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ABSTRACT: The purpose of this paper is to present an innovative and creative approach to the problem of solution in decision making, based on the understanding of decision makers as human beings, and decision making processes as human networks, in an organizational context.

This approach basically consists of the development of a powerful ontological tool for the observation, self-observation, design and innovation of human beings from passive observers towards enactive observers, who have to make decisions and solve problem situations through the interactions in which they participate.

This tool named CLEHES© (Body – Language – Emotion – History – Eros – Silence) allows to develop not only all the human potential inside us, but also to bring all organizational resources, such as information technology and communications, into the decision makers bodies, to invent and re-invent new human practices that can create value to our organizations.

Several applications of this tool have taken place in different domains and organizational contexts with amazing results, which have been the focus of continuous research projects and managerial education instances.

I. Introduction

Managers face a permanent dilemma in order to increase effectiveness and to take care of the organizational systems' viability they are responsible for, which is the high complexity they have to deal with. That is why managers need to rely on a set of tools that allow them to attenuate that complexity. These tools have historically been provided by the already known concepts, theories, techniques and models proposed by the dominant scientific paradigm, centered in people's intellect and rationality. However, these kinds of tools are capable to deal with problem situations of very limited complexity, because they do not deal with human nature, which constitutes one of the main sources of complexity.

After many experiences in management, education and consultancy fields, we have realized that tools that managers really need cannot be provided by the science or technology anymore, but by the manager himself as a human being, that is, by constitutive elements, which interaction generates recursively the same network of processes which produced them. This is what we call *Self Management*, the process whereby a system produces its own organization and maintains and constitutes itself within a particular space.

The same characteristics of Self Management are present in both the manager and the organization. In order to obtain effectiveness increasing, performance improvement and organizational viability, it is necessary to generate effectiveness first, performance and viability in the human being in charge. How can we do this? As we said, tools are inherently in human beings, so they can be recognized and their education cultivated.

Here is where an educational program, based on Self Management, has been created. This relates to education management to absorb uncertainties and complexities in different contexts and domains. Three Self Management strategies are the content of this program:

- **Self Observation:** where the central part has been the creation of a tool named CLEHES© (Body, Language, Emotion, History, Eros, Silence), their conservation and missing in the distinctions for change and performance in an enactive way.
- **Observation of Orthogonal Interactions:** to maintain conversations of trust, cooperation, collaborative work and cohesion, in different domains and organizational contexts.
- **Observation of CLEHES Networks in an organizational context and their care taking**

---

1 CLEHES is an abbreviation in Spanish, and it will be used just as it is. The only letter that changes in English is the C (Cuerpo) that converts in B (Body)
1.1 Origins of the Program: managerial and educational dilemmas

One of the starting points we need to recognize to understand the managerial dilemma, is the fact that the manager is not only an instrument, a resource, a well trained element, or in the best case a professional; but also -and foremost- the manager is a human being. This leads us to the need to revise many concepts and distinctions.

A human being, as a living system, is determined by his structure, which means that every thing we experience, it occurs in our structure, and not beyond that (Maturana, 1993; Maturana & Varela, 1984; Varela, Thompson & Rosch, 1992).

Therefore, human beings do not perceive an objective reality, because whatever we perceive will be interpreted by our particular nervous system through senses, which are part of our structure. This is also related to the education and historical path that every one of us has acquired, because all we have learnt in our lives becomes part of our structure and generates a set of distinctions that affect the interpretation of what happens to us.

This is possible to do because human beings, and not any other living being, operate in language, which allows us not only to speak, to listen, to think or to interpret, but also to couple with other human beings, constituting conversational networks (Maturana, 1988). By coupling in language, our nervous system, and therefore, our body is triggered to change the disposition to act, and an emotional state is produced. On the other hand, emotions can trigger action as much as inhibit it.

Now, this manager, structurally state determined, blind and ignorant in all those domains he does not have distinctions and observing capacity, and whose disposition to act is determined by his emotional state, must deal with a much higher complexity than what he is capable by his own. Conversations we bring about markets, customers, new technologies and globalization are all sources of complexity and uncertainties of the environment that are constantly menacing the stability of our organizational systems, to which the manager is facing every day.

Besides, productive processes, sales, services, and any other activities are examples of the high complexity inside the human activity system, because they imply conversational networks. Even more, only one human being is already a source of enough complexity itself, and managers have to deal with many of them every moment.

