

Organizational Campaigning

Frederik Hertel

Department of Business & Management, Aalborg University, Fibigerstraede 2, Aalborg East 9220, Denmark

Abstract: This conference paper will explore the difference between communicating changes and changing communication. Based on a case study in which a manager applies two quite different approaches to organizational communication in order to change the organization he is leading. The first and failing approach will be named: organizational campaigning and means that the manager takes control with communication and communication channels in order to ensure successful organizational changes. Since the changes were not succeeding the approach is replaced with a new approach which will be named organizing communication. During the case analysis is we will see that this change in approach not only change the managers perception of communication but also his perception of the organization he is leading.

Key words: Change communication, organizational changes, organizational development and case study.

1. Introduction to the Case

This article is based on a case study conducted in a public organisation. The manager of the organization will obviously be anonymous in this article, but for convenience we will here use the pseudonym Thomas. The former manager, known for his conservative style of management, was forced to resign after a number of unfortunate events that influenced the performance of the organization in a negative way. All these events established a burning platform forcing the board to modernise the organization, the style of management and the internal interpersonal relations.

At his appointment Thomas is neither offered instructions on how to start or manage the organizational changes demanded by the board. The only instruction offered is: ensure the success of the changes. In order to fulfil the demands of the board Thomas starts initiating changes by taking control of the communication channels in the company in order to ensure that the staff and middle managers share his perception of the renewed organization. This is done by a long seminar involving middle managers, temporary and permanent staffs. During this part of the process

Thomas decides to introduce the employees to the visions, norms, values and goals he considers being essential for a new and modern organization. During interviews Thomas states that he makes these decisions to avoid open discussions as this might lead the members of the organization into false or wrong interpretations of the organizations visions, norms, values and goals. False interpretations might, states Thomas, be difficult to change afterwards. This obviously produces a top-down process in which the staff and middle managers are only introduced to the new visions, norms, relations, values and goals of the organization through Thomas.

In connection to organizational changes, it is important to distinguish between first-order and second-order changes [1]. In this case, the changes initiated by Thomas appear to be first-order changes since they do not change the employees and middle managers basic world-view. If it ought to be a second-order changes we would need to identify deeper, more fundamental and radical changes in the interpretive schemes of those involved. Interpretive schemes are being used in the organizational everyday life whenever human beings are producing and exchanging meaning [2]. Our approach towards changes is in contrast to the approach of Eisenberg,

Corresponding author: Frederik Hertel, Ph.D., research fields: semiotics, change communication, organization study, organizational creativity and philosophy of management.

Andrews, Murphy & Laine-Timmerman [3] perceiving first-order changes as minor changes such as quality assurance, structural changes, ISO etc. and second-order changes as changes in the aim of the organization. In some cases, change in the aim of the organisation creates change in the organizational members' interpretative schemes, but changing the aim of the organization does not necessarily affect or change the mental schemes. The reason for highlighting the importance of the mental schemes is our conception of organizations as social constructions [4]. Mental schemes are also connected with perceiving human being as "...an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun..." [5]. It is therefore important to focus on how members of the organization produce and exchange meaning with others inside and outside the organization. The consequence of this approach is to maintain a focus on the interpretative scheme of the staff, middle managers and managers. But since the concept of interpretative schemes often are connected with cognitive psychology it is important to introduce the concept [6] interpretant known from the peircean semiotics.

Interpretants could be explained as the coding system used by e.g. employees while producing and exchanging meaning in everyday organizational life. The employees will obviously not have identical codes—since it requires [7] being ramifications of the same personality. Organizational members understand each other since they have comparable codes developed [8] through processes of secondary socialization. The organizational context is basically a vehicle for the institutionalization of social acts involving a typified production and exchange of meaning [9].

After the 2nd seminar Thomas notices a low employee involvement and concludes the seminars have to change. Thomas decides to use a new type of seminar involving a short presentation of the objectives, visions and values of the organization.

Afterwards the staffs are divided in subgroups to discuss their perception of the organization and its values. After this session Thomas pairs the groups into new groups, which start a discussion about the values of the organisation. The groups are composed of people not working closely in the everyday organizational life. In plenum, composed by staff members and management, each group present their suggestions, comments etc. and afterwards plenum decides the values, visions etc. being applicable for the following year. During the following year staff meetings are held regularly in order to discuss the common interpretation of values, visions etc. of the organization. According to Thomas the seminars are an essential discussion about the values and their eligibility. Values have been changes or abolished as a consequence of the seminars.

