knowledge production in autonomous structures such as projects, thereby enhancing the potential for investment in organizational learning (Annosi et al., 2024). It may also be situated within the exploration of how non-managerial actors perceive and interpret the process of strategic change at the very moment of its unfolding (De Metz et al., 2024).

From a standpoint that moves beyond traditional approaches to organization and management, the philosophical constructs of *sensemaking* and meaning production risk being reduced to abstract notions, whose operational translation into organizational reality remains a persistent challenge. The issue of *sensemaking* itself constitutes a complex social problem—philosophical, cultural, and technical in nature—interwoven with intellectual tensions over the modalities of its apprehension. This condition implicitly presupposes the presence of an organizational framework capable of structuring scientific knowledge toward definitive truths—an objective attainable only through an approach whose level of complexity is commensurate with that, manifest, in its constituent elements. Accordingly, the central research question arises: ***What role does the project-based approach play in transcending traditional organizational models while fostering sensemaking?***

Building on a critical analysis of traditional models and approaches to organization and management, and on the identification of their limitations in integrating the complexity inherent in *sense* and its construction, this research seeks to examine the potential contribution of the project-based approach to reconfiguring organizational action toward more dynamic and participatory frameworks for the production of *sense*. In doing so, it aims to develop both a conceptual model and an organizational framework closely aligned with the issue of *sensemaking*.

The central hypothesis posits that the project, as an organizational arrangement characterized by high complexity, constitutes a privileged space for the generation and structuring of *sense*. This perspective also calls for moving beyond the methodological caution that tends to prevail in management sciences and, more broadly, in the social sciences.

## II. From Organizational Philosophy to the Philosophy of Sensemaking:

Scientific analyses addressing the relationship between organizations and the demands of their environment—complexity and uncertainty—remain marked by polar tensions, opposing stability and transformation, concordance and contradiction. This is not an intellectual movement destined for its own deconstruction, but rather an existential inquiry into *sense*, which underpins the very legitimacy of the organization and its outcomes. This issue, in itself, provides sufficient justification for considering a conceptual linkage between organization and *sense*.

The notion of *sense*, as understood here, refers to a refined awareness of the complexity of organizational issues, the multiplicity of their dimensions, and their operational implications. Organizational philosophy is conceived as an endeavor aimed at subjecting environmental complexity to the exercise of reason, through the decomposition and analysis of phenomena into primary elements, followed by their reduction to a self-referential functional logic.

This perspective prompts an inquiry into whether the classical organizational model is capable of constituting an exhaustive truth able to encompass the complexity of reality, or whether it is merely an instrument that reconfigures environmental elements into an altered representation thereof—one devoid of a holistic vision and of the rational freedom required to confront uncertainty (Pavlov et al., 2023).

This research aims to analyze the conceptual contradictions inherent in the duality between *sense* and organization within the field of management sciences, with a focus on identifying potential sources of tension within the overall system in its interaction with the environment. *Sense* emerges from the organization through its ability to establish sustainable balances between the organizational structure and the surrounding context, which endows the relationship between *sense* and organization with a qualitative nature—one that becomes particularly salient in every situation of imbalance in this equilibrium (Weick, 1988, 1993).

A similar observation can be made regarding the relationship between the organization and its environment, conceived as a relationship imbued with *sense*. In other words, it is a social structure defined by the uniqueness of its actors—a structure that can only be dissociated from them at the cost of disrupting its meaningful coherence (E. Morin, 1980). Consequently, *sense* cannot be shielded from axiological distortions, nor from the possibility that its presumed objectivity and rationality may be called into question. This is why classical approaches to organization and management tend to limit, as far as possible, the influence of contextual factors on the organization by circumscribing the role of various actors within the overall system.

This is merely a conception that allows addressing an administrative and organizational issue while omitting a fundamental and essential aspect. However, the mind inevitably returns to the term “but”: there is no ideal organization capable of encompassing the full complexity of its environment. Rather, it constitutes a reflection of a limited set of representations, practices, systems, and modes of thought, and even through rigorous philosophical examination, it remains impossible for it to transcend this factual reality.