Organizational problem situations have usually been managed by those called «hard methodologies» as structured problems, whose main characteristics are: goals definition easiness, taking decisions procedures clearness, and the possibility of quantify performance measurement. However, most of the problem situations show
up as organizational pains, ruptures, frustrations and mistakes, that appear as not structured problems, characterized by a difficult goals definition, qualitative performance measurements and the appearance of the human being, showing his/her body, emotions and actions in an irrational and contradictory way, to manage which «soft methodologies» are required.

Thus, the real organizational problem situations, in which managers invest most of their time, are not precisely goals definition or resources optimization, but the inability to mobilize human work teams. In this sense, Self Management can be considered as a strategy to improve managers’ performance and effectiveness in those domains of action where hard methodologies are not fully useful (Varela, 2000).

A few people who write about creativity and innovation would doubt that their crucial effect is the production of radical social change.

Historically, there has been an abuse of this kind of linear thinking, because the complexity of organizations has usually been associated to processes, which focus on the hard aspects of the problem situations, instead of paying attention to the people involved in them, and as a result, the human aspects remain hidden. Thus, “soft methodologies” arise as a more satisfactory alternative to confront organizational problems.

As human beings, we are listening and learning from history a circularity of creations in the world that we live in. We listen how the creation of the world has been done through our bodies, the language and all the inventions with and through the words. Evolution in our bodies from monkeys to our days: arts, sciences, religions as well as hard and soft creations in solved dilemmas.

Our emotions have allowed the invention of states, governments and enterprises. We know, or at least we have a critical mass of knowledge about the creation of products and services, as well as about their creation of value. However, we are far from knowing the process of creating ideas.

It may help looking back to our history as a linage: our biology says that we are vulnerable and underdeveloped creatures compared to animals. Animals are born complete: they know what to do and when; their life goes through the instincts direction, so their behaviour responds to a fixed and determined biological reaction. However, if we get close to the human being in evolutionary terms, we can find ideas and material creation. In effect, primates or specifically chimpanzees are able to create social behaviour as well as to manipulate objects and to create a tool, but they cannot cumuli creations and re-create over it.

Human beings are born incomplete and it takes a long time to mature as an independent organism: we depend upon the others through all our childhood; besides, our organism is opened, with an enormous adaptation capacity to any context or environmental condition. Our organism creates a dialog with the
environment, making changes and adjustments in both the organism and the environment.

Human beings are characterized by unspecific instincts (or impulses), without a direction, plastic and flexible, which has developed a tremendous capacity to absorb the environment complexity, distinguished by the ideas and technological creation and innovation. In these terms, we can say that the human being has a basic condition: it is able to “listen” to the world, giving it sense and meaning according to the interactions that he or she produces.

The openness of human beings refers to the many different states as behaviour possibilities, therefore cultural diversity rests in this characteristic, but more than that, it is possible to create multiple possibilities more “listening” to the new context conditions.

The basic phenomenon we can distinguish into this characteristic are learning and re-learning through conversation with others. In these terms, an interaction is a unique resource in human connivance which allows being, designing, creating and, consequently, changing the reality.

The interaction is a condition of human life and the human being. Interaction means “action with others” where conversations, consensus and conflict emerge as constructions in language, emotions and history, drawing a symbolic figuration of bodies in space. An interaction is like a choreography, where movements create a rhythm and a coherence with others, which can be disrupted when an actor changes its expectative.

Language, as we know now, is a life phenomenon which flows in our lineage’s history and constitutes the humane. The human being operates and lives into language creating realities or worlds, according to the observers we are. However, language can be a rigid system in terms that it is a product of cultural significance and has boundaries.

As an alternative, the body offers a more open space for interactions, which allows a more universal linkage among human beings. Sometimes, language is insufficient to communicate, because of its boundaries; instead, body can operate in a different channel, extending the interaction possibilities.

As long as the human being belongs to an interaction network, it provides him/her a singular view (observation) about the world: meanings and actions. As observers we build the reality following the order we learn through our interaction networks.

The observer constitutes from the individual experiences, social and cultural learning, personal history, opinions and desires. We live into interpretative worlds, according to the observers we are, and we act consequently.

We argue that this process, more than being an intellectual or rational effort, constitutes an Emotional-Erotical experience.
1.2. What are creativity and innovation?

We argue that creativity is a particular comment given by an observer in a particular context within a social domain. In this sense, another human being makes an interpretation of this and it is installed in his/her body.