Organizations are changed when the interpretants of the actor involved are changed. Actors cannot be understood as passive subjects just awaiting adjustments of their interpretants. They are on the contrary active acting subjects influencing their own and co-worker's interpretants. Whenever interpretants are changed new meaning is produced and that might create a change or adjustment of the existing [9] social acts. The interplay between production of meaning and the social acts is not determined by changes in social acts established before or after changes in the interpretants. Beside from that variations in existing social acts are not clear evidence of the interpretants being changed. The mutual interplay between interpretants and social acts either maintains or changes meaning produced and exchanged in the organization.

We notice variations in how the staffs actually perceive the seminars. Members of the permanent staff describe the seminars as trivial but also an opportunity to influence the organization and its decision-making. Members of both the permanent and the temporary staff experience the seminar being a place for introducing new employees to the

organization and its core values. The temporary staffs do not consider the seminar as an arena for influence. Based on our observations we can conclude that the seminars have changed from low involvement of the employee to a situation with some involvement of temporary staffs and high involvement of permanent staffs.

There are probably multiple reasons for organizational changes and some managers seem to have a basic belief in “shaking” organizations in order to change, what they perceive as, hard core power positions. Organizational changes are mainly a result of dialectic contradictions within an organization [10]. Members of an organization will seemingly have comparable interests but it is actually their conflicting interests, which work as vehicles for organizational changes. In some situations, one cannot determine a crystal clear aim with organizational changes—since the aim start to exist as a retrospective post reflection [11]. One reason for this might be meaning coupled to organizational changes retrospectively [11]. But it is also a result of organizational changes being established as a consequence of employees experiencing [12] the chock of noting that their existing interpretants being unable to comprehend reality as experienced. Such a chock offers an impression that something need to be changed but it seldom provides a deeper understand of the scope, character, or depth of such changes. A rational explanation of organizational changes will always be something constructed though a retrospective cognitive process [12].

The case study described above describes two quite opposite paradigms of organizational changes and change communication. In the following sections we will develop a theoretical frame for the two paradigms (the campaigning and the organize paradigm) in change communication.

2. Organizational Campaigning

In organization studies [13, 14] change

communication is understood as the presentation techniques or methods most suitable for influencing members of the organization, in order to make them accept changes initiated by the powerful guiding coalition. Change communication becomes the doctrine of, how campaigning can make employees and middle managers excited about changes, or at least make them realize the pointlessness of resistance. The impact of this approach will mainly be gaining the “positive” staffs and middle leaders for the changes, and make the “negative” voluntarily or not find another job. Such an approach towards change communication will in this article be named organizational campaigning, and it is understood as an approach based on the belief that changes must be transmitted or communicated to “positive” staff members.

3. Organizing Communication

The oppositional approach will here be named organizing communication and it is based on the belief that nothing can be changed, before communication itself has being changed. The expression change communication is obviously composed by two words: change and communication. One thereby gets the opportunity to emphasize either changes or communication. In some cases, appreciation is placed on changes, and then one notice the silhouette of the campaigning paradigm. Consequently, will appreciation placed on communication be a vehicle for the organize paradigm. An example of the campaigning paradigm is stating that change communication ought to be defined as the strategic communication produced in purpose of implementing the managements change requirements among employees, in order to ensure the distribution of the right organizational culture [15]. Petersen’s [15] statement seems to replace a dialogical communication with a one-way communication distributing the right organizational culture [16].

Petersen’s use of the expression strategic

communication can be seen as an indication of the campaigning paradigm's ideal of change communication as a well-planned and rational activity [17]. But despite of that, change communication will always somehow relate to the general communication strategy regardless whether the communication strategy is perceived as an intended plan or as emergent process [18] in the everyday communication activities or communication culture [19]. Here we should probably state, that in our perception communication strategy must be a combination of strategy understood as an intended strategic plan, and strategy understood as emergent processes.