Hence, it is impossible to exclude the possibility of a distortion of *sense*—that is, the organization ceasing to fulfill its role in achieving a balance with its environment. Does this situation constitute mere exceptions, or does it represent a general rule that necessitates a continuous quest for *sense*?

This question cannot yet receive a sufficient and exhaustive answer, but it keeps us within the framework of the search for *sense* through the positivism/relativism duality. Indeed, the dominant positivist doctrine has progressively equated reason with a form of knowledge, without fully succeeding in establishing strict criteria separating organizational rationality from the subjectivity of the representations that shape it. Moreover, the system does not abandon its intellectual theory of organization when it contradicts certain new facts.

Thus, the method or philosophy of organization acts as a safeguard that allows acceptance of ideas compatible with the dominant context and their degree of service to the hegemonic logic, regardless of their truth or credibility (Max Scheler, German philosopher, 1926; Vilfredo Pareto, Italian economist and sociologist, 1916).

Thus, the *sense* attributed to the organization requires an apprehension that is both political and economic, situated within a system of priorities and objectives. It appears that the organization does not necessarily pursue a scientific or cognitive goal in all its configurations but rather tends to orient action around key notions such as order, performance, and coordination. It is therefore necessary to acknowledge the possibility of a reality distinct from the representations of the various actors, which becomes more evident with even the slightest imbalance. It is at this juncture that the philosophy of *sense* intervenes to repair ruptures by mobilizing more inclusive concepts, such as collective understanding of the problem, mutual recognition, and organizational identity.

However, it should be noted that the most radical stance of this approach leads us to a point where the organization is denied any significance, reduced to mere constructs that are objectively empty, thereby exhausting the system’s energy in the pursuit of hardly attainable compromises [constructivism]. Nevertheless, the complexity and uncertainty characterizing the relationship

between the organization and its environment do not preclude the existence of a relatively stable reality with which it is possible to interact rationally through the definition of functional roles and formal procedures.

Yet, the dissociation of the various parts—separated by obscure and profound zones (principle of functional specialization)—prevents us from perceiving the complex unity that constitutes organizational identity (Morin E., 2009, p22). The search for *sense* then focuses on one of the most difficult and enigmatic dualities: that between unity and plurality (monism and pluralism).

Monism is a philosophical conception that postulates the possibility of reducing a set of elements to a single unity, whether from a material standpoint (the human being reduced to a machine), through general laws governing this unity (respect for hierarchy, separation between thought and action, operational procedures), or from an ethical perspective (law, justice, duty). Thus, when the organization attempts to dissociate the system and its actors from the environment—which implies that it plays no role in achieving equilibrium—organizational action becomes economically isolated within the organization itself, paving the way for the disappearance of the *sense* that underpins it.

Clearly and rigorously, this organizational philosophy postulates that ideas, theories, and models tend to converge to form a homogeneous and stable unity—what can be described as an intellectual framework that rejects any manifestation of *sense* beyond its boundaries. This leads to the neglect of pluralistic thinking that generates *sense* (complexity theory), as well as the logic of coexistence of contradictions within the organization, thereby reinforcing conflicts and distancing the organization from the fundamental goals it seeks to achieve. Specialization then transforms into a form of philosophical domination with economic and financial implications, producing solutions disconnected from reality by excluding human, social, and ethical dimensions. Thus, regardless of the response provided, the *sense* that emerges cannot transcend this one-dimensional framework, which also constitutes an occlusion of *sense* as a dynamic and evolving phenomenon within organizational contexts.

Conversely, the reality of an extremely diverse, multidimensional, and highly complex environment fully manifests itself. The perception of organizational issues is itself pluralistic, varying according to schools of thought, cultural contexts, and the perspectives of individual actors within the organization. This diversity paves the way for the emergence of erroneous understandings (Morin E., 2009, p73). Consequently, the construction of *sense* within the organization cannot be reduced to interpretations validated solely by the prevailing dominant logic.

The principal threat to the credibility of the organization, within the framework of pluralist philosophy, does not lie in criticism nor in the shortcomings attributed to it. Indeed, no theory or social program, however coherent and knowledge-based it may be, can escape rational contestation (Coenen-Huther, 2001). In our view, the true risk lies in an unreflective commitment to the logic of pluralism, without sufficient awareness of the organizational and epistemological consequences that ensue.

