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SUMMARY

Changes are the order of the day. Organizations find themselves in complex and dynamic environments (Roobeek, 1988). Product, service and process change are carried out at a fast pace. Many developments in economy, technology, politics, social culture, but also in the own organization are more dynamic and complex than ever before.

Such circumstances require a change approach that does justice to this complexity and dynamic. That certain change approaches have worked elsewhere is no guarantee for success here and now, under these circumstances (Pettigrew 2000; Chia, 1996; Gergen, 2001). Changes require customized work. Furthermore, complex changes can only be approached meaningfully by dealing with them integrally. And as if this is not enough, the complication presents itself that some problems are so unique that neither the changer nor the client organization knows what the problem is or what the solution could be (Koopman & Pool, 1992).

Objective of this study

Changes are complex, lead to resistance and are marked by the oral character of the time. In change literature, instead of approaching complexity with sufficient complexity, complexity is repressed and flattened to one-dimensional solutions. Whoever looks at the bookshelves with popular management literature will become despondent from the screaming titles: 'This is the way!' 'This is how to approach change!' 'How to be successful too!' This study aims to offer a completely different view on unique, complex and dynamic change issues. Foremost is not the provision of general solutions, but the set up and explicating of a common learning and choice process. This takes place by developing a process model (Van Aken, 1994) or sensitizing device (Giddens, 1990), with which change processes can be set up as a discursive process. We will summarize the objective of this study:

The objective of this study is the design of an integral, contingent, dynamic and practical change model that can serve as a guiding principle for setting up unique, dynamic and complex change processes, thereby stimulating the learning capacity of organizations by stimulating productive tension in a (collaborative) process of co-creation.
Summary of organizations: system or behavior
When we talk of organization change it is necessary to define the terms ‘organization’ and ‘change’. In this study organizations are considered as open systems (Harrison, 1990). Openness simply means that an organization is not shut off from environmental influences. An organization is called a system because of the way in which, and the elements from which an organization is composed. Additionally an organization comprises of behavior and social processes such as cooperation, conflict management, communication (French & Bell, 1990). Moreover an organization is more than the sum of the parts. It is a dynamic whole (Voogt, 1995). ‘Change and organization are static nouns. We need the dynamic vocabulary of changing and organizing if we are to take charge of a changing world’ (Pettigrew, 2000, p 246)

Summary of organization change: design or development
Secondly there is the term ‘change’. Many writers on change management sketch a plan based approach to controlling changes. The aspect of control of organization change is accentuated by putting an emphasis on goals, procedures, rules and plans. As well as the strong aspects of this approach such as clarity and purposiveness, there is a danger that only the formal organization will be covered. Soft factors such as politics and irrational processes in organizations remain unconsidered. This outlook is also called the design approach. The opposite approach is called the development approach, with more attention for problem orientation and politics amongst others. Both approaches have their own rationality (Ganzevoort, 1985; Boonstra, 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design approach</th>
<th>Development approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Organization as formal system</td>
<td>• Organization as a whole of social processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technical-economic rationality</td>
<td>• Social-political rationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solution oriented</td>
<td>• Problem oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advisor is primary expert</td>
<td>• Advisor is primary facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design and planning (control)</td>
<td>• Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Top down: participation not desired</td>
<td>• Bottom up: participation a necessity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 0.1 Design and development approach
Model for integral change management: productive tension

The combination of views of an organization as an open system/social processes with both paradigms yields a double order of organization perspectives (see table 0.2). Each perspective can be used to analyze complex questions and generate solutions. Each perspective is a ‘spotlight’ for analyzing and solving organizational problems and illuminates certain aspects of that problem. In our opinion these spotlights should be managed contrarily. It is not the combination of, but the confrontation between different views that counts during the design of a change process (Feyerabend, 1975).

In essence organization perspectives consist of language. This language does not so much represent reality but in particular constructs it. Language is action. This view, which can be found by post-modern organization scientists amongst others, brings the accent of a phenomenological approach of perspectives as spotlights to a change as a process of intersubjective reality construction in a specific context through language. The consequence is that the participants in a change process must be conscious of their ‘language of change’ since this language shuts out other mental frameworks and with it other reality constructions and change processes. We call the whole of perspectives on a change process The Language of Change.