Our bodies reinterpret our histories through language and emotions, with a silenced Eros create a difference inside us, called reality. This belongs to a community of observers and actors and to a specific time. This difference is a social gift.

The central questions are about the rupture and the psychical states and emotional space that trigger this particular comment given by this observer. Interruptions and flow are the key aspect of what we call design. Continuity and transparency, as well as negative and positive breakdowns, inhibit and disclosure different worlds we can bring to our bodies.

Innovation means that a human being brings to our history a new or a different world and this is installed in our bodies. It may be an economic fact, a technological production in a cultural context, a comment of value and satisfaction in the body of the client, or the citizen.

Innovation is related to a social and cultural impact, as long as it involves a significant group changes their choreographic interactions (think about mobile phones, the internet, or emotional intelligence as a new concept).

In this sense, creativity and innovation are movements in the observer, so they imply singular actions, each of them with different consequences.

The movements in the observer can be naturally produced when the individual can “listen” to its context and acts consequently or can be produced for an external and qualified observer; this opens a significant space for educational programs in any group, community or organization.

II. A particular CLEHES Methodology

We have experienced the above mentioned reality very closely, and we have tried to handle and to get a better understanding of it through several educational programs, from engineering and other disciplines and transdisciplines; and we have created some innovative tools and strategies to get into a learning process through this increasing complexity that allows us to dance through ruptures in a creative way.

Our methodology is based upon the understanding of human being as a unit and as a system which provides enormous opportunities to learn about ourselves, about the others and about the interactions networks in which we participate.

In this context, CLEHES represents the idea of a human being as a system, as a dynamic unit composed by six interactive and crisscrossing elements (Body,

The strategy proposed can be summarized as follows:

1. **Self Observation in CLEHES**: What to keep and what to transform of our CLEHES.
2. **Observation of Orthogonal Interactions**: The affective listening (listening with Eros), coupling in language and emotions with others.
3. **Observation of CLEHES Networks**: To see the structure of our conversational networks, and the resulting commitment networks in which we operate.

The main thrust of the methodology is to support participants throughout a process of development of an observer and actor. This is shown as a redesign of the network of relations in which they participate, and through the adjustment of their interactions with others. This process may adopt different forms according to the context of the intervention.

The design of the intervention basically attempts to create dramatic instances in which the participants go through a cycle of encounters, dis-encounters, accidents and surprises, not only concerning the others, but in their very own observation. The different episodes of the observer transformation process occur under different educational forms such as laboratories, workshops, automating writing, the development of poems and songs, coaching sessions, project review meetings, presentations, modelling, theatre composition and acting, scenographic and choreographic arrangements, audiovisual composition, report analysis, linguistic exercises, analytic and self observation home works, body observation and dancing (Lorac, 2002. This is what we have named RHPLA (Human Reengineering for Action) technologies and “Enactions and Effective Communication in High Management”.

The methodology is intended to expose people to situations that are new to them, in which they have little or no competence and where their functional expertise is not useful. It is a result of accepting that what occurs, occurs in the bodies of people through linguistic, emotional, historical, erotic, and silent coupling, and their crisscrossing interactions, therefore, it is not wise to restrict the interactions to the professional analytic type of languages that dominate the organizational conversations.

More than two thousand students have participated in this program, as well as people responsible for high management, CEO’s and policy makers in the transformation of their organizations. The purpose in this program is to create design conditions in articulate identities with autonomy, that is, an observer with the capacity of self regulation and self organizing through problem situations and
ruptures at the organizational or production systems that he or she is responsible for, in a continuous learning process.

2.1. CLEHES Strategy

1. Self Observation in CLEHES

CLEHES is an invitation to observe ourselves as organizational observers and actors, and to answer the question: How can we re-create/re-invent our living together, work together, develop our career and improve our performance? These open spaces allow the design, redesign and action in a continuous learning process once it is incorporated as a personal and organizational tool and methodology. Each capital letter represents one element of the system, and their crisscrossing interaction configures a space of design, redesign, self organizing, self regulation, autonomy and functional balance.

(C) Body

The body is our presence in interactions. Body contents us; it is the habitat of each one of the other components of CLEHES, and where they take place. It moves as a semantized unit, plenty of meaning. The way we move is the message we send, so the reality we create. We don’t need words, just a body to say who we are and what do we want. Some questions appear to ascertain in this element such as “am I taking care of my body?” “How does it appear in the different problem situations I must solve or dance into?” “Where would I like to put my body?” This last question involves the idea that the own presence (“where I put my body”) in a particular domain, place or situation contributes in a specific way to create my own stability and that of the environment, which gives a sense of belonging and identity.