Planning is one of the distinctive features of the campaigning paradigm, and it is a consequence of the belief that management by using campaigning activities can implement the changes among staffs and middle managers. Corporation communicational experts will produce communication products or activities at a strategic level, monitored and sanctioned by management. The connection between the company's communication strategy, and the campaigning paradigm can also be understood as an attempt to create coherence between the communication activities in the company. Communication literature offers different attempt to define the strategy concept. Sepstrup [20] and others use the concept to describe the action plan or part of such an action plan but such a use of the concept might create disturbance. Organizational studies, as well as in communication studies, offer a distinction between the strategic, the tactic and the operational level [21, 22]. The strategic level is perceived as the overall, long-term goals while the tactic level is perceived as the road to these goals, and the operational level is the stand-alone communication campaigns, activities or initiatives. This division might be challenging to handle in real life, and the Communication Department in Danish Defence, for example prefer a two-part strategy [22, 23]. The first and overall strategic level is the communication policy [24], while the second

tactic/operational level is perceived as the communicative focus areas of the organization. The communication policy describes mission, vision, objectives, and values of the organizational communication, and it ends by pinpointing the communicative focus areas of the following period. The expiration date, evaluation criteria and methods are described at both a strategic level and a tactic/operational level. At the strategic level the strategic aims and the communication activities of each of these focus areas are described.

Change communication is basically equivalent to other communication activities executed by the organization. Coherence between change communication and mission, vision, objectives, and values as part of a company's communication strategy is quite important. In case of a mismatch one ought to adjust either the communication strategy, or the change communication in order to create coherence. Obviously this can only work as a starting point since change communication is not only a question about planning but also includes emergent strategy processes with a interplay between members of the organization and the change communication. Such interplays seem neglected by the campaigning paradigm's belief in planning. Apparently the campaigning paradigm is based on the assumption of communication planning and knowledge of the target group ensuring the dissimilation of the managements change messages.

4. Senders and Recievers

In literature criticism Umberto Eco, among others, describes a concept named the implied reader [25] quite valuable while evaluating change communication. The implied reader is the expectations facing the reader, while reading the text. It is a combination of competences, skills, experiences, knowledge, norms, cultural values etc. required for reading the text. This includes e.g. grammaticality for understanding the text, as well as reading skills

required by the readability index. It is obviously also a question about a lexical, or cultural knowledge required for understand the reality experienced by the protagonist. The implied reader is to some extent comparable with the concept of the model reader. The model reader is applied in literature of communication planning [26], and it is considered useful while dealing with the characteristics of a target group. Communication planning [27] replaces a model reader with perception matrices [28] and classification patterns [29]. Perception matrices focus on the subject and its creation of a worldview and perception of the world. It is influencing the subject's action including the communicational acts. They are interconnected with the habitus of the subject, which is here understood as the disposition of the subject being a result of primary socialization processes in childhood, and the secondary socialization processes in adulthood [30]. Despite perception matrices and the implied reader might appear to be different concepts, they are both applied by the communication industry, while predicting the reader in order to include this knowledge in the production of (media) texts.

Since we are dealing with change communication, we will transform the implied reader to the implied employee (understood as staff and middle managers). Change communication will always contain an implied employee (receiver), and thereby also an implied sender, the managers. These concepts are useful while planning, executing or analysing change communication produced in an organizational context. But the concept might also be applied for analysing the ontological and epistemological approach included in the paradigms of change communication. An example could, e.g., be analysing Kotter [31], in order to show how the ontological approach included in the campaigning paradigm, and while doing so one might notice employees being reduced to objects. The implied employee is not only a reflection of a change communication, obviously the change communication is also producing its own implied employee. This is

quite comparable to literature criticism, where the competences of the reader are being described as something evolving during the process of reading—e.g. by introducing the reader to the universe of the text and the vocabulary of the author. The development of reader competences is integrated in the reading process, and the reader is mainly unaware of the process. The implied expectations of a text are mainly unknown until the mismatch between the implied and the empirical reader becomes impossible to deny. In line of this will change communication not only reflect, but also be a co-producer of its own implied employee. Change communication will nearly unnoticeable introduce the expectations directed to and in some cases internalized by the employee. In some cases the mismatch between the implied employee of the change communication and the empirical employee becomes insurmountable. The result might make the empirical employee feel offended, and therefore either rejecting or misunderstanding the change communication.

The organizing paradigm is built on the assumption that the communication must be changed in order to perceive the aims of the change communication. A new form of communication must be developed, and it is likely to be based on dialogue, and to some extent reciprocity between employees, middle managers and managers. Communication therefore becomes a matter of sharing something, and having something in common. This is turning away from the monologue (one-way communication) of the campaigning paradigm to a renewed form of communication. While analysing change communication one therefore ought to include the communication approach present in actual change communication. Since the campaigning paradigm focus on efficacy the sender and the message (a certain organizational change) is the essential aspect. We can therefore describe such a change communication as sender-oriented communication. The counter position is a receiver-oriented communication developed in the tradition of media

research [32]. Receiver-oriented communication focuses on the receiver's production and exchange of meaning. Here we probably need to exclude the most radical receiver-oriented approach [33].