In summary we should approach change processes from several perspectives. Each perspective puts the users on the trail of a certain reality construction. As well as the practical advantages of every organization perspective, the changers must realize that their approach shuts out other reality views and interventions. This reduces the complexity of the issue. The deconstruction of system perspectives and paradigms creates space for other reality constructions and provides possibilities to express the complexity of a change issue in a process of co-creation (Bouwen & Steyaert, 1990; Wierdsma, 1999).
Table 0.2 Metaphors for integral change management

Structure of this study
We will start the construction of the process model with a literature study into the double arrangement of system perspectives and social processes. This provides an overview of the organizational perspectives, laws and heuristics that are available when forming change processes. The objective of the literature study is not a synthesis of opinions or organization theory forming, but a typification of a general organizational change idiom (The Language of Change). The deconstruction of the various perspectives and the comparison of different positions of the participants in The Language of Change provide the opportunity to express the complexity of the change process and to achieve a richer approach.
Chapter 2: Strategy
The design approach has dominated the strategy discussion for a long time. Strategy formulation is typified as a linear, rational process (Porter, 1980, 1985; Krijnen, 1992, Hax & Majluf, 1991). A company carries out a strategic investigation, from which a positioning and marketing strategy are developed, which is carried out in the organization through a strategic plan. The metaphor for strategic planning is therefore the Plan. The control based and expert based approach is a characteristic of this method. The advantage is clarity in the coordination of activities (Van Cauwenbergh & Van Robaeys, 1978). The disadvantage is that these prescriptive models tell 'how it should be' but do not adequately demonstrate how fuzzy processes really happen, due to the dynamics and political processes in organizations. Plans are speeded up, delayed, removed from the agenda, meet resistance, resulting in the change process taking a completely different course than contemplated.

In strategic management, orientation is aimed at political processes, learning processes and at creating a vision. That is because environments are turbulent and complex to such an extent that making good forecasts (such as strategic planning contemplates) is questionable. The challenge consists of dealing quickly and flexibly with the complexity and turbulence, and quicker than the competitor to profit from changes (De Geus, 1988; Hamel & Prahalad, 1999). Hence it is necessary that people in an organization learn to speak the same language, understand each other's frame of reference and that one 'learns to learn'. One speaks of 'learning organizations' (Senge, 2000). In this approach the changer takes up the position of a facilitator or 'helper' for the management of social processes (French & Bell, 1990). The disadvantage is that the attention to social processes makes the developmental approach sensitive to cooptation, power and cultural bias, meaning that processes slow down and get stuck. Moreover, participative approaches require a lot of skills, both cognitive and social, from participants. The metaphor is Vision.

Chapter 3: Culture
For the change of organizational culture we distinguish three layers. The design approach is directed towards change in the outer layers. The development approach digs deeper into the identity of the organization and uses other change techniques. The outer layer of the organization culture is easy to see: the symbols, the design of an organization, the stories that go round. This layer of the culture is easy to change. For instance, a merger is communicated by the use of a common logo. Even though symbolic management is often applied unprofessionally (Van den Nieuwenhof, 1996) it is incorrect to banter about it (Scott, 1994). On the other hand it is far too optimistic to expect radical and enduring cultural changes herein. Furthermore, change of artifacts does not give much insight into the working mechanisms of the culture.
The second layer of the culture is that of the ‘official statements’, such as policy statements of organizations. Intervention at this level has the advantage that deeper levels of cultural change can be achieved (rather than mere changes in artifacts, without changing people’s values). Particularly the influence of HR systems on this layer of the culture is large (Scott-Morgan, 1994). The change has the character of a ‘school’ due to the use of disciplining strategies and the asymmetric relationship between changer and change object (social engineering). As a result, interventions are only followed up halfheartedly. Programs remain on the shelf or find little response from the organization. Differences arise in what one says (espoused theories) and what one really does (theories in use). Pointing out this difference is not usually highly regarded. Defensive routines are brought in (Argyris, 1993) that hinder the learning process of the organization. As a metaphor we use School.

