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ABSTRACT

The thesis investigates the representation of knowledge and meaning in management, with special reference to 'effectiveness' in library and information services. It is argued that management is a socially constructed and negotiated reality in which the meaning of management is the management of meaning. Knowledge paradigms, ideologies, and values form key components of this reality, and operate in a state of change, particularly that arising between 'service' and 'entrepreneurial' models of library management over the last decade. Issues of consensus, hegemony, organisational culture, and learning are investigated with reference to practitioner ('expert') and student ('novice') managers, and to the dialectic between traditional managers ('craftsman managers') and adaptive generalistic managers ('gamesman managers'). The research methodology is based on ethnographic, ideographic, grounded theory, and semio-narrative principles. These are selected as being appropriate and effective interpretative ways of obtaining an understanding of what managers know and know they know, and how they reflect on how they act. It utilises a range of test instruments (including consensus table, scalogram and narrative structure analysis) to elicit knowledge and meaning from representative groups of respondent managers. The central component of this approach is a referential hierarchy. This consists of four major forms of discourse (concepts, propositions, scripts, and stories), in terms of which it is possible for researchers to elicit, and then comprehensively organise and analyse, the main ways in which managers express knowledge and meaning. A model is constructed in which six dimensions of knowledge and meaning receive effective expression through such discourse: the experiential, the teleological, the axiological, the deontic, the epistemic, and the praxiological (acronymically, the PETADE model). It is argued that this approach brings together work hitherto dispersed over a wide variety of disciplines and that it provides an important and useful method of understanding and eliciting the representation of knowledge and meaning in the domain of management.
PREFATORY NOTE

The abstract provides a distillation of the content and methodology of the thesis.

In addition to that, abstracts are provided at each stage of the thesis. Readers will find such abstracts immediately preceding Part 1 (the introduction) and the twelve chapters (Parts 2, 3, and 4) forming the main argument. Part 5 (the conclusion) needs no such abstract.

The purpose of this feature is to allow readers to obtain an overall perspective of the major strands of the argument and familiarise themselves with the ways in which the parts of the thesis interconnect and develop.

The chain of abstracts is also intended to provide a point of general reference when readers are examining individual parts of the thesis.
COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognize that the copyright rests with its author and that no quotation from the thesis and no information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.
'... Every hegemonic position is based ... on an unstable equilibrium: construction ... is only consolidated to the extent that it succeeds in constituting the positivity of the social ...'


'... We have become habituated to and dependent on effective knowledge, and hence have bound ourselves to this kind of genuine explanation ...'


'... Thus ... narratives allow ... society to define its criteria of competence and to evaluate according to those criteria what is performed and can be performed within it ...'


'... statements, like all other illocutions, bear great responsibilities for maintaining the communities in which they circulate ...'


'... hermeneutic understanding ... grasps individual life experience in its entire breadth ... (and) has to adapt a set of intentions centered around an individual ego to the general categories of language ...'

Jurgen Habermas: Knowledge and human interest. Heinemann, 1972, page 162.

'... the concept of effectiveness refers to an organization's ability to exploit its environment in the acquisition of scarce resources ...'

'... In the end, it is success that matters, that legitimizes striving, and that makes work worthwhile...'

'... Managers draw elaborate cognitive maps to guide them through the thicket of their organizations. Because they see and experience authority in such personal terms, the singular feature of these maps is their biographical emphasis. Managers carry around in their heads thumbnail sketches of the occupational history of virtually every other manager of their own rank and higher in their particular organization. These maps begin with a knowledge of others' occupational expertise and specific work experience, but focus especially on previous and reported relationships, patronage relationships, and alliances. Cognitive maps incorporate memories of social slights, of public embarrassments, of battles won and lost, and of people's behavior under pressure. They include as well general estimates of the abilities and career trajectories of their colleagues...'

'... In a world where appearances - in the broadest sense - mean everything, the wise and ambitious manager learns to cultivate assiduously the proper, prescribed modes of appearing.... Such adroit self-rationalization demands continual self-scrutiny... one reflexively examine's one's performance, as if glancing in a mirror.... The real task for the ambitious manager then becomes how to shape and keep shaping others' perceptions of oneself... This whole informal body of knowledge is a crucial set of maps to the organization. It helps you gauge how you relate to others - what you can and can't do...'  


'... Librarians and information specialists ... may fulfil their expected roles admirably but ... the competence of their contributions is exceedingly difficult [to define]... [This] makes it difficult for librarians themselves to assess levels of competence in detailed fashion, a state which allows librarians to accept competence as an issue largely limited to institutionally determined assessment criteria, complemented on rare occasions by exercises intended to elicit user assessments of services provided and, even more rarely, touching upon practitioner competence...'  

PART 1

INTRODUCTION
PART 1

ABSTRACT

Part 1 describes and discusses the aims and scope of the research. The research investigates the representation of meaning and knowledge in management. Such meaning and knowledge are expressed through discourse. The discourse takes the form of concepts and propositions, scripts and stories.

Part 1 outlines the qualitative research approaches taken by the thesis. It is qualitative because it refers to and produces descriptive data (eg people's own written and spoken words and observable behaviour). Within the qualitative tradition, the research is ethnographic, because it seeks to describe 'events from within'. This entails the researcher entering the research setting, and attempting to elicit evidence of subjects' viewpoints and values. The research seeks to emphasise and reflect the complex effects of this setting on the evidence (ie it is contextualistic). It also attempts to represent ways in which subjects construct, as well as express, meaning in discourse (ie it is constructivistic).

The methodologies utilised in the research are discussed along with their underlying rationales and reliability.
PART 1

INTRODUCTION

For most people there is joy in really understanding something. It means that we can do it and explain it. It means that we can fit our knowledge to action, and both knowledge and action into the texture of life and thought. We know (and want to know) that we know what we know. We derive satisfaction from knowing that we know. New things come along to force or encourage us to change what we know, and what we know about knowing what we know. We may accept or reject new information on various grounds, plausibility, truth, relevance, meaningfulness. Our coming to know, and acceptance of anything new, will be influenced by what we regard as true or relevant, and probably by how we can integrate it with what we already know, and legitimise or justify it to ourselves and others. Such knowing is linked with actions. It is highly pragmatic, taking place in our daily lives, much of which is at work.

The meanings we use and construct at work are important. They cannot be disconnected from patterns of information and knowledge in society at large. The context directs our attention to ideologies, beliefs, and values: these affect what and how we come to know and explain. In the workplace there are patterns of information, knowledge, and ideology. They are implicit in managerial decision-making, in what managers (say they) say they do and why. They are evident in the forms of discourse used in organisations, from the conceptual and propositional meanings used by managers to the stories which they tell.
Aims and scope of research

This thesis aims to investigate the ways in which managers represent knowledge in forms of discourse or narrative. It argues that an understanding of knowledge paradigms and ideologies in management is essential to this aim. Attention is directed towards change in the field of library and information management in the United Kingdom during the last two decades, and to the changing, and conflicting, meanings between professional librarians / managers orientated towards service or profit. Discussion focuses on effectiveness.

It is suggested that the representation of managerial knowledge takes place mainly in discourse. Even when symbolic, meanings take practical and identifiable form in concepts and propositions, scripts and stories. We may regard these as forms of knowledge representation. Since some of these forms can be 'brought out into the open' (eg when people talk about their work), we call them 'exteriorisations'. Because meaning or knowledge is given a 'form' when this happens (eg a concept is used, a story is told), we call them 'instantiations' of meaning. Such forms 'refer' to 'things', 'events', and 'states' (say, in the workplace), and act 'referentially'. We may argue for the existence of a hierarchy of referentialities. Most concisely, this hierarchy deals with concepts. More elaborately, it contains stories. More elaborate parts subsume the others. At the heart of this 'referential hierarchy', lies the idea of 'effectiveness'. It has numerous synonyms and alternatives (eg 'performance', 'goodness', 'quality'). Effectiveness pervades work, and is a major element of and for change. It is examined extensively in the thesis.

