

Challenging Organisations and Society

reflective hybrids®

Involving Stakeholders to Develop Change Capacity for More Effective Collaboration and Continuous Change

Tonnie van der Zouwen

Editor's Introduction: The Shift in Perception of Hierarchy and How to Provide Space for Shared Leadership

page 309

Alain de Vulpian . Tonnie van der Zouwen
Socioperception and the Emergence of an Economy of Meaning

page 314

Tova Averbuch

"The Little Engine that Could"

page 333

Lucien van der Plaats

Consigning Public Services to the People

page 353

Marc Vermeulen

Too Many Cooks Spoil the Broth

page 372

Peter Heintel . Tonnie van der Zouwen

Reflecting Power and Consultancy

page 389

Antonie van Nistelrooij . Eva van der Fluit .

Rob de Wilde

The Paradox of Programmed Dialogue in Large Group Interventions

page 405

Marvin Weisbord . Sandra Janoff

Ten Principles for Making Meetings Matter

page 421

Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids®

The Journal "*Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids® (COS)*" is the first journal to be dedicated to the rapidly growing requirements of reflective hybrids in our complex organisations and society of the 21st century. Its international and multidisciplinary approaches balance theory and practice and show a wide range of perspectives organised in and between organisations and society. Being global, diverse in thinking and acting outside the box are the targets for its authors and readers in management, consulting and science.
www.cos-journal.com
Contact: office@cos-journal.com

Founding Editor-in-Chief: Maria Spindler, Vienna, Austria
email: m.spindler@cos-journal.com

Founding Editorial Board: Ann Feyerherm (US), Karin Lackner (DE), Marlies Lenglachner (AT), Barbara Lesjak (AT), Ilse Schrittmesser (AT), Maria Spindler (AT), Chris Stary (AT), Gary Wagenheim (CA), Nancy Wallis (US), Tonnie van der Zouwen (NL)

Deputy Editor-in-Chief: Gary Wagenheim (CA)
Deputy Editor-in-Chief: Tonnie van der Zouwen (NL)

Founding Managing Editor: Elisabeth Schmidt, Vienna, Austria
email: e.schmidt@cos-journal.com

Manuscript Submission: Manuscripts original in style and content (not under review, accepted or published elsewhere) are welcome.

Terms of Publication: Before publication authors are requested to assign copyright to Verlagshaus Hernalts. At least one year after initial publication in "Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids®" the authors can retain their right to reuse the paper in other publications. Authors are responsible for obtaining permissions from copyright holders for reproducing any illustrations, figures, tables, etc. previously published elsewhere. Each author will receive an emailed proof of his article and a copy of the journal.

Disclaimer: The authors, editors, and publisher will not take any legal responsibility for errors or omissions that may be made in this issue. The publisher makes no warranty, expressed or implied, regarding the material contained herein.

Copyright: verlagshaus hernalts, vienna 2013

Too Many Cooks Spoil the Broth

Stakeholder management in 21st Century nonprofit organizations

Abstract

In the political system we see a dramatizing of processes because citizens are better educated and more critical. They claim value for money and social media may provide a very rapid diffusion of information about the quality of service delivery. An organization can be overexposed to all sorts of uninvited stakeholders. The dynamics in an organization may cause them to 'freeze' rather than to innovate. In this article I will specifically address the role and position of front-line professionals, because they are essential in service delivery, whereas they have to operate more and more in a glass house. Harvard political scientist Archon Fung, a specialist in stakeholder involvement, spoke of a Panopticum in which professionals are the prisoners and stakeholders are in the watching tower.

The article aims at providing a better understanding of the dynamics of public service delivery in a very critical and panoptical context, using a combination of sociological, policy science and HRM perspectives. Based on this better understanding, I will provide some conclusions and suggestions both for further research and for policymaking, regarding the role of stakeholders.

I. Introduction

Stakeholder involvement is supposed to have a positive influence on the development of organizations. Stakeholders help organizations to keep a sharp orientation on their clientele, they provide critical feedback on quality of services and they may also provide interesting networks for coproduction. In a way one could say 'the more the

merrier': you cannot have enough stakeholder participation. It might be exaggerated, but in general organizations rather run the risk of being too closed for stakeholders than of being too open.

However, things are changing. As a result of political, sociological and technical changes organizations may become overwhelmed with stakeholder attention. I will illustrate this with two rather painful cases/affaires in Dutch education (*Inholland* and *Amarantis*) in which a large public attention to failing systems overwhelmed organizations in education and highly contributed to low trust in organizational dynamics.