The third layer in the culture is the deepest rooted values. Some values are subconscious and are also called (basic) assumptions (Schein, 1992). What applies to change in values applies even stronger to assumptions. Questioning these leads to even more insecurity and resistance (Gabbard, 1994). However, sometimes this is necessary to start up learning processes. ‘Wo Es war, soll Ich werden’ is Freud’s famous sophism. For example, a strong split between ‘thinking’ and ‘doing’ is characteristic of schizoid organizations. Bureaucracies often demonstrate compulsive streaks. Consultancy firms with ‘charismatic leaders’ often struggle with the shortcomings of a narcissistic organization. Here the change of identity is concerned. Therefore we use Identity as the metaphor. However, this requires much introspective capacity from organization members (which can also be regarded as cause of the problem) and one must be prepared to give things up for the change process (Sifneos, 1972). Further, an enduring result is only reached after a long period of time. The moral question is whether intervening at this level is justified (Janssens & Steyaert, 2001).

Chapter 4: Organizational structure

A next system perspective is the organizational structure. Changes can be directed to processes, functions, and procedures. The advantage of this approach is the convenient way in which complex changes in the organization can be formalized. On the other hand unique, complex and dynamic changes have high requirements of coordination and communication (Galbraith, 1976). If the emphasis is one sidedly put on formalization and control, then actions are continually taken ad-hoc, and the amount of detail of the measures continues to increase (Boonstra, 1992). In time this will be at the expense of the organization’s versatility, flexibility and innovation. At its extreme this approach leads to machine type structures and low motivation in the employees. The metaphor here is the Machine.
In the variant of organizational development, organic structures (teams, networks) are mainly taken as organizational unit to solve distribution and coordination problems. Team building is a method to optimize social processes and goal achievement of teams (Cummings & Worley, 2001). Organizations can be seen as networks of parties between which various types of relationships exist, such as power relationships, exchange relationships and social-emotional relationships (Mastenbroek, 1992). These relationships develop through social processes. Self-organizing teams are also an example of a more organic structure (Pascal, 1990; Stacey, 1996). The metaphor here is the Organism. The disadvantage is that changes by teams and interventions to social processes are slower and less controlled. It is difficult to obtain 'quick wins' and the risk of falling back into old patterns exists. Furthermore, working in teams is idealized: teams are often stumbling (Bettenhausen & Murningham, 1985) and the relationships troubled (Prein, 1992).

Chapter 5: Social processes and communication
Social processes are a key element in the description of the different system perspectives. This applies in particular to the role of communication in organizations. Communication is often regarded as a major tool for the implementation of change processes. Communication is mainly used to facilitate changes or to lessen resistance to change. Here we differentiate again between the design and the developmental approach.

In the design approach one attempts to bring information to the attention of organization members efficiently. On the one hand to provide support for task execution (supportive communication) and on the other hand to achieve behavioral change in change processes (instrumental communication). To this end the design approach utilizes an objective rational method. In supportive communication policy principles, objectives and means are established, the communication is carried out based on a plan, research is carried out into the effectiveness, and where necessary the structure is changed (Hamilton, 1987; Downs, 1988; Wijo, 1988). The instrumental communication does not differ essentially. To achieve behavioral change one should know which knowledge the target group already has, which attitudes play a role in the behavior and what the intended behavioral change implies. Subsequently one can then accurately establish the content of the communication for the target group, choose the right channels and messages, and send the information by which the behavioral change is reached (McGuire, 1985). The advantages are speed, unambiguity and scale size of this form of communication. The disadvantages are the mechanical, one-sided communication and social engineering character, resulting in the complexity of
behavior or problem definition being insufficiently scrutinized. The intended results of these forms of communication are also often disappointing.