The campaigning paradigm must be seen as part of the traditional communication paradigm, where communication is a matter of a sender transforming a message to a receiver. It is a sender acting strategic, in order to make the receiver react in a certain way. The desirable reaction is basically: changing the attitudes, values and behaviour of the receiver, and it is the needs or desires of the sender being the key point during the communication process.

5. Communicative Acts

The speech acts of a management applying the campaigning paradigm will obviously reflect a sender-oriented communication [34]. Important aspects of speech acts are obviously that we act while talking, and this means we e.g. threaten, promise and rebuke one another. Such a discourse [35] will involve [34] three levels of acts: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary level. Analysing speech acts helps us to understand the relation, and mutual understanding of the communicators involved. Such analysing might offer a supplement to analysis of the implied employee. In the following section we will turn to the universal pragmatics, developed by Habermas [36] with inspiration from e.g., Wittgenstein, Austin and Searle. Others [37] have already involved Habermas in organizational studies. Habermas' universal pragmatics offers a distinction between communicative actions of importance, while dealing with change communication. Habermas' distinctions might provide a point of departure for ethical discussions e.g. about conscious or unconscious manipulation in change communication.

Habermas constructs a main distinction between communicative actions and the strategic actions. The communicative action is basically an ideal situation, where people involved interact in a power-free space

in order to obtain a common understanding about the content discussed. This requires four basic conditions:

Comprehensibility — the speaker must produce cohesive and understandable sentences;

Propositional truth—the sentence produced must offer something to be understand;

Validity—communicators recognize each other in order to maintain mutual confidence and they must comply the norms and rules of conversations;

Sincerity – the speaker must be sincere and mean what he says [38, 39].

During the communicative action communicators cooperate sincerely, in order to obtain a common perception of the subject discussed. The communicative action must therefore take place in a power-free space, and it must involve equal communicators. Conversations that do not qualify can be described as strategic actions [40]. Such actions are pursuing a certain aim, and they are involving communicators enrolled in a hierarchy of power. Strategic actions can be divided between open and hidden/closed strategic actions.

In open strategic actions the ends and means is either known or can be clarified through meta-communication. During closed strategic actions the ends and means will be unknown for some communicators, and they are actually becoming objects of others will. In such a case meta-communication about the ends and means will make the communication collapse. Closed strategic actions can be conscious attempt to manipulate or unconscious results of pathology.

Change communication cannot follow the ideal of the communicative actions since an organizational context involves different positions/roles, formal power and hierarchy. Change communication is therefore forced to include strategic actions. But the communicative action might be applied as a vehicle for discussing the degree of dialogue and mutuality, necessary for obtaining the ends and means of a change communication. The difference between open

and closed strategic actions might work as a tool for discussing whether conscious or unconscious manipulation is part of a certain change communication. This pinpoints the importance of having ethical and moral discussions connected with change communication. In the following section we will deal with the conception of communication involved in the two paradigms of change communication.

6. The Communicative Approach to Campaigning

Advocates [41] of the campaigning paradigm experience the change communication as mistaken or failed, if receiver and sender do not obtain identical messages. Just like ordinary textbooks in organizational studies [42] the campaigning paradigm seems to follow the principles of the transmission model of communication. Here communication is perceived as a matter of a sender encoding and sending information/messages to a receiver decoding the information/messages. The transmission school was founded by the engineers Shannon & Weaver during WW2 and published in 1949 [43]. They focused on the redundancy and predictability of the message, and its entropic and unpredictability. Shannon and Weaver assumed that all kind of noise means information is disappearing, and the message is therefore being difficult to receive. The problem is critical for messages with high level of entropic or unpredictability, while it is less critical for messages with a high level of predictability and redundancy. Shannon and Weaver suggested either reducing or avoiding entropic e.g. by transmitting messages with high level of redundancy and predictability.