(L) Language

As we already said, human beings live in language: our words create worlds. To understand our language as a reality building instrument moves the focus to our own responsibility for the interactions in which we move on. Each statement designs an interaction. So the point is how to incorporate more linguistic distinctions that allow redesigning and changing the interactions inside the organizations. Once again, some questions can facilitate our observation, such as: “How do I talk?”, “How do I listen?”, “How do I interpret?”, “What are my ‘favourite’ words?”, Just from the language, “am I inviting to create cooperative worlds?”. To observe our language means to observe the reality we create and to be responsible for that. To observe others’ language allows including distinctions as the interaction is going on and thus
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that specific reality opens widely to change. This tool opens a design and action opportunity and represents itself a powerful learning clue with us and with others.

(E) Emotion
Emotion means action. Every emotion: fear, pleasure, love, anxiety, anger, pain, sadness, trust, involve an action. As human beings, our language is crisscrossing with emotions and body, and this interaction shapes our psychic states. To observe our emotions opens the chance to move our condition once we can identify the relation between situation-interaction and emotion. The recognition of this element has been out of traditional educational programs and, moreover, it has been denied (because of the in force paradigm) as a way of knowledge and learning. Fortunately, many formal study centres are increasingly including emotions in management training. Observing emotions in an organization can provide of a cartography which has an enormous effect in the final results of interaction and company production. Emotions move us and move any organization to one way or another. We have the chance to recognize our own resources that allow us to produce the movement if we want to. The question is: “what do we want to conserve and what do we want to change?” The answer necessarily goes through a simple but deep observation, design, action and learning processes about ourselves and the organizations we belong to.

(H) History
The individual history appears as a very important element in our interaction networks. It is always there, even if we do not want it, and we usually make tremendous efforts to hide it. Our personal history, in spite of the past, is present and it speeds up continuously in our language, emotions and body. Our history reveals experiences, ruptures, good and bad memories, family education, right or wrong decisions, learning, things that shape our perception. In a wide sense, history betrays our cultural and personal identity. To observe our history, not in a therapist way but as the opportunity to re-interpret individually and collectively some events that affect our interactions also opens an interesting space of redesigning. Most of the organizations’ critical situations, in which people must make decisions in a tense environment, or when people must solve conflicts within or between other organizations, history appears as a hard brand which could open or close opportunities to assume the situation. To review personal history implicates to ask ourselves about those events that today paralyse or allow our interactions.

(E) Eros
OH! Eros. Greek culture understood Eros as a God and as the energy which moved human beings to create and modify the world. This means that human beings can go
farther than themselves, it means to go out for the others and to do something else than the sum of the parts. Eros reveals our sexual identity, but this energy also allows us to take care of others, to create intimacy and tenderness, to build imagination spaces and networks of trust. To create a company, to keep up marriage or friendship, to hold up your attention, Eros is required. It is not the same a relationship with eros and without eros. It is not the same a cooperative work or a team work with eros or without eros. When eros is not there, things are dark, negative, without shine and attraction. To observe our eros means to make connection with the energy inside us and to activate it in order to spread it for the others: relatives, job, and roles. Eros is also related with affective listening: all our senses are in the other person to capture him or her. Indeed, to observe our eros is to observe our listening capacity and thus our capacity to develop linkage with others.

(S) Silence
What can we learn about the sound of silence? Silence presents us a diversity meaning in interactions and it occurs voluntarily and involuntarily. Silence has been used for many societies as a strong message for undesirable people. Eskimo culture for example, used silence to say “we don’t want you anymore” and this message means the strongest punishment: exile and therefore, death. Silence can provoke tension or anger, but also can flow for a transcendental connection (prayer, meditation) or reflexive state. Silence is a stop, a pause that can invite to a quiet inside land. To keep silence could be sometimes the better way to solve or freeze a conflict. The use of silence in our interaction networks also reveals those things we want to hide or the missing talking. This last point has a very strong effect in organizations and people from a structural perspective, when we ask for example: “Which are those missing talking?”, “Which is the missing talking sense?”. Silence seems to make a situation or a person appear that it does not exist. From this point of view, the invisible thing is just an illusion, is still there affecting everything from the sound of silence.