By means of forms of discourse, managers communicate meaning. They also reflect upon the meanings which they communicate. The meaning of management is the
management of meaning. This is inherent in organisational culture, and crucial to an understanding of the complexity of how meanings are socially constructed in the workplace, especially under conditions of paradigmatic change. Paradigms are organised patterns of knowledge and values, and are investigated more fully in Chapters 1 and 2. The approach is multi-disciplinary, partly because the science and art of management is so, partly because an explanation of knowledge representation requires it. Techniques are drawn from sociology and philosophy, semantics and discourse analysis, cognitive psychology and information management. This has been necessary to reflect the contextualistic and ethnographic character of the research. It has also been intentional to provide the reader with a comprehensive historiographic introduction to the field.

This Introduction and Part 2 are intended to present the critical argument of the thesis, the idea and approach base from which the empirical work in later chapters will develop. Abstracts of the argument are provided for each chapter. In Part 3 the concept of 'effectiveness' is investigated and analysed, with reference to objective and subjective knowledge, experts and novices, and learning and consensus, all ideas introduced in Parts 1 and 2.

In Part 4 it is argued that scripts and stories allow for the expression of managerial meanings. Reference is made to how managers represent goals and decisions, how stories help managers make sense of work, and how reflexivity (ie when managers reflect on their own activities and the learning process there) and ideological viewpoint operate in managerial storying. It is suggested (in Part 5) that managerial meanings can be represented in forms of discourse, and that the methodologies utilised by the research are reliable for the purpose.
Ethnography is social or cultural anthropology. For anthropologists, culture (that body of knowledge and beliefs, symbols and behaviours distinctive to a community) is created by people, and handed on by them. Social anthropology tends to emphasise sociological interests, and is evident in studies of the industrialised world. Knorr-Cetina's (Knorr-Cetina & Cicourel, 1981) approach demonstrates how close social anthropology is to sociology itself when she suggests that macro-sociology is the study of social institutions and socio-cultural changes, while micro-sociology 'examines cognitive order and situationism' (ie individuals in their unique context). She stresses how important it is for the researcher to take account of intentionalities (ie what we can elicit or infer about what people intend when they do things or refer to them in particular ways), and the ways in which what individuals regard as 'meaningful', taken collectively, may be regarded as forms of community meaning. Shared knowledge, and so norms and consensus, must be regarded as a key element in social networks and collective activities such as apply in management (Morgan, 1986; Morgan & Spanish, 1985; Foa, 1963).

Dominant in ethnographic research is the interpretive role of the researcher who often 'describes events and customs from within and explores the cognitive maps of the subjects' (Kuper & Kuper, 1985). Knowledge of the politics and history, and semantic/linguistic aspects of the subjects is required in social anthropological research (ESRC, 1991), and characterises much research in library and information management (Slater, 1990; Ellis, 1990; Belkin & Vickery, 1985; Noon, 1988). Often researchers involve themselves in participant observation, residing in a community, studying institutional settings within a
culture (Sanday, 1979). Notes are taken, data collected from observation and interview, patterns elicited, findings communicated.

The intention is to derive a representative view of the group studied, and to emphasise how the group makes up its own meanings and regard things as true and significant (Geertz, 1973). This view is often called a 'configurational' or 'holistic' view. Such meanings form a texture or 'text' with and by means of which people construct reality (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Atkinson, 1990; Becker, 1951; Merton & Lazarsfeld, 1950; Blum, 1952). The researcher is 'inside the whale' when looking at the locally powerful (Bell & Encel, 1978) or, here, practitioners and students of library and information management.

Relevant here is ethno-methodology which examines the 'common sense knowledge of social structures' and finds documentary ways of interpreting the language and factuality of subjects (Garfinkel, 1967 & 1962). This world of knowledge does not just consist of intellectual or abstract knowledge, but of common sense and action-based knowledge ('knowing that' and 'knowing how'). Understanding such knowledge brings the researcher close to the ways in which people make sense of things, explain causality and time sequences, relevance and truth. It helps the researcher evaluate how realistic it is to say that, because the subjects use these ideas and feel these states, then particular modes of research are workable. The ways in which people exteriorise meanings, and contest such meanings, is of value to the researcher, because it is often only through such evidence that the subjects' meaning and knowledge can be analysed.

There are important links with 'public' and 'private' knowledge, 'objective' and 'subjective' knowledge, how people know and know they know, and how we can study these things. These matter in the sociology of knowledge (Polanyi, 1958; Ziman, 1968 & 1979; Kuhn, 1970; Gurvitch, 1971; Wolff, 1983; Hannabuss, 1988).
comparison is important in directing our attention to the ways in which knowledge is created and disseminated (eg through the publishing chain and invisible colleges, and the citational patterns of bibliography). It has a more important micro application when we consider how information flows in and through organisations, who gate-keeps and opinion-leads, who is information rich and poor, and how particular meanings become associated with power.

A division is often made between quantitative and qualitative research (eg. Bryman, 1984). The quantitative tradition emphasises 'scientific' or 'positivistic' approaches, often tests hypotheses, prefers 'hard' data, subjects data to statistical testing, regards the researcher as outside the events studied, and appeals to 'laws' (ie is nomothetic) and 'truths' (ie epistemic warrants). On the other hand, the qualitative tradition 'sees the social world from the point of view of the actor' (ie the subject), taking 'the actor's perspectives as an empirical point of departure'. It seeks to derive contextual understanding (ie understanding what happens 'in the context of meaning systems'), predicates an epistemology based on understanding the personal and ideographic constructions of reality of the group under investigation. Researchers usually distinguish between 'ideographic' and 'nomothetic' when they wish to emphasise how idiosyncratic individual pieces of qualitative evidence are, and how difficult they are to 'reduce' to rules and laws. Part of this, the phenomenological approach stresses understanding human behaviour from the actor's own frame of reference' (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984; Mellon, 1990). Such research uses instruments like interviews, life histories, participant observation and the examination of documentary evidence.

Research in the social sciences has drawn on both traditions, on measurement and interpretation. The research paradigm has changed in recent decades from quantitative to qualitative, and this thesis embodies this change. Phillips
(Phillips, 1971) characterises it when he states that in social science investigations 'people tend to organize their behavior and responses in the light of the definitions of the situation' (Phillips, 1973, 70). He argues that the 'positivistic tradition of sociology has ignored the presuppositional aspects of knowledge' (ibid., 115) (ie the tacit and assumptive knowledge and beliefs which respondents have and hold). For him and for others (eg Popkewitz, 1984, 87-104; Morgan & Smircich, 1980), modern research in the social sciences must take on board the language, presuppositions, warrants and signs inherent in the socially constructed meanings of the group studied.

These changes have been chronicled by Guba and Lincoln (Guba, 1990; Lincoln, 1985; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) as well as by others (Van Maanen, 1983). They suggest that positivistic approaches do not account for the value pluralism of much social science research, and leave out the fact that respondents are 'stakeholders' in the organisation studied (and hold and communicate meanings which are idiosyncratic and ideographically reseachable constructions of meaning) (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

The value-ladenness of such research information means that research has to be 'constructivistic'. This means that the inquiry starts by looking at the natural and tacit knowledge, setting and the people. Evidence is continually tested and shaped by negotiation, an interpretative approach is taken to the complex evidence obtained, continual attention is paid to the truth of the evidence, as the material is patterned and structured into coherence. It may well be that truth as perceived by the respondents is the truth for the purposes of the research, rather than any truth corroborated by some physical 'law'. This approach implies that traditionally positivistic criteria of reliability (eg the experimental research design) and assumptions of inference (eg that tests such
as significance tests on a particular group will confirm or conform to a law) cannot easily be used (Guba & Lincoln, 1982; Guba, 1982).

A feature of such qualitative research is the construction of intelligible frameworks. It has been termed 'constructivism'. There is continual construction, re- and de-construction of hypothesis and structure, as intellectual and procedural frameworks are built, tested and reviewed. It shares with the managerial world it investigates the features of a negotiated reality, in which meanings derive through exteriorisation (ie becoming known or being made known), dialectic (ie coming into being in the context of conflict and argument), and negotiated consensus. Major themes are inferred from the ongoing research, from the interview material, from the evidence, from the perceived ontologies (what subjects regard, or appear to regard, as important for knowing what is) and epistemologies (what subjects regard as true) of the participants.