The emergence of numerous approaches claiming to address complex issues should come as no surprise. However, this will be gradually accompanied by a loss of a foundation of shared understanding, which is fundamental for the production of *sense*. Consequently, the organization risks becoming associated with a philosophy of chaos, nihilism, deconstruction, and the absurd.

The quest for and construction of *sense*, through the contradictions between organizational philosophy and the philosophy of *sense*, undoubtedly attest to the necessity of transcending simplifications, classical stereotypes, and specialized reductions in the face of plurality. The relationship between the organization and its environment always conceals a dynamic system of great complexity. The resulting *sense* thus surpasses the circumstantial meanings of its components—whether subjective or objective, relative or absolute, stable or changing. Consequently, the depth and essence of the organizational process do not reside in the relative stability offered by the organization but in the understanding of reality and the production of *sense* at the interfaces of contradictions.

### III. Methodological and Conceptual Framework of the Study:

This study adopts a systemic approach grounded in a pragmatic philosophy, considering the project as a temporary and targeted organizational system designed to optimally address environmental complexities and the inherent state of uncertainty. This perspective goes beyond mere description to embrace an interdisciplinary and multidimensional approach, philosophically articulated as a rational transcendence of positivist rationality, aimed at the construction and co-construction of sensemaking.

The research design is exploratory, targeting the analysis of the most recent and relevant cases within the field of project-based approaches and sensemaking, in line with the work of Annosi et al. (2023), Söderlund (2011), Henning et al. (2023), Thomas & Mengel (2008), Avenier & Cajaiba (2012), Müller & Locatelli (2023), Kajamaa et al. (2022), Sharan et al. (2024), and Afzal & Tumpa (2025).

Data were primarily collected through direct observation and document analysis, enabling immersion in the studied contexts as well as access to diverse and relevant information.

The analysis relies on mixed methods combining content analysis, thematic analysis, and statistical treatments, enriched by validated statistical data such as FasterCapital (2023), DartAI (2023), Sustainability Directory (2023), Project Management Report (2023), as well as methodological approaches presented by Dingsøyr, Moe, and Teigen (2017).

The conceptual framework mobilized draws on the model by Henning et al. (2023), which identifies three key elements in the quest for sensemaking:

First, it concerns the capacity to aggregate heterogeneous and dispersed information and to structure it into a coherent narrative framework. Within this perspective, the project is conceived as an organizational arrangement open to an environment characterized by high levels of complexity and uncertainty, and engaged in multidirectional interactions (Huang et al., 2025; Bonnstra & Reezigt, 2023; Midler & Alochet, 2023).

Second, the existence of a collective awareness operating at multiple levels, understood as the capacity to perceive and apprehend the various situations and configurations the organization encounters. From this perspective, the project draws on a specific methodology aimed at designing solutions adapted to complex problems (Mamédio & Meyer, 2020).

Third, the development of a dynamic and shared cognitive model intended to coordinate efforts toward a precisely defined objective. The project thus emerges as the concrete embodiment of a line of thought (Midler & Alochet, 2023) that remains open to the complexities of its operational implementation (Lorino, 2018), as well as to a set of instrumental considerations oriented toward the production of knowledge (Le Moigne, 1990–2022).

### IV. Results: The Project within the Organization–Sensemaking Dialectic:

Until now, the notion of the project has been deliberately left unaddressed, insofar as it is conceived as a modern organizational philosophy capable of encompassing both the contradictions of the classical organization and the complexity inherent in the philosophy of meaning. Although this initial foundation may serve as a model for organizational action focusing on the production of meaning, the previously identified contradictions continue to generate a degree of ambiguity regarding representations of the relationship between the organization and its environment. The project-based approach now emerges as a potential organizational response to the problem of stagnation, by incorporating a still-developing reflexive dynamic, positioned between the rigor of specialized organization and the complexity of a plural reality.

