

COMPLEXITY AND  
MANAGEMENT

ROUTLEDGE

# The Complexity of Consultancy

Exploring Breakdowns Within Consultancy Practice

Edited by Nicholas Sarra, Karina Solsø and Chris Mowles



“To the extent that consultancy involves immersing oneself in an alien (client) environment so as to elicit a feel for the culture and relational dynamics of that setting, it represents a derivative – albeit commercial – form of ethnography. What better method, then, to explore the practice of consultancy itself? Furthermore, and as the editors of this volume rightly observe, the complexity and uncertainty of everyday consultancy life belies the orderliness and linearity of consultancy technique prescribed in mainstream management literature. The (auto)ethnographic methods advanced collectively by the contributors of this book takes aim at this tension. This volume makes for a read that is genuinely insightful, rewarding, and pedagogically rich.”

**Dr. Tom Vine**, Associate Professor, University of Suffolk, and editor,  
*Ethnographic Research and Analysis: Anxiety, Identity and Self*

“This timely book is for reflective managers as well as consultants who are unconvinced or disillusioned by conventional wisdom. It proposes a ‘grown up’ approach that moves away from the easy idealizations and simplifications of organizational realities and consultancy interventions. Based upon insights born of curiosity and lived experience, each chapter deals with the ‘dirt’ and explores the ‘shadows’ of organizing and managing. Emphasizing the importance of increased self-understanding and deeper sense-making, this path-breaking book urges and advances the adoption of more thoughtful, less self-defeating means of grappling with the demanding, contradictory practices of managing and consulting.”

**Prof. Hugh Willmott**, Bayes Business School

“How stimulating to encounter a text that probes those discomforting experiences that arise during consulting processes, and, rather than explaining them away or trying to avoid them, shows how discussing these frankly and thoughtfully unearths a fertile ground for informing ethical action.”

**Dr. Patricia Shaw**, Co-founder of the Doctor of Management  
Programme at University of Hertfordshire

“A unique book, based in the autoethnographic experience of its contributors, this collection provides a richly nuanced and reflexively theorised insight into the complex reality of everyday consultancy practice. It is essential reading for practitioners, researchers and students.”

**Prof. Ian Burkitt**, University of Bradford



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# THE COMPLEXITY OF CONSULTANCY

Consultancy is a lucrative industry dependent on the production and use of tools and techniques which hold out the promise of success for the organisations it supports: transformation, or greater efficiency and effectiveness, perhaps even culture change. However, a critical and important question is whether these promises are fulfilled in everyday practice in organisations. Is it possible at all for consultants to predict and control the changes that their clients ask for? This volume reframes the role of consultants from detached observers wielding a stable body of knowledge useful in all contexts, to that of skilled participants in the conscious and unconscious processes of organisational life.

In this book, one of three in a series looking at complexity and management, the expert authors bring together their experiences to provide vibrant accounts of how to lead in everyday organisational situations using practical judgement. The book includes a brief historical introduction to complexity and leadership, real-world narratives illustrating concrete dilemmas in the workplace, and a concluding chapter that draws together the practical and theoretical implications.

With both theoretical grounding and practical insights from managers and consultants in leading firms, this is an ideal resource for executives and students on leadership development and talent management programmes, as well as those undertaking higher education courses in leadership and consulting.

**Nicholas Sarra** works as a Consultant Psychotherapist within the NHS. He is also a Visiting Professor at Hertfordshire Business School, University of Hertfordshire, and affiliated with a number of programmes at Exeter University. He is a member of the Institute of Group Analysis.

**Karina Solso** is a Self-employed Organisational Consultant in Denmark working with organisational change and leadership development. She is also a Visiting Lecturer at Hertfordshire Business School, University of Hertfordshire.

**Chris Mowles** is Professor of Complexity and Management at Hertfordshire Business School, University of Hertfordshire.

## **Complexity and Management**

Series Editor: Chris Mowles, University of Hertfordshire, UK

### **The Complexity of Consultancy**

Exploring Breakdowns within Consultancy Practice

*Edited by Nicholas Sarra, Karina Solsø and Chris Mowles*

### **Complexity and Leadership**

*Edited by Kiran Chauhan, Emma Crewe and Chris Mowles*

### **Complexity and the Public Sector**

*Edited by Chris Mowles and Karen Norman*

For more information about this series, please visit: [www.routledge.com/  
Complexity-and-Management/book-series/CM](http://www.routledge.com/Complexity-and-Management/book-series/CM)

# THE COMPLEXITY OF CONSULTANCY

---

Exploring Breakdowns Within  
Consultancy Practice

*Edited by*  
*Nicholas Sarra,*  
*Karina Solsø and Chris Mowles*

Cover image: Getty Images / Giorez

First published 2023

by Routledge

4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge

605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2023 selection and editorial matter, Nicholas Sarra, Karina Solsø and Chris Mowles; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Nicholas Sarra, Karina Solsø and Chris Mowles to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Names: Sarra, Nicholas, editor. | Solsø, Karina, editor. | Mowles, Chris, editor.

Title: The complexity of consultancy : exploring breakdowns within consultancy practice / edited by Nicholas Sarra, Karina Solsø and Chris Mowles.

Description: Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2023. | Series: Complexity and management | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022011265 (print) | LCCN 2022011266 (ebook) Subjects:

LCSH: Business consultants. | Management. | Leadership.

Classification: LCC HD69.C6 C5866 2023 (print) | LCC HD69.C6 (ebook) |

DDC 658.4/6—dc23/eng/20220314

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022011265>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022011266>

ISBN: 978-0-367-54470-6 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-367-55980-9 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-09594-1 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003095941

Typeset in Joanna  
by codeMantra

# CONTENTS

List of contributors	ix
Preface to the Complexity and Management series: The key ideas of complex responsive processes of relating and their recent development	xi
Acknowledgements	xxi
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
KARINA SOLSØ AND NICHOLAS SARRA	
<b>1 Moving beyond neutrality: recognising the moral agency of the consultant through reflexive inquiries into shame</b>	<b>16</b>
KIRAN CHAUHAN	
<b>2 Consulting: facilitation and shame: working together to avoid challenges to our sense of self in the recognition of others</b>	<b>38</b>
GRAHAM CURTIS	
<b>3 What are consultants actually recognised for?</b>	<b>60</b>
ERIC WENZEL	

<b>4</b>	<b>Actualising plurality: an Arendtian perspective on responding to powerlessness and loss of freedom</b>	<b>83</b>
	KARINA SOLSØ	
<b>5</b>	<b>Collaboration as a politics of affect</b>	<b>105</b>
	ROBBERT MASSELINK	
<b>6</b>	<b>Selling ourselves short: marketing the self strategically: towards success beyond recognition</b>	<b>127</b>
	JACQUELINE JANSSEN	
	<b>Conclusion: summarizing reflections on the practice of consultancy</b>	<b>153</b>
	KARINA SOLSØ AND NICHOLAS SARRA	
	Index	163

# CONTRIBUTORS

**Kiran Chauhan** is an Organisational Consultant at The King's Fund, a health and care policy think tank in the UK. He is also a Visiting Lecturer at Hertfordshire Business School, University of Hertfordshire, UK. Kiran graduated as Doctor of Management from the University of Hertfordshire in 2019.

**Graham Curtis** is a Senior Organisation Development Consultant at Roffey Park Institute, an organisation, leadership and executive development centre based in Sussex, UK. Graham graduated as Doctor of Management from the University of Hertfordshire in 2018.

**Jacqueline Janssen** is a Self-employed Consultant in the Netherlands, where she collaborates in Public-Private Partnerships and practice-based research. She graduated as Doctor of Management from the University of Hertfordshire in 2016.

**Robbert Masselink** is an Organisational Consultant at het Zuiderlicht, a consultancy firm in the Netherlands. He is a Lecturer at the Business University of Nyenrode and a Visiting Lecturer at the University of Groningen and the University of Utrecht. Robbert graduated as Doctor of Management from the University of Hertfordshire in 2019.

**Karina Solso** is a Self-employed Organisational Consultant in Denmark working with organisational change and leadership development. She is also a Visiting Lecturer at Hertfordshire Business School, University of Hertfordshire, UK. She graduated as Doctor of Management from the University of Hertfordshire in 2016.

**Eric Wenzel** is a Senior Partner in a globally operating HR consulting firm, where he focuses on board advisory services, such as executive coaching, top team development and transformation consulting. He graduated as Doctor of Management from the University of Hertfordshire in 2012.

# **PREFACE TO THE COMPLEXITY AND MANAGEMENT SERIES**

## **THE KEY IDEAS OF COMPLEX RESPONSIVE PROCESSES OF RELATING AND THEIR RECENT DEVELOPMENT**

Chris Mowles

Our experience at work tells us that we make plans but they rarely turn out as we intended. We communicate as clearly as we can, but we are still often misunderstood. Even when acting with the best of intentions we can cause harm. Sometimes, leaders and managers become brutally aware that they may be in charge, but they are not always in control because work life has the quality of being predictably unpredictable. Management training and education has become much more widespread in the last 30 years, yet still largely relies on assumptions of predictability and control. Often dealing with abstractions and idealisations, the majority management discourse rests on assumptions of an orderly world where leaders and managers propose and dispose using tools and techniques of technical rationality (Stacey, 2012).

The minority disciplines within the natural sciences, the sciences of complexity, have been an alternative source domain for thinking differently

about the stable instability of organisational life for more than 30 years. Even so, management as a tradition finds it hard to shake off old habits. Just as it is now widely accepted that organisations are sites of complex activity, so there are tendencies within organisational scholarship that assume that even complexity can be managed, putting the manager back in control. For example, it may be assumed that the manager can decide whether a situation is simple, complicated or complex, thus determining whether a 'complexity approach' is needed or not. Alternatively, it may be suggested that a manager can 'unleash/embrace/encourage' complexity, as though complexity is always good and is at the manager's command, thus reinstating managerial control.