In the development perspective, communication mainly concerns formation of meaning and two-sided communication. The relational aspect of the communication plays a large role (Watzlawick, 1972). Feelings, trust, conflicts, conflict of interest and power are important elements of communication (French & Bell, 1984; Gergen & Thachenkery, 2001). Social processes refer to communication networks, participation, feedback, problem solving in groups, and conflict management (Rogers & Rogers, 1976; Alblas, 1983; Mastenbroek, 1992, 1997). Organization members are less the object of communication, rather active and participating subjects. Organization members themselves give form and content to the change process, with the objective of increasing the problem solving capacity of the organization, and achieving a learning organization (Weick, 1995, 2000). The disadvantages are the ideological character of this way of thinking (the approach is sometimes not feasible) and the cultural bias of the organization (cooptation, emotional sensitivity, stickiness, insufficiently broad analyses).

Chapter 6: Integral management of unique, complex and dynamic change processes

Both the design and the development approach provide usable starting points for the formation of change processes. This ‘double track’ forces the assumptions that are enclosed in each approach to get in view and remain in view. By referring to the position of a speaker in The Language of Change, the restriction of the position is accentuated, and it becomes clearer that the one sided accent in the changing discourse does not do justice to the complexity of the 2nd order issues. The paradigm that is at the basis of the double order goes back in most cases to basic assumptions of changers. From there the deconstruction of the language of change of the speaker, as well as the deconstruction of the mental model of the speaker and learning processes take place.

As a comment one could suggest that the sketched model is integral, but still not a contingent, dynamic and practical model. The approach of issues from multiple points of view still has to be combined with a process to achieve changes in a specific context. According to one of the oldest change management theories, ‘systems’ (organizations, departments, groups, etc.) are a quasi equilibrium of forces (Lewin, 1951). This ‘dynamic equilibrium’ can be disrupted by internal or external influences, such as a government that implements strict rules, liberalization of the market, choices of organization members. The reaction of the organization to this can be seen as a ‘change in condition’ of unfreezing, changing and freezing. Even though later change models contain more distinct phases, and voice criticism on these views, in our opinion the problematic nature of unique complex and dynamic change process
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is captured well in the description of the dynamic equilibrium. In any case, practically all change managers agree that changes in conditions take place in time – even though the design approach employs a different definition of time than the developmental approach.

An integral and dynamic change model

The combination of both paradigms, the three system perspectives of organization and the opinion of change as a change in condition of forces in time, leads to an integral and dynamic model for changes: The Language of Change (see table 0.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigma</th>
<th>System perspective</th>
<th>Unfreeze</th>
<th>Change/Move</th>
<th>Freeze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 0.3 The Language of Change

In the ‘unfreeze’ phase, the design approach in particular pays attention to drawing up policy, making plans, carrying out structure changes and a ‘steering philosophy’ to monitor progress. The communication mainly takes place along formal channels. In the development approach, common formation of meaning is central. Interventions consist of common problem diagnosis, research into problem areas as various parties experience them, creating change readiness, addressing political relationships within the organization. The process has a common, learning character.

In the ‘change’ phase the design approach employs a ‘top-down approach’. This is mainly oriented to change of the formal organization: implementing programs, reorganizing departments, eliminating functions, reengineering processes, assigning task and responsibilities, authority, training of separate skills and cognitions. The developmental approach is mainly participative, directed towards social processes and
uses the informal organization. People or interest groups (coalitions) that want to take the initiative are sought after. But also common analysis of, and negotiating on roles within the organization are some of the possibilities. Training consists of ‘learning on the job’ such as during action research and work conferences.

The third phase of the change process is called consolidation (freeze). Freezing seems to be a typical term from the design approach. Once a newly implemented procedure works well, it is made permanent and included in the structure of the organization. Instead the development approach assumes a continual learning process with a more open-end character. But also the partial results of these processes have to be made permanent: consolidation of the growing learning capacity. Without consolidation new insights, attitudes and other learning effects disappear.