From this perspective, arriving at a relatively satisfactory definition of the project requires positioning it within the broader framework that underpins its legitimacy. The starting point lies in the very philosophical essence from which it originates, as an integrative conceptual framework uniting human thought and action:

- 1- Belonging to the philosophy of organization, the project can be defined as a dynamic, temporary, and purpose-driven organizational form, open to innovation, change, and adaptation in response to environmental developments.
- 2- Within the philosophy of meaning, it also constitutes an epistemological framework (describing the formation of consciousness and meaning), a cognitive framework (analyzing

the relationship between knowledge production and the construction of meaning), and an ontological framework (addressing the nature of the project and the organization, as well as the legitimacy of their existence). This framework is grounded in a system of values, a set of priorities, a social conception of time, structuring narratives, and a learning process derived from the relationship between the organization and its environment.

The current landscape of modern managerial dynamics objectively reflects the range of correlations between the project-based approach and the necessity of engaging in sensemaking. The table below (Table 1) presents a synthesis of recent theoretical and empirical contributions concerning the interaction between project management practices and sensemaking dynamics within contemporary organizations.

**Table (1): Projet de la philosophie organisationnelle à la philosophie de sens**

| Dimension              | Core Content                                                                                                                                   | Contribution to the Philosophy of Organization                                                                    | Contribution to the Philosophy of Meaning                                                                                       |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Organizational</b>  | The project as a temporary organizational form aimed at innovation and transformation. (Annosi et al., 2023; Söderlund, 2011).                 | The project constitutes an emerging flexible organizational form, suited to complex and dynamic environments.     | It provides a shared narrative structure through which actors can situate their actions within a coherent collective framework. |
| <b>Cognitive</b>       | The project as a mechanism for interpretation, learning, and ambiguity reduction. (Henning et al., 2023; Thomas, J., & Mengel, T., 2008)       | The project enables cognitive alignment among actors, serving as an adaptive guide for action.                    | It offers a frame for interpreting shifting situations, transforming uncertainty into shared meaning.                           |
| <b>Epistemological</b> | The project as a framework for the generation of situated and reflective knowledge. (Avenier, M.-J., & Cajaiba, L., 2012; Annosi et al., 2023) | The project activates an epistemology of situated action, enabling practitioners to theorize their own practices. | It supports a dialogical construction of meaning, through the confrontation and adjustment of perspectives.                     |
| <b>Ontological</b>     | The project as an existential space of engagement and identity transformation. (Weick, K. E., 2009; Söderlund, 2011)                           | The project renews the view of organization as a living, impermanent, and becoming-oriented space.                | It anchors meaning within a lived temporality, rendering action significant within personal and collective trajectories.        |

**Source:** This table was developed from a comparative analysis of recent studies on the project philosophy and its implications for sensemaking, within an interdisciplinary perspective combining management, epistemology, organizational cognition, and social ontology.

It thus becomes relevant to examine the forms of knowledge specific to the role of the project in transcending classical organizational philosophy, through its opening toward the philosophy of sensemaking.

This evolution progresses from an empirical posture to a constructivist–interpretive (hermeneutic) relativism, and from structuring thought according to the dominant logic of the organization to producing meaning through the integration of diverse subjective representations and identity dynamics. The project is therefore conceived as a process of dialectical and progressive integration of the organization–sensemaking duality, as supported by the works of Lemoigne (1995) and Legay (1996). A recent empirical study conducted by Müller and Locatelli (2023) further confirms that projects are explicitly oriented toward sensemaking.

The study by McLeod et al. (2012) provides detailed evidence that perceptions of success differ among stakeholders and evolve over time, depending on the formal (positivist) and informal (interpretive) criteria used to evaluate the project. These observations confirm the existence, within the project framework, of a dynamic in constant transition between organizational normativity and the process of co-constructing sensemaking.

In the same vein, the perception of the tension between unity and plurality can generate internal fragmentation and a dispersion of sensemaking within the organization. Directly assigning the production of sense to a specialization risks weakening its connection to the complexity of reality. Indeed, there is no guarantee that a given specialty will devote equal attention to a complex problem that falls outside its methodological framework, even when the situation would require it (Silberman, D. et al., 2022). Similarly, nothing ensures that interdisciplinary tensions will subside in the absence of an organizational level that is self-aware and cognizant of its ethical responsibilities in the construction of knowledge.