More generally my argument in this article will be that managing stakeholders may be quite a different game nowadays. With more permeable boundaries of organizations the definition of groups of stakeholders becomes blurred. Open organizations may have stakeholders they didn't even know of. People may feel that their interests are at stake and they want to be involved or at least informed, without having formal relations to organizations. As a consequence the idea of *managing* stakeholders becomes more complex. Management presupposes ratio and relation: but if we are not aware of a relation and/or these relations may be less rational than expected, how can we manage them? Organizations thus may have even unwelcome guests looking over their shoulder and interfering with internal affairs.

Inholland and Amarantis

My analysis is based on two recent major crises in large educational institutes in the Netherlands. For Dutch people the words *Inholland* and *Amarantis* have become well known examples of failing large schools, mismanagement, crisis and intense political deliberation. In both organizations I had the opportunity to play a role in the aftermath of the crisis.

Inholland is a large university for professional education operating in the major cities of the Western part of the Netherlands. They took a high profile not only by their size (very large) and their location in 3 of the largest cities of the Netherlands (Amsterdam, Rot-

terdam and The Hague). Inholland was the result of a series of swift mergers. They intended to provide high educational standards with for instance a very modern design of their curriculum, the acquisition of shares in a private university business school (Nyenrode) and a landmark type of buildings (Rotterdam). The organization ended up in a large crisis after a number of irregularities were discussed in national newspapers regarding examination procedures in a limited number of their programs. Investigation both by journalists, the Ministry of Education's Inspectorate and accountants revealed very meager quality control systems, mismanagement and big governance problems. Both in regular media and in social media many personal stories circulated of students and staff giving air to their frustrations with the Inholland organization. Under large pressure from parliament and the Minister of education the board was replaced. The new interim board faced massive frustration by professionals and a decline of students numbers causing large financial problems.

Amarantis was a more or less similar case, also in the Western part of the Netherlands, but now regarding vocational training. This very large organization rapidly moved towards full bankruptcy. Although the first alarming signals had a financial background, in the next weeks the educational results, quality control and style of management were heavily criticized. After much pressure in media and parliament the board was replaced and an interim manager decided that the organization had to be split up in 5 separate entities. Three national committees were installed to investigate the process.

This crisis was extensively debated as well in national political fora, in newspapers and news shows and on the internet.

Both crises at Inholland and Amarantis evolved in a climate where other public organizations (housing corporations and hospitals) got into more or less similar trouble. At the same time, the financial crisis hit the Dutch economy hard. Discussions of budget cuts were connected to the malfunctioning of those public organizations, the role (and incomes) of top management etc. They all fed into a system of mistrust in public performance. As a consequence

the political system reviewed a number of laws replacing confidence by control.

2. Stakeholders in the Public Domain

Three Discourses: Civic Society, State and Market

In the Netherlands, and perhaps more generally speaking in the Rhineland societies in Europe, many public organizations¹ have their roots in civic society of a previous era. Healthcare, education, social housing or welfare were typical functions where either well to do citizens and/or religious groups took the initiative to organize better conditions for those not able to do so. In the area I grew up (in the Dutch province Limburg), most schools, hospitals and welfare organizations were an initiative of either nuns or monks. Social housing was an initiative of the wealthy entrepreneurs, partly driven by (Catholic) social concerns, partly by functional motives (e.g. housing labor force in the vicinity of their plants). Over the past hundred years or so those organizations migrated from civic society to more or less state driven bureaucracies² and from there to semi-commercial enterprises. In the post second world war period states got very much involved in providing public services, as a result of the wish for the social security state. Together with money came bureaucracy, probably reaching a climax in the eighties of the last century. Large, inefficient and expensive bureaucracies got under the fire of Chicago school economists, in particular by Milton Friedman, and politicians, such as Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan who were inspired by Friedman's ideas: *new public management* boiled down to the idea that public services either should be sent to the market or that organizations at the very least should be managed as a company. Both effectiveness and efficiency would maximize in a businesslike setting.

1 Definition: also nonprofits or second sector organizations, privately run by boards, providing (welfare) services to the public at large. Note the difference with governmental organizations, such as public schools, policy forces etc. They are not privately owned and directly governed by elected politicians.

2 Without completely becoming part of the government, foundations, cooperations, mutuals etc. stayed independent as an organization with their own boards. However, their activities were (almost) fully funded by government and thus intensely regulated and supervised.

At the turn of the 20th century this model failed in my opinion: very large schools like Inholland and Amarantis got into trouble because of their size, the misunderstood idea of entrepreneurialism and competition by the top management, and the leading principles of returns of investments rather than educational quality and the creation of public goods. More or less similar patterns occurred in health care (Meavita, Orbis) and in social housing (Vestia) in the Netherlands³.