Some critics have stated that the problems seem to be communicators shifting from being senders and receivers. Several solutions have been suggested in order to solve the problem running from the linear model of communication. Some suggest transforming the receiver and the sender to communicators [44]

while e.g., books of organization studies [45] introduce a certain feedback system. None of these attempts seems to deal with more serious ontological and epistemological problems of the assumption of a message being the same for both sender and receiver. The transmission school produces a “thing metaphor” assuming that the sender is giving the receiver something [46]. The thing metaphor and the assumption of the message being identical for sender and receiver must be rejected [47]. The time dimension involved means the message cannot be identical for sender and receiver. The contextual understanding and the interpretation of the context depend on the position people take during the communication. Since the transmission school is not paying attention to the time dimension, it is also neglecting different positions and roles taking by the communicators. The communicators coding systems must vary, since they are developed as a result of their linguistic experiences memory, norms, values, culture and cultural background etc. If sender and receiver had identical coding system, they would be reduced to ramifications of the same personality [48]. Since communicators take different positions and roles, messages do not exist as “das-ding-an-sich”[49] absorbable for the receiver. Messages appear as “das-ding-fur-uns” [50] and interpretation is therefore an essential part of the communication.

7. The Communicative Approach in Organizing

The organizing paradigm is connected to the semiotic school. Semiotic here understood as the doctrine of the sign and its meaning, developed in both a European and an American tradition. Ferdinand De Saussure founded the European tradition, i.e., semiology, while C. S. Peirce founded the American tradition, i.e., semiotic. As a consequence of Umberto Eco’s work the two traditions have merged to one tradition named semiotic [51]. Semiotic is interesting here since the concept of semiosis [52] describes the

endless production of meaning in a human being. The production of semiosis involves three elements: a sign (immediate sign), its meaning (the object) and the mental process (the interpretant) creating the connection between sign and its meaning. Semiosis is an endless process, since the sign is always part of changing sign-relations. By researching the productions of meaning one gets the opportunity of discovering the habits [53] or conventions governing semiosis, and one will thereby notice the phenomenological concept: intentionality being essential [54, 55]. Intentionality shows that consciousness is always a consciousness about something, it is directed towards something [56] and it is thereby coproducing the communicator's understanding. Intentionality might be understood as underlying the conversation contributing to the creation of the communicator's interests, intentions and motives. Self-perception and the perception of the other involve intentionality. The intentionality of the communicator cannot be divided from the communicator's background or interests, and it is therefore useless as a tool for face-to-face interaction analysis. It is not possible to operationalize intentionality and it is therefore useless in relation to interaction analysis, the intentionality concept is still essential for understanding human interactions.

Semiotics communication [57] is perceived as communicators cooperating about producing and exchanging meaning. If communicators produce different meanings, the interaction is neither perceived as mistaken or failing. The purpose is not optimization of the communication, and the ontological/epistemological approach is therefore being quite different from the one known noticed in the transformation school. The rejection of anything given a priori, [58] as something unmediated and independent, shows the inspiration from Kant. Since the sign cannot appear a priori it appears as "das-ding-fur-uns", and that is actually another reason for our previous rejection of signs and their meanings

being identical for the communicators involved in an interaction.

The reason why communicators understand each other is basically the context [59] playing a significant role in interpretations, and thereby semiosis. The context ought to be perceived in its broadest meaning, making even the communicators part of each other's context. The position or role taking in the organization will have an influence on the communicator's interactions, e.g., by influencing the interpretation process during interactions. Members of the same organization regularly develop, adjust and change the context dependent patterns of interactions in this article described as social acts [60]. Social acts are widely recognized, since the members of the organization intuitively understand the mutual expectations addressed to their own and others actions in the organizational context. This intuition is the result of a continuing process of secondary socialization [61] taking place in the everyday organizational life. In the following section we will focus on the organizational approach present in the two paradigms introduced above.

8. The perception of Organizations

There seems to be a close coupling between ones perception of organizations and ones approach to change communication. Petersen [62] states that change communication is basically about implementing the "right culture" in the organization and thereby she obviously establishes a strong connection to Schein's functionalistic approach to organizational culture. The connection to Schein's perception of culture indicates the campaigning paradigm belonging to a functionalistic [63] tradition of organization studies. John P. Kotter [64] who is another central figure in the campaigning paradigm considers communication being an instrument or a tool for implementing the change plan of the management or coalition. The campaigning paradigm consists of a combination between a strong

management perspective, and a tool-oriented perception of change communication.