By using the time dimension the model is (rudimentally) made dynamic. This makes it possible to express possible dynamic interactions in the change process. These interactions can vary from relatively simple, linear relationships between processes, to complex interactions of multiple coupled change processes in turbulent, dissipative or chaotic circumstances. The ‘complex dynamic dialogue’ is directed towards recognizing an (underlying) pattern in the jumble of interactions and providing it with a meaning. By doing so the dynamic of change processes can be sufficiently well analyzed. There is still the requirement that it becomes a practical and contingent model. For this we shall introduce the role of language again.

The Language of Change: subtle contingency & productive tension

The model is a sensitizing device (Giddens, 1990) to make integral and dynamic interpretations and considerations possible in diagnosis, choices of interventions, plan of approach and similar during complex organizational change processes. The model is not prescriptive, but an analytical and generative model that enables common meaning in a change process. In the literature study algorithms and heuristics from organizational science and change management were provided for this purpose. The disadvantage of many of these algorithms and heuristics is their general character. Context specific considerations and tacit knowledge of the client systems are excluded. However, complex and dynamic changes can not be viewed separate from the specific conditions in which they take place (Pettigrew, 2000; Wierdsma, 1999; Bouwen & Steyaert, 1990). These changes are very context sensitive and demand subtle contingency in our terms.
A ‘method’ to achieve a practical, context sensitive, subtle contingent change approach is the technique of ‘productive tension’. This tension can be aroused by directing attention in a dialogue to contrary or lacking reality definitions. The dialogic tension is therefore aimed at differences by which the complexity of the change process can be expressed and new meanings can unfold. The comparison with, and the problematization through other positions in The Language of Change accent the differences in the reality definitions. The tension is productive if it leads to an increase in the quality of the change approach for the one case (‘custom made’). The increase in complexity should lead to an increase in actionable knowledge (Argyris, 2000). The deconstruction of paradigms and system perspectives lies in essence in the deconstruction of the position of the speaker in The Language of Change. Changes are typified as a discursive process in which the language of change (of the speaker) is inseparably bound to the process of reality construction. The productive tension is aimed at the deconstruction of speaking to allow the complexity of the one case to be expressed, so that in a process of co-creation a richer, subtle contingent common approach can be achieved.

We have divided the functions of the dialogue into a falsifying, dialectic and reflective- generative function. Subsequently we have distinguished seven types of dialogues, based on the possible differences in The Language of Change. These dialogues are increasing in degree of difficulty. Dialogues within a knowledge
domain and within a paradigm are relatively simple. Dialogues between paradigms, dynamic dialogues and dialogues with the 'empty field' are complex. As dialogue forms we first use the classical Socratic dialogue (Kessels, 1999) with the stadiums of elencus and maieutique, and the modern (Socratic) dialogue in which taking in the other’s perspective is at the forefront. By re-specting the other, the realization of a multiple (and complex) reality arises and a relativation of one's own perspective occurs (Isaacs, 1999). The second form of dialogue examines speaking in psychoanalysis and in particular Lacan's outlook on language (1960). According to Lacan the meaning of a change can never be fully addressed by the idiom of the changer. Each 'meaner' (word, concept, perspective) illuminates its own meaning in an 'endless' chain of possible meanings. The real meaning according to Lacan is 'subconscious' but does have a structure, namely that of a language. The parallel is that we interpret organization problems as symptoms with a subconscious underlying structure (a set of unknown complex and dynamic causes) that can never be fully known. The meaning can only be approached by an 'endless' chain of meaners (in our case the double system perspectives in time) that each illuminate separate different meanings. The displacement in meanings has the structure of the metonymic (the reference to a part of a whole). The condensation of meaning has the structure of the metaphor (meaning based on resemblance). Where Lacan indicated the subconscious with 'le discours de l'Autre', we have called the principally endless change discourse The Language of Change. The third dialogue form is derived from the complexity theory and chaos theory (Homan 2001). The core of it is that closed terms exclude complexity and open approaches are needed that lead to 'dissipative state', (far-from-equilibrium, Stacey 1996) in which chaos can unfold to a higher order. All these dialogue forms are therefore directed towards the unfolding of complexity. By deconstructing and problematizing common regularities from our change model to the one case, the complexity of the change issue can be expressed. This is what we call a 'subtle contingent approach'. The subtle contingent approach leads to a richer, more practical approach, since the complexity is not denied but addressed.