***Authorizing Environment of Street Level Organizations:
Government, Clients, Professionals***

In his seminal work on the creation of public value, Harvard political scientist Mark Moore⁴ introduced the idea of an authorizing environment of public organizations. Schools, hospitals etc. get a public license to operate by the society at large, either by democratic or by moral obligation. This public ‘audience’ may organize formally (parliaments, boards, inspectorates) or informally (public opinion, press) but in one way or another they provide an authorizing environment to those public organizations. The discourse in this environment may be dominated by more civic, more stately or more market driven types of deliberations.

A useful way of looking at the authorizing environment of public organizations is provided by McKevitts analysis of street level public organizations⁵. Building on the ideas of Lipsky’s street level bureaucrats⁶, McKevitt depicts schools, hospitals etc. as *street level* public organizations (SLPO’s): on a street level these organizations provide very practical public services (healthcare, housing, education) to clients in return for the (tax-) dollars they have paid. SLPO’s typically have to deal with 3 types of forces: government, clients and professionals. All three parties have double bindings outside the system. Using Dutch education as an example again: the *government’s*

3 Camps, T. & Vermeulen, M. (Eds.) (2012)

4 Moore, M. (1995, 2013)

5 McKevitt, D. (1998)

6 Lipsky, M. (1980)

hands are more and more tied by EU-regulations (e.g. higher educational policies are now decided to a large extent on an EU level, rather than on a national level). *Clients* may be both students and members of other social systems, they most certainly will comply with the rules of their peer groups and they might also be influenced by e.g. political or religious groups.

Finally *teachers* look for a balance between their role as an (loyal) employee and as an autonomous professional, perhaps referring more to their peers outside the organization and following more the outside professional rules and codes rather than the organizational ones. A typical and probably also very positive characteristic of professionals is that they keep in close contact with their professional communities outside the organization, thus staying connected to state-of-the-art insights from those professional communities.

Depending on the dominance of a particular discourse, government, professionals and clientele as main stakeholders of schools or hospitals may each follow a different line in their perception of the value created by the SLPOs.

When SLPO's were predominantly initiated by civic initiatives, clients were the recipients of good deeds and had to be humble and grateful. Professionals (many of them probably being volunteers) had a strong moral conviction in doing their work and were driven by calling and religious aspirations. In this system, the state as an authorizing environment only played a distant role backing up civic elites.

When the discourse becomes predominantly state driven, governments as a consequence will be active rulers, professionals will see themselves as acting bureaucrats and clients will be obedient subjects of public policies, enforcing their influence by elections every so many years. However, in a *new public management* type of public value creation, governments will play a distant role at best as a market manager, trying to create level playing fields for open competitions. Clients become customers, demanding value for money, and professionals become salespersons in public services trying to satisfy the customer and to optimize their hospital or housing agency.

So far, we have encountered 3 types of stakeholders (politicians, professionals and clients) and three types of discourses (civic, state and market) providing a structure to describe dynamics in public services delivery over the past century. The dynamics in roles and responsibilities may be summarized as shown in table 1:

Discourse/ Stakeholders	Politicians	Clients	Professionals
Civic	Support through Elite Networks	Gratitude Obedience	Trust
State	Constructivist and Activist Regulation	Rights & Obligations	Bureaucratic Control
Market	Create Level Playing Field	Deals, Consumption	Transaction

Table 1: Stakeholders' perspective in three different discourses

The final decades of the 20th century also provide us with more professional managers running public agencies. Inspired by new public management, the scale of public service providence exploded: large schools, large hospitals etc. A caste of professional managers started running those complex organizations. One of the main challenges for them was understanding their position in this 3 x 3 system of stakeholder influence, both trying to read the dominant discourse and trying to balance the positions of clients, professionals and government. Strategic analyses of threats and weaknesses are combined with the analyses of the playing field and of relevant stakeholders. The whole idea of *managing stakeholders* results from those insights: it boils down to selectively activating and de-activating groups in society in order to support the goals of the organization.

3. Dynamics and Dilemmas in Stakeholder-Management

Although the combination of stakeholders and political discourses as provided in table 1 may be helpful from an analytic perspective it should not be viewed as a stable nor as a consistent and well-balanced process. In this section I will present some dilemmas and dynamics within the system of public service delivery.

Clients

A classic issue within this line of thinking is how we have to deal with the group of voiceless stakeholders. Core of the welfare state is that it takes care of people who for some reason do not succeed in organizing their own income, housing, health etc. In the earlier days this was typically a low income and low education group having troubles to develop their own 'voice' within the public system. In the civic society as it developed in the 19th century, they were taken care of by either religious groups and/or by well to do citizens who acted from a calling. Other people decided what was best for them; they were not able to address their own needs in a rational and informed way. Voiceless gratitude was the best these groups had to show to their beneficiaries. After the introduction of general elections their position was strengthened by giving them a formal vote in the political system. However, all democratic systems struggle with the problem of underrepresentation. Either groups of people do not use their vote or they use it (e.g. if voting is an obligation) in a non-informed and/or non-rational way, thus silencing their own voice within the system.