Self Observation in CLEHES as a strategy leads into the question: “What would he or she like to conserve and what he or she would like to change of his/her own CLEHES?” The more distinctions a person incorporates to CLEHES, the more capacity to cope with complexity. In this way, to observe CLEHES and learning through it increases the individual and collective inventive to re-design individuals’ life and organizations’ life.

2. Observation of the Orthogonal Interactions
When we couple in language with other human beings through conversations, interactions between CLEHES are produced. Every CLEHES is different and
complex, so when a CLEHES couples with another, there is a high probability of incompatibility and collision. This situation constitutes a high complexity source and a challenge to people, because this coupling takes place in both a vertical and horizontal sense, that is to say, interactions with the boss, partners and subordinates, or interactions into an interdisciplinary work team, creating micro-identities in each case, and constituting organizational networks of conversations.

People need to observe and monitor these orthogonal interactions in order to maintain conversations with autonomy. This domain shows up competence to speak, to listen and to interpret. Particularly, listening becomes a crucial strategy, when this is an affective listening, or in other words, listening with eros. When we listen with eros, we are interacting from taking care of the other, which produce a set of favourable consequences, such as creativity, trust, cohesion, collaborative work, cooperation and solidarity. On the contrary, listening without eros means that we are interacting from negation of the other, which provoke fear, insecurity and inhibition.

Observation of orthogonal interactions leads to a continuous dance through ruptures and CLEHES collision, forcing to a learning process about those CLEHES components that generate incompatibilities, and therefore, attenuate organizational problem situations.

3. Observation of CLEHES Networks

This strategy is related to the structural adjustments of the organization, which implicate changes to the organizational identity, functional capacity, learning and adaptation mechanisms to absorb the complexity at different recursive levels within the contexts and domains to which an observer is coupled (Beer, 1979, 1994; Espejo, Bowling, Hoverstadt, 1999).

Some of the basic distinctions to observe in organizations are the following:

Identity: The process of organizational self reflection allows for the rising of questions in which people can examine the meaning of their work as an enhancement of the organization’s viability. The understanding of work in the light of the whole allows for discussion on the balance between the organizational policies and decision taking.

Distributed Management: As observers take care of multiple domains of action, networks of trust can be established to absorb the variety of contingent situations. The design of the networks involves the specific distribution of responsibilities to take care of complexity.

Complexity Unfolding: The understanding of viability allows for the proposition of a recursive structure of care that specifies domains of action that constitute the identity. This is the basic care structure.
Functional Capacity Unbalances: The concern for the gap between what is being done and what is possible reveals functional capacity unbalances regarding structure, the conversational network and technological support.

Organizational Learning Inhibitors: Establishing conditions for organizational learning requires building up the organization’s self reference capacity which could be triggered by the adequate design of conversational support. The design should consider “cultural” as well as technological inhibitors (Argyris & Schön, 1996).

Measurements: The “numbers” by which the system’s performance is assessed and activities measured are an expression of the prevailing organizational observer and an indication of the type of “system states” that will prompt adjustments to the system or corrections to the level of activities. The cohesion of the reporting structure to the perceived problem situations and to system’s performance is another measurement of possible blindness of the observer and an indication of what aspects of the organization remain “hidden”.

The development of the observer is characterized by the acquisition of CLEHES competences functional to organizational care. As people have different histories, experiences and concerns, a human activity system can be characterized as a system of organizational observers.

Therefore, solution for action results from the crisscrossing of conversational networks constituting the system of organizational observers and the psychic states aroused by their interaction.

2.2. Cases Studies

CLEHES, as an educational program, has been applied in different areas such as: high management (companies, governments), conflict mediation (family, schools, communities), educational curriculums (engineering, counselling), employability, (graduated and professionals), overcoming of the poverty (poor communities, school model in Haiti) (García & Saavedra, 2006). Each one of these programs has focused in a specific problem situation experienced by the CLEHES of the participants and has developed skills for observation, self observation and design of new interaction. One of the main efforts of these programs is in inviting the participants to open new conversations and to risk themselves to design actions non-explored from observing the context where it is acted.

From those experiences we can say that to take a look to the fears and distrusts with others, is an interesting space to open the transformation and being responsibly “insolent”, in the sense that the people can break the behaviour that is assumed as natural, correct or adapted but that nevertheless, he/she has brought pain and malaise because he/she cultivates the fear and the distrust. From ours to observe, people are
involved in relations that cause dissatisfaction but that they cultivate themselves under the premise of the resignation. CLEHES invites to move from the resentment and resignation to the design and the enaction.