This approach characterises 'grounded theory', by which the researcher develops 'a theoretical account of the general features of a topic while simultaneously grounding the account in empirical observations or data' (Martin & Turner, 1986; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978; Brown, 1981; Paris, 1988; Turner, 1971; Turner, 1981 & 1983; Conrad, 1978). It is a way, in Patton's words, of guarding against allocating too much power to 'analyst-constructed typologies' (Patton, 1980, 309), although this cannot preclude the existence and formulation of hypotheses (such as 'that effective managers are more adaptive to change') which are at work throughout the research (Lundberg, 1976; Robbins, 1989).

Examples in the thesis include the application of an ideological framework after it was found that interview evidence suggested the existence of a 'craftsman - gamesman' dichotomy in library and information management. This dichotomy represents opposing viewpoints on what library and information services are
for. A second consists of the way in which structural patterns, organised using semantic and narrative methods, appeared in managerial stories, in what managers actually said and in what they said about what they said.

The contrast between quantitative and qualitative research traditions in the social sciences has led others to characterise the changing research paradigm as having three aspects: 'positivistic', 'interpretive', and 'critical' (Breda & Feinberg, 1982). Positivistic approaches emphasise 'formalising empirical generalisations and theory construction' (loc.cit.,13-21) and nomological (ie 'law-making', 'law-orientated') modes of explanation. Interpretive approaches accept that the researcher is partly embedded in the world he or she investigates, and that 'facts are not entirely independent of the way of looking' (loc.cit.,115-28). It draws upon the 'Verstehen' (or interpretative understanding) notion of Weber (Abel, 1948): explanation has to take account of how people interact and exist inter-subjectively in a historical time-frame.

Making meanings explicit is a task influenced by what we think actually is (the ontological dilemma), what we think is true (the epistemological dilemma), and what we think might genuinely or plausibly have caused something to happen as it did (the aetiological dilemma). Practitioners and learners recognise the difference between what happens and what should happen (or should have happened) (the deontic dilemma, from a word referring to 'duty' and 'ought'). These dilemmas persuade us to 'reconstruct knowledge and verify inferences' (Bredo & Feinberg, 157). The meaning of meaning is itself a subject of study, much of the meaning being 'experiential' (eg 'shame'). The thesis investigates the effects of some of these dilemmas.

In fields like politics and management, meanings are disputed and negotiated, and 'such meanings are constitutive of social structures' like 'the American way'.
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Interpreting the views of many authors or respondents is a hermeneutic activity. The 'hermeneutic' approach is interpretative, and emphasises the importance of meanings in forms of discourse. Weber applied this approach to the social sciences, borrowing it from Biblical criticism. It is taken by writers like Ricoeur into the interpretation of texts, and will be used later in the thesis to explore and explain managerial storying.

The third approach of Breda & Feinberg is 'critical'. Drawing on Habermas's view that we shape the world and its meanings through action, it argues that knowledge is constituted by 'interests' and consists of 'knowledge over events' (technical) and 'understanding with others' (practical). These work together as 'emancipatory knowledge'. Since knowledge is constituted by interests, 'the researcher is not a passive observer but a participant reconstructing the social life-world', and research (into a management process like how managers make decisions) 'a social process, not merely a rationally contrived act' (Pettigrew, in Lawler & others, 1985, 222-74).

Such research is suspicious of merely rationalistic explanations. The risks for research into policy making of being too rationalistic have been noted (Lindblom & Cohen, 1979). Forms of explanatory understanding are necessary to take account of distortions in communication, partiality in learning, and 'how sentiments and ideologies legitimise what people say, do and think'. To achieve this, access to 'authentic communication' in the form of discourse is needed.

Social science research of the interpretative kind gives attention to 'the event-in-its-setting' (Spencer & Dale, 1979). This derives from Pepper's 'world hypotheses' : one, the contextualistic, concerns itself with events in their settings, takes a qualitative approach, and often examines 'historic events' (Pepper, 1942). For Pettigrew (Pettigrew, in Lawler & others, 1985) fields like
organisational psychology benefit from contextualistic approaches, because they try to understand the ways in which people regard things as true, and processes as possible. Research into management needs to consider the socio-economic relationship a company has with its environment, or how managers use particular rituals to impress others, or resort to familiar routines to get things done, or come to be persuaded that they agree that certain things should be known if one is a specialist, and this takes researchers fully into the context.

Qualitative research in management

Research into management practice brings the researcher up against the pragmatic character of management. It is a 'praxis', not just a 'theoria'. Such a study of how processes work, how strategic decisions are made, how change occurs, is likely to emphasise how interrelated things are, causally and politically; how interest groups work within management for their own ends; and how managers reflect upon their own activity. These highlight ways in which the context matters as much as content, and researchers working on such problems need to examine such contexts as the environment (economic, demographic) of the organisation as well as the knowledge and ideological contexts of the organisation and its staff.

Debate about quantitative and qualitative approaches can be found in the field of organisational research. Much of the best research draws on both. These qualitative approaches to management research have become widespread in recent decades. Entering the situation under study, the researcher examines the 'procedures and considerations actors invoke in relating terms of rational commonsense construction to things in the world' (Das, 1983, citing Bittner,
1974). Often such constructions involve a study of language and meanings (semantics) and of sign-systems in the organisation (semiotics).

Morgan (Morgan, 1984) describes these as 'modes of engagement'. He considers the ontological and epistemological premises on which various modes of engagement take place, summarising them as threefold. First, 'paradigmatic', in which the rationale for the strategy is 'grounded in a network of implicit or explicit assumptions' about ontology and human nature that 'define the researcher's view of the social world'. Second, 'metaphorical', based on the view that researchers shape their knowledge by their own 'concretizing' of assumptions in their work. This 'epistemological stance' argues that some types of understanding are more appropriate than others, and that there are 'different grounds for knowledge about the social world'. Third, 'puzzle solving', in which methodologies are regarded as 'puzzle-solving devices that bridge the gap between the image of a phenomenon and the phenomenon itself'. The researcher uses methodologies close to the rules and assumptions of the researched.

Morgan's framework identifies, at a meta-critical level (ie looking critically at the critical approach), the assumptions for non-positivistic research into management. It points to three important procedural issues for the thesis. First, that a coherent pattern of knowledge and beliefs was assumed in the respondents, and it was believed that this coherence could be elicited as coherent and in a coherent manner. Second, that an ethnographic and contextualistic approach to the ways in which managers represent knowledge allowed for exploration and exposition of the 'grounds for knowledge' of the social world of management. Third, that an attempt was made to come alongside the dilemmas and participants in management practice and learning, and use research strategies which would reduce suspicion and enhance open disclosure, and reduce the gap between the unknown and the known, between impression and
such phenomenon. Such strategies included the use of natural language inquiries and the use of testing instruments which managers could apply at work.

Such approaches are well demonstrated by Smircich's work on organisational cultures (eg Smircich in Morgan, 1984, 160-72), Blau's on the dynamics of bureaucracy (Blau, 1955; Blau in Hammond, 1964, 16-49), Boisot's anthropological study of managers and information (Boisot, 1987), and Weick's on loosely coupled organisational systems and ambiguity at work (Weick, 1982 & 1985). ('Loose coupling' exists in an organisation when 'structures and activities in various parts of an organization are only weakly connected to each other and therefore are free to vary independently', Aldrich, 1979, 76-7). Blackler and Brown (Blackler & Brown, 1983) speak of research evaluation techniques being 'dramaturgical', examining actors and the unfolding of plots and subplots.