Uniquely, then, the books, articles and teaching which has emerged from the faculty group at the University of Hertfordshire (UH), and graduates of the Doctor of Management (DMan) programme there, have taken up insights from the complexity sciences, but have tried at the same time to cleave to their radical implications. It has been a decades-long experiment working with the idea that ultimately the social world is uncontrollable, but that we need to find ways to go on together anyway. This is not the same as saying that there is nothing to be done. Rather, the perspective developed at UH, termed complex responsive processes of relating, takes management seriously as a contingent group activity that requires highly reflective and reflexive individuals to negotiate and improvise, particularly in situations of high uncertainty. It assumes that some ways of managing are more helpful than others, and that with practice, it is possible to become more skilful.

Between 2000 and 2008, Routledge produced a series of volumes, both single-author and curated books of chapters written by faculty and graduates from the DMan programme, which set out this perspective. The foundational volume was the jointly authored book by Ralph Stacey, Doug Griffin and Patricia Shaw titled *Complexity and Management: Fad or Radical Challenge to Systems Thinking*. In it the authors interpreted the complexity sciences by analogy and drew on the social sciences to locate it as a resource for social science thinking and research. It marked a radical departure for organisational theory and was a pioneering attempt to mobilise complexity theory to understand organisational life. The subsequent series of edited volumes was titled *Complexity and the Experience of Organizing* and comprised titles on research, managing and leading in the public sector, emergence, improvisation, values and leadership (Stacey, 2005; Stacey and Griffin, 2005a; Stacey et al., 2000). These volumes evolved out of the research work

undertaken by students on the DMan, which had become an experiential doctorate run along psychodynamic lines. The volumes had wide appeal and demonstrated the importance of taking every day complex experience seriously, inquiring into it as a participant rather than from an assumed independent position.

The current series reimagines the experience of 15 years ago with the programme under the directorship of Chris Mowles and faculty colleagues Nick Sarra, Karen Norman, Emma Crewe, Karina Solsø and Kiran Chauhan. To date, more than 70 DMan students have successfully completed their doctorates. Over recent years, the graduates in the programme have drawn on a wider and wider variety of scholars and ideas to illuminate their work, including anthropology, social psychology, political economy, feminism, intersectionality and critical organisational theory.

In these co-edited volumes (Leadership, Consultancy and Management in the public sector), the first in a new series, a group of vibrant, engaged researchers inquire into complex phenomena at work and write about the insights they have gained as a way of provoking resonance, recognition and insight in the reader. This is very different from the more orthodox entity-based research which is more typical in business schools, or research which is undertaken to increase the effectiveness or efficiency of organisations, or to test some tool or technique of management. Rather, the research in this volume is driven by doubt and curiosity to draw out the plurality of everyday interactions in organisations. Aimed at producing complex knowledge, it is governed simply by paying attention to what is going on and what sense people are making of it, including the researcher. The generalisability of the findings, their usefulness if you like, is to be found in the extent to which the reader finds this resonant, provoking, insightful and wise. There are no tools, techniques or stepwise methods to be found here.

Readers of the original Routledge series may be interested in comparing and contrasting methods and references from the previous publications to judge how thinking has changed. But first it is worth going back over some of the original scholarship which shaped the thinking of the founding of the DMan and the perspective it embodied, which I do briefly now as a way of providing some context for the chapters which follow. This review does not do justice to the wide variety of sources which students and graduates now draw on for their research, but it may help frame the key tenets of thinking which pervade the chapters in this volume.

## Theoretical and practical origins

At the beginning of the millennium, three colleagues at the UH, Ralph Stacey, Doug Griffin and Patricia Shaw, decided to start a new professional doctorate. The trio's aim was to combine all that was productive, if sometimes uncomfortable, from their shared experience of group-based pedagogy with an interdisciplinary research perspective combining the natural and social sciences. This perspective was forged in a very close friendship between the three colleagues, a fact consonant with the perspective they were developing, and which highlights the centrality of relationships to understanding social life.

Starting the DMan also marked a theoretical break from Stacey's previous oeuvre and fascination with the complexity sciences. Ralph had been working with researchers in groups for some time, but in his previous publications he had argued that organisations were complex adaptive systems (CAS), or that they were like them, using the complexity sciences as metaphor. CAS are computer-based models comprising multiple interacting agents. He even argued that complexity thinking was applied in certain situations and not others, the subject of the still ubiquitous Stacey diagram.<sup>1</sup> After many heated hours of discussion, Stacey, Griffin and Shaw moved from simple metaphor to interpret the CAS by analogy, identifying properties of interest in the models and refracting them to the social domain. In doing so they tried to hang on to the generative tension of keeping an in-depth understanding of CAS to set alongside a granular interpretation of relevant social theory, and argued that complexity applies in all situations and at all degrees of scale.

I explore what the two domains share in common, and what the conceptual implications are later. But the combined perspective these colleagues developed, complex responsive processes of relating, is an example of what the French philosopher Edgar Morin (2005) later expressed as a necessary development in dealing with insights from the complexity sciences. Morin argued that there needed to be a transition from a restricted understanding of complexity to a general understanding. He set out to encourage new ways of thinking that brought the natural and social sciences together. For him, there was further to go than simply collapsing some of the radical implications of taking the complexity sciences seriously into orthodox natural science thinking based on disaggregation, prediction, and control:

The principle of disjunction, of separation (between objects, between disciplines, between notions, between subject and object of knowledge),

should be substituted by a principle that maintains the distinction, but that tries to establish the relation.

(*ibid.*: 7)

Complex responsive processes of relating are an attempt at describing such a new paradigm of thinking, researching and acting which privileges relationships, process and collaboration, uniting the knower and the known in paradoxical tension.

The perspective originally wove together four principal traditions of thought: the complexity sciences, in particular evolutionary CAS, pragmatic philosophy, process sociology, especially Norbert Elias, and group analytic thinking and practice. I briefly explore these four influences sequentially. The purpose of the following paragraphs is to point to some of the key assumptions which inform the work of authors contributing to this volume, so that the reader might better locate their arguments.

### **Complexity – radically different assumptions about stability and change**

More orthodox theories of management often contain assumptions about social life drawing on systems theory, which depend on spatial metaphors, notions of equilibrium, and consider organisations as entities. Organisations are described as operating at different ‘levels’, are disaggregated into parts and whole and go through distinct and managed processes of change. There is an assumption that managers are somehow outside the organisation understood as a system and can therefore operate upon it. As an example, in every day ways of talking about organisations, managers are thought to be able to ‘move it in the right direction’, to ‘create the right culture’, and to ‘drive change’. These assumptions hide in plain sight: they are taken for granted and are therefore often not alluded to or justified, because they are dominant assumptions. This is the way that ideology works. When I present complexity ideas to groups of managers, they often rightly ask me to work hard to justify them, often without acknowledging that their own ideas about stability and change in organisations are informed by a set of ideas which are equally questionable.

The perspective of complex responsive processes of relating interprets CAS in particular as having profound implications for thinking about

stability and change in social life. For example, CAS models are never at rest, but iterate, then reiterate. The implication by analogy is that this is equally true for social life. Assuming this problematises more orthodox theories of management, which propose that organisations have to undergo periods of change from an undesired stable state to an ideal stable state, stability is contrasted with change. Instead, to corrupt Churchill's observation about history, from a complexity perspective we might think that organising is simply one damned thing after another. Even states of stability are dynamically maintained.

Second, in CAS, population-wide patterns of stable-instability arise as a result of what all agents are doing together in their local interactions, and may change as a result of the amplification of small differences. Cause and effect are in a non-linear relationship. Interpreting this characteristic by analogy challenges thinking about wholesale, often top-down change predicated on linear cause and effect. To transpose this insight to organisations is to assume that whatever happens does so as a combination of managerial framing and employee interpretation in local interactions, which, in turn, feeds managerial framing. As an example, and to give a complexity perspective on why wholesale organisational change programmes often fail, what everyone is doing together in their local interactions may be precisely to resist the proposed change.

In CAS, agents negotiate conflicting constraints in their local interactions. By analogy, this directs us to think about how people in organisations negotiate their mutual constraints, their power relationships at work. Power and politics are often avoided in contemporary organisations and orthodox organisational scholarship, and when they are we avoid the ethical implications of the negotiation of how to go on together. Fourth, in CAS there is no controlling agent or group of agents which direct activity. Interpreting this characteristic by analogy deflates the common assumption that individual leadership is everything. Thinking about general patterns of influence is not the same as denying the importance of leaders, but rather broadens our thinking to consider the exercise of authority as an improvisational group activity.

And last, CAS have a paradoxical movement: local interaction creates the global pattern, while at the same time the global pattern shapes local activity. In organisational life, we can only take up idealisations of global patterns, call them strategies, in local activity. At the same time, our local improvisations produce what we might think of as strategy in practice. In every day management thinking, contradictions are resolved by splitting

them out with the manager able to choose one pole over the other, leaders or followers, transformation or transaction, strategy or implementation. Interpreting insights from the complexity sciences from a complex responsive process perspective implies that there is no splitting and no choosing, and so no escaping the paradox.

Evolutionary CAS interpreted by analogy do offer a different source domain for thinking about what's going on when we're at work trying to get things done with other people. But they only take us so far, and are, after all, models which run on computers. In order to develop a more subtle, durable suite of ideas, in a move from a restricted to a general understanding of complexity, complex responsive processes drew on three additional strands of thinking from the social sciences/humanities. In doing so it sketched out a more comprehensive theory of mind, of action, of identity, of communication, of ethics and of the paradox of stability and change.

### **Pragmatic philosophy**

Complex responsive processes of relating are infused with pragmatic thinking. Pragmatic philosophy, particularly the works of GH Mead (1932/2002, 1934), John Dewey (1929/2008, 1946), and Dewey and Bentley (1949), directs us to consider the importance of everyday experience. We mobilise our human capacity for doubt, the ability to reflect on what we are doing. If, as the CAS suggest, global patterns arise simply and only from what we are all doing together acting locally, then the pragmatists' preoccupation with experience, which turns on the exploration of what we are doing together and what sense we make of it, is a useful perspective. Rather than proceeding from abstract ideas, from the idea of systems, pragmatism is concerned with what people are saying and doing in the co-construction of their social worlds. Both Mead and Dewey assume a thoroughly social self, that the body is in the social world and the social world is in the body. We are formed by the social world, just as we form it, the same dynamic of forming and being formed that I drew attention to in CAS.