This difficulty is often overlooked in classical organizational philosophy, even though the philosophy of sensemaking fosters the emergence of diverse conceptualizations for addressing complex problems. However, in the absence of a shared foundation of understanding, such diversity tends to undermine the possibility of reaching agreement, thereby leading to the erosion of sensemaking within the unity–plurality duality.

This issue calls for the implementation of an ambidextrous organizational architecture, systematically deployed and directly embedded within the social body, and oriented toward an objective encompassing economic, technical, and temporal dimensions. Such a framework enables, in a concrete and immediate manner, the unity of action within the multiplicity of its meanings. This conception is supported by an empirical study conducted in a Finnish hospital, which demonstrated that the adoption of cooperative organizational arrangements—structured around a shared language, a common vision, and institutionalized exchanges—helps reconcile innovation and performance. Conversely, their absence tends to generate fragmentation that may compromise the very cohesion of the organizational structure (Kajamaa, A. et al., 2022).

In light of the preceding developments, the project can be understood as a structured response to the challenge of methodological specialization, as well as a lever for addressing dysfunctions inherent in the system of knowledge production and the accompanying process of sensemaking. Recent literature (Sharan, M. et al., 2024; Afzal, F. & Tumpa, R. J., 2025) highlights that the project-based mode of operation not only strengthens collaborative skills, critical thinking, and communication abilities, but also fosters the development of real-time adaptability and decision-making in contexts of uncertainty.

This operational framework thus proves particularly well-suited for managing complex issues that require collective alignment around a shared strategic direction and efficient organizational coordination.

It follows that projects incorporate a strategy of temporal regulation that Kalff (2022) describes as a performative organizational model, oriented toward structuring the collective experience of sensemaking. This framework imposes a dual temporality, combining linear and social dimensions (as illustrated in Table 2), embedded within the organization’s operational mode. Such a configuration engages the various stakeholders in a convergence process aimed at harmonizing efforts and seeking, within limited timeframes, possible compromises and agreements.

**Table (2): Linear Time and ProcessTime**

|                                              | <b>Linear time</b>                                                                      | <b>Process time</b>                                                                                                        |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>View of time</b>                          | Newtonian conception of time as absolute, unified, invariant, linear, and mechanical.   | Conception of time as subjective, open, relative, organic, and cyclical.                                                   |
| <b>Description</b>                           | Quantitative                                                                            | Qualitative                                                                                                                |
| <b>Reference frame</b>                       | Clock based and absolute. Time is an objective measure independent of human experience. | Event based and relative. Time is dependent on human experience. Temporality is integral to the experience of being human. |
| <b>Orientation</b>                           | Deadline oriented                                                                       | Process oriented                                                                                                           |
| <b>Link between past, present and future</b> | Discrete. Past, present, and future as endless “succession of now-points” (Joas 1997).  | Continuous. Temporal continuity and ongoing flow of past, present, and future                                              |
| <b>Logic</b>                                 | Efficiency: Time as scarce resource                                                     | Flexibility: Time as contextual feature                                                                                    |

**Source:** Adapted from Reinecke and Ansari (2015, p. 621).

It thus becomes evident that the explicit articulation of a temporal understanding contributes to the shared construction of knowledge and the anchoring of a common collective sensemaking in complex contexts, where projects serve as a structuring framework for collective innovation (Karlsen, J. & Hildebrandt, C., 2023).

Clarifications regarding the performativity of sensemaking within the project framework also appear to align with various orientations, including an epistemological approach that privileges the construction of sense through the confrontation and readjustment of perspectives. From this standpoint, the project emerges as a mechanism within which consciousness develops through interaction with the broader environment, enabling the organization to attain an enhanced capacity for addressing complex phenomena.

This process is accompanied by an elevation toward a reflexive consciousness, capable of resisting the mind’s prevailing tendency toward detachment—a tendency that profoundly shapes its modes of knowledge production. In this way, the project can be understood as a materialization of both reality and social rationality.