Chapter 7: Argumentation
Based on five case studies the 'working' of an integral, practically dynamic, and contingent change approach has been demonstrated. In handling the cases a description from inside has been employed. We have shown how the complexity of an issue gradually unfolds. We are not so much interested in substantive recommendations for the type of change questions of the case, but rather in a demonstration and development in the application of a process model. Case studies have been chosen because of the richness of description and because more justice can
be done to unique social phenomenon (Hutjes & Van Buuren, 1992). The cases are aimed at proving that the model 'works' (Chia, 1996) as a sensitizing device, i.e. as an instrument to make changers more sensitive to unique, complex and dynamic change processes and to achieve richer, subtle contingent analyses and solutions (De Zeeuw, e.a., 1980). More specifically we demonstrate how the model works as diagnostic instrument, as guideline for complex change processes, as method for generating effective interventions, as integral, contingent and dynamic model and as language for change processes. Concerning the construction of the five cases we used a 'theory building structure' (Yin, 1984) with the help of 'reflective action research' (Boonstra, 2001) (see table 7.1.1.). As well as the development of the model, and the demonstration of its working, a number of heuristics are developed through this method for the application of the model in general, and the generation of productive tension in dialogue in particular.

The first case has an exemplary character, and indicates in which steps the model can be applied. The case handles the implementation of an environmental care system at a Glass factory. The steps for the application of the model are distilled from here (see figure 7.1.1.) The second case concerns the outsourcing of a maintenance service for an electricity company. In retrospective analysis it becomes clear how (closed) one has employed the design paradigm. The introduction of other paradigms and system perspectives lead to a generative dialogue and enrichment of the change strategy for the future. From these cases we have derived the steps for the deconstruction process (figure 7.2.2.). The case demonstrates well the role of resistance in the deconstruction, the importance of (the acceptance of) doubt for entering into the 'dissipative state' and the role of perceptual knowledge in the change discourse. The third case concerns a supportive service for a police organization. In this case the participants drew up a change strategy and program themselves using the model, and the researcher played a facilitating role. The Language of Change has been used here as a 'construction model' in which speaking to each other is at the forefront (and not so much speaking about change). This doesn't lead so much to cognitive insights but more to 'corrective experiences' at the level of action. Insight is achieved in this case by the figure of a Gestalt that (at meta level) shows the positions in the Language of Change. It also becomes clear that complexity of the change issue lies in the relationship between changers. Recognizing differences in outlook (and routines) is certainly not automatic: differences can be denied, the relationship can be denied or one makes the generation of differences an objective as such (and not the production of action knowledge). The fourth case concerns the 'rounding off' of a reorganization of a department, Extraordinary Affairs, of a province. In it the model was applied at different scale levels of the change. Varying from the diagnosis of the change history
to the diagnosis of the reaction of a group of account managers to an intervention during a work conference. Furthermore, in this case we show the (endless) displacement of meanings as one indicates that the employers find it difficult to ‘set priorities’. The multiple analysis of this change issue leads to richer analysis and richer interventions. The (dependent) reaction of client system to the change process can be seen as symptomatic for that system and included as meta objective in the change process: explicit or implicit. Interventions should also be congruent to the meta objective. The last case concerns a merger between two directorates of a municipality. It concerns an emergent design, in which reasonably identical change objectives from five departments led to completely different change processes with completely different results. In this BWR case we also deal with the two remaining complex dialogue forms: the complex dynamic dialogue (type 6) and the dialogue with the empty field (type 7). The dynamic analysis gives (an) insight into the underlying dynamic problem structure, providing the possibility of more effective intervention. The stickiness of in particular the dialogue with the empty field shows which transfer processes take place in this dialogue. Also this transfer can be seen as a characteristic of the organization.