The campaigning paradigm is not necessarily linked to the technical-rational tradition of organizational changes [65] it might as well be linked to the tradition of organizational development [66] build on a systemic approach to organizations. Anyone experiencing both a technical-rational and an OD (organizational development) process will most likely notice the major differences in the values of the two different approaches to organizational changes. One difference is a higher and deeper involvement of employees in the tradition of OD. In some part of organization literature [67] it is uncommon to establish a connection between a systemic and analytic approach to organizational studies, despite they [68] run from same the philosophy of science here named: functionalism. The systemic approach perceives an organization as a system of interplaying sub-elements. Change communication partly becomes a tool for the change agents attempt to change the system, and a part of the new system arising during the change process. Communication becomes an element interacting with other elements and thereby developing, maintaining or changing the organizational system. Communication and change communication is thereby being evaluated in terms of utility, which here must be understood as its ability to implement the change wishes of management.

The campaigning paradigm contains both elements of a technical-rational change tradition and elements of OD tradition. If the organizing paradigm ought to break away from the campaigning paradigm, it must run from a philosophy of science being distinct from the functionalistic approach to organizational studies. Such an approach is sometimes [69] named actors approach, or [70] the life-world tradition or a hermeneutic phenomenological tradition of science [71] showing clear inspiration from phenomenology and hermeneutics. In this perspective change communication becomes a description of how

employees are actively involved in the development and changes of the social actions [72], or in other words: the context dependent patterns of interactions. Change communication means involving the members of the organization in changing their own mutual patterns of interactions. This will include a change of the mutual expectations to own and others actions in context dependent patterns of interactions. Such change processes could probably be described as a learning process or a new secondary process of socialization [73]. In the following section we will describe, how one can analyse change communication.

9. Analysing Change Communication

Change communication must be perceived as a discourse interplaying with other types of discourses and it is therefore a part of the [74] discursive order of the organization. The change communication cannot be perceived isolated, but must be considered in relation to its interplay with other organizational discourses. Such discourses could e.g., be daily coordinating and collaborating meetings, job interviews, performance and development meetings, salary negotiations etc. Analysing the different discourses and the communication strategy enables us to make a description of the communication policy or communication culture of the organization. The discourse located in an organization depends obviously on the organizational context, and it cannot be described without empirical studies. The discursive order produces and interplays with the social order [74, 75]. The social order is produced by Ref. [76] the subject-positions or roles [77] taking by employees, middle managers and managers. Analysing the discursive and social order offers: an opportunity to understand the context of the change discourse, and the subject-position or roles at play and the aims of the change process.

The social order is a consequence of [78] the interactions between members of the organization, and it must therefore be perceived in relation to the mutual

role expectations [79] present in the organization. Despite of being dynamic and evolving, the social order is rarely changed radically. Analysing the mutual role expectations evolved during the process of change communication offers an opportunity to uncover the implied employee, receiver, and the implied leader, sender. The change discourse can be uncovered by analysing the interaction between employees and managers. In some cases, this might result in an alternation between sender- and receiver-oriented communications.

Change communication is part of the discursive space required for changing organizations. Analysing the change communication as a discursive space enables us to uncover the staffs' and managements' perception of organizations and changes. Since change communication, and e.g., the roles included, are social constructions they must be established and accepted by members of the organization. Acceptance of the change communication is based on the legitimation established by implicit and explicit arguments. Burning platforms [80] might be an example of implicit and explicit arguments used for legitimating organizational changes as well as change communication. As a result of this the legitimization of change communication can contain both open and closed strategic actions (agendas), not necessarily known by all involved. Analysing the change communication seems to show the relevance of discussing Habermas' distinction between open and closed or hidden strategic actions. Analysing the legitimization of change discourses should probably include the combination between text analyses of documents (e.g. invitations to meetings, minutes, strategy notes etc.), participant observations and qualitative interviews with staff, middle managers and managers.

10. Conclusion

This conference paper introduces concepts useful while analysing the two paradigms of change

communication. Whenever change communication is perceived as a tool [81], applied by the management, to communicate changes to the staff/middle managers it will become an essential part of organizational changes. In such cases we will most likely notice the skeleton of the campaigning paradigm. But change communication cannot be reduced to a relation between sender, management, and receiver/target group, employees and middle managers. Instead employees and middle managers must be seen as co-producers of meaning produced in connection to change communication. The meaning produced and exchanged during change communication must be seen as a result of the interactions between managers, middle managers and employees. Thereby we notice the softly silhouette of the organize paradigm.

