Unfinishedness as a Method — Why early states are powerful

From Draft to Commitment: A conceptual Model and Design Principles from framed Provisionality

Author: Marc Bischof (ORCID: 0009-0004-3346-0000)
Contact: Marc.Bischof@archimetis.de
Series: Archimetis Working Papers
Type: Archimetis Essay (AE)
Paper ID: AE-2026-02-en
Version: 1.0.0
Date: 17. März 2026
Canonical Home: https://archimetis.de/en/thinkspace/working-papers/unfinishedness
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18825864

Notes & Transparency

- A versioned, citable reference version (not peer-reviewed) is deposited on Zenodo in the *Archimetis Working Papers* series. Should a journal version be accepted, the Zenodo record will be linked to the version of record. Further research texts and practice formats are documented separately.
- English translation of the German original:
  Unfertigkeit als Methode — warum Anfangszustände kraftvoll sind https://archimetis.de/denkraum/working-papers/unfertigkeit

Abstract

Unfinishedness works — not despite, but because of its openness. In organizations it is often treated as a flaw: as something one must hide, smooth over or „think through to completion first“. Yet early states carry a distinctive power. They keep possibility spaces open, make assumptions visible and allow ealry cource corrections before they become expensive.

This paper treats unfinishedness as a method. Not as sloppiness or an excuse, but as a deliberately designed mode of working. It develops a conceptual mechanism model showing how framed provisionality, through visibility,versioning, participation and clear transitions, affects learning behavior, ownership and implementation quality. From this, testable propositions and practical design principles are derived, including boundary conditions under which unfinishedness can tip into dysfunction. In archimetic terms: we mark the rough structure instead of presenting it as a facade. And we learn early, so that change does not later turn into a repair shop.

Keywords

Archimetis, unfinishedness, early state, prototype, versioning, psychological safety, organizational learning, sensemaking, exploration/exploitation, complexity, architecture of attention, metis, coherence

1 Blueprint

1.1 Problem statement: When the facade comes before the rough structure

Organizations have a pronounced relationship with finishedness. Finishedness soothes, signales competence and reduces exposure. In change contexts, this produces a familiar reflex: the beginning should look like the end. Drafts quickly become plans, sketches become target pictures, hypotheses become commitments.

The paradox change comes with no guarantee of finishedness. Where the environment is dynamic, early commitments are often not an expression of clarity, but of tension. And where finishedness is simulated, a secondary mode of work emerges later: repair communication, reinterpretation, resistance — the theater of retrospective legitimation.

The counter-proposal suggested here is: unfinishedness as a method. A designed early state that does not destabilize, but creates orientation, through marking, versioning, participation and clear transitions.

1.2 Aim of the paper

This working paper pursues three aims:

1. Conceptual: define unfinishedness as a method as framed provisionality (not as a deficit) and distinguish it from arbitrariness, sloppiness and permanent provisionality
2. Theoretical-practical: formulate a mechanism logic for how early states, via framing/format, shape the architecture of attention and how visibility/versioning, via psychological safety, influence learning behavior, ownership and implementation quality
3. Design-oriented: offer propositions and design principles, including boundary conditions, that show when the method works and when it tips into dysfunction

2 Contribution

The contribution of this paper can be bundled into four points:

- It defines unfinishedness as a method as framed provisionality and distinguishes it from arbitrariness, sloppiness and permanent provisionality.
- It develops a conceptual mechanism model explaining how early states, via framing/format, influecne learning behavior, ownership and implementation quality.
- It offers propositions and design principles that structure empirical follow-up work and show when unfinishedness works and when it tips.
- It situates unfinishedness as a practice of attention architecture, as the operating mode of metis-guided navigation-in-motion and as a contribution to the organization of the soul/coherence.

Thus unfinishedness is not described merely as an attitude, but defined as a scientifically connectable and practically operationalizable form of design.

3 Methodological note (position of the text)

This paper is a conceptual theory and model contribution. It connects research lines from organizational learning, sensemaking, psychological safety and complexity logic with archimetic theory work (architecture of attention, metis, coherence/soul) and condenses them into a model, propositions and design principles.

It does not claim to present a new empirical study. It aims for conceptual precision, mechanism clarity and connectability as a building block within a larger canon „architecture of thinking“.