Being sensitive to what Blackler and Brown call 'the processual nature of social system dynamics' entails the choice of appropriate research methodologies. For them it took the form of structured interviews, observation, and the examination of historical records. Daft (Daft, 1983) stresses the importance of learning about the organisations under investigation at first hand, and allowing research to accommodate the contingencies and non-linearities of the domain being studied. The concept of non-linearity deals with the ways in which, in real-life management situations, processes (and time itself) are not shaped in a deterministic serial manner, and are vulnerable to contingency and loose coupling. It is possible to suggest an important similarity between the character of the domain and the research itself. In particular, researchers are best advised (unless circumstances suit) against adopting a rigidly positivistic approach. Practical studies in the field (eg of recruitment and appraisal interviewing) confirm that experimental results tend to ignore the complex interpersonal, political, ethnographic characteristics of the situation.
Methodological issues

Methodological problems are posed for the researcher under this regime, as Bryman and Buchanan (Bryman, 1988) have described. Buchanan refers to the process as 'getting in, getting on, getting out, and getting back', while Bryman calls ethnographic managerial research as 'inside accounts'. Researchers face two challenges. The first concerns the validity of the 'knowledge' elicited and the extent to which it is generalisable—from rather than partisan, insular or idiosyncratic. This invites the researcher to consider how plausible the testing instruments are in and for themselves and compared with other appropriate investigative procedures (Easterby-Smith & others, 1991, 121). Validity, on a theoretical and instrumental level, is also helped by the choice of 'right names', terms and representations in the research which are intelligible (even endemic) and applicable for and by respondents (Kirk & Miller, 1986, 13-40).

The second concerns the reliability of the ways used to elicit the knowledge, whether the design of the testing instruments allows for dependable replicability, and if the assumptions and methods genuinely lead the research to its declared destination. Reliability is a matter of 'stability' (Easterby-Smith & others, 1991, 121-2). Atkinson (Burgess, 1984, 163-85) discusses the elusiveness of organisational and 'culture' knowledge, taken from his own ethnographic research into the medical profession. Similar challenges were found in this research and will be discussed at appropriate stages of the thesis.

Both take us back to the differences between types of qualitative research, and to what validity, reliability, and generalisability mean. The positivistic tradition judges validity on the ground of the instrument measuring what it is supposed to measure, while ethnographic research looks for evidence of how
fully the researcher has gained access to 'knowledge and meanings of the informants' (Easterby-Smith & others, 1991, 41). Reliability tends to emphasise the same results in a positivistic tradition, but comparable similarities, despite differences, in the other. Generalisability, in this thesis, stresses how inferences from the situations and respondents investigated might apply in other contexts, rather than any statistical aberrations from some notional norm attributable to populations and samples (Hakim, 1987).

Knowledge in management can be public or private, and, if private, may be 'tacit' (ie the knower may not know it is there). Such knowledge (assuming that knowledge is organised information, which is retrieved data from the general environment) can be 'organised' in many ways, cognitively (eg objectively, subjectively, affected by too much or too little information, influenced by bias or prejudice or habit), or pragmatically in terms of actions and decision-making which managers carry out every day. Practitioners may endow practical knowledge with greater credence than theoretical knowledge, while learners are coming to know and their knowledge is in states of change.

Such knowledge is 'knowable' from documentary sources by means of such techniques as 'content analysis' (eg Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, 106-22). We may assume that documentary evidence about what management is, what managers do, what effective managers achieve, as found in recognised academic works, textbooks and journals in the field, can be regarded as valid and reliable knowledge. Such knowledge is authoritative in the sense that reputable authors and publishers concretise it in textual forms. This research draws on this kind of evidence, by presenting 'analectic' knowledge (about 'effectiveness', in Chapter 2), conceptual information from twenty major textbooks (in Chapters 5 and 7), and stories from the management literature (in chapter 11). Reliability
is built in by asking experienced practitioners and academics in the field to cite appropriate works (discussed in Chapter 7).

Two important issues are who is asked for information, and how they are asked. Two criteria apply here, first that the informants should cover a representative range of types of 'manager' and their experience and contribution to the elicitation of knowledge about effectiveness should be representative. Representativeness was interpreted in the statistical sense of random sampling only where appropriate. Quota and reputation group sampling (with quasi-random features nested within sub-group instrument design) were also used. The second criterion was that the ways in which informants were asked should be intellectually accessible, convenient to complete given (for practitioners) that they were busy and might not wish to be confidential and (for students) they might be influenced by authority effects. In this way, issues of disclosure, of the researcher 'studying people where they are' as invited and uninvited guest' (Reece & Siegal, 1986, chapters 5 and 6), were addressed.

Groups surveyed and interviewed included managers at various levels of library and information service (junior, middle, and senior), in the major spheres of service (public, academic, special, school), and with different roles (eg reader, services specialists in academic libraries, deputy chief and zone and branch librarians), and students starting BA Degree and PG Diploma courses in Librarianship and Information Studies. Choice of the latter predicates the assumption that both groups come (with very few exceptions) fresh to the formal study of management and are representative of larger cohorts of such initiates to the profession. Such groups are widely recognised as both distinct and typical in library management research (eg as evident in British Library Research & Development and other sponsored and independent research).
The sample design of the major survey of practitioners in Chapter 5, and what they think of 'effectiveness', follows the principles outlined above. Quasi-random methods were used, and weightings allocated to data. This sample is referred back to when the story evidence of a sub-set of ten managers is analysed in Chapter 11. Reputational samples were used in Chapter 8 (three managers, at three levels, at five service points) for the consensus table analysis test. Two reader services librarians in academic libraries (in contrasting subject specialisms) were interviewed. Roles were important, as when evidence was gathered from librarians in positions of appraiser and appraisee in appraisal (again in Chapter 8).

A random sampling design was used in two samples of respondents for the action-maze analysis in Chapter 9, thirty practitioners in library and information management, and thirty students (first year BA and PG students). A similar approach was taken with twenty and then thirty first-year students in Chapter 7, where features of an experimental 'before-and-after' model were used in the testing. At suitable points (eg in Chapter 7), tests (such as chi-square) are used to evaluate findings, although a systematic application of significance testing was regarded as marginal to the instruments used in the research design, with their high susceptibility to contingency and ideographic evidence.

Major methodologies used to elicit information were documentary and interpersonal. The documentary methodologies included the completion of testing instruments by respondents. The assumption was that spontaneous written material (responses, stories) would provide exteriorised evidence of knowledge representation by managers. This approach included handling action mazes (in chapter 9), defining a 'good' manager (in Chapter 6), the writing of essays by students (in Chapter 10) and stories about success (in Chapter 11).
Following contextualistic and constructivistic approaches, and the principles of validity, reliability and generalisability outlined above, evidence was gathered, analysed, coded and patterned, and built up into a coherent ethnographic and semio-narrative (ie combining semantics, or meaning, and narrative) portrait of the ways in which managers represent their knowledge of effectiveness in various forms of discourse. Schedules and practical details are described 'pari passu' in the chapters concerned as the argument develops throughout the thesis. Common to these was the philosophy of 'coming alongside respondents' to elicit evidence in a friendly, confidential and non-interventionist manner.

Reliability lay at the back of this empirical work in that the researcher had, independently and in other research and publication, investigated key concepts and propositions, scripts and stories as represented in management literature, and conducted associated research (including a 1985 MEd thesis study of managerial concepts, see Bibliography). These investigations were able to identify the extent to which there is a complex and urgent debate about 'effectiveness' in the contemporary library and information profession, how meanings and knowledge may be expressed and elicited by organised research. Specific sources (eg on 'competences' in Chapter 5) defined key ideas of topical relevance to the research, while, throughout the investigation on knowledge representation, there was a continual emphasis on experiential thinking and learning, encouraging participants to draw on what they did and what they thought about it.

Interviews were widely used. Some included the completion of tests or writing evidence down. Some interviews entailed 'talking around' an agreed text (as for the study of 'ancillary elements to managerial scripts' in Chapter 11). Transcripts were made of numerous interviews and, using ethnographic and grounded theory and content analysis techniques, dominant meanings and themes
and structures were identified and grouped for analysis (Agar, 1980; Zuboff, 1988; Hart, 1986, 49-69; Campbell, 1955).

Evidence in the thesis derives directly and indirectly from this source. Structured interviews were used in Chapter 5 to define and elicit meanings about 'effectiveness', and these were followed by expansive 'solo' writing by respondents. Validity and reliability may be influenced by the researcher's presence and manner, and responses can be biased, in terms of structure and viewpoint. Such factors impel any researcher continually to examine whether he is getting the truth, or what kind of truth one is getting (Dexter, 1970).