Change communication might be clear examples of the two paradigms introduced above but other examples will probably show either a mixture of or switch between the two paradigms.

References

- [1] Bartunek, J. M. 1984. "Changing Interpretive Schemes and Organizational Restructuring in Administrative Science Quarterly." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 29 (3): 356.
- [2] Hertel, F., and Fast, M. 2009. "Betydningsfuld Ledelse in Aalborg Universitet: Working Paper." *Series of Department of Business Studies*.
- [3] Eisenberg, E. M., Andrews, L., Murphy, A., and Laine, T. L. 1999. *Transforming Organizations through Communication in Salem. Organizational Communication and Change*. New Jersey: Hampton Press, Inc.
- [4] Berger, P. L., and Luchmann, T. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books.
- [5] Geertz, C. 2000. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- [6] Peirce, C. S. 1998. *The Essential Peirce*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [7] Lotman, Y. M. 2000. *Universe of the Mind*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [8] Berger, P. L., and Luchmann, T. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books.
- [9] Mead, G. H. 2005. *Sindet, Selvet og Samfundet*. Århus: Akademisk Forlag.
- [10] Benson, J. K. 1977. "Organizations: A Dialectic View."

- Administrative Science Quarterly* 22 (1): 1-21.
- [11] Weick, K. E. 1995. *Sensemaking in Organizations*. California: Sage Publications.
- [12] Schultz, A. 2005. *Hverdagslivets Sociologi*. Gylling: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- [13] Kotter, J. P. 2012. *Leading Change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- [14] Clegg, K., and Pitsis, T. 2009. *Managing & Organizations*. Cakovec: Sage.
- [15] Petersen, H. 2005. *Forandringskommunikation*. Gylling: Samfundslitteratur.
- [16] Madsen, B. 1997. *Organisationens Dialogiske Rum*. Organisationsudvikling Gennem Dialog. Aalborg: Aalborg Universitet Sforlag.
- [17] Kotter, J. P. 2012. *Leading Change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- [18] Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., and Lampel, J. 1998. *Strategy Safari*. London: Prentice Hall.
- [19] Frandsen, F. 2007. "En morale Om Kommunikation in Jyllandsposten." *Organization Development*.
- [20] Sepstrup, P. 2007. *Tilrettelæggelse af Information*. Viborg: Academica.
- [21] Gjerding, A. N., Nielsen, T., Rasmussen, J. G., and Vinding, A. L. 2007. *Virksomheders Hverdagsstrategier*. Aalborg: Institut for Erhvervsøkonomi.
- [22] Sepstrup, P. 2007. *Tilrettelæggelse af information*. Viborg: Academica.
- [23] Kirk, L. B. 2008. *Corporate Communication*. Kbh: Borsens Forum.
- [24] Jorgensen, J., and Windfeld, S. 2005. *Kommunikation Spolitikker*. Gylling: Samfundslitteratur.
- [25] Eco, U. 1981. *Læserens Rolle*. Værk og læser. Holstebro: Borgen.
- [26] Ingemann, B., and Kjørup, S. 2002. *Tekster Skal Ses*. Roskilde: RUC/Kommunikation.
- [27] Mostov, C. B., Sondergaard, K. B., and Ostergaard, S. H. 2005. *En kampagne*. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitet Sforlag.
- [28] Bourdieu, P., and Wacquant, J. D. 2004. *Refleksiv Sociologi*. Kbh: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- [29] Bourdieu, P. 1995. *Distinksjonen—En Sosiologisk Kritik av Dommekraften*. Oslo: Pax Forlag a/s.
- [30] Bourdieu, P. 2005. Udkast til en Praksisfilosofi. Kbh: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- [31] Kotter, J. P. 2012. *Leading Change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- [32] Jensen, K. B. 2008. *Medier og Samfund*. Gylling: Samfundslitteratur.
- [33] Fish, S. 2000. *Is There a Text in This Class?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- [34] Searle, J. R. 2005. *Speech Acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [35] Ricoeur, P. 2002. *En hermeneutisk brobygger*. Aarhus: Klim.
- [36] Habermas, J. 1997. *Teorien Om Den Kommunikative Handlen*. Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.
- [37] Eriksen, E. O. 1999. *Kommunikativ Ledelse*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- [38] Habermas, J. 1997. *Teorien Om Den Kommunikative Handlen*. Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.
- [39] Thyssen, O. 1999. *Kommunikation, Kultur Og Etik*. København: Handelshøjskolens forlag.
- [40] Habermas, J. 1997. *Teorien Om Den Kommunikative Handlen*. Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.
- [41] Kotter, J. P. 2012. *Leading Change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- [42] Jacobsen, D. I., and Thorsvik, J. 2008. *Hvordan Organisationer Fungerer*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- [43] Fiske, J. 1990. *Introduction to Communication Studies*. London: Routledge.
- [44] Alro, H., and Kristiansen, M. 1988. Farsø: Holistic.
- [45] Jacobsen, D. I., and Thorsvik, J. 2008. *Hvordan Organisationer Fungerer*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- [46] Luhmann, N. 2005. *Sociale Systemer*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- [47] Luhmann, N. 2005. *Sociale Systemer*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- [48] Lotman, Y. M. 2000. *Universe of the Mind*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [49] Kant, I. 2003. *Kritik Af Den Rene Fornuft*. Hellerup: Det lille Forlag.
- [50] Kant, I. 2003. *Kritik Af Den Rene Fornuft*. Hellerup: Det lille Forlag.
- [51] Jensen, J. F. 1990. *Computer-Kultur, Computer-Medier, computer-semiotik*. Aalborg: Nordisk Sommeruniversitet.
- [52] Peirce, C. S. 1998. *The Essential Peirce*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [53] Peirce, C. S. 1998. *The Essential Peirce*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [54] Gadamer, G. H. 2004. *Sandhed Og Metode*. Viborg: System Academic.
- [55] Rosensohn, W. L. 1974. *The phenomenology of Charles S. Peirce*. Amsterdam: B. R. Gruner B.V.
- [56] Clark II, W. W., and Fast, M. 2008. *Qualitative Economics*. Oxford: Coxmoor Publishing Company.
- [57] Peirce, C. S. 1998. *The Essential Peirce*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- [58] Rosensohn, W. L. 1974. *The Phenomenology of Charles S. Peirce*. Amsterdam: B. R. Gruner B.V.
- [59] Eco, U. 2000. *Kant Og Næbdyret*. Viborg: Forum.
- [60] Mead, G. H. 2005. *Sindet, Selvet Og Samfundet*. Aarhus: Akademisk forlag.