4 Theoretical background (connections / related work)

4.1 Psychological safety as a condition for learning

Unfinishedness is made-visble not-knowing. It is therefore always an interpersonal risk („I am showing something that is not yet solid“). Psychological safety describes the climate in which such risks are possible without sanctions and links this to learning behavior in team [4].

4.2 Organizational learning: Exploration vs. Exploitation

Unfinishedness is structurally tied to the tension between exploration (searching for the new) and exploitation (using what is proven). While exploration causes short-term costs and typically pays off only with delay, exploitation yields immediate return but can endanger long-term adaptibility [7].

4.3 Sensemaking: Meaning emerges in motion

Early state frame how an initiative is understood. Sensemaking describes the ongoing construction of meaning that structures perception and action [12]. Unfinishedness as a method is therefore also a sensemaking practice: it keeps frames negotiable before they silently harden into „reality“.

4.4 Complexity: Context logics instead of one-size-fits-all methods

In complex situations, „best practices“ fail more often and learning-in-motion becomes central. Context logics (e.g. Cynefin) make it plausible that approach and decision logic are context-dependent [10]. Unfinishedness as a method is especially effective where complexity is high and where early hypotheses are faster than early certainties.

4.5 Design practices: Design thinking & prototyping

Design work does not treat sketches and prototypes as „unfinished products“, but as a form of thinking. Design thinking describes an approach that systematically uses iterative learning and prototyping [3]

4.6 Learning as a participation: Situated learning

Learning is also a social movement from the periphery toward legitimate participation [6]. Early involvment in the „rough structure“ can strengthen participation and responsibility binding.

4.7 Reflective practice

Professionalism is not only rule application, but thinking-in-action (reflection-in-action) [9]. Unfinishedness as a method is an organizational equivalent: the organization allows thinking in doing, rather than treating thinking only as upfront planning.

5 Delimitation: What the literature explains and what is added here

The cited lines provide important building blocks, but leave open a gap that is central to change work:

- [4] explains conditions for learning (psychological safety), but not the design of provisionality as an artifact and communication practice.
- [7] explains the exploration/exploitation tension, but not the micro-mechanics by which transitions (decision gates) are stabilized in everyday work.

- [12] explains framing/sensemaking, but not the concrete design of versioning/visibility that reduces expectation breaks.
- [3] provides prototyping as a practice, but not as design principles integrated into organizational learning, sensemaking and governance.
- [6] explains participation as learning, but not its coupling to ownership/commitment and transition logic in change contexts.
- [9] explains reflective professionalism, but not the organization-wide institutionalization of such reflection via artifacts (version, logs, prototype).

This paper targets exactly this gap: it translates the literature into an integrated mechanism model and derives testable propositions and design principles for unfinishedness as a method.

6 Concept clarification: Unfinishedness as a method

6.1 Working definition

Unfinishedness as a method denotes a deliberately framed early state in which

- provisionality is visibly marked
- development is kept traceable through versions
- participation is opened as genuine co-creation
- transitions to commitment are explicitly organized

Dimensions (operationalizable):

- Visibility: status markers (draft/version/traffic light), explicit declaration of the conversation mode (exploration vs. decision).
- Versioning: traceable iterations including reasons for changes (learning log)
- Participation: real co-creation latitude (not merely a feedback ritual)
- Transitions: explicit consolidation and decision gates as well as stabilization after a decision

6.2 Outcomes (briefly defined)

- Expectation breaks: retrospective conflicts about „what was decided“, visible in rework/escalations
- Learning behavior: forming hypotheses, testing, reflecting, adapting [4], [9]
- Ownership/commitment: psychological binding to „this is also mine“ and the resulting action [8]
- Implementation quality: quality of coordination, collaboration and goal attainment in implementation [5]
- Coherence: fit between inside (experience/reality) and outside (narrative/artifacts) — here understood as an integration outcome

6.3 Delimitation

Unfinishedness as a method is not: sloppiness, arbitrariness, permanent provisionality or responsability avoidance.
It is: a form of professionalism that lowers learning costs under uncertainty, creates ownership and reduces later repair costs.

7 Model: How unfinishedness works (mechanism logic)

7.1 Core assumption

Early states encode direction. Not (only) through decisions, but through the first invitation: format, tone, sequence, participation — i.e. through attention, meaning and belonging [12].