In a market driven system for public value creation, citizens find forms of purchasing power; the client becomes a customer. As in a regular market people could decide to have education from one or from another school thus forcing schools to be responsive to the needs of their students. Competition forces schools to be efficient and effective. Rational actors choose the best schools for themselves or their children, as they do with housing, healthcare etc. However, not every customer acts rational and fully informed⁷. Complex sys-

7 Tiemeijer, W. L., Thomas, C. A., Prast, H. M. (Eds.) (2009)

tems have high entrance barriers, need specialist knowledge to understand them, or are culturally miles away of some groups in society. As in regular markets, also in the public domain market failure seems to be hard to handle and excludes groups from public services that are either good for those groups or for society as a whole (externalities). People do not act rationally all the time, e.g. some people do not find their way to hospitals when they should or do not follow up on medical treatment.

Professionals

More or less similar lines of thinking can be applied to public servants. In civic society their main motives to engage in education, healthcare or welfare work was calling. In many instances people acted as volunteers or were underpaid. Motivation was intrinsic (calling, religion) and altruistic. 'Drives' of those volunteers were predominantly moral, local and (specifically in Catholic systems) obedient. The dominant characteristic of the labor relation between professional and their organizations was *trust*.

With increasing government rule in public service provision, professionals became bureaucrats, acting from a legal mandate that provided guidelines for their professional judgment and actions. Motivations probably were mixed: both altruistic but also avoiding risk⁸. Loss of professional autonomy and mediocre pay schemes were compensated by regulated labor conditions and high levels of job and income security. The public domain became a *sheltered sector* within the economic arena, not very much influenced by business cycle dynamics, changing slowly and not very competitive in the labour market⁹. Essential in the labor relation between professional and organization was *bureaucratic control*.

Pushing SLPO's into market dynamics, labor relations were supposed to reform drastically. Tenured schedules were replaced by

8 Buurman, M. (2011), Dohmen, T. (2010)

9 With as a dramatic consequence that the public sector organizations are more attractive for low skilled people compared to private firms and for high skilled people the opposite is true. See for further discussion Donahue, J. (2008).

temporary contracts; well predictable income patterns were distorted by the introduction of performance pay and bonuses. The core of the labor relations became *transactions* or deals.

Political System

Changes in the political dynamics may have consequences for the influence the political system can have on street level public organizations. At the starting point, in a night watchman state there was hardly any involvement in public service delivery (except for safety), private civic initiative was leading in delivering welfare to society. In shifting to state run bureaucratic systems, obviously political influence increased dramatically and subsequently it seemed to evaporate in new public management. Another interesting development was the increasing influence of Bruxelles in the European Union. A growing part of public services is influenced by international rather than national legislation. Higher educational policy (Lisbon agreement) may be the best example of this logic: higher educational systems have to be aligned within the EU in order to stimulate the mobility of students and professionals and to enhance transparency in qualification systems.

So also at the level of (national) politics we see changes in the relations between government and public institutions redefining the balances between them in terms of influence (voice) and stakes.

Conclusion: All Stakeholders Are Equal but Some Are More Equal than Others

This Orwellian statement may very well applied to a number of tactics by public organizations. Managing stakeholders according to textbooks implies a selective activation of some stakeholders over other stakeholders. One might expect this tactical development of relations as a means of realizing the goals and mission of the organization. However, goals may shift over time and may be ambiguous as well. A typical characteristic of public organizations is that they are vulnerable to shifts in the political climate. For good reasons boards of those organizations may want to develop a more independent policy, create

Relation between Organization	State	student	Professional
	<p>C/M> Organizations behave very independently</p> <p>C/M> Limited state influence in governance (appointing key executives, supervisors etc.)</p> <p>M> Lump sum budget, both driven by student numbers and by output</p> <p>M> Financial risks partly in organization, partly state level too big to fail</p> <p>C/M> No regulator in playing field, free competition</p> <p>C> Indirect quality control, no state influence on curriculum</p>	<p>M> Student is mass consumer, bringing in money</p> <p>C/S> Students do not choose on quality or price but on proximity and image</p> <p>S> In meritocracy study is defensive necessity and/or commodity</p> <p>C/S> Non-voluntary relation between student and school: there is no other choice</p> <p>S> Strong pressure from government to attend college education</p>	<p>C> Professional seeks autonomy and focuses on class rather than organization.</p> <p>C/M> Low buy in in organizational issues: relation is transactional</p> <p>S> Risk avoiding behavior, tenured tracks are dominant</p> <p>C> Professionals try to avoid bureaucratic procedures, forms etc.</p>