It is argued that, as an integral part of the research design, the interview role was made easier for the researcher in having community membership and a continuing relationship with respondents (Platt, 1981). It was further argued that the researcher, as an academic associated to a practitioner community, was a linesman rather than a player, not actively involved in competing with respondents and not personally implicated within their own organisational textures. Disclosure and confidentiality did not present invalidating obstacles to the research, particularly when anonymity was assured. The spontaneity with which respondents agreed to express their ideas in story forms not only yielded much relevant evidence for the thesis, but confirmed how accessible and flexible stories are as modes of professional communication.

In all encounters with respondents, the aims and scope of the research were described. Confidentiality and anonymity were assured. At any point, with practitioners, the interview could be broken off, temporarily or permanently. Respondents were asked well in advance. During the programme of the research, most of the interviewing took place, mainly in Scotland, during the period 1987-1991. All tests and structured interview schedules were piloted with
representative 'experts', academic and practitioner, and with appropriately representative 'novice' groups, before use.

Interviewing one's peers (Platt, 1981) and those new to the professional domain who are likely to attribute the researcher with authority associated with his or her status as a professional (rather than as a researcher) is a complex experience, because pre-established social linkages and impressions have been formed, and the sharing of norms can blind the researcher to objective facts, as well as distort primary evidence given by respondents.

To enhance validity and reliability, information was gathered at first hand. It was gathered in familiar surroundings. Tests were designed to be 'entirely clear' (ie any term or question not immediately understood was explained). Tests were intended to resemble tests which managers could organise for their own workplace. To this extent, the ostensible level of the research is obtrusive, while analysis and inference unobtrusive.

The issues proved of direct interest and concern to respondents: 'what is it to be effective?', 'am I effective?', 'what do people think it means?', 'is my view out-of-date?', 'can I tell it as it is for me?'. These are experiential and 'real' for respondents, particularly practitioners, and have an everyday verisimilitude validity. The ideas and concepts at the heart of the issues are also of daily utility to them. This is, in their view, 'useful knowledge' (Brown & Tandon, 1983), as likely to derive from work practice (or, in the case of students, learning) as from taking part in research. It is knowledge linked with the 'interests' on which writers like Habermas base knowledge and meaning, giving it greater credibility with respondents (for being effective is, ultimately, being successful). As a study into reflective managerial learning, it drew good feedback from its implicit encouragement of reflection among participants.
It is argued also that 'storying' (i.e., representing experience and feeling in story-forms) is a natural way for people to express themselves, increasing the reliability of the ethnographic knowledge. Respondents were flattered to be asked, particularly about where they thought they had been successful and how in some way they had not (which could be revealingly rationalised in accounts about effectiveness). Respondents were entirely at ease during interviews.

Managerial meanings and discourse research approaches

Management is full of language, talk, texts, meanings. The major ways in which this appears will be the subject of the thesis. The presupposition is that the meaning of management is the management of meaning. The meanings, discourse, rhetoric of management, are of concern to the ethnographic researcher (Conrad, 1990, 95-106). Much of the discourse most meaningful to the people talking is not formal but is office conversation. Graham (Graham, 1984) calls this 'telling it like it is', and says that 'surveying through stories' gets access to parts other forms of research do not reach. Implicit in such discourse are the warrants by which assumptions, beliefs and values operate (Heap, 1977).

Ethnographic research aims to present 'a systematic and vivid representation of a world that seems total and real to the reader' (Marcus & Cushman, 1982). An important aspect of this authenticity and plausibility lies in the extent to which the researcher elicits, and then presents, 'the native point of view', as well as using 'a language of description that carries embedded deep within it associations that entail the common sense of his own culture' (loc.cit., 46; Marcus, 1980). For Krieger (Krieger, 1979) such an ethnographic text actually was the completed research text of a study into a radio broadcasting station.
Distinctions are made between 'hard' and 'soft' data in sociology (Eriksson, 1978), and Lindberg (Lindberg, 1987) differentiates between hard information like statistics and statements of fact and soft information like opinions, beliefs, statements of intent and narratives. Examination of such soft information needs a systematic structure. It is important to identify common and important themes, ideas, concepts, patterns (Miles, 1979), drawing both on ethnographic and grounded theory principles. Another is to use language familiar to respondents in their working context (Daft & Wiginton, 1979).

This research is systematic in its elicitation and analysis of discourse in two major ways, first by devising a 'referential hierarchy' within which managerial discourse can be examined. This consists of concepts and propositions, scripts and stories: all are widely used by managers, and enable them to represent meanings from what they know, know they know, believe, think they should do, review what is past and what is to come, how they make decisions, and account for why things appear to happen.

The second consists of incorporating into the ethnographic thrust of the research the methodologies used by writers on narrative, discourse theory, and semantics (Jackson, 1988). Some of these ideas will be structuralist in approach. There is a third organising factor, that knowledge and ideology express themselves in and through forms of discourse (Dant, 1991; Fowler, 1991). All these ideas are developed and discussed in later chapters, and applied to managerial storying. The aim of the thesis is to capture something of the subjective and assumptive world of the manager and suggest ways in which managers' meanings can be brought into the open through research.
PART 2

MEANING IN MANAGEMENT
Part 2 devotes itself to 'Meaning in Management', and looks at knowledge and meaning (chapter 1), the negotiation of meaning (chapter 2), ways in which ideology and discourse work in management (chapter 3), and how managers think and learn (chapter 4).

Chapter 1 describes and discusses how knowledge and meaning are important for understanding the process of management. It suggests that recognising these links between knowledge and meaning on the one hand, and action and experience on the other, are crucial for management research. They underly both the content and methodology of qualitative research.

Knowledge and meaning in management are regarded as 'paradigms' or systematically created bodies of knowledge. These have content (substantive) and methodological (procedural) sides to them, and are explained and applied to qualitative research in management.

Management is characterised as a socially constructed reality. Comparisons are made with the sociology of knowledge (the ways in which knowledge is created and disseminated), and to what people know and regard as meaningful and true. Often, knowledge and meaning depend on what people's interests are. The discussion goes on to identify types of knowledge, and to consider how rigidly rationalistic approaches to management are being superseded by ones which rely on interpretation and an understanding of how stakeholders in organisations interact and construct meanings.
Knowledg has many forms: knowing the way to Edinburgh, knowing John, knowing how to change gear, knowing that buses run every thirty minutes, knowing how little we know about black holes, knowing there will be an afterlife.

Whatever practical or theoretical connotations attach to these instances, what they appear to have in common is the principle of organisation. Selection and retrieval have taken place from among all or any of the potentially available information about routes or people and so on, information which, considered generally, might be termed data. We try to impose coherence on the information to make it meaningful and relevant. Implicitly, such outcomes predicate grounds for our knowledge (eg that we know buses come along the road, or that we have read studies about black holes, or that we believe in God).

The intention of this chapter is to discuss those major issues about knowledge which are of most concern to management. It will emphasise the link between knowledge, action and experience, and argue that such a link underlies both the content and procedural character of research into management.
Approaches to the Problem of Knowledge

If knowledge is organised information (Hannabuss, 1984), we need to examine how this occurs and in what setting. From a general position, what we know (and know about what we know) is social and communal. We experience the 'reality' of the world around us, and talk about it (ie represent our experiences in forms of discourse). We reflect upon our experiences and, since much of this reflection involves inference and a search for coherence, we 'envision alternatives' (Gergen, 1982, 19) about the past, present and future. This is an interpretative act on the part of the knower. It also involves making decisions based on information, and, knowledgeable or in states of partial or imperfect information, attributing legitimacy to and demonstrating belief about realities, truths and norms which, arguably, the information appears to represent.