7.2 The quiet mechanism: The room fills up

An early state is like an empty room. What is placed in it first shapes how the room is later used:

- stage → audience
- round table → participation
- org chart → strcutural thinking
- metric → proof logic
- question → exploration

This „furnishing“ is rarely explicit and yet functions as an architecture of attention and thus as early steering of sensemaking [12].

7.3 Mechanism path (text model)

- Input: early state (high malleability, high uncertainty)
- Method (dimension): visibility, versioning, participation, transitions
- Mechanism A (architecture of attention): framing/format directs attention, relevance and conversation mode [12]
- Mechanism B (safety → learning): psychological safety enables learning behavior [4]
- Mechanism C (ownership): co-creation produces psychological ownership and commitment [8]
- Mechanism D (stabilization): transitions translate exploration into exploitation [7] and operationalize the core of the method: from draft to commitment without destroying the learning space
- Outputs: fewer expectation breaks/rework, higher implementation quality, higher coherence, higher adaptability

Moderators: context domain (complexity), regulation, time pressure, power asymmetries and baseline level of psychological safety [4], [10].

8 Propositions (testable statements and mechasnism justification)

The following propositions are formulated such that they would be empirically testable (case studies, surveys, process metrics). Under each proposition is a brief mechanism justification.

P1 (visibility): The more visibly provisionality is marked (draft/version/status), the lower the likelihood of later expectation breaks and conflicts about „what had already been decided“ [12].
Mechanism: Visibility stabilizes the meaning frame („what mode are we in?“) and reduces contradictory interpretations that later surface as conflict/rework [12].

P2 (Versioning x psychological safety): Versioning increases learning capability because changes become traceable. This effect is moderated by psychological safety (high = amplified, low = weakened) [4].
Mechanism: Versioning makes development walkable. Psychological safety determines whether

people openly contribute errors/changes or whether versioning becomes formal documentation without learning [4].

P3 (Participation → ownership): Early participation increases ownership only when decision latitude is real. Symbolic participation increases cynicism and resistance [8].
Mechanism: Psychological ownership arises through control/influence and invested self. It influence is merely performative, investment lacks efficacy and becomes fertile ground for alienation [8].

P4 (Transition): Without explicit transitions from exploration to decision, unfinishedness tips into persistent uncertainty and reduces performance — especially under time pressure [7], [10].
Mechanism: Exploration without transition consumes attention budget and undermines reliability. Under time pressure, the tendency toward conflict, defensiveness and opportunistic pseudo-finishedness increases [7], [10].

P5 (Complexity as moderator): Unfinishedness as a method yields the greatest benefit in complex contexts and a smaller benefit in simple/standardized contexts [10].
Mechanism: In complex domains, cause-effect is only clear in hindsight. Early hypotheses and fast learning loops are superior. In simple domains, standardization is more efficient than continous drafting [10].

P6 (Sensemaking frame): Early framing shapes later acceptance more strongly than later communication campaigns. Unfinishedness works here because it keeps frames negotiable [12].
Mechanism: Early meaning offerings become silent premises. When unfinishedness keeps these premises visible, sensemaking can be corrected before it hardens into identities and fronts [12].

P7 (Reflection-in-action): Teams that use unfinishedness as a method show reflection-in-action behavior (formulating hypotheses, testing, adapting) more often than teams that simulate finishedness early [9].
Mechanism: Framed provisionality legitimizes thinking-in-doing. Pseudo-finishedness shifts reflection into justification [9].

P8 (Participation → implementation quality): The earlier people are brought into the „rough structure“, the more their role shifts from observation to legitimate participation, which increases implementation quality [6], [5].
Mechanism: Participation produces competence and belonging [6] and improves coordination/communication as core dimensions of implementation quality [5].

9 Design principles

D1: The beta sign (visibility)

Mark provisionality consitently: working draft, draft, v0.3, traffic-light status (green/yellow/red). Aim: expectation management, conflict prevention, clarification of the space [12].

D2: Versioning as a learning protocol (versioning)

Versioning is not merely file handling, but a transparency practise: What changed — and why? Aim: make learning loops traceable [4].

D3: Clarify assumptions instead of fighting opinions (assumption work)

Every sketch rests on assumptions. Make them explicit and test them early. Aim: move conflict to the level of assumptions (testable) rather than to the level of persons (political) [9], [12].