State		<p>S> Clientele looks for recognition in political system (public opinion)</p> <p>S> Political systems finds interesting electoral support in frustration of both students/parents and professionals</p> <p>C/S> Education becomes 'hot' in both public opinion and political debate</p>	<p>C/S> Indirect influence of inspectorate and national (non-state) bodies on curriculum and assessment</p> <p>C/M> Limited legislation on professional standards, licensing etc.</p> <p>S/M> Labor conditions are hybrid: partly determined by national agreements and partly by local employers (flexible and decentralized)</p>
Client			<p>C/S> Student and teacher did not chose each other. No positive commitment, weak psychological contract</p> <p>S > Due to bureaucracy relations are anonymous</p>
<p><i>Type of discourse: market dominated discourse (M), civic society dominated (C) or state dominated (B)</i></p>			

Table 2: Classification of the relation at Inholland and Amaranis between students, schools and government by type of discourse.

a distance to overactive political involvement. They may want to build up a heat shield in order to develop a stable operation, boards will prioritize their activities and involvements. As a consequence they will serve some specific needs more explicitly over other needs or in other words they may accommodate some stakes better than others.

Changes in discourse may also force them to do so: those changes will have different consequences for different stakeholders; and some will adjust easier than others. This will bring along misbalances within the system. In the cases that I was involved in (Inholland and Amarantis) I saw a very unbalanced system where different stakeholders held different positions and acted according to the lines of different discourses. In a way those differences created a lock-in situation in which no one actually had a clue of what was the leading mechanism within the organization. Obviously the top executive level was not successful in balancing the organization and the different internal and external stakeholders. This contributed to a large extend to the major crises that struck those organizations.

The balancing act and the selective activation of stakeholders will be standing much more in the spotlight and will therefore involve unexpected 'guests'. Due to social media SLPO's are in a glass house: deliberations and consequences will be out in the open all the time. It is easy to tape behavior of street level bureaucrats and put it online. This will have two consequences. First, professionals and their managers may become very uncertain and risk avoiding not knowing where and how their behavior will become subject of discussion. The idea of a Panopticum comes to mind: a perfect way to immobilize people is to make their behavior visible at unexpected moments and without any option to hide. Second, voiceless stakeholders may find new ways to express their intentions; spectators without a stake may be of growing influence as unexpected arbiter of value¹⁰. Thresholds to comment (if necessary anonymous) are low, and people do not have to be involved themselves to form an opinion about

10 The idea of the glass house and the Panopticum came up in an interview with political scientist Archon Fung of the Harvard Kennedy School of Governments. See Vermeulen, M. (2012)

the quality of schools, hospitals etc. All of this occurs in a political arena that seems to be more fragmented, both in ideology and in short term, single issue attention. Dramatization in the democratic process¹¹ may bring much unexpected and upfront dynamics for SL-POs. Politicians may not be interested in the bigger picture, the general interest, or the long term.

4. Discussion: Four Issues Challenging 21st Century Public Organizations

The changes in the dominant discourse for managing street level public organizations are very much a fact of life in the early 21st century. Executives of public organizations will be challenged to constantly adapt to new combinations of different stakeholders engaging in different types of discourse. For that reason I see four major issues waiting for answers:

1. In the 21st century we don't know how to develop new directions after the failure of state and market as dominant mechanisms. Is there a 21st century re-invention of civic society? For which stakeholders will this be an attractive perspective and will all stakeholders 'migrate' to the same set of expectations?¹²
2. Traditional democratic institutions (parliament, elections etc.) lose ground to more informal democratic processes, such as supervising a school board or influencing a housing corporation. Politicians may follow up on this and actively interfere with day to day management and governance issues, simply because it is a new way of getting into touch with their electorate¹³. On the one hand this provides good opportunities for activist involvement in order to open up autistic or fossilized institutions such as large schools, hospitals etc. On the other hand, however, it will intro-

11 Elchardus, M. (2002)

12 Some indications are found in changes in the US society after 9/11 and after the Obama election. Putnam revisited in 2010 his idea of a disintegration of social structures as put in his book *Bowling Alone*. Temporary social structures (supporting firemen's families after 9/11 and supporting the first Obama campaign) unexpectedly seemed to persist, supported by social media. See Putnam, R. & Sanders, T. (2010)

13 Fung, A. (2002)

- duce unpredictable new elements in process that need to have some form of stability and sustainability.
3. Large organization may have little buy in of both clients and of professionals; they will become (even more) loosely coupled due to virtualization of relations (blended learning, distance health-care, flexible working). Insiders and outsiders of organizations will be more intertwined, the boundaries between inside and outside of an organization will become blurred. For this reason new groups will engage with organizations, not necessarily driven by direct interests in those organizations.
 4. Stakeholders are better educated, more rational and more critical towards the added value provided for their personal situation. In general in the Western world people become more rationalistic, they want to have evidence for the quality of public services rather than beliefs and stories¹⁴. Also they seem to be less orientated on public goods or collectiveness and more on individual benefits. This implies that accountability to the public will have to change from generic and ideological to specific and evidence based.