This process is social because we live in a socially constructed reality, and communal because, as social (and, mostly, working beings) we share and create and change meanings in and for the various groups we inhabit (organisations, clubs, neighbourhoods). These remarks assume that the foundations of our knowledge lie in everyday life, that 'we apprehend reality as ordered, as it moves around the here and now of our consciousness' (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Such reality is structured spatially (eg our knowledge of our route to work) and temporally (eg our knowledge of what we were last year, or of what actions of a particular kind will cause in the future).

For Berger and Luckmann such subjective processes are 'objectivized' as 'objective realities' once we consider how knowledge is organised in and into institutional social structures (like organisations), with their own norms and systems of meaning and discourse. In this way 'collective stocks of knowledge
are built up', handed on (eg through training and education and socialisation) to new knowers, within complex social and professional networks. Meanings and messages are intersubjectivities (Rommetveit, 1974), shared reciprocal definitions of what we think we know we know.

This forms the basis not only of general social meaning but of professional meaning in fields like management. Such meanings often take on permanent or overt forms in discourse (eg monographs, reports, minutes, conversations), each of which instantiates meaning, and each of which coexists intertextually with the others. (This means that each individual act of discourse can best be understood in terms of the others, and that it is because interlocutors know of the others that such acts of discourse are what they are).

As we live and know and come to know, we come to recognise that types of information and knowledge recur, prove useful or essential for making decisions (Lindblom & Cohen, 1979), and represent routines at work where we know what to use of what we know to get things done effectively. Lindblom and Cohen call this 'usable knowledge', reflecting how 'relevance and typicality' (Schutz & Luckmann, 1974, 119) are key elements in the process by which we come to know: 'we acquire knowledge by the sedimentation of current experience in meaning-structures, according to relevance and typicality'. This is affected also by 'the clarity and determinateness of objects and events', and is socially conditioned (loc.cit., 146 and 287).

Links between forms of knowledge (especially scientific and religious) and social life are made by Mannheim, whose influence on the sociology of knowledge is pervasive (Mannheim, 1936; Mannheim, 1952). For him, 'world-views' (eg Marxism) are important ideologically in shaping social forces like class and experience. His view that we understand what we know by examining the context
holds as important in ethnographic research. As important is his view that
knowing is contingent upon the context, and, by reflecting upon our knowledge,
we should alert ourselves to the assumptions and truths underlying it. For him
the relationship between thought and action is essential, emphasising the point
which this thesis explores, that action-based or experiential knowledge is
ultimately of greatest interest to practitioners of management.

Mannheim's idea that no one world-view existed (he discussed the church-led
social and intellectual structure of the Middle Ages, leading us to reflect on
Durkheim's distinction between mechanical societies, where common states of
knowledge and consciousness putatively apply, and organic ones, where segmented
knowledge and views allow for the individualistic pursuit of rational interests)
suggests that diversity exists both about the content of what we know (and
know we know) and the ways in which we come to know what we know (ie
research).

To this we may add Durkheim's 'collective representations' and 'orders of social
facts' (Durkheim, 1938; Thompson, 1982; Lukes, 1973). He argues that religion
(and a fortiori any systematic body of knowledge and custom) is a
'representation of social reality', an idea adopted by cognitive psychologists
(eg Fransella, 1984) and of utility for discussion in later chapters of this
thesis. When Mannheim suggests that we need to see 'the different positions [of
individual viewpoints or protagonists] as contingent on their particular
histories' (Dant, 1991, 14; Millstone, 1978), it is an approach with direct
bearing on the ways in which managers know or appear to know, and in which
research can attempt to find out.

Another important sociological dimension is the connection between knowledge,
interests and action. Setting knowledge firmly in a social and political
setting, Habermas casts doubt on an analysis of society which ignores a socially-contexted epistemology. From Comte he moves through Peirce and Dilthey to suggest that human interests are realities 'constituted in a frame of reference where individual configurations are different' (Habermas, 1972, 143). A skilled understanding is rooted in social reality, he says. This is particularly clear and effective in the 'cultural sciences' (eg history) where interpretation and self-reflection are present.

With knowledge intersubjectively and reflectively understood, Habermas is then able to define 'knowledge-constitutive interests' as 'basic orientations rooted in specific fundamental conditions of the possible reproduction and self-constitution of the human species, namely work and interaction' (loc.cit., 196). They are a 'function of the objectively constituted problems of the preservation of life that have been solved by the cultural form of existence as such' (ibid.). Such KCIs are rooted in conditions of work and interaction and involve cognitive interests (since self-knowledge implies knowledge handling skills). Self-reflection takes one towards autonomy and responsibility. We have a strong practical interest in actions and the objects of actions (needs, intentions, and attitudes) (loc.cit., 199).

Given this, Barnes is able to argue that knowledge is a product of communities with an instrumental and predictive role: knowledge exists in history and the context of culture, where new knowledge is produced, relativism assessed, taken-for-granted knowledge used, and causation and differences noted (Barnes, 1977). It also enables Habermas to suggest that, through technical (events) and practical (understanding others) knowledge, emancipatory knowledge (resolving contradictions between the other two) is a major interpretative way of understanding ourselves (and carrying out interpretative research into
Implicit in this discussion is the movement away from apriorism, where, simply, research ideas start as concepts or ideas not derived from experience, to a kind of empiricism (where they are). For Mannheim epistemology is crucial to an understanding of knowledge. The truth or grounds of belief or warrant of what we know, or claim to know, are tightly bound into any systematic investigation of knowledge. Much management knowledge is regarded as 'real', 'true', or 'good' when managers know it will work in a practical situation. Much theory is 'tested' this way (eg psychological testing in staff appraisal, queueing theory and critical-path analysis in production management, as well as, more broadly, seeing if theoretical ideas actually work). In teaching and learning, conceptions of the truth are important: knowledge may be 'what is true', coming to know may entail 'learning to know, and reject, what is not true', as well as coming to know that true things may be simple or complex (Brandon, 1987; Haes, 1982; Piaget, 1972; Novak, 1980; O'Connor & Carr, 1982; Bloor, 1976 Mellor, 1980; Popkewitz, 1984).

Such an approach challenges researchers to explore epistemological foundations for their subject, particularly those epistemic (truth-orientated, truth-seeking) meanings and warrants used by informants when they come to mean. Furthermore, the 'epistemic fidelity' ('the degree of completeness to which the physical realization of a representation brings a rendition of the expertise defined at an epistemic level', Wenger, 1987, 312-13) is of importance in understanding and eliciting knowledge representation itself. Truth plays a large part in decision-making (see chapter 9) and is an integral part of the model developed for the analysis of storying (see chapters 11 to 12 and the discussion of the ETAD(E) model). Such an approach, too, invites researchers to consider the assumptive
worlds underlying the forms of meaning which managers exteriorise, and the ways in which relevance and meaningfulness work to modify this epistemic process (Sperber & Wilson, 1986; Schank, 1979; Van Dijk, 1979).

In their turn, epistemic inquiry and meaningfulness lead to the broader social areas of norms. People know or think things are important or valuable, and ascribe meanings to them. Such things are then accepted as 'real', forming part of the actor's or agent's coherent structure of knowledge (Holy & Stuchlik, 1983). Knowledge becomes objective when, having been created by individuals, it becomes external to the collectivity of individuals. Such meaning is 'transpersonal', intersubjective, contextual, pragmatic (ie judged by how well it represents what actually happens) and conative (ie associated with forms of trying and expressing meaning through action). They are often idiosyncratic or 'indexical'. Many may be normative, and undergo profound change for many reasons. Such meanings affect transactions between people, and affect research carried out on them. They form the basis of collective action and bargaining (Elster, 1989), and for this reason the thesis (in chapter 2) gives emphasis to the negotiation of meaning in management (Hannabuss, 1988b; Forssell, 1989; Billig & others, 1988).

For any full view of social knowledge legitimisation and justification are of central interest, and for Lyotard (Lyotard, 1984; see also Turner, 1990), part of the postmodernist debate is that dialectic between 'scientific knowledge' and 'narrative', the latter of which he claims 'relates to the internal equilibrium' (loc.cit.,?) and the individualistic knowledge norms of those who decide what knowledge is, and who know (or think they know, or arrogate to themselves the position of deciding) what needs to be decided. Kitcher (Kitcher, 1983), too, bases his examination of the nature of mathematic knowledge on the empirical
position that 'the knowledge of an individual is grounded in the knowledge of community authorities'.