Chapter 8: Final remarks, conclusion, doubts and recommendations
The conclusions are that the model leads to a richer, subler contingent approach of unique, complex and dynamic change issues (De Zeeuw, 1980). It makes underlying schemas and theories of participants explicit to the change process, contributes to the learning capacity of organizations, offers a common frame of reference for those involved to formulate complex and dynamic change processes, leads to richer context specific approaches and more robust interventions, and is applicable to the different phases of a change process (analysis, diagnosis, etc) and at different scale levels (total scope, small in-between steps). Guidelines are given to apply the model as meta model (to the change process) and construction model (in the change process). The heuristics that were developed for the application of the model in this study are directed towards deconstructing the problem perspective, making the displacement of meanings visible (in the relationship between symptom and cause) relating the dialogue choice to the quality of the working relationship, resistance and other factors, integrating ‘meta objectives’ (as context specific manifestations of changes) into the change process, and coupling the change model to a dynamic analysis of the problem structure, and by grafting intervention possibilities into it, thereby increasing the effectiveness. Amongst others, techniques to deconstruct are problematizing, clarification, confrontation, pointing out that n=1, demonstrating, and pointing to omissions.
At the start of this study we set our objective as problematizing common laws from organization science, change management and the tacit knowledge of the client organization for the one case. The approach here is the reasoning of the general to the special. That also took place. Additionally it appears in many cases that the starting point for the dialogue lies in the problematizing of the complexity and subtlety of the one case. In the discussion of a number of change issues attention was paid first and foremost to perceptual knowledge; to the exceptions and circumstantial ingredients of a specific situation (Nussbaum, 1986). The development of meaning was aimed at gathering, problematizing and radicalizing of this dissonant information for the one case. This is an opposite process of meaning development, namely from special to the general. Attention was directed towards recognizing patterns and regularities in the exceptions. Based on that we have adjusted our research model (see figure 0.1). Rough complexity is general, follows rules and laws, and is linear, mechanistic and universal. Subtle complexity is actual, perceptual non-linear, dynamic and contextual. The perception of the specific situation and the gathering of perceptual knowledge are however just as determined and restricted by the language. It is an illusion to think that perceptual knowledge should be theory free. Here too restrictions in language cause the exclusion of other perceptions. Here too the deconstruction of the language of change comes up, but then inductively. The process of co-creation is therefore in essence a process of deconstruction of the restricting idiom of the speaker and reconstruction of a new collective idiom, and therefore in essence a discursive process. This deconstruction process we have described in this study.

We have completed the final remarks with the observation that destabilization or the deconstruction of the language of change of the participants can create fear and cause damage. The question is therefore in which manner one can limit the fear and nonetheless generate sufficient complexity to achieve a sufficiently rich approach? We have mentioned three observations: firstly, the quality of the working relationship and the introspective capacity of the client system, secondly, bringing the transfer into the change process (in the form of meta objectives) and thirdly, intervening in or influencing the relationship by introducing corrective experiences.

Theoretical and practical relevance

The integral model for dynamic and complex change processes is developed based on theoretical and practical starting points. Literature research, development of a process model, case descriptions and the development of application heuristics provide a contribution to the change management body of knowledge. The final product is not theory that has crystallized out (new) but a 'neue Kombination' of organization science, change management, linguistic, psychological and dialogical insights in the
form of a sensitizing device (process model), for managing unique, complex and dynamic changes. Through the discursive approach of change process, the model 'integrates' a number of approaches such as system theoretical approach and an approach to organizations as social processes, connects organization science and change management, makes combinations possible between modern science approaches with post-modern outlooks on context bound knowledge and co-creation and as a dialogical model offers practical handles for the collective design of unique, complex and dynamic change processes. The result is a richer and subtle contingent approach of the one case that sufficiently meets the complexity of the problem situation. This makes the change model more realistic and increases the chance of a successful change. The model is also more practical. Creating productive tension and the (de-)construction of the language of change are at the forefront here. The model can be used by changers (external advisor but also internal changers) and provides different interesting leads for further scientific and practical research.