References:

- Buurman, M. (2011), *Beyond the Call of Duty? Essays on motivation and self-selection of bureaucrats*. Erasmus University (PhD thesis), Rotterdam.
- Camps, T. / Vermeulen, M. (Eds.) (2012), *Een hele onderneming. Liber amicorum voor prof. dr. ir. C.A.M. Mouwen*. TiasNimbas, Tilburg.
- Dohmen, T. (2010), *Waarom sommigen liever leraar worden en anderen beter geen bankier kunnen worden*. In *TPEdigitaal 2010*, Vol. 4(2), pp. 106–129.
- Donahue, J. (2008), *The Warping of Government Work*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Elchardus, M. (2002), *De dramademocratie*. Lannoo, Thielt.
- Fung, A. (2002), *Creating Deliberative Publics: Governance After Devolution and Democratic Centralism*. In *The Good Society*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2002, pp. 66–71.
- Lipsky, M. (1980), *Street-level bureaucracy*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Moore, M. (1995), *Creating Public Value*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass).
- Moore, M. (2013), *Recognizing Public Value*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass).

¹⁴ Results from the Global Value Survey from OECD (2008), *Trends Shaping Education*. Paris: OECD page 74.

- McKevitt, D. (1998), *Managing core public service*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Mouwen, C. (2011), *Handboek Strategisch Management voor de Non-profit Organisatie*, Van Gorcum, Assen.
- Putnam, R. D. / Sanders, T. (2010), Still Bowling Alone? The Post-9/11 Split. In *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 21, No. 1, January 2010, pp. 9–16.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000), *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Tiemeijer, W. L. / Thomas, C. A. / Prast, H. M. (Eds.) (2009), *De menselijke beslisser. Over de psychologie van keuze en gedrag*. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Vermeulen, M. (2012), Dertig jaar na Street-level Bureaucracy. Een blik terug en een blik vooruit met Archon Fung. In Moors, H. / Bervoets, E. (Eds.) (2012), *Frontlijnwerkers in de veiligheidszorg. Gevalsstudies, patronen, analyse*. Boom Juridische uitgevers, Den Haag.

Table of figures

- Figure 1: The reflective hybrid—transformation: distancing from oneself and inventing oneself anew.
- Figure 2: Theory as orientation, recognition and judgement in the world
- Figure 3: Practice as orientation, recognition and judgement perspectives in connection with the world.
- Figure 4: Poiesis as orientation, recognition and judgement of effect on the world.

Literature

- Arendt, H. (2011), *Vita Activa oder Vom tätigen Leben* (10th edition). Piper Verlag, München.
- Arendt, H. (1999), *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Argyris, C. / Schön, D. (1974), *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Aristotle (1983), *Nikomachische Ethik*. Reclam, Stuttgart.
- Baecker, D. (2007), *Studien zur nächsten Gesellschaft*. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main.
- Battilana, J. / Dorado, S. (2010), Building Sustainable Hybrid Organisations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organisations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2010, Vol. 53. No. 6, pp. 1419–1440.
- Bolden, R. (2011), Distributed Leadership in Organizations: A Review of Theory and Research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13 September 2011, pp. 251–269.
- Conklin, J. (2006), *Dialog Mapping: Building Shared Understanding of Wicked Problems*. Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Cook-Greuter, R. (2004), Making the Case for a Developmental Perspective. *Industrial and Commercial Training*. No. 36, pp. 275–281.
- Dewey, J. (1933), *How we think*. D.C. Heath, Lexington, MA.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1999), *Das postmoderne Wissen*. Passagen Verlag, Wien, Köln.
- Luhmann, N. (1986), *Soziale Systeme*. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main.