It has been assumed that knowledge is confirmable by reference to experience. This is true of 'empirical' knowledge which has been defined as 'knowledge [which] predicts experience as [the] consequence of action' (Lewis, 1946), though by this poses a challenge for the place of abstract knowledge and phenomena like dreams. Methodologically it poses challenges too for investigations into subjective realities and impressionistic truths in the social sciences. The ideographic, as opposed to the nomothetic, character of such research has already been noted in the Introduction which forms Part 1 of the thesis.

The aspect of empirical knowledge of importance to this thesis pertains to that knowledge directly experienced by managers (practitioners and students), particularly that which can be exteriorised by contextualistic and constructivistic testing. Such knowledge, to be reliable, presupposes a high degree of knowledge by direct observation on the part of both groups examined, and of their knowledge expressed as statements and judgements based on notions of legitimation, belief, and probability. It takes on board the ideas that knowledge is action achievement, performance and ability, which White (White, 1982) summarises in his study of the nature of knowledge.

Another important aspect of knowledge is whether it is common-sense. Such knowledge concentrates on 'the world of the concrete and the particular' (Lonergan, 1958, 179), a world of immediate relevance to practising managers. The concrete meanings of 'effectiveness' and the particular settings in which such meanings are used and turned into narrative are of direct concern to this research. At the same time, following ethnographic and grounded theory principles, attempts are made to generalise from particular evidence (while
acknowledging the uniqueness of the evidence in its context), and develop coherent and relevant models which explain and illuminate the way managers create meanings.

Such examination suggests that subjective knowledge can be objectivised to some extent. The classic statement of this process is Karl Popper's (Popper, 1972; McArthur, 1987), in which three worlds are postulated, one of physical objects and states (e.g., matter, actions, tools, creativity), one of states of consciousness (e.g., thinking, creative imagination), and one of knowledge in an objective sense (the world of culture and ideas). In World 2 we evaluate and interpret, a view which is of relevance to any discussion of cognitive representation and mental maps (see chapter 4). There is a dialectical interaction between World 2 and World 3 'that leads us to enquire into the nature and ground of our experience, belief and knowledge' (McGarry, 1991).

Popper's views have modified and enriched the common sense theory of knowledge (Perkinson, 1984, 21-41), especially in getting us to consider how we criticise the knowledge claims of other people and of ourselves, particularly since 'we can never actually criticize our own knowledge' (ibid.). Methodologically, the implied difficulty of relativism and its consequences for reliability have been considered in the Introduction. Furthermore, it is argued that the process of exteriorisation, reflection, and generalisation are important devices for objectivising the research evidence.

Much objective knowledge takes form in systematically created bodies of knowledge such as the knowledge a profession exercises (and has of itself and by which it establishes its norms). We shall examine such knowledge in management later in this chapter when we look at the rational view of management. The other major form of knowledge here is the subject discipline.
The substantive (content) and procedural (methodology) aspects of these are important, and are reflected in Popper's World 3 (eg philosophical and scientific codifications of culture, as well as scientific problems and critical arguments).

Collingwood (Collingwood, 1924) suggests that all such subjects, together, form a map in their own right. Many are 'academic' and are taught in educational institutions. Some are more factual ('hard', as opposed to 'soft') than others. Batty (Batty, 1976) describes how knowledge grows through its disciplines, which not only map known knowledge but also reflect and induce change (eg 'new' subjects like cybernetics appear). The process takes place within a sociology of knowledge - the creation, dissemination and use of information and knowledge within social (eg institutionalised and ideological) structures.

Disciplines demonstrate structure (eg through consensually agreed 'facts' or 'norms' or 'methods') (Schwab, 1962; Elam, 1964; Blum, 1971; Addis, 1987; Peters, 1966) and in their turn predicate and reflect social structures (family, community, organisation, profession) and their 'perceptual knowledge of the external world' (Gurvitch, 1971, 74). So, when managers speak about things being 'good' or 'real', they are referring to complex mixtures of what they know works, what they think should be done, what they may regard as custom and usage in the workplace, and what they have absorbed from theory. This suggests that practising professionals draw on both practitioner (or 'street', on the job) knowledge and academic knowledge (from books, courses, and so on), and that each modifies the other (see the present author's article 'Kinds of knowledge', Library Review 40(4) 1991 27-34, reproduced as Appendix I, [Hannabuss, 1991]). It also argues that such knowledge is pragmatic and rooted in beliefs (about management, about themselves, as well as in belief 'that they know' and in 'what they know') (Vendler, 1972, 89).
A further distinction should be made between public and private knowledge, that overtly expressed (eg what we know about the British constitution or about Scottish schools) and that held personally by you and me. Private can become public, public affects private, public is not necessarily consensual. Behind both there is tacit knowledge, unformalised but an essential prerequisite to explicit formalised knowledge (Kemp, 1976; Polanyi, 1962; Polanyi, 1967; McGarry, 1975; Ziman, 1976; Ziman, 1968; Ziman, 1979; Ziman, 1981; Graves & others, 1973; Grene, 1966; Ayer, 1940; Givet & Shoemaker, 1983). There are research challenges in ascertaining how these various domains interact and affect, and are affected by, action and meaning.

Knowledge paradigms and change

The systematically created bodies of knowledge referred to above are often called 'paradigms'. These are 'axiomatic systems characterized essentially by their differing sets of assumptions about the phenomena into which they are designed to inquire' (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Patton (Patton, 1989, 43) states that they are world views or general perspectives, 'embedded in the socialization of adherents and practitioners', telling them 'what is important, legitimate, ... reasonable [and] normative'. Examples are what scientists know about DNA or relativity, or what appears to be common managerial wisdom about managing companies for profit.

Such paradigms address themselves to both content and procedure, so that, for instance, scientific research draws on reliable prior knowledge and accepted experimental methodologies to explore frontiers of its subject. Kuhn (Kuhn, 1962; Masterman, 1970; Stephens, 1973; Nagel, 1961) applied these ideas to
science, since when it has been much debated, particularly for the way in which defining paradigms is an activity itself dependent on paradigms (Shapere, 1971). Kuhn assumed normative science, intended his ideas to be used practically, and rightly suggesting that they were always subject to change. In the 1970 revised edition of his 1962 work, Kuhn added that paradigms might include 'constellations of beliefs and values' (issues examined in chapter 3 of this thesis) as well as problem-solving strategies (the methodological aspects).

Knowledge paradigms are those which emphasise frameworks of knowledge (De Mey calls them 'cognitive paradigms', De Mey, 1982; Minsky, 1981). It is a name given, variously, to the received wisdom of a profession, to structures of fact in the domain of factuality (eg a national library and information infrastructure is referred to as a paradigm by Rehman, 1991), to organised assemblages of facts and theories and models (Lawler & others, 1985, 62), to ways in which part of the world sees another on television news (Adams, 1982, 45-65), and to the way in which information research should be carried out (Feeney & Merry, 1990, 21-9). Kuhn applied his ideas to science: when they are applied to the social sciences, adjustments about 'laws', 'theories', and methods have to be made (Harvey, 1981; Bloor, 1976; Mackenzie & House, 1978; Eckberg & Hill, 1979), particularly because notions of laws and normative science apply in different, more qualitative ways in the social sciences.

This thesis suggests how managerial 'knowledge domains' can be elicited by means of concept analysis (see Chapter 11), how different types of knowledge (practitioner and academic, axiomatic and impressionistic (see Chapter 11) are used, how knowledge systems underly forms of managerial storying (see Chapter 11), and how hegemonistic narrative positions are adopted in such storying (see Chapters 9 and 10). The existence of paradigms, among experienced and novice managers, is implied through the discussion of the concept of 'effectiveness' in
Part 3. Such methods, it is argued, enable researchers to probe the idiosyncratic and tacit knowledge frames of respondents, frames which are not just chunks of knowledge but recurrently relevant and meaningful knowledge with reference to which managerial meanings are represented.