The perspective of complex responsive processes of relating draws on Mead's complex theory of communication, that in order to understand each other we communicate in shared significant symbols. Equally the perspective borrows his idea about the predictable unpredictability of conversation, that meaning arises in our gestures towards one another taken together with the responses these provoke, both in ourselves and in others.

We may start out by knowing what it is we want to say but change our minds as we hear ourselves speaking and as we notice and respond to our interlocutors. Consonant with Morin's suggestion that we consider the subject and object of knowledge in relation, so pragmatism works to overcome dualisms, self and other, I, me, and we, and reframes them as paradoxes. Both Dewey and Mead were concerned with an emergent theory of ethics which addresses the competing goods in any dynamic situation.

### **Process sociology**

The main sociological informant of the original statement of complex responsive processes of relating is Norbert Elias (1978, 2000, 2001), who also considers the 'I' and 'we' element of our personality structures to be two sides of the same coin. For Elias, the relatively contemporary idea that we are discrete, autonomous individuals cut off from one another is an illusion which doesn't serve us well. Instead, we are highly interdependent, social selves with no 'inside' and no 'outside', just as there is no outside of social life from which we gain a privileged view. Elias frames the structure/agency discussion at the heart of sociology as a paradox: society is made up of highly social individuals who together create the *habitus*, the dynamic recognisable patterns of behaviour which we shape and which shape us. Our place in the social network we are born into and the groups we belong to produces our sense of self: paradoxically it individualises us. I argue that this is a shared assumption between Mead, Dewey, and Elias, and is consonant with the interpretation I made from CAS previously.

Though Elias developed his oeuvre long before there were computers, he develops similar insights about society that I drew by interpretation from CAS. Elias is preoccupied by the fact that language and thinking represents entities at rest much better than it does relationships in motion. Instead, he uses the analogy of the game both to understand the constant change in social life and to frame the role of power and reflective detachment in gaining social advantage. We are interdependent and have need of one another: the greater the need, the greater the power disadvantage. But so too greater power accrues to those who are able to notice their own participation in the game of social life. This too is resonant with the value that Dewey in particular attributes to our human capacity for reflection and thought in the deepening of experience.

## Group analytic theory

SH Foulkes, the founder of group analytic theory and practice (1964/2002; Foulkes and Anthony, 1957/1984), had a troubled friendship with his fellow German Jewish refugee, Nobeit Elias. Both were concerned with inherent sociality of human beings, and shared the insight that we could act more wisely if we gained insight into group dynamics and our own participation in them. For Foulkes, the best way to find out about a group was to participate in a group, so developed a method of running agenda-less, free-flowing inquiry in groups, where the principal task is to talk about what is going on. This brings to mind the focus of the pragmatists and their interest in what it is we are doing together and how we come to think and talk about it. In the course of inquiry a variety of perspectives emerge: there is no need for consensus and no need to take action, except the action of noticing and reflecting. The point is to be together with no particular end in view and to pay attention to relationships. Foulkes called this the development of ‘group mindedness’, which we might understand as a form of decentring of the self, or reflexivity.

Experiential groups run in the tradition of Foulkesian thinking are at the heart of the method adopted by the DMan, and every graduate of the programme will have experienced a minimum of 36 one-and-a-half-hour group meetings run without anyone in charge and without a task except to talk about what the participants have on their minds.

### Summary: key ideas which inform the chapters in this volume

All four strands of intellectual tradition inform the perspective of complex responsive processes of relating privilege history, sociality, and paradox. The social theory which underpins the insights from the complexity sciences weave together the traditions of Aristotle, Hegel, and Darwin to focus on the processual and evolutionary qualities of social life.

All the chapters in this volume borrow from and develop the founding ideas of complex responsive processes and borrow from the intellectual traditions outlined above. They also supplement and deepen them with their own reading. In doing so, they take what is considered a micro-social approach to researching organisations and depend upon narrative and

interpretation. The focus on everyday interaction arises from the key insight informing the perspective of complex responsive processes that whatever happens does so as a result of what everyone is doing together. As a set of intellectual assumptions, complex responsive processes are concerned with the structured flux of relationships, power, practical judgement and ethics. It is concerned to complexify our thinking about the social world, but nonetheless to draw distinctions, to generalise, to call out resonance and to provoke.

To be clear that there are no easy answers in working out how to go on together is not the same as giving up and claiming that there is nothing to be done. Rather, the emphasis in the chapters in this volume is to make sense of what the researchers have been doing in the hope of acting more wisely in future, on producing complex and plural ways of thinking more helpful in navigating uncertain times.

## References

- Dewey, J. (1929/2008) *The Quest for Certainty: The Later Works 1925–1953*, Vol. 4, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1946) *The Public and Its Problems*, New York: Gateway Books.
- Dewey, J. and Bentley, A. (1949) *Knowing and the Known*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Elias, N. (1978) *What is Sociology?*, London: Hutchinson and Co.
- Elias, N. (2000) *The Civilising Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Elias, N. (2001) *The Society of Individuals*, London: Continuum Books.
- Foulkes, S.H. (1964/2002) *Therapeutic Group Analysis*, London: Karnac Book.
- Foulkes, S.H. and Anthony, E.J. (1957/1984) *Group Psychotherapy: The Psychoanalytic Approach*, London: Karnac Books.
- Mead, G.H. (1932/2002) *The Philosophy of the Present*, New York: Prometheus Books.
- Mead, G.H. (1934) *Mind, Self and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviourist*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Morin, E. (2005) Restricted complexity, general complexity. Presented at the Colloquium “Intelligence de la complexite: “epistemologie et pragmatique”, Cerisy- La- Salle, France, June 26th, 2005”. Translated from French by Carlos Gershenson.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is dedicated to the memory of Ralph Stacey and the remarkable community he helped to create at the University of Hertfordshire through the Doctor of Management programme.

Ralph was always interested in the dilemmas experienced by consultants and took a lively and thoughtful interest in the work of his students.

He took pleasure in getting behind the surface of things and enjoyed expressing his exasperation at the excesses of instrumental managerialist tendencies so familiar in contemporary organisational life. He was kindly, humorous and at times extremely fierce in his approach and always very determined.

The writers of this volume were all Ralph's students and are members of a wider community of practice which extends beyond their doctoral work and without which Ralph's own work could not have developed. He would have been delighted with their achievements.

The community he helped to found along with Patricia Shaw and Doug Griffin works together to continually develop understanding about organisational life and the contributions here are indebted to a participation in countless conversations and readings about actual events which go on in the day-to-day work of the students on the programme as well as with and between the faculty lead by Chris Mowles and which, besides Karina and

Nick, include Karen Norman, Kiran Chauhan, and Emma Crewe, all of whom bring specific skills and experience and a capacity to develop ideas in an ongoing way.

Most of the writers in this volume came through a particular learning set on the Doctor of Management programme and together conducted research into the particular themes in consultancy explored through these pages. So, besides the writers included here, it's important to acknowledge the contributions over the years of Luke Mkubvu, Sam Talucci, Pradeep Sharma, Asa Lundquist Coey, Majken Askeland, Michal Goldstein, Carla Blackadder, Svein Hoftun, and Rebecca Myers, all of whom helped to develop the work here.

Finally, but certainly not least, to our partners Bryony and Jonas for their endless patience, encouragement, love, and support.

### **Note**

- 1 Stacey abandoned the diagram when he accepted that complexity wasn't a special condition that applied in certain circumstances but is a quality of all human relating. Additionally, he was concerned that such diagrams, which are ubiquitous in business schools, give false reassurance that managers are still in control.

# INTRODUCTION

*Karina Solsø and Nicholas Sarra*

This book explores the complexity and uncertainty of consultancy practice. The consultancy experience is presented here in a rigorous and nuanced manner, which tries to give a granular account of consultancy practice as opposed to some idealised view or prescriptions of what should be happening.

Each chapter involves autoethnographic narrative descriptions of the messy and complex nature of consultancy work including the doubts and uncertainties that permeate the everyday lives of consultants. In each of the chapters, this sense of doubt and uncertainty become the starting point of reflective inquiry and theorising. As such, the unique contribution of this book lies in the thickness of narrative descriptions as well as in critical and reflexive theorising, which offers novel and thought-provoking ideas about their practice. As editors of this book, we suggest that contributions of this kind are important in the field of consultancy literature, because of their difference from many publications in the field which take a prescriptive and instrumental view which tends to conceal the complex, political and emotionally embodied nature of consultancy practice.

Recently, there has been some discussion about whether there is a sense of stagnation in the Organisation Development (OD) tradition. Critique has been raised within this tradition that there haven't been any serious innovations since the emergence of Appreciative Inquiry back in 1987 (Cameron, 2020). This critique has once again restarted a debate amongst OD researchers about 'the rigour-relevance balance', with researchers emphasizing rigour whilst practitioners ask for relevance (Paine & Delmhorst, 2020). The problem which has been repeatedly articulated is that practitioners don't seem to find the research particularly helpful, because the research tends to be too disconnected from practice. Researchers coming from different traditions have different solutions to this problem. For example, Cummings and Cummings (2020) argue that the most promising way forward is through relying more extensively on action research as an approach to knowledge creation. Cameron (2020) finds hope in 'Positive Organizational Scholarship', which "aims to reveal and foster positive capabilities and activities that lead to flourishing in organizations". Beer (2020) emphasizes the collaboration between researchers and practitioners in creating actionable knowledge with clarity around why, when and how new practices improve organizational outcomes. Beer's apparent longing for a stronger sense of explanatory causal connection between interventions and their outcomes can be seen to reflect a more general trend around instrumentality in OD research.

A key assumption underpinning OD research is that the key task is to seek causal explanations of organizational phenomena. The validity of this knowledge "rests on its ability to explain organizational phenomena; the validity of OD knowledge is based on its effectiveness in guiding action in a valued direction" (Cummings & Cummings, 2020).