- Luhmann, N. (2006), *Organisation und Entscheidung* (2nd edition). VS Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- Morgan, G. (2006), *Images of Organisation* (updated edition of the international bestseller) Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.
- Oevermann, U. (1996), Theoretische Skizze einer revidierten Theorie professionellen Handelns. In Combe, A. & Helsper, W. (Eds), *Pädagogische Professionalität*. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt, pp. 70–182.
- Rodgers, C. (2002), Defining Reflection: Another Look at John Dewey and reflective Thinking. *Teachers College Record*. Vol. 104, Number 4, June 2002, pp. 842–866.
- Torbert, W. R. (2010), The Power of Balance: Transforming Self, Society, and Scientific Inquiry. *Integral Review*. Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 208–235.
- Scharmer, Otto (2009), *Theory U. Leading from the Future as It Emerges*. Berret-Koehler, San Francisco.
- Schwarz, G. (2007), *Die "Heilige Ordnung" der Männer. Hierarchie, Gruppendynamik und die neue Rolle der Frauen*. VS Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- Smithsonian Institute (2012): <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history-archaeology/Uncovering-Secrets-of-the-Sphinx.html> (download from 26. November 2012)
- Spindler, M. (2012), How to Awaken the Potential of Organizations to Act as Societal Transformers. *Challenging Organisations and Society*. Vol. 1, Issue 1, October 2012, pp. 23–43.
- Spindler, M. / Steger, M. (2008), *Metamanagement in gebildeten Unternehmen*. VDM, Saarbrücken.
- Wimmer, R. (2012), Die neuere Systemtheorie und ihre Implikationen für das Verständnis von Organisation, Führung und Management. In: Rüegg-Stürm, J. / Bieger, T., *Unternehmerisches Management. Herausforderungen und Perspektiven*. Haupt Berne, Göttingen.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Tova Averbuch has been an Organization Development practitioner for over thirty years. She pioneered with Open Space Technology (OST) in Israel and the world since 1999. She teaches Master degree students of Organizational Consultation in Recanati School for Business at Tel Aviv University, giving courses in consulting behavior and in Large Group Interventions with the whole system in the room. She carries a deep interest and unique style in hosting whole systems for meaningful conversations and for the emergence of collective new wisdom. For more information, visit

www.tovaaverbuch.com

Eva van der Fluit is management consultant with 30 years experience in a variety of consultancy roles and industries. She has worked in Europe, the US and Africa. She is an experienced program manager of change programs in the area of strategy, organizational design and culture-change. Her programs include small and large-scale interventions. She mostly works with professionals and combines her work with a PhD study on conflict handling. She does field research in the cockpit and focuses on the question how pilots handle potential conflict. Eva believes that effective change is the result of facilitating people to solve complex problems themselves and to develop their own organization.

www.evavanderfluit.nl

Peter Heintel is professor emeritus for philosophy and group dynamics at the University of Klagenfurt, Department of Intervention Research and Cultural Sustainability. His publications on philosophy of history, philosophy of science and history of science have been internationally recognized. Professor Heintel is well known for his research on time and is the founder of the “Society for Decelera-

tion of Time”. He has made numerous contributions to Process Ethics, Intervention Research, Cultural Sustainability, and Conflict Management. For more information and contact:

www.uni-klu.ac.at/iff/ikn/inhalt/1.htm, peter.heintel@aau.at.

Sandra Janoff, PhD is a consultant and psychologist, co-recipient of the Organization Development Network’s 2011 Outstanding Global Work Award for the Future Search Network and a member of the European Institute for Transnational Studies. Sandra’s work has taken her to every continent working on issues of globalization, sustainability, economic renewal and humane practice in Africa, Asia, Australia, West and East Europe and New Zealand. She was a staff member in Tavistock conferences sponsored by Temple University in Philadelphia and The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London, England. She is co-author with Yvonne Agazarian of “Systems Thinking and Small Groups” for the Comprehensive Textbook of Group Psychotherapy.

sjanoff@futuresearch.net and
www.futuresearch.net

Antonie van Nistelrooij is management consultant for all types of clients in government and industry and Assistant Professor of ‘Organizational Change & Development’ at the VU University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. His research focuses on challenges in facilitating participative organizational change. This has resulted in several scientific books and articles on subjects like ‘Change Leadership’, ‘Large Group Interventions’ and ‘Change Management’. Most of his publications are embedded in a social constructionist perspective on change. He is editor of the Journal of Change Management and works as a lecturer and academic supervisor for several MBA’s, in company programs and postgraduate programs at several Dutch universities.

Lucien van der Plaats has been an interim communications manager and consultant for fourteen years. Predominantly in Dutch local and regional (semi-) governmental institutions, Lucien coaches and advises PR professionals, managers, directors and policy makers in their communication activities during change projects or policy projects and programs. He is also a facilitator of Large Scale Intervention Events (i.a. Open Space, Worldcafé). His main fields of interest are citizen participation, co-creation and communicating organizational change. Lucien lectures and writes blogs on co-creation, serious gaming (gamification as a means to involve people in change processes) and corporate storytelling. He holds a master's degree in European Public Relations.

Marc Vermeulen is professor of educational sociology at Tilburg University and at the Open University NL and he teaches strategic analysis for public organizations at TiasNimbas Business School in the Netherlands. He is academic director of the Strategy, Innovation and Governance course for top managers in education. He is also a consultant for leaders of public organizations and member of the Supervisory Council for several social enterprises.