A praxeological and cognitive orientation of the project reflects the necessity for the organization to rise toward a pragmatic handling of real-world issues, while integrating in-depth reflection on the project’s key success factors. Sinacoeur (1983) had already highlighted the intrinsic linkage between the relational dimension pertaining to the domain of action and the dimension pertaining to the domain of knowledge—an inherent feature of any project. In this perspective, Muchielli and Noy (2005) emphasize that the cognitive construction of goals cannot be dissociated from the knowledge process itself.

Thus, contrary to the expectations of the specialized paradigm with regard to the various actors operating within its scope, organizational inputs and outputs will be articulated primarily around the problem rather than around functional specializations. This shift in focus necessarily leads to profound transformations in the nature of work, in modes of thinking, and in the diversity of tools and methods mobilized, thereby conferring meaning to action within both individual and collective trajectories.

## V. Discussion of the Results:

The focal point of the dialectic between organization and sensemaking undoubtedly lies in the capacity of the overall system to design and implement responses to issues characterized by high complexity and the uncertainty inherent in its operating environment. Nevertheless, the likelihood that the organization will deviate from the optimal exercise of its functions in such contexts remains substantial, which renders the ongoing pursuit of sensemaking not only indispensable but also constitutive of organizational sustainability.

This paradigm precisely opens the field to reflection on the necessity to transcend the limits of classical organization in order to embrace the complexity inherent to the philosophy of sensemaking, notably the dualities between positivism and relativism, as well as between monism and pluralism. The study rejects the idea of an ideal organization capable of reducing divergences into a coherent and closed system, emphasizing that subjectivity is not a controllable given but results from a social dynamic intrinsic to the organization. Consequently, the organization cannot be conceived as a system perfectly rational and fully aligned with its environment; rather, it must engage in a continuous process of adjustment by developing its capacity to aggregate and synthesize heterogeneous, differentiated, and dispersed information into a structuring narrative, while building a collective integrative awareness of the multiple stances and situations it faces.

Resolving the intrinsic challenge in the relationship between organization and sensemaking requires an approach of complexity equivalent to that of the phenomena studied. This research highlights the project's capacity to integrate a plurality of subjectivities and an identity dynamic within a dialectical balance between experimental positivism and interpretive constructivist relativism. It also emphasizes the fundamental role of the project in producing meaning through the explicit nature of temporal knowledge and the establishment of a framework conducive to the confrontation and revision of perspectives, structured according to a hierarchical system of priorities. In so doing, organizational action acquires significant meaning within individual and collective trajectories, thereby constituting a major philosophical transcendence of the traditional oppositions between unity and plurality.

In conclusion to this discussion, it is important to highlight the significance of the project as an organizational approach to sensemaking, whose repercussions on the overall system go beyond mere philosophical dialectics to result in improved organizational performance, revitalization of internal interactions, concrete engagement with the value of work and time, as well as the production of meaning as a lever of organizational effectiveness. This tangible reality is corroborated by the quantitative and statistical data presented in the following table:

**Table (3): Statistical Synthesis of the Integrative Role of the Project**

| Statistic                                                                                                 | Interpretation                                                                                | Source                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Projects with high stakeholder engagement are 70% more likely to succeed (on time, budget, satisfaction). | Stakeholder engagement, as a source of meaning and identity, enhances structured performance. | FasterCapital. (2023).                            |
| Proactive stakeholder integration during the initiation phase increases the likelihood of success by 20%  | Recognizing subjectivities early structures a better organizational dynamic.                  | DartAI. (2023).                                   |
| 80% of projects fail due to poor stakeholder management.                                                  | Exclusion of collective meaning leads to symbolic rupture and operational disengagement.      | Sustainability Directory. (2023).                 |
| Organizations with a structured PMO experience 33% fewer failures and up to 15% higher ROI.               | A reinforced organizational structure supports the integration of engagement and meaning.     | Project Management Report. (2023).                |
| Relational quality (trust, recognition, shared meaning) explains 61–81% of perceived performance.         | Collective meaning is a major causal factor in perceived project success.                     | Dingsøyr, T., Moe, N. B., & Teigen, H. K. (2017). |

## VI. Conclusion:

This study highlights that overcoming the deadlocks encountered by traditional organizational models requires the adoption of methodological approaches more open to the philosophical dimension of sense and its construction processes within organizations. The literature emphasizes that the absence of stable truth in organizational contexts increases the complexity of understanding change dynamics and diminishes actors' capacity to respond efficiently to the demands of an uncertain environment. Within this framework, the project-based approach stands out for its potential to constitute a dynamic space for sensemaking and collective learning, through the mobilization of organizational preparedness, cognitive coordination among actors, as well as the revisiting and reinterpretation of organizational actions from the stakeholders' perspectives.