- [61] Berger, P. L., and Luchmann, T. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books.
- [62] Petersen, H. 2005. *Forandringskommunikation*. Gylling: Samfundslitteratur.
- [63] Clark II, W. W., and Fast, M. 2008. *Qualitative Economics*. Oxford: Coxmoor Publishing Company.
- [64] Kotter, J. P. 2012. *Leading Change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- [65] Borum, F. 2001. *Strategier for Organisationsændring*. Århus: Handelshøjskolens Forlag.
- [66] French, W. L., and Bell, C. H. 1999. *Organization Development*. New Jersey: PrenticeHall.
- [67] Arbnor, A., and Bjerke, B. 1995. *Foretagsekonomisk Metodlære*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- [68] Clark II, W. W., and Fast, M. 2008. *Qualitative Economics*. Oxford: Coxmoor Publishing Company.
- [69] Arbnor, A., and Bjerke, B. 1995. *Foretagsekonomisk Metodlære*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- [70] Clark II, W. W., and Fast, M. 2008. *Qualitative Economics*. Oxford: Coxmoor Publishing Company.
- [71] Gadamer, G. H. 2004. *Sandhed Og Metode*. Viborg: Systime Academic.
- [72] Mead, G. H. 2005. *Sindet, Selvet Og Samfundet*. Århus: Akademisk Forlag.
- [73] Berger, P. L., and Luchmann, T. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books.
- [74] Faiclough, N. 2001. *Language and Power*. Malaysia: Longman.
- [75] Bernstein, B. 2001. *Pædagogik, Diskurs Og Magt*. Viborg: Akademisk.
- [76] Faiclough, N. 2001. *Language and Power*. Malaysia: Longman.
- [77] Mead, G. H. 1977. *On Social Psychology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [78] Cooley, C. H. 1998. *On Self and Social Organization*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- [79] Mead, G. H. 2005. *Sindet, Selvet Og Samfundet*. Århus: Akademisk forlag.
- [80] Kotter, J. P. 2012. *Leading Change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- [81] Petersen, H. 2005. *Forandringskommunikation*. Gylling: Samfundslitteratur.