D4: Prototypes instead of programs (prototyping)

When uncertainty is high, decouple learning from large investments: small prototypes in safe zones. Design thinking provides an established logic of iterative learning [3].

D5: Transitions as an integrity act (transitions)

Exploration needs an end. Define consolidation and decision (decision gates) and make commitment visible as an artifact, not merely as an implicit expectation [7]. Minimal standard:

- Decision record: What is decided, what remains open, which assumptions hold, by when will it be refined?
- Baseline: From here on, this is the binding working basis. Changes occur only via a clear adjustment mode (e.g., new version + justified switch).

10 Boundary conditions: When unfinishedness does not work (or only to a limited extent)

10.1 Contracindications

- Acute crises/chaotic situations: stabilize first, then explore [10].
- High-risk operations without a sandbox: unfinishedness only in shielded test environments.
- Regulatorily „frozen“ areas: unfinishedness only within clear approval boundaries (draft $\neq$ approved).
- Strongly asymmetric power relations without protected spaces: visible unfinishedness may sanctioned (psychological safety low) [4].

10.2 Protective mechanisms

- Stability islands: not everything may wobble at once
- Separate spaces: exploration space $\neq$ decision body
- Explicit responsabilitites: who keeps it open, who decides, who carries implementation?
- Transparent criteria: how do we recognize decision readiness? [7]

11 Canon positioning: Unfinishedness in the architecture of thinking

In the archimetic canon, „unfinishedness“ is not a side motif, but a coupling element. It connects attention (what is seen?), metis (how do we navigate what is in motion?) and soul/coherence (may reality be visible?).

- Architecture of attention: unfinishedness shifts attention from surface to assumptions [12]. It protects against placing facade rough structure.
- Metis: Metis is the intelligence of navigating change while it is still in motion. Unfinishedness becomes navigable when transitions, dosages and test are set wisely.
- Organization of the soul / coherence: Unfinishedness touches belonging. When unfinishedness may be visible, performative pressure decreases and coherence between inside and outside becomes more likely [4].

12 Discussion

12.1 Implications for leadership and governance

Unfinishedness as a method requires governance that can distinguish between exploration and decision. Leadership appears here not only as an „answer-giver“, but as a space-holder. It endures provisionality without losing the group and closes it when maturity is reached [7]. Context logics such as Cynefin help treat this distinction not as a style question, but as a situational question [10].

12.2 Limitations: Boundaries of this contribution

This paper is conceptual. From this follow specific limitations:

1. Endogeneity / selection problem: teams with already high psychological safety are more likely to use unfinishedness as a method. Thus the observed effect (unfinishedness → learning) can partially be reversed (safety → use of unfinishedness) [4].
2. Contruct validity / cultural readings: „unfinishedness“ may be interpreted differently across organizational cultures (as an invitation vs. as a signal of incompetence). Effects of the visibility dimension therefore vary.
3. Context and power moderation: power asymmetries and sanction expectations can block the method (e.g., intermediate states are used politically). This paper names power as a moderator but does not model it fully.
4. Causal-path complexity: outcomes such as a coherence and adaptability are multi-stage constructs. The model is deliberately parsimonious and may understate important intermediate variables (e.g., identiy, intergroup trust) [12].

12.3 Research and practice questions (for the canon)

- How can transitions from exploration → decision be designed reliably in committees without suffocating learning windows? [7]
- Which minimal „scaffolds“ increase psychological safety without bureaucratization? [4]
- How do ownership mechanisms work under symbolic participation and how can tokenism be detected early? [8]
- How do teamwork quality and implementation quality change when early unfinishedness is made systematically visible? [5]

12.4 Implications for measurement/evaluation (operationalization)

P2 (psychological safety): Measurable via established team items. Expected relationship to learning behavior [4]

P4 (transitions/transition quality): Process metrics on decision gates, cycle times, number of open topics. Theoretically frameable as the allocation problem of exploration/exploitation [7]

P3/P8 (ownership): Measureable as psychological ownership/commitment. Theoretical anchor: psychological ownership [8]

„cheap correction“ argument: error-cost escalation as an analogue [2], [9]