Thus, the project is not merely a technical solution but serves as both a philosophical and empirical entry point into the process of reconstructing sense within complex contexts. This dual dimension grants it a strategic position to drive a profound renewal of contemporary organizational thought.

The conscious and balanced organizational process does not aim to eliminate philosophical dialectics, as doing so would effectively erase all forms of meaning. Rather, it calls for mobilizing a conceptual framework capable of integrating the multiple dimensions of human complexity in all their contradictions—whether scientific or philosophical, objective or subjective. This observation fully justifies the research question of this study: ***What role does the project-based approach play in transcending traditional organizational models while fostering sensemaking?***

The study concludes that resolving the challenge of organization and sensemaking requires an approach whose complexity matches that of organizational reality itself. The project-based approach has demonstrated its capacity to integrate philosophical tensions, such as the duality between positivism and relativism, as well as between monism and pluralism, by incorporating subjectivity and identity dynamics within an interpretive and participatory framework.

The project enables the production of organizational sense linked to lived temporality and fosters constructive interaction among stakeholders through the convergence of visions and the negotiation of priorities. From this perspective, the project is not merely a management tool but represents a profound transcendence of the rigid rational model, favoring a more open, flexible, and efficient organization. This observation is further supported by quantitative indicators highlighting the positive impact of the project-based approach on enhancing organizational effectiveness and sensemaking within complex systems.

It appears that the project-based approach can only constitute a relevant operational scientific contribution insofar as it provides effective responses to organizational, technical, social, and cultural issues, thereby ensuring alignment between the level of knowledge mobilized and the concrete benefits achieved. Consequently, it is essential that the project advances simultaneously in its organizational dimension and its capacity to generate sensemaking.

## Bibliographic References :

- 1- Afzal, F., & Tumpa, R. J. (2025). Project-based group work for enhancing students' learning in project management education: An action research. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 18(1), 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-06-2024-0150>.
- 2- Annosi, M. C., Appio, F. P., & Martini, A. (2024). Institutional context and agile team innovation: A sensemaking approach to collective knowledge creation. *Technovation*, 129, Article 102894. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2023.102894>.
- 3- Avenier, M.-J., & Cajaiba Parmentier, A. (2012). The Dialogical Model: Developing academic knowledge for and from practice. *European Management Review*, 9(4), 199–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-4762.2012.01038.x>.
- 4- Berthelot, J.-M. (2003). Plaidoyer pour un pluralisme sous contraintes. *Revue européenne des sciences sociales*, 126, 34–49.
- 5- Boonstra, A., & Reezigt, C. (2023). A complexity framework for project management strategies. *Project Management Journal*, 54(3), 253–267. <https://doi.org/10.1177/87569728221142229>.
- 6- BAUMARD Philippe, (2014), les Contextes cognitifs de la stratégie, F. Tannery; A.C. Martinet; T. Hafsi; J.P. Denis. Encyclopédie de la stratégie, Economica; Paris, 2014. hal-03227732.
- 7- DartAI. (2023). *The importance of stakeholder engagement in project management*. <https://www.dartai.com/blog/the-importance-of-stakeholder-engagement-in-project-management>.
- 8- de Metz, N., Jansen van Rensburg, M., & Davis, A. (2024). Shared sensemaking during a strategic change process: A non-managerial perspective. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 17(4), 763–780. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSMA-10-2023-0264>.
- 9- Dingsøyr, T., Moe, N. B., & Teigen, H. K. (2017). Teamwork quality and project success in software development. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.06146>.
- 10- Eckstein, G., Shrestha, A., & Russo, F. (2024). Thirty-five years of sensemaking in business & management research: A bibliometric analysis, review and discussion. *Management Review Quarterly*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-024-00458-5>.
- 11- FasterCapital. (2023). *How stakeholder engagement impacts project success*. <https://fastercapital.com/articles/How-stakeholder-engagement-impacts-project-success.html>.
- 12- Henning, P., Hughes, J., & Robertson, J. (2023). Sensemaking and knowledge work in Agile teams: A phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 44(2), 215–232.
- 13- Huang, Y., Furter, M., & Zardini, G. (2025). On composable and parametric uncertainty in systems co-design. *Submitted to IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC) 2025*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2504.02766>.
- 14- Kajamaa, A., & Hurmelinna Laukkanen, P. (2022). Organizational arrangements as a key to enhancing innovativeness and efficiency: Analysis of a restructuring hospital in Finland. *BMC Health Services Research*, 22, Article 1022. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-08376-6>.
- 15- Kalff, Y. (2022). Managing projects as a mode of temporal ordering: Performative organising of time and temporality in projects. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 15(1), 82–101. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-05-2021-0132>.
- 16- Laland, A. (1993). *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie* (Vol. 1).
- 17- Legay, C. (1996). *Les fondements du management de projet*. Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- 18- Le Moigne, J.-L. (1990/2022). *La modélisation des systèmes complexes* (Éd. orig. 1990 ; rééd. 2022). Dunod.
- 19- Le Moigne, J.-L. (1995). *Les épistémologies constructivistes*. Presses Universitaires de France.
- 20- Lorino, P. (2018). Le management de l'action complexe : contrôler ou explorer ? *Projectics / Proyética / Projectique*, 19(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.3917/proj.019.0013>.
- 21- Mamédio, D. F., & Meyer, V. (2020). Managing project complexity: How to cope with multiple dimensions of complex systems. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 13(4), 727–744. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-06-2019-0147>.