Attempts to guide the actions of OD practitioners in a valuable direction developed from Action Research (Lewin, 1947) and the T-group (Lippitt & Lippitt, 1978), followed by Schein's (1987) description of Process Consultation. Later, the tradition developed to include a focus on Organisational Learning (Argyris & Schön, 1978, 1996) and Teambuilding (Tannenbaum et al., 1992). The most recent branches of the OD tree show the influence of the social constructionist discourse with Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Gergen, 2009) as well as the development of Dialogic OD (Busche & Marshak, 2009, 2015).

Each of these theories has attempted to fulfil the research task of seeking explanations of organizational phenomena; each of these theories attempts at creating value through guiding actions in directions that create value.

From the perspective of the chapters comprising this book, we wonder about whether this focus on ‘guiding actions in directions that create value’ can potentially be counterproductive. Most literature on consultancy shares two characteristics, which can be seen to arise out of this particular understanding of the task and the value of OD research: (1) It is focused on tools and techniques – instruments by which the consultant can help groups of people develop and change (Mowles, 2011), and (2) it often portrays organisational life and consultancy practices in idealised ways which neglect, suppress or marginalize more uncomfortable aspects of experience. The implication of this is that consultants may struggle to find resonance in the above theoretical descriptions. The complexity and uncertainty of everyday consultancy life is out of tune with the clarity and orderliness implicit in the literature. In the following, we reflect on these two characteristics in order for us to present an alternative view that is offered by the chapters within this book.

### **Tools and instrumentalism in OD**

The use of tools is a significant human capacity, without which we wouldn’t be able to do much (Byrne, 1995). Tools are artefacts that we use to increase and extend our human capacities. Through the use of tools, we regulate our human activity and enable the realization of our goals (Stacey, 2012). Tools are seen to play a significant role in most of the OD literature. Here, organisations are seen as self-regulating systems and the consultant is seen as a detached observer, who – through tools-based analysis and intervention – can help groups of people bring about the desired change (Mowles, 2011). There is an implicit assumption that these tools make it possible for the consultant to choose and control the future of the organisation to some degree. As such, relying on tools involves some degree of instrumental rationality. If a consultant uses a tool in a proper way, then the desired outcome will materialise (Stacey, 2012). Being competent as a consultant is largely seen as being aware of and confident with a variety of tools and capable of using them flexibly.

According to Stacey (*ibid.*), tools can be seen as *second-order abstractions*. Abstractions are attempts to describe and make sense of the generalised patterns that we are caught up in when we interact with others. First order abstractions are our stories about our experience. Stories are abstractions because they involve simplification and interpretation of our embodied

experience. Second-order abstractions involve yet another move away from embodied experience through further simplification. In management and consultancy literature, this often takes the form of either 2×2 grids or by stages which follow each other in a chronological form. The advantage of tools is the clarity and uniformity through which consultancy can be practiced; they enable the possibility of feeling a degree of control. This sense of control may mitigate the overwhelming uncertainty and attendant anxiety that sometimes comes together with the responsibility of consultants.

One of the ways in which tools offer a sense of control for consultants (and their clients) is through establishing a sense of linearity when it comes to time. The earliest example in OD, perhaps, is Lewin's unfreeze-move-freeze model (Lewin, 1947), which has been powerful in practitioners' ways of thinking about change. A more recent example is the 4D model of Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987), a tool which is being used to plan change processes, by ordering the change into managed stages. These tools have the advantage of helping consultants order their practice and interventions. They provide consultants with a discourse by which they can talk about the change with a sense of clarity and confidence. The complex change that nobody can really manage in their minds becomes manageable through these tools and models. Furthermore, the use of tools may be seen as serving to decontextualize the politics of the consultancy encounter, rendering them invisible and masking the improvisatory gestures of participants and consultants alike. This instrumentalising and categorising of the world renders problematic the notion of human freedom as Solsø, drawing upon Arendt (1958) and Loidolt (2019), points our attention to in Chapter 4; for if consultancy method is deterministic as to outcome, then participants are reduced to automata without ethical choice. Technical responsibilities come to take precedence over moral responsibilities or obscure them entirely.

The chapters comprising this book involve a reflective scepticism about the way tools often get used in consultancy practice. This is not a question about using tools or not. Certainly, to be included in the groups of consultants who are hired to do work, one has to be a skilled participant in this discourse (Stacey, 2012). However, being reflexive about the responses of others and oneself when these tools are in use is key when it comes to both being effective as a consultant and also in the context of the moral aspects of consultancy practice.

In Chapter 1, Chauhan uses an example of working with *Open Space Technology* to explore the way in which the practice of consultants is shaped by the mutual expectations about what a consultant ought to do in particular situations. The expectations towards the consultant are partly shaped by the tools the consultant chooses to use, and as such the tools play a significant function in regulating the actions and expectations of participants. The tools enable action, but at the same time, tools play a powerful role in closing down spaces for further inquiry, which may be significant in the context of change. Chauhan demonstrates how tools perform a function through the ordering and categorising of a context of uncertainty. He also demonstrates how this ordering and categorising can lead to a collapse of the space within which it is possible to think in nuanced ways about what is going on and the moral significance of the situation.

A key limitation of consultancy tools therefore lies in the inconsistency between the certainty and clarity of the tool and the uncertainty and messiness of social interaction. The complexity of social interaction will inevitably exceed the clarity and uniformity of the tool, which can easily be experienced as a loss of control, particularly if the participants in a group expect the consultant to be in control and manage a change process according to a particular tool. If the simplifying logic of tools comes to dominate the expectations towards consultants, leaving everyone with an illusion of certainty and predictability, then the capacity of everyone to actually respond to the unique openings that arise in the emergent conversation may collapse. This collapse can have moral consequences, as well as implications for the capacity for novelty to arise (Mowles, 2011; Stacey, 2012).

A number of authors in the book mention their emotional or affectual responses as central to their understanding of the consultancy situation. The sense of collapse referred to above is mitigated through reflexivity into the emotionally nuanced context of consultancy. In the literature on emotion in organisational studies, authors often distinguish between emotion and affect, where emotion refers to the ways in which psychobiologists approach emotions through a positivistic framework to find universal phenomena across a variety of contexts and situations (Wetherell, 2012); an approach that has been critiqued for the tendency to sanitize and scientize the phenomenon of emotion into a physiological sensation (Townley, 2008). Affect, on the other hand, is taken up by scholars to resist

the tendency towards reification and process reduction. Wetherell (2012) draws attention to *affective practices*, which:

focus on the emotional as it appears in social life and tries to follow what participants do. It finds shifting, flexible and often over-determined figurations rather than simple lines of causation, character types and neat emotion categories.

(*ibid*, p. 4)

In this book, authors don't distinguish between emotion and affect, and both of these terms are understood in a way that is similar to what Wetherell describes when using the concept of affect. It means embodied meaning-making, and emotion is a means of knowing the world, as a visceral apprehension of context. The consultant's emotional response resonates with the complex histories of their unique life and intergenerational experience. In this sense, emotion becomes our means to make sense in the moment, through our condensed and undifferentiated experience, of all moments and the anticipation of all moments to come. Through emotion, the implications of the present are imbued in the moment with the experiences of the past and the anticipations of the future (Shaw, 2002). This apprehension of the moment through emotional response is, of course, fallible; we can only rely on our historically evolved capacities to experience and to interpret those experiences, and thus, we have to remain open to ongoing reinterpretation (Bernstein, 2007). The current context may be novel in some respects in relation to our previous experience. So, the consultant's ways of responding to given situations are formed through their histories of responding to other individuals and groups, which may prove to be more or less relevant but have the potential to open us to a vast array of historical experience. Nonetheless, experiencing breakdowns and in unique moments in time stir up emotion, which allows consultants like Chauhan and Curtis to make some sense of their feelings of shame, for example, as a signal for potential exclusion from significant groups. Therefore, emotion informs agency and through reflexivity we gain the potential to move beyond flight/fight responses or compulsive reaction to existential threat.

This book holds the perspective that possibilities for skilful and insightful action are more likely to arise if groups can manage to stay with the feelings evoked by uncertainty for a little longer than usual rather than hankering after solution finding, which can amount to little more than anxiety

alleviation. Often, when uncertainty is a felt quality in a conversation, a strong pressure on the consultant is co-created in a social setting with the purpose of alleviating the uncertainty, for example, through the consultant introducing the next step within the logic of the model or the tool. In moments of uncertainty, consultants often have a lively – sometimes hectic – private conversation about how to respond. The urge from participants as well as the temptation coming from within one's own need for control can lead to a collapse of the inquiry. The temptation becomes one of going along with the tool that offers a route in a landscape, which is already complex and demanding. This dilemma is discussed by Wenzel in Chapter 3 where he explores people's needs for their identities to be affirmed through paradoxical processes of recognition and misrecognition and by Solsø in her description of what can be achieved through focussing upon the politics of participation.

We are interested in the potential for change that can emerge when a group of people can manage to stay with the heat of this uncertainty. That is when the doubt and the questions that arise from conversational inquiry into the lived experience of change for the people involved can be dwelled upon in a way that can allow for an exploration of the emergent themes arising in the conversation in the living present. Although they may wish to do so, people cannot reinvent themselves instantly or convincingly in terms of their performed identities (Goffman, 1969). We are pattern creating creatures who constrain and enable ourselves, to express through our interactions, our habitual power relationships (Elias, 1991). This means that the emergent interaction of the consultancy situation tends to express whatever relational patterns are current for the group present. The consultant is therefore inevitably co-opted into the interdisciplinary processes which construct these relational patterns. The sense of uncertainty, which many consultants are prone to wish to alleviate, may herald the expressive breaking through into open communication of habituated patterns of relating which may have masked uncomfortable political difficulties. This tolerance of uncertainty by the consultant therefore creates an opportunity, not without its own risks, of permitting an engagement with underlying dynamics which may create new possibilities for people present.

Consultancy which attends closely to the dynamics of conversation is not about learning a new tool. It takes seriously the process of reflexivity about one's own participation. It means practicing one's capacity to exercise

judgment critically and reflexively whilst improvising in an ever-changing political landscape together with others.