12.5 Implications

Theoretical implications

- The contribution connects psychological safety (condition for learning) and sensemaking (framing) in an integrated model. Unfinishedness is thus not only captured as a „state“, but as a designable construct with dimensions (visibility, versioning, participation, transitions).
- Propositions enable the shift from narrative plausibility to testable claims and open empirical test (case/survey/process data)

Practical implications

- The five design principles (beta sign, versioning, assumption work, prototypes, transitions) form a minimal, implementable set
- Boundary conditions show that unfinishedness does not mean „more openness“, but safely framed provisionality that does not displace stability, but organizes it deliberately

13 Summary

This conceptual paper described unfinishedness as a method as a designable form of framed provisionality and addressed a widespread organizational reflex: beginnings are often treated as if they must already deliver end states — especially under uncertainty, where learning and course correction would be decisive. The central finding is: early states are powerful because they encode attention and meaning early. When provisionality is made visible, versioned, participatory and stabilized through transitions, better conditions arise for learning, ownership and implementation quality.

Theoretically, the contribution integrates psychological safety as a condition for learning [4], organizational learning as the exploration/exploitation tension [7], sensemaking as a framing process [12], complexity logics as a context moderator [10], as well as ownership/participation as appropriation mechanisms [6], [8]. From this, a mechanism model was derived and translated into propositions that are testable in empirical designs.

Practically, five robust design impluses follow: (1) mark provisionality visibly, (2) keep versioning as a learning protocol, (3) make assumptions explicit and testable, (4) use prototype as low-cost learning, (5) explicitly organize transitions from exploration to decision [3], [7]. Under complex conditions, this practice is expected to reduce rework and increase implementation quality. In strongly regulated or psychologically unsafe enviroments, protective spaces (sandboxes, stability island, separate decision spaces) must come first [4], [10]. The limitations lie in endogeneity, cultural readings of unfinishedness and power moderation not fully modeled — as open fields for empirical follow-up work.

Overall, the paper argues that professional change work consists less in simulating finishedness early and more on framing drafts such that commitment with ownership can emerge. Unfinishedness as a method is therefore not the opposite of commitment, but its lead-in under uncertainty: a designed early state that enables learning and prepares commitment before implementation turns into repair.

Takeawy: Unfinishedness is not the deficit before the result. It is the space in which possibility becomes reality, as long as correction is still cheap [2], [11].

14 Glossary (brief)

Unfinishedness as a method: framed provisionality (visible, versioned, participatory, with transitions)

Early state: phase of high malleability of attention, meaning, and belonging [12]

Prototype: small, real test for early learning [3]

Versioning: making development stages and learning paths visible [6]

Psychological safety: climate in which questions, errors, and learning are possible without fear [4]

Exploration/exploitation: tension between searching and using knowledge [7]

15 Reading trails (curated follow-up literature)

1. Psychological safety & learning in teams [4]
2. Exploration vs. exploitation [7]
3. Complexity vs. context logics [10]
4. Sensemaking [12]
5. Design thinking / prototyping [3]
6. Situated learning / legitimate peripheral participation [6]
7. Reflective practice [9]
8. Psychological ownership [8]
9. Teamwork quality [5]
10. Cost of late errors / rework escalation [2], [11]
11. Organizational learning II [1]

Literatur

[1] Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method and practice*. Addison-Wesley.

[2] Boehm, B. W. (1981). *Software engineering economics*. Prentice-Hall.

[3] Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. *Harvard Business Review, 86*(6), 84–92.

[4] Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

[5] Hoegl, M., & Gemuenden, H. G. (2001). Teamwork quality and the success of innovative projects: A theoretical concept and empirical evidence. *Organization Science, 12*(4), 435–449. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.4.435.10635

[6] Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

[7] March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science, 2*(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71

[8] Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2001). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 298–310. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2001.4378028

[9] Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.

[10] Snowden, D. J., & Boone, M. E. (2007). A leader's framework for decision making. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(11), 68–76.

[11] Stecklein, J. M. (2004). *Error cost escalation through the project life cycle* (Report No. JSC-CN-8435). NASA Johnson Space Center.

[12] Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. SAGE.

Recommended citation (APA)

Bischof, M. (2026). Unfinishedness as a Method — Why early states are powerful (AE-2026-02-en, Version 1.0.0. Archimetis Working Papers. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18825864)

Short form: Bischof (2026), AE-2026-02-en, 1.0.0, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18825864

Document history

- v1.0.0 (18 Mar 2026): First publication.