- 22- McLeod, L., Doolin, B., & MacDonell, S. G. (2012). A perspective-based understanding of project success. *Project Management Journal*, 43(5), 68–86. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21290>.
- 23- Midler, C., & Alochet, M. (2023). L'odyssée de Spring : manager des stratégies d'innovation globale dans un monde fragmenté et instable. *Annales des Mines – Gérer & comprendre*, 153(3), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.3917/geco1.153.0035>.
- 24- Müller, R., & Locatelli, G. (2023). Knowledge development in project management research: Contributions, methodologies and epistemologies. *Project Management Journal*, 54(3), 235–250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/87569728231159324>.
- 25- Pavlov, A., & Micheli, P. (2023). Rethinking organizational performance management: A complexity theory perspective. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 43(6), 899–915. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-08-2022-0478>.
- 26- Project Management Report. (2023). Project management statistics. <https://projectmanagementreport.com/blog/project-management-statistics>.
- 27- Sharan, M., Karoune, E., Hellon, V., Gould van Praag, C., Kayumbi, G., Bennett, A., ... Whitaker, K. (2024, August 27). Professionalising community management roles in interdisciplinary research projects [Preprint]. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.00108>.
- 28- Silberman, D., Carpenter, R. E., Cabrera, E., & Kernaleguen, J. (2022). Organizational silofication: Implications in grouping experts for organizational performance. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 36(6), 15–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-10-2021-0193>.
- 29- Söderlund, J. (2011). Pluralism in project management: Navigating the crossroads of specialization and fragmentation. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(2), 153–176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00290.x>.
- 30- Sustainability Directory. (2023). What statistics indicate the impact of stakeholder engagement? <https://sustainability-directory.com/question/what-statistics-indicate-the-impact-of-stakeholder-engagement>.
- 31- Thomas, J., & Mengel, T. (2008). Preparing project managers to deal with complexity: Advanced project management education. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26(3), 304–315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2008.01.001>.
- 32- Übellacker, T. (2025). Making sense of AI limitations: How individual perceptions shape organizational readiness for AI adoption. *Organizational Readiness and Change*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2502.15870>.
- 33- Weick, K. E. (2009). *Making Sense of the Organization: The Impermanent Organization* (Vol. 2). Wiley. ISBN 978-0470742204.