Such a process involves confrontations with one's own contingencies and patterns of interaction. These confrontations with oneself can be painful, and can easily lead to feelings of incompetence or inadequacy, particularly if these themes are organising the emotional worlds of other participants. The chapters within this book explore consultancy experiences of inadequacy, shame, guilt, powerlessness and feelings of incompetence. Such experiences are familiar to those participating in organisations and worth exploring as inevitable qualities in many consultancy encounters.

### **Idealised portraits of reality – the neglect, invisibility and marginalization of uncomfortable aspects of experience**

In their summary of the OD tradition, Cheung-Judge and Holbeche (2015) summarize 'the OD core values' as (1) democracy and participation, (2) openness to lifelong learning and experimentation, (3) equity and fairness – the worth of every individual, (4) valid information and informed choice and (5) enduring respect for the human side of enterprise. According to Cheung-Judge and Holbeche, the early founders saw these values as 'practice values', and they believed that "these values, when operating effectively, would engage people collaboratively to address a wide range of organization issues, as well as help organizations to search for lasting solutions to incredible challenges in the changing world" (ibid, p. 19).

The most recent OD innovations, namely Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastca, 1987) and Dialogic OD (Busche & Marshak, 2015), are very explicit about their idealisation around appreciation and dialogue. According to Cooperrider:

Appreciation is creative rather than conservative precisely because it allows itself to be energized and inspired by the voice of mystery. As an active process of valuing the factors that give rise to the life-enhancing organisation, appreciation has room for the vital uncertainty, the indeterminacy that is the trademark of something alive.

(Cooperrider, 2001, p. 18)

Ideals of appreciation, creativity, energy, life enhancement and liveliness all have positive connotations and invite the impression of a sense of

harmonious collaborative atmosphere. Likewise, in writing about dialogic practices, Cheung-Judge and Holbeche (2015) write:

When we use dialogic practices to engage the people of a system in conversations that address their own issues, we not only solve the immediate problem, we leave behind a more evolved system, with a greater sense of direction and hopefully of personal connection, and the energy and will to work across previously unbridgeable boundaries.

(*ibid*, p. 44)

Again, ideals like dialogue, direction, personal connection and ‘energy and will to work across previously unbridgeable boundaries’ are values that are very similar to the appreciative idealisations of collaboration and harmony. Such an implied refutation of the unappreciative, conflictual and critical is taken up in Masselink’s chapter where he explores a nuanced view of collaboration as inherently conflictual due to the ongoing negotiations of power and difference in the consultancy situation.

The style of writing exemplified by writers like Cooperrider can be characterised as visionary and has the quality of engaging people emotionally and appeals to a yearning for a form of psychological fulfilment (Mowles, 2011, p. 118). However, visionary speak and text also have disciplinary power, and appeals to ideals can easily have the consequence of evoking guilt, shame and the potential for exclusion (Willmott, 1993, 2003) when such ideas are not realised in practice; they can become a way of covering over dissent, conflict or power struggle (Mowles, 2011).

The American social psychologist George Herbert Mead (1934), whose work informs several of the chapters in this book, thought about such ideals as cult values. Cult values are collective idealisations that arise in groups in intense social situations. In such situations, one can experience an imagined wholeness, which leaves one with a feeling of an enlarged personality. Cult values according to Mead are a very important part of our heritage. However, Mead doesn’t talk about a conflict-free form of living together. The imagined wholeness exists only in the abstract. As soon as cult values are carried out – or functionalised, as Mead would have it – in concrete social interaction between people, conflict arises, because people have diverse expectations about what an ideal means in practice or because competing ideals vie against each other. Interaction between people in the workplace is an interaction between individuals with unique histories,

who nevertheless can recognise their similarities and cultural affinities but which are nonetheless involved in a complex ongoing negotiation of unique perspectives and alliances of perspective. The basis of Mead's thinking is that conflict, disagreement and dissent are unavoidable aspects of our everyday experience as humans. They are aspects which can lead to feelings of guilt, shame and exclusion. These are affectual responses, which are bound to materialise in complex social situations like consulting, but which are often neglected, suppressed or marginalised in the literature on consultancy. There is often the assumption that uncomfortable experiences indicate an unhelpful situation, which somehow is not working, and that if participants in the consultancy experience are feeling good and are comfortable within that experience, then things are going well and that the comfortable experience is an outcome in itself. But what if the opposite was sometimes the case? What if the capacity for reflexivity, the development of possibility, the finding of novel direction was made possible through the disturbance of the status quo and a disruption of the accustomed patterning of power in particular groups? Then this rupturing of what we come to expect may become a *sine qua non* for the development of creative outcome. Here the voice of the consultant may come to play a significant role in the noticing of what might be being co-created through the emergent interaction of the participants. This suggests an attention to a different form of temporality, one focused not upon idealised futures and places we need to get to, but upon the co-creation of those futures through interaction in the living present.

A key characteristic of the chapters within this book is that they pay attention to the patterns of interaction that unfold when values and ideals are enacted in practice. In Chapter 5, Masselink draws attention to ideological notions of collaboration and the depoliticizing qualities of the ways in which collaboration is taken up in organisations, making it hard to handle agonistic aspects of collaboration. According to Masselink, drawing on the work of Georg Herbert Mead (1934), agonistic qualities are inherent aspects of collaboration, which don't disappear just because they are marginalised from the literature on organisational processes and the tools and recommendations to consultants. Likewise, Janssen in Chapter 6 looks at the implications of the dominance of abstract and idealised text and talk, which present 'glossy' images of both corporate and personal identity, leaving an affectual impact on the self and fostering feelings of alienation.

The chapters in this book don't attempt to arrive at prescriptions for what consultants should do to be successful by helping groups of people get to a desired promised land. Instead, they focus upon the reality of the lived experience of consultancy. Plurality is an essential part of the human condition (Arendt, 1958), and it is because of the fact that we are different that novelty can arise (Stacey & Mowles, 2016). Rather than developing descriptions about how to make conflict go away, this book is an example of consultants paying attention to what they are doing in their practice.

Rather than reinforcing the utopian longing for conflict-free and harmonious forms of interaction, this book acknowledges the inherent plurality of human interaction, and the chapters all wrestle with the important question of how we respond to conflict. Bernstein (2007), writing from a pragmatic position, acknowledges the struggle of engaging with a plurality of views. According to him, "The achievement of a 'we' – where 'we' are locked in argument with others – is a fragile and temporary achievement that can always be ruptured by unexpected contingencies" (pp. 336–337). Through engaging in reflective inquiry into the attempts at achieving such a 'we' in interaction with clients, the authors in this book produce wider and deeper understanding of that practice, which may have generalisable qualities to the practice of others. The aim of this book is not to narrow thinking in particular (positive) directions, but to provide descriptions of consultancy practice, which can allow us to understand more with an acceptance that understanding is a process which has no totality. The difficulty with idealised decontextualization of practice is that they may create such totalities of understanding. There is always more to be understood due to the movement of time and the consequent dynamism of cultures.

### **Recurring themes arising across the chapters**

This book comprises six chapters which have a particular sequence. The first two by Chauhan and Curtis take up the experiences of internal consultants faced with the implementation of expected organisational methods. Chauhan uses Owen's Open Space Technology and Curtis, somewhat reluctantly, Myers-Briggs type processes. Both encounter difficulties along the way and both take up the experience of the consultant's experience of shame as meaningful and worthy of exploration. Chauhan questions the idea of the consultant's neutrality, suggesting that it implies a pressure to abdicate moral

agency. He reengages with this problematic negation of ethics by paying close attention to his experiences of shame in the situation. For Chauhan, shame may indicate a crisis of belonging to a significant group, the potentiality of exclusion is an emotional experience which through reflexivity offers further possibilities for understanding and therefore acting with moral agency. Curtis also attends to the theme of moral agency using Mead's concept of the social object. This could be thought about as the implicit attitudinal dispositions and expectations which allow people to take an understood means of relating to a given idea. With this in mind, he explores facilitation as a social object, pointing out the pressures on the consultant to collude with an idea of facilitation which closes down and reduces the politics of team working and renders the consultant powerless and without opinion.

The following three writers explore external consultancy situations, developing a close attention to the politics of the situations described and the significance of the impasses experienced.

Wenzel in Chapter 3 focusses his attention on processes of recognition and in particular the importance of how the consultant works with their experience of being misrecognized, a quality which may arise when, as is often the case, things do not go according to plan. He explores the possibilities which arise when the consultant can tolerate the anxiety and even anger of clients whose expectations are not immediately fulfilled. Implicit in his method, as with many of the writers in this volume, is an attention to the freedom of the consultant in these situations and how that freedom is enabled and constrained by those for whom he is consulting to.

In Chapter 4, Solsø explicitly takes up issues of freedom and meaningfulness for both consultant and participants and the significance of taking seriously the interpersonal politics of consultancy in work cultures in which instrumental rationalities and a preoccupation with outcome and productivity tend to negate this sense of freedom and meaningfulness. This emphasis on procedures and outcomes may lead to hopelessness and a sense of impasse for those involved since differences become buried or concealed. Drawing upon Arendt, Solsø uses the idea of actualising plurality as a means of creating real movement in a tense consultancy situation.

In his chapter, Masselink takes up the complexity of collaboration and in particular the agonistic and conflictual aspects of collaboration in the consultancy endeavour. Like other writers in this volume, Masselink demonstrates the importance of reflexivity into the embodied emotional

experience of the consultant as a means of engagement with the situation to hand. In his view, the idealisation of collaboration conceals the paradoxical nature of the process, which again is an engagement, often fraught with relational difficulty, with the politics of difference.

Finally, Janssen turns the tables and writes about her experience of being coached on how to market herself on seeking to return to the world of work. Her experience on her sense of self, informed through insights from her own practice as a consultant, of being on the receiving end of a particular style of consultancy, exposes the perils of such processes. The pressure to embody and perform an idealised self threatens to reduce her to a branded corporate artefact.