Many laboratories and consultancies have been done in different organizations and human activity systems, where these new educational tools have been applied with amazing results, in their organizational transformation processes. An emblematic case is the implementation of this program in a very large global miner company. The main steps of the methodology used in this case were the following:

1. Characterization of managers as observers in the domains of CLEHES.
2. Recreation of the organization's identity and functional capacity.
3. Building up of the observation capacity in cognitive maps, references, indexes, system's performance and learning configurations.
4. Direct coaching and mentoring of managers.
6. Study of the organizational narratives regarding the past (history), the future (vision), and the present (diagnosis).
8. Structural adjustment design.

The first step was oriented toward the creation of a common language regarding the characterization of the organization and the main problem situations. This was done by performing an organizational diagnosis which included a series of debates with middle and top management. A set of structural conditions that appeared to inhibit learning was found, such us strong hierarchical relationships, cushioned face to face criticism (except in the case of long standing personal relationships), the lack of conversational networks throughout the company (except the ones required for operations), the architecture and status tradition favoured separate offices that inhibited people from knowing what was going on in other areas. After several months of interactions and continuous observation and action in a “learning by doing” process, the following adjustments were implemented:

- The re-orientation of an operational centred organization to a business oriented enterprise.
- The distributed reorganization of products and portfolio of products and its relation with clients and productive divisions.
- The creation of new business units as a result of the decision to measure performance.
- Redesign of the CLEHES networks and creation of new instances for cooperation between the commercial unit, the corporate planning unit and the Mining Divisions.
- Re-design of the business and client support networks.
- Re-design and implementation of day to day practices.
- Re-design of corporative policies, standards and regulations.

In this case, Self Management strategies were applied in different organizational observers and actors. Self observation process, as well as observation of others in the context of this particular CLEHES network finds closure when it finally leads people to make decisions and taking actions, provoking an organizational transformation process, and consequently, an organizational performance improvement.

2.3 Learning and Final Remarks

A different approach to face human dilemmas based on education has been proposed in this paper. Experience demonstrates that complexity increases, and there is none effective tool that allows to deal with it. The majority of organizational problem situations we experience are triggered by a disagreement about needs, purposes, performance measurements or resources scarcity. This disagreement is not only because of lack of information, but mainly because of a constitutive and interpretative incompatibility in the perceptions of the problem. In this sense, the invention of CLEHES as an innovative tool creates and allows the conditions for creating and innovating and as a Self Management strategy constitutes a significant contribution which advantages are many:

- CLEHES is for free, it inherently belongs to us.
- CLEHES is invariant, it stays with us from our birth until our death.
- CLEHES can be educated by acquiring distinctions, which increases our own variety and allows to absorb the complexity that surrounds us.
- CLEHES can be used in many creativity and innovation domains and organizational contexts. It is not restricted to organizations, but it is applicable to any human activity system we are part of.
- CLEHES allows us to solve or to attenuate problem situations and dance through ruptures
- CLEHES configurates a designing space.

Although a tremendous effort have been done in the development of mathematical models, optimization and automatization through years and we have also experienced a large progress in information and communications technologies development, and their support in decision support systems, it is hard to believe that
those tools can solve our daily problems by their own, or maybe allows us an automatic adaptation through digital age. In this context, domains pertaining to the sphere of intimate or personal experiences, that is CLEHES experiences, are recognized as an invaluable source for the adaptation process by developing the organizational observer and actor. Having CLEHES skills by acquiring CLEHES distinctions, can make the difference between doing and not doing things. However, is difficult to talk about this kind of things in an organizational context, because the fear to become exposed and vulnerable arises.

On the other hand, the inclusion of artistic and ludic techniques as an educational methodology helps to change the view of different and unknown situations, enhancing the disposition to action, enaction and the possibility of dancing through them, obtaining as a consequence structural adjustments and redesign of the emotional and conversational networks, as well as the improvement of the organizational performance as a final result.

Finally, we believe that CLEHES constitutes a powerful tool, that allows creating value in all human activity domains, but is still in its earliest stages of development, which invites to a continuous learning process and a further philosophical, transdisciplinary and technological research oriented to improve our performance in daily life and our stability as organization’s building human beings.
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