Alain de Vulpian is a socio-anthropologist and the founder of Cofremca, RISC, and Sociovision. He has dedicated his professional life to conducting action research, observing the evolution of western societies, and designing humane interventions. His book "Towards the Third Modernity: How Ordinary People Are Transforming the World", Triarchy Press, 2008, summarizes this work. Since his retirement, Alain has continued to research topics of general interest. He is vice president of SoL France.

Marvin Weisbord is a distinguished Visiting Scholar of Organizational Dynamics Graduate Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, a Distinguished Visiting Fellow at Ashridge Business School (UK) and

a fellow of the World Academy of Productivity Science. During 50 years as a manager, consultant, researcher and teacher he has worked with businesses, NGOs, and medical schools. He has been a partner in the consulting firm Block Petrella Weisbord and a member of NTL Institute and the European Institute for Transnational Studies for more than 20 years. He has a Lifetime Achievement award from the Organization Development Network, which voted “Productive Workplaces” one of the most influential books of the past 40 years. The 3rd edition in 2012 was chosen Best Business Book on Organizational Culture by *strategy+business* magazine.

mweisbord@futuresearch.net and www.futuresearch.net

Rob de Wilde Msc works as management consultant, interim (change) manager and teaches at several Dutch business schools. He is specialized in Large Scale Interventions and leadership development and is one of the pioneers in introducing Large Scale Intervention and Whole Scale Change in the Netherlands, after he had been invited by the founders of Whole Scale Change and Real Time Strategic Change in the early nineties. He is (co)author of several books on this topic and wrote about thirty articles.

www.sigma-rt.nl

Tonnie van der Zouwen studied Ecology and Change Management in the Netherlands. After a career as researcher, teacher, environmental consultant and organizational consultant she now works as an independent organizational consultant. She guides organizations and networks in developing their change capacities. She does this by introducing interactive change methods, bringing people together beyond the boundaries of organizations and disciplines. She writes informative handbooks and articles on these methods and educates professionals on how to apply them. She wrote a doctoral thesis on a framework for effectiveness an evaluation of sustainable change with Large Scale Interventions. For further information and contact see

www.tonnievanderzouwen.com and www.largescaleinterventions.com


Maria Spindler . Eva Maria Bauer
(Eds.)

**Research Case Studies as
Learning Challenges
for Leaders and Organisations . Bridging University
and Corporation . Volume II**

€ 49,50 178 pages, hardcover

ISBN 978-3-902744-28-9

Case studies support leaders to take up a reflective, inquiring and open attitude toward their own leadership practices. A specially developed form of case study is used in the MBA programme "Communication and Leadership" at the Danube University Krems.



The research case study is developed for investigating unclear and critical phenomena and is used as a vehicle for translating leadership phenomena into comprehensible language.

The leaders work on their own real life situations in the form of case studies, applying practical and theoretical perspectives. They each tell their story with its highs and lows and identify organisational learning patterns. Telling these core stories becomes an effective opportunity to create an appropriate distance and new mindsets, resulting in new opportunities to understand and act as a leader and organisation.

- Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids®**
Volume 1, Issue 1, October 2012
Mental Leaps into Challenging Organisations and Society
Editor: Maria Spindler (AT)
€ 28,- plus shipping costs
- Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids®**
Volume 2, Issue 1, May 2013
Title: Reflective Hybrids in Management and Consulting
Editors: Maria Spindler (AT), Gary Wagenheim (CA)
€ 28,- plus shipping costs
- Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids®**
Volume 2, Issue 2, October 2013
Title: Involving Stakeholders to Develop Change Capacity for
More Effective Collaboration and Continuous Change
Editor: Tonnie van der Zouwen (NL)
€ 28,- plus shipping costs
- Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids®**
Subscription . 2 issues each year
€ 56,- plus shipping costs each year

Subscription:

The journal is published semi-annually (May and October). The price of an annual subscription is € 56.-. The subscription can be terminated until 31.12. for the next year.

Order the journal at www.cos-journal.com
or mail to sales@cos-journal.com
or use the fax machine + 43 1 923 19 38.

Name: _____

Address: _____

verlagshaus hernals e.U. ottakringer straÙe 14 . 1170 vienna
easybank
IBAN: AT611420020010671460
BIC: EASYATW1
www.verlagshaus-hernals.at
UID: ATU 64197657



ANNOUNCEMENT

"Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids"

Volume 3 Issue 1, appears May 2014

Title: Different Cultures, Different Rhythms

Editor: Karin Lackner (DE)

The Journal “Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids® (COS)” is the first journal to be dedicated to the rapidly growing requirements of reflective hybrids in our complex organisations and society of the 21st century. Its international and multidisciplinary approaches balance theory and practice and show a wide range of perspectives organised in and between organisations and society. Being global, diverse in thinking and acting outside the box are the targets for its authors and readers in management, consulting and science.