## References

- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational Learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Beer, M. (2020). Making a Difference: Developing Actionable Knowledge for Practice and Theory. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(4), 495–509.
- Bernstein, R. J. (2007). *The New Constellation*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Busche, G. R. & Marshak, R. J. (2009). Revisioning Organization Development: Diagnostic and Dialogic Premises and Patterns of Practice. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 45, 348.
- Busche, G. R. & Marshak, R. J. (2015). *Dialogic Organization Development: The Theory and Practice of Transformational Change*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Byrne, R. (1995). *The Thinking Ape: Evolutionary Origins of Intelligence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, K. (2020). Responses to the Problem of OD Stagnation: A Tribute to Warner Burke. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(4), 462–481.
- Cheung-Judge, M. & Holbeche, L. (2015). *Organization Development*, 2nd ed. London: Kogan Page.
- Cooperrider, D. (2001). *Positive Image, Positive Action: The Affirmative Basis of Organizing*. Stipes Publishing L.L.C. <https://mitchmatthews.com>

com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/06-Cooperrider-1990-Pos-Image-Pos-Action-1.pdf

- Cooperrider, D. L. & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In W. Pasmore & E. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in Organization Change and Development* (Vol. 1, pp. 129–169). Bingley: JAI Press.
- Cummings, T. G. & Cummings, C. (2020). The Relevance Challenge in Management and Organization Studies: Bringing Organization Development Back In. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(4), 521–546.
- Elias, N. (1991). *The Society of Individuals*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gergen, K. (2009). *Relational Becoming: Beyond Self and Community*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1969). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Equilibrium and Social Change. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5–41.
- Lippitt, R. & Lippitt, G. (1978). *The Consulting Process in Action*. La Jolla, CA: University Associates.
- Loidolt, S. (2019). *Phenomenology of Plurality: Hannah Arendt on Political Intersubjectivity*. London: Routledge.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mowles, C. (2011). *Rethinking Management: Radical Insights from the Complexity Sciences*. Farnham: Gower Applied Research.
- Paine, J. W. & Delmhorst, F. (2020). A Balance of Rigor and Relevance: Engaged Scholarship in Organizational Change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(4), 437–461.
- Schein, E. H. (1987). *Process Consultation, Vol. 2: Lessons for Managers and Consultants*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Shaw, P. (2002). *Changing Conversations in Organisations: A Complexity Approach to Change*. Abingdon: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Stacey, R. D. (2012). *Tools and Techniques of Leadership and Management: Meeting the Challenge of Complexity*. London: Routledge.
- Stacey, R.D. & Mowles, C. (2016). *Strategic Management and Organizational Dynamics: The Challenge of Complexity*. New York: Pearson Education Limited.

- Tannenbaum, S. I., Beard, R. L., & Salas, E. (1992). Team Building and Its Influence on Team Effectiveness: An Examination of Conceptual and Empirical Developments. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Advances in Psychology*, 82. *Issues, Theory, and Research in Industrial/Organizational Psychology* (pp. 117–153). Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Townley, B. (2008). *Reason's Neglect: Rationality and Organising*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. London: SAGE.
- Willmott, H. (1993). Strength Is Ignorance, Slavery Is Freedom: Managing Culture in Modern Organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4), 5151–552.
- Willmott, H. (2003). Renewing Strength: Corporate Culture Revisited. *M@n@gement*, 6(3), 73–78.

## Introduction

- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational Learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. A. (1996). *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Beer, M. (2020). Making a Difference: Developing Actionable Knowledge for Practice and Theory. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(4), 495–509.
- Bernstein, R. J. (2007). *The New Constellation*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Busche, G. R. & Marshak, R. J. (2009). Revisioning Organization Development: Diagnostic and Dialogic Premises and Patterns of Practice. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 45, 348.
- Busche, G. R. & Marshak, R. J. (2015). *Dialogic Organization Development: The Theory and Practice of Transformational Change*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Byrne, R. (1995). *The Thinking Ape: Evolutionary Origins of Intelligence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, K. (2020). Responses to the Problem of OD Stagnation: A Tribute to Warner Burke. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(4), 462–481.
- Cheung-Judge, M. & Holbeche, L. (2015). *Organization Development*, 2nd ed. London: Kogan Page.
- Cooperrider, D. (2001). Positive Image, Positive Action: The Affirmative Basis of Organizing. Stipes Publishing L.L.C. <https://mitchmatthews.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/06-Cooperrider-1990-Pos-Image-Pos-Action-1.pdf>
- Cooperrider, D. L. & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In W. Pasmore & E. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in Organization Change and Development* (Vol. 1, pp. 129–169). Bingley: JAI Press.
- Cummings, T. G. & Cummings, C. (2020). The Relevance Challenge in Management and Organization Studies: Bringing Organization Development Back In. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(4), 521–546.
- Elias, N. (1991). *The Society of Individuals*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gergen, K. (2009). *Relational Becoming: Beyond Self and Community*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1969). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lewin, K. (1947). *Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Equilibrium and Social Change*. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5–41.
- Lippitt, R. & Lippitt, G. (1978). *The Consulting Process in Action*. La Jolla, CA: University Associates.
- Loidolt, S. (2019). *Phenomenology of Plurality: Hannah Arendt on Political Intersubjectivity*. London: Routledge.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mowles, C. (2011). *Rethinking Management: Radical Insights from the Complexity Sciences*. Farnham: Gower Applied Research.
- Paine, J. W. & Delmhorst, F. (2020). A Balance of Rigor and Relevance: Engaged Scholarship in Organizational Change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(4), 437–461.
- Schein, E. H. (1987). *Process Consultation, Vol. 2: Lessons for Managers and Consultants*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Shaw, P. (2002). *Changing Conversations in Organisations: A Complexity Approach to Change*. Abingdon: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Stacey, R. D. (2012). *Tools and Techniques of Leadership and Management: Meeting the Challenge of Complexity*. London: Routledge.
- Stacey, R.D. & Mowles, C. (2016). *Strategic Management and Organizational Dynamics: The Challenge of Complexity*. New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- Tannenbaum, S. I. , Beard, R. L. , & Salas, E. (1992). Team Building and Its Influence on Team Effectiveness: An Examination of Conceptual and Empirical Developments. In K. Kelley (Ed.), *Advances in Psychology*, 82. Issues, Theory, and Research in Industrial/Organizational Psychology (pp. 117–153). Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Townley, B. (2008). *Reason's Neglect: Rationality and Organising*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. London: SAGE.

Willmott, H. (1993). Strength Is Ignorance, Slavery Is Freedom: Managing Culture in Modern Organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4), 5151–5552.

Willmott, H. (2003). Renewing Strength: Corporate Culture Revisited. *M@n@gement*, 6(3), 73–78.

## Moving beyond neutrality

Bion, W.R. (1967) Notes on memory and desire. *The Psychoanalytic Forum* 2: 272–280.

Brinkmann, S. (2017) *Stand firm: Resisting the self-improvement craze*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Brown, B. (2007) *I thought it was just me (but it isn't)*. New York: Penguin

Bushe, G. and Marshak, R. (2015) *Dialogic organization development*. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cheung-Judge, M. (2012) The self as instrument: A cornerstone for the future of OD. *OD Practitioner* 44(2): 42–47.

Cheung-Judge, M. and Holbeche, L. (2015) *Organization development*, 2nd ed. London: Kogan Page.

Cozolino, L. (2013) *The social neuroscience of education*. New York: Norton.

Czander, W. and Eisold, K. (2003) Psychoanalytic perspectives on organizational consulting: Transference and counter-transference. *Human Relations* 56(4): 475–490.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2017) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*, 5th ed. London: SAGE.

Elias, N. (1939) *The civilizing process*, revised ed. [2000]. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gertler, B. and Izod, K. (2004) Modernism and postmodernism in group relations: A confusion of tongues. In S. Cytrynbaum and D.A. Noumair (eds.), *Group dynamics, organizational irrationality, and social complexity: Group relations reader 3*. Jupiter, FL: A.K. Rice Institute, 81–98.

Joas, H. (1997) *G.H. Mead: A contemporary re-examination of his thought*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kilkauer, T. (2013) What is managerialism? *Critical Sociology* 41(7–8): 1103–1119.

Mead, G.H. (1923) Scientific method and the moral sciences. *International Journal of Ethics* 33: 229–247.

Mead, G.H. (1925) The genesis of the self and social control. *International Journal of Ethics* 35: 251–277.

Mead, G.H. (1934) *Mind, self, and society; from the standpoint of a social behaviourist*, 17th ed. [2015]. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mead, G.H. (1938) *The philosophy of the act*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Morrison, A.P. (2011) The psychodynamics of shame. In R.L. Dearing and J.P. Tangney (eds.), *Shame in the therapy hour*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 23–44.

Owen, H. (1992) *Open space technology: A user's guide*. Potomac, MD: Abbott Publishing.

Probyn, E. (2005) *Blush: Faces of shame*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rainey Tolbert, M.A. and Hanafin, J. (2006) Use of self in OD consulting: What matters is presence. In B.B. Jones and M. Brazzel (eds.), *The NTL handbook of organization development and change: Principles, practices, and perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer, 69–82.

Sedgwick, E.K. and Frank, A. (1995) *Shame and its sisters: A Silvan Tomkins reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Schein, E.H. (1987) *Process Consultation: Its role in organization development*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing Co.

Schein, E.H. (2011) *Helping: How to offer, give, and receive help*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Seashore, C.N. , Shower, M.N. , Thompson, G. and Mattare, M. (2004) Doing good by knowing who you are: The instrumental self as an agent of change. *OD Practitioner* 36(3), 42–46.

Stacey, R. (2012) *Tools and techniques of leadership and management*. London: Routledge.

Thomason, K. (2018) *Naked: The dark side of shame*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolstein, B. (1988) *Essential papers on countertransference*. New York: New York University Press.

## Consulting

Aram, E. (2001) *The Experience of Complexity: Learning as the Potential Transformation of Identity*, unpublished thesis, University of Hertfordshire.

Bee, F. and Bee, R. (1998) *Facilitation Skills (Training Essentials)*, London: Chartered Institute of Personnel & Development.

Bens, I. (2005) *Advanced Facilitation Strategies: Tools and Techniques to Master Difficult Situations*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, B. (2020) *Listening to Shame*. Accessed at [https://www.ted.com/talks/brene\\_brown\\_listening\\_to\\_shame?language=en](https://www.ted.com/talks/brene_brown_listening_to_shame?language=en) on 14th September 2020.

Crewe, E. (2014) *Doing Development Differently: Rituals of Hope and Despair in an INGO: Development in Practice*, Vol 24, No 1, pp 91–104.

Dearing, R. L. and Tangney, J. P. (2002) *Shame and Guilt*, New York: Guilford Publications.

Elias, N. (2000) *The Civilizing Process*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Foucault, M. and Hurley, R. (1998) *The History of Sexuality: The Will to Knowledge: V. 1: The Will to Knowledge*, London: Penguin Books.

Griffin, D. (2002) *The Emergence of Leadership, Linking Self Organisation and Ethics*, London: Routledge.

Harvey, G. , Loftus-Hills, A. , Titchen, A. , Kitson, A. , McCormack, B. and Seers, K. (2002) *Getting Evidence into Practice: The Role and Function of Facilitation: Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol 37, No 6, pp 577–588.

Heron, J. (1977) *Dimensions of Facilitator Style*, London: Human Potential Research Project.

Heron, J. (1989) *The Facilitator's Handbook*, London: Kogan Page.

Hogan, C. (2003) *Practical Facilitation: A Toolkit of Techniques*, London: Kogan Page.

Mann, T. (2007) *Facilitation: An Art, Science, Skill or All Three? Build Your Expertise in Facilitation*, London: Resource Productions.

McCain, D. V. and Tobey, D. D. (2004) *Facilitation Basics (ASTD Training Basics)*, 2nd edn, Alexandria: ATD Press.

Mead, G. H. (1934) *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviourist*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Mead, G. H. (1938) *The Philosophy of the Act*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mowles, C. (2007) *Promises of Transformation: Just How Different are International Development NGOs? Journal of International Development*, Vol 19, No 3, pp 401–411.

Mowles, C. (2009) *Consultancy as Temporary Leadership: Negotiating Power in Everyday Practice: International Journal of Learning and Change*, Vol 3, No 3, pp 281–293.

Mowles, C. (2015) *Managing in Uncertainty: Complexity and the Paradoxes of Everyday Organisational Life*, London: Routledge.

Reason, P. (1988). *Human Inquiry in Action: Developments in New Paradigm Research*, London: Sage.

Reason, P. and Rowan, J. (1981) *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research*, London: Wiley.

Rogers, C. R. (1951) *Client-Centred Therapy*, London: Constable and Robinson.

Schwarz, R. M. (2002) *The Skilled Facilitator: A Comprehensive Resource for Consultants, Facilitators, Managers, Trainers, and Coaches*, 3rd edn, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sharp, D. (1987) *Personality Types, Jung's Model of Typology*, Toronto: Inner City Books.

Stacey, R. D. , Griffin, D. and Shaw, P. (2000) *Complexity and Management: Fad or Radical Challenge to Systems Thinking*, London: Routledge.

Stacey, R. D. (2007) *Strategic Management and Organisational Dynamics*, 5th edn, London: Pearson Education.

Stacey, R. D. (2012) *Tools and Techniques of Leadership and Management*, London: Routledge.

Unger, R. , Nunnally, B. and Willis, D. (2013) *Designing the Conversation: Techniques for Successful Facilitation*, Indianapolis, IN: New Riders Publishing.

## **What are consultants actually recognised for?**

Cockman, P. , Evans, B. , and Reynolds, P. (1999) *Consulting for Real People: A Client-Centred Approach for Change Agents and Leaders*, Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.

Daniels, A.C. (2000) *Other People's Habits: How to Use Positive Reinforcement to Bring Out the Best in People Around You*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Elias, N. (1970) *What Is Sociology?* New York: Columbia University Press.

Elias, N. (1978) *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Gostick, A. and Elton, C. (2007) *The Carrot Principle: How the Best Managers Use Recognition to Engage Their People, Retain Talent, and Accelerate Performance*, New York: Free Press.

Griffin, D. (2002) *Emergence of Leadership*, London: Routledge.

Hansford, D. (2003) *The Magic of Employee Recognition: 10 Proven Tactics from CalPERS and Disney*, Scottsdale: WorldatWork.

Hegel, G. (1977) 'Phenomenology of Spirit' in Wood, A.W. (1990) *Hegel's Ethical Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Honneth, A. (1994) *Kampf um Anerkennung*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Honneth, A. (2001) *Leiden an Unbestimmtheit*, Stuttgart: Reclam.

Joas, H. and Knöbl, W. (2004) *Sozialtheorie: Zwanzig einführende Vorlesungen*, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Kegan, R. and Laskow Lahey , L. (2009) *Immunity to Change: How to overcome It and Unlock the Potential of Yourself and Your Organization*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Kofman, F. (2006) *Conscious Business: How to Build Value through Values*, Boulder, CO: Sounds True.

Mead, G.H. (1934) *Mind, Self and Society*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Peters, T.J. (1988) in Willmott, H. (1993) (ed) 'Strength is Ignorance; Slavery is Freedom: Managing Culture in Modern Organizations', *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4): 515–552.

Schein, E.H. (1999/2009) *The Corporate Culture Survival Guide*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shaw, P. (2002) *Changing Conversations in Organizations: A Complexity Approach to Change*, Oxon: Routledge.

Stacey, R. (2007) *Strategic Management and Organisational Dynamics*, Harlow: Pearson Education.

Stacey, R. (2010) *Complexity and Organizational Reality*, Oxon: Routledge.

Stacey, R. , Griffin, D. , and Shaw, P. (2000) *Complexity and Management: Fad or Radical Challenge to Systems Thinking?*, Oxon: Routledge.

Willmott, H. (1993) 'Strength is Ignorance; Slavery is Freedom: Managing Culture in Modern Organizations', *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4): 515–552.

Wood, A.W. (1990) *Hegel's Ethical Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## **Actualising plurality**

Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, H. (1963). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. London: Faber and Faber.

Arendt, H. (1973). *Origins of Totalitarianism*. New Edition with added prefaces. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Arendt, H. (1983). *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. New York: Penguin.
- Arendt, H. (2005). *The Promise of Politics*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Bernstein, R.J. (2007). *The New Constellation*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brinkmann, S. (2017). *Stand Firm: Resisting the Self-Improvement Craze*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Canovan, M. (1992). *Hannah Arendt: A Reinterpretation of her Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clegg, S. (2006). The Bounds of Rationality: Power/History/Imagination. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*. 17, pp. 847–863.
- Ehrenreich, B. (2010). *Bright-Sided: How Positive Thinking in Undermining America*. New York: Picador USA.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails And How It Can Succeed Again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Griffin, D. (2002). *The Emergence of Leadership: Linking Self-Organisation and Ethics*. London: Routledge.
- Loidolt, S. (2019). *Phenomenology of Plurality: Hannah Arendt on Political Intersubjectivity*. London: Routledge.
- Mowles, C. (2011). *Rethinking Management: Radical Insights from the Complexity Sciences*. Farnham: Gower Applied Research.
- Mowles, C. (2015). *Managing in Uncertainty: Complexity and the Paradoxes of Everyday Organisational Life*. London: Routledge.
- Rosa, H. (2016). *Resonance: A Sociology of Our Relationship to the World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Shaw, P. (2002). *Changing Conversations in Organisations: A Complexity Approach to Change*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Shaw, P. (2005). Conversational Inquiry as an Approach to Organisation Development: *Journal of Innovative Management*. 3, pp. 19–22.
- Stacey, R.D. (2012). *Tools and Techniques of Leadership and Management—Meeting the Challenge of Complexity*. London: Routledge.
- Stacey, R.D. and Mowles, C. (2016). *Strategic Management and Organizational Dynamics: The Challenge of Complexity*. New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- Taylor, C. (1991). *The Malaise of Modernity*. Toronto: Anansi.
- Townley, B. (2008). *Reason's Neglect: Rationality and Organising*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willig, R. (2014). Emancipation: From Introvert to Extrovert Critique. *Advances in Applied Sociology*. 4(7), pp. 190–196.

## **Collaboration as a politics of affect**

- Alvesson, M. , Kärreman, D. , Sturdy, A. and Handley, K. (2009) Unpacking the client(s): Constructions, positions and client-consultant dynamics. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 25(3), 253–263.
- Alvesson, M. and Sköldbberg, K. (2009) *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications.
- Betta, M. (2015) Foucault's Overlooked Organisation: Revisiting His Critical Works. *Culture, Theory and Critique*, 57(3), 251–273.
- Brinkmann, S. (2012) *Qualitative Inquiry in Everyday Life: Working with Everyday Life Materials*. London: Sage Publications.
- Burkitt, I. (2014) *Emotions and Social Relations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bushe, G. and Marshak, R. (2015) *Dialogic Organization Development*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Butler, N. (2010) 'Lessons for Managers and Consultants': A Reading of Edgar H. Schein's Process Consultation. *The Leading Journal in the Field* Destabilizing: Authority in the Social Sciences of Management. 61–84.

- Cheung-Judge, M. and Holbeche, L. (2011) *Organizational Development, a Practitioner's Guide for OD and HR*. London: Kogan Page.
- Clark, T. and Salaman, G. (1998) Telling Tales: Management Gurus' Narratives and the Construction of Managerial Identity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 35(2), 137–161.
- Coghlan, D. (2018) Edgar Schein at 90: A Celebratory and Exploratory Metalogue. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 54(4), 385–398.
- Costea, B. , Crump, N. and Amiridis, K. (2008) Managerialism, the Therapeutic Habitus and the Self in Contemporary Organizing. *Human Relations*, 61(5), 661–685.
- Crossley, N. (2011) *Towards Relational Sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Curtis, G. (2018) *Functional Collusion in a UK Non-Governmental Organisation: Processes of Shame and Exclusion from the Perspective of an Organisational Development Practitioner*. (Unpublished dissertation, University of Hertfordshire, UK).
- Czander, W. and Eisol, K. (2003) Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Organizational Consulting: Transference and Counter-Transference. *Human Relations*, 56(4), 475–490.
- Dale, K. and Latham, Y. (2014) Ethics and Entangled Embodiment: Bodies-Materialities-Organization. *Organization*, 22(2), 166–182.
- Dewey, J. (1922/2007) *Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: Cosimo.
- Elias, N. (1991) *The Society of Individuals*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Engwall, L. and Kipping, M. (2013) Management Consulting: Dynamics, Debates, and Directions. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 7(2), 84–98.
- Fincham, R. (1999) The Consultant-Client Relationship: Critical Perspectives on the Management of Organizational Change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(3), 335–351.
- Gherardi, S. (2017) One Turn ... and Now Another One: Do the Turn to Practice and the Turn to Affect Have Something in Common? *Management Learning*, 48(3), 1–14.
- Hicks, J. (2010) *Co-Constructive Consulting: A Pragmatic, Relational Constructionist Approach*. Enschede: University of Twente.
- Jones, B. B. and Brazzel, M. (2006) *The NTL Handbook of Organization Development and Change: Principles, Practices and Perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Kipping, M. and Engwall, L. (Eds) (2002) *Management Consulting: The Emergence and Dynamics of a Knowledge Industry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lambrechts, F. , Bouwen, R. , Grieten, S. , Huybrechts, J.P. and Schein, E. H. (2011) Learning to Help Through Humble Inquiry and Implications for Management Research, Practice, and Education: An Interview with Edgar H. Schein. *Academy of Management, Learning & Education*, 10(1), 131–147.
- Leung, K. and White, S. (2006) Exploring Dark Corners: An Agenda for Organizational Behavior Research in Alliance Contexts. In: Shenkar, O. & Reuer, J.J. (Eds), *Handbook of Strategic Alliances*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage publications.
- Marcus, G. E. (2001) From Rapport Under Erasure to Theaters of Complicit Reflexivity. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7, 519.
- Marsh, S. (2009) *The Feminine in Management Consulting, Power, Emotion and Values in Consulting Interactions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marshall, G. S. (2016) Neoliberalism and the Entrepreneurial Subject: Tracking Bevir's Decentered Theory of Governance. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 19(3), 361–371.
- Messervy, A.S. (2014) *The Knowing Client: A Processual Perspective on Knowledge Shaping in Consulting Engagements*. (Unpublished dissertation, Business School, Queensland University of Technology, Australia.)
- Mouffe, C. (2013) *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically*. London: Verso.
- Petriglieri, G. and Wood, J. D. (2003) The Invisible Revealed: Collusion as an Entry to the Group Unconscious. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 33(4), 332–343. doi 10.1177/03621537030300408.
- Rosa, H. (2020) *The Uncontrollability of the World*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Schein, E. H. (1987) *Process Consultation. Vol. 2: Lessons for Managers and Consultants*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Scott, J. C. (1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Shuman, S. (2006) *Creating a Culture of Collaboration*, the International Association of Facilitators Handbook. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sturdy, A. (1997) The Consultancy Process: An Insecure Business. *Journal of Management Studies*, 34(3).
- Sturdy, A. , Clark, T. , Fincham, R. and Handley, K. (2009) Between Innovation and Legitimation: Boundaries and Knowledge Flow in Management Consulting. *Organization*, 16(5), 627–653.
- Sturdy, A. , Wright, C. and Wylie, N. (2015) *Management as Consultancy: Neo-Bureaucracy and the Consultant Manager*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trundle, C. (2018) Uncomfortable Collaborations: The Ethics of Complicity, Collusion, and Detachment in Ethnographic Fieldwork. *Collaborative Anthropologies*, 11(1), 89–110.
- Van der Ploeg, M. (2010) *Samenwerken onder huwelijkse voorwaarden*. (Unpublished Master thesis, University of Utrecht.)
- Weisbord, M. R. (1992) *Discovering Common Ground*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Wright, A. (2017) Embodied Organizational Routines: Explicating a Practice Understanding. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 1–13.

## Selling Ourselves short

- Abrahamson, E. (1996) Management Fashion. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), pp. 254–285.
- Alvesson, M. & Kärreman, D. (2000) Varieties of Discourse: On the Study of Organizations Through Discourse Analysis. *Human Relations*, 53(8), pp. 1125–1149.
- Bauman, Z. (2002) Identity in the Globalizing Word. In: E. Ben-Rafael & Y. Sternberg , eds. *Identity, Culture and Globalization*. Leiden: Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme, pp. 471–482.
- Birnbaum, R. (2000) The Life Cycle of Academic Management Fads. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), pp. 1–16.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003) *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. , 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. 2007 ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cheek (for LearnVest-Forbes), D. (2013) 10 Things You Should Know About Career Coaching. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/learnvest/2013/07/09/10-things-you-should-know-about-career-coaching/> [Accessed 27 August 2014 ].
- Clark, A. , Georgellis, Y. & Sanfey, P. (2001) Scarring: The Psychological Impact of Past Unemployment. *Economica*, 68(270), pp. 221–241.
- Council of the European Union (2008) *Council Resolution on Better Integrating Lifelong Guidance into Lifelong Learning Strategies*. Brussels: Council of the European Union.
- Cremin, C. (2009) Never Employable Enough: The (Im)possibility of Satisfying the Boss's Desire. *Organization*, 17(2), pp. 131–149.
- Darmon, I. & Perez, C. (2010) 'Conduct of conduct' or the Shaping of 'Adequate Dispositions'? Labour Market and Career Guidance in Four European Countries. *Critical Social Policy*, 31(1), pp. 77–101.
- Elias, N. (1956) Problems of Involvement and Detachment. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 7(3), pp. 226–252.
- Elias, N. (1978) *What Is Sociology?* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Elias, N. (2000) Part Four: Synopsis: Towards a Theory of Civilizing Processes State Formation and Civilization. In: *The Civilizing Process*. E. Dunning , J. Goudsblom & S. Mennell , eds. Malden (MA): Blackwell Publishing.
- Elias, N. (2001) Part I: The Society of Individuals. In: *The Society of Individuals*. M. Schröter , ed. New York/London: Continuum.
- Fleck, L. (1979) *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press,
- Fogde, M. (2011) Governing Through Career Coaching: Negotiations of Self-Marketing. *Organization*, 18(1), pp. 65–82.

- Gandolfi, F. (2009) Executing Downsizing: The Experience of Executioners. *Contemporary Management Research*, 5(2), pp. 185–200.
- Goffman, E. (1959/1990) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Penguin Books.
- Hancock, P. & Tyler, M. (2004) 'MOT Your Life': Critical Management Studies and the Management of Everyday Life. *Human Relations*, 57(5), pp. 619–645.
- Hareli, S. & Tzafrir, S. (2006) The Role of Causal Attributions in Survivors' Emotional Reactions to Downsizing'. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5(4), pp. 1–22.
- Herr, E. L. , Cramer, S. H. & Niles, S. G. (2003) *Career Guidance and Counseling Through the Lifespan: Systematic Approaches*. 6th ed. Boston (MA): Pearson Education Inc.
- Intermediar (2014) <http://www.intermediar.nl> [Online], Available: <http://www.intermediar.nl> [Accessed 8 December 2014 ].
- Jackall, R. (2010) *Moral Mazes, the World of Corporate Managers*. 20th anniversary ed. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Krejsler, J. (2007) Discursive Strategies That Individualize: CVs and Appraisal Interviews. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(4), pp. 473–490.
- Mead, G. H. (1992) *Mind, Self, & Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviourist*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London.
- Montgomery (for McKinsey on Finance), C. (2012) How Strategists Lead. *McKinsey on Finance*, Summer. Issue 44.
- Mowles, C. (2015) *Managing in Uncertainty – Complexity and the Paradoxes of Everyday Organizational Life*. 1st ed. Oxon: Routledge.
- Orwell, G. (1987) 'The Principles of Newspeak' an Appendix to 1984. In: *Complete Works of George Orwell*. 1987 ed. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Rose, N. (1999) *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. 2nd ed. London: Free Association Books.
- Sharone, O. (2013) Why Do Unemployed Americans Blame Themselves While Israelis Blame the System? *Social Forces*, 91(4), pp. 1429–1450.
- Shaw, P. (2002) *Changing Conversations in Organizations: A Complexity Approach to Change*. Oxon: Routledge - Taylor & Francis Group.
- Sidiropoulou-Dimakakou, D. , Mylonas, K. M. , Argyropoulou, K. & Drosos, N. (2013) Career Decision-Making Characteristics of Primary Education Students in Greece. *International Education Studies*, 6(5), pp. 22–32.
- Spicer, A. S. (2013) Shooting the Shit: The Role of Bullshit in Organisations. *M@n@gement*, 16(5), pp. 653–666.
- Stacey, R. D. , Griffin, D. & Shaw, P. (2000) *Complexity and Management: Fad or Radical Challenge to Systems Thinking?* London: Routledge.
- Taylor, C. (1992) *Modernity and the Rise of the Public Sphere*. Stanford: Stanford University.
- The National Black MBA Association (2014) *National Black MBA Association Inc. – Empowering Visionaries*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.nbmbaa.org/programs/ntential/Default.aspx> [Accessed 8 December 2014 ].
- Wilkinson, M. (2019) *The Secrets of Facilitation*. Available at <https://www.leadstrat.com/facilitators/michael-wilkinson/> [Accessed 18 December 2021 ]

## Conclusion

- Agar, M. (1986). *Speaking Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Brinkmann, S. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry in Everyday Life: Working with Everyday Life Materials*. London: SAGE.
- Dewey, J. (1922) *Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: Warren Press.
- Elias, N. (1987) *Involvement and Detachment*. Oxford: Blackwell. MIT Press.
- Elias, N. (1991) *The Society of Individuals*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Elias, N. (1939/2000) *The Civilizing Process*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Fleck, L. (1979) *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Griffin, D. (2002). *The Emergence of Leadership: Linking Self-Organization and Ethics*. London: Routledge.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mowles, C. (2011). *Rethinking Management: Radical Insights from the Complexity Sciences*. Farnham: Gower Applied Research.