Paradigms also change. Such changes, like that changed interpretation of evolution from Genesis to Darwin or of the universe from Ptolemy to Copernicus, characterise the revolutionary or evolutionary nature of science. Change occurs in all bodies of knowledge, as new content and methods become acceptable and boundaries redefined. Chaos theory and para-psychology show this now, and in management post-rationalistic (post-positivistic) research methods show it too. Methods of explanation change in research (Baldamus, 1976; Popper, 1976; Carr & Kemmis, 1985, 61 et seq.; Scheff, 1967; ), giving rise to a two-level 'dialogue'.

The first level is that of dialogue between holders of different paradigms, or different interpretations or valuations of the same paradigm. For instance, hospital managers are in transition between care and profit paradigms of service, each paradigm constructed from what is known and knowable but, influenced by ideological change, constructing key meanings differently. These ideas have been applied directly to management by the present author (see 'Knowledge paradigms and change', International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy 8(1) 1988, 23-31, reproduced as Appendix II, [Hannabuss 1988a]; and 'Knowledge representation and conceptualising in management', International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy 9(4) 1989, 27-45, reproduced as Appendix III,[ Hannabuss 1989a]). The thesis examines paradigmatic change, with particular reference to scholar-librarians in a service context moving in entrepreneurial directions (Chapter 5).
The notion of consensus is important, for, if most people think in one way, then it suggests that knowledge is paradigmatic; if not, that it is multi-paradigmatic (Cullen & others, 1985; Clutterbuck & Crainer, 1990). Managers' tolerance of antinomies in workplace knowledge is examined in Chapter 6, where practical consensus analysis, with experts and novices, is carried out. Storytelling is suggested as a way of presenting alternative meanings (see Chapter 9). Links between paradigms, coherence, and decision-making are noted in Chapter 8.

There are direct links, too, with learning about management. When paradigmatic knowledge is provided in the teaching-learning situation, it is termed 'canonical knowledge', implying authoritativeness and hegemonic order (ie the existence of 'expert' paradigmatic knowledge to be 'learned' by the 'novice', see Chapter 4). In response to exposure to such canonical knowledge, learner paradigms are constructed, de- and re-constructed (see Chapter 7), with interesting implications for the meanings and cognitive frameworks of all participants.

Further to this is the important way in which forms of coming to know (particularly a manager's orientation towards formulating goals) appears to move, with greater expertise, from the strictly paradigmatic (ie logical explanation and categorisation) to freer forms of narrative concentrating on sequential relationships, concatenation and conjunction, characteristics of the storying which, the thesis argues, is a major way in which managers turn experience into meaning (see chapter 9). Connected to consensus is the idea of expertise, a body of knowledge and skills demonstrable by an 'expert' and learnable by a 'novice' (Kelly, 1970; Donohue & others, 1975; Ettema & Kline, 1977) and the coherence and authority which expertise endows (Spitzer & Denzin, 1965; Del Sesto, 1983). Contrasts between experts and novices (in decision
making in chapter 9, and in storytelling in chapter 11) are intended to develop this argument.

The second level of dialogue concerns the paradigm itself, and its effect on methodology. 'Management' as an area of practice, theory and research investigation consist of many parts each of which may be regarded as a paradigm (eg sociology, social and cognitive psychology, law, information technology, economics, politics). This makes management 'multi-paradigmatic'. As a consequence, expertise is multi-paradigmatic, and meanings (concepts, axioms, explanations, inferences, norms and the like) are ideographic rather than nomothetic (ie they tend to confirm that understandings are diverse and particularistic rather than law-confirming, like experiments in chemistry). Indeed, many managerial meanings are use concepts which are 'contestable' (see Chapter 4), constructed and negotiated by and between experts, semantically more fluid than, say, much scientific terminology (Adkinson, 1979; Axelsson & Easton, 1991; Graham, 1989; Biglan, 1973; Collins, 1990; Berger, 1982).

The effect on methodology is predictable. Changing and disputed meanings abound, research methods show diversity, as social science research demonstrates the presence of a constructivistic, rather than a positivistic, paradigm (Guba, 1990). Change from outside the management paradigm (eg from politics and finance) accentuate the protean character of this paradigm. It opens up conflictual interpretations of the paradigm, a dialectic found both in the knowledge debate and in the practical texture of organisations. A specific example in the thesis is the ideological dialectic between craftsman and gamesman managers which is explained and explored later in the thesis.
Paradigm change and library management

Areas of professional work may be said to have bodies of knowledge about what is done, how things should be done, and what practitioners know. Such knowledge is a complex mixture of street/practitioner and academic strands. Moreover, it is a pluralistic field: management itself is made up of many disciplines and practices, while 'the world of information' is multifarious and fragmented, 'no longer contoured by the ethical and bibliographical standards set by libraries', but a domain of vigorous, international change (Cronin & Davenport, 1988; Moore, 1987; Dedijer & Jequier, 1987; Poster, 1990; Lyotard, 1984). This means that knowledge is complex (Jolley, 1973) and pluralistic, constructed inter-subjectively by the key protagonists in the information world, authors and publishers, librarians and information scientists, teachers and managers (Meadows, 1991; Parsons, 1989; Altbach, 1987; More & Laird, 1985; Menou, 1983). This domain, then, is multi-paradigmatic and that any investigation should take account of this characteristic (Olaisen, 1985; Brown, 1987).

This thesis aims to investigate effectiveness in library and information services. It concentrates on public and academic libraries. The practice and process of management in such libraries may be regarded as a body of knowledge in this way, with key meanings, actual and perceived expertise, and susceptibility or resistance to change. It is argued that understanding and exteriorising the concept of effectiveness is central to elucidating both the knowledge and change there.

Management in this area has been traditionally associated with the organisation and administration of services for the community. Many professionals have assumed that their expertise lay in librarianship and information work first
and management second, and that the aims and objectives of service were based on the ideals of 'service'. Knowledge and belief-systems fed and led this approach. Recent decades have induced structural and cognitive change. Information technology has altered ways services are run and changed perceptions of and priorities in training and education (British Library, 1991; Brittain, 1989; Hannabuss, 1987). Financial constraints have put pressure on libraries to examine policy and planning and budgetary control (Harris & Gilder, 1983; Thompson & Carr, 1987), accelerating change and throwing doubt upon traditional modes of thinking and working.

Central assumptions and practices in the field have changed in recent decades. The notion that most libraries are 'free' is under threat (or, less emotively, in a state of change). Information as a product for sale is increasingly common. Political and financial pressures, from central and local government, have induced libraries to concentrate on 'value for money', and work more and more to a market philosophy of the three E's (economy, efficiency and effectiveness). How these key concepts are defined is fluid, ideological, contestable or dialectical, even iconoclastic. This challenge and dilemma is one libraries share with hospitals and schools.

The implications for practical management are clear: new skills and attitudes are needed for the future, and ways of justifying current provision are needed in the face of scepticism and commercial competition. These changes have good and bad effects: no profession should stand still, and accountability and effective performance put managers on their mettle and benefit users. Yet for many traditional professionals, such changes of knowledge and value have induced unsettling change.
This scenario is crucial for understanding the setting within which the analysis of managerial discourse takes place, because the concept of effectiveness, and how it is used in various forms of discourse, reflect ways in which managers think and learn, and record their response to change, in such a context. The expression of knowledge through forms of discourse will be a major concern of the thesis (Deetz & Mumby, 1990; Bernstein, 1990; Toolan, 1988; Fowler, 1991; Macdonell, 1986).

A clear idea of what effective management is considered to be can be found in key textbooks and journals. In this research, such materials, complemented by extensive discussions and interviews with respondents, provide the documentary sources which ethnographic research often needs to rely on (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975, chapter 6). From such materials, too, key concepts about effectiveness may be found, and these arguably represent not only the definitions of many professionals but the formative guidelines for those coming to library management for the first time. The principles by which textbooks containing such definitions were selected are described in the Introduction in Part 1.

Such definitions or concepts (Boaz, 1979) were used by the investigation to formulate and identify managerial meaning, along with others elicited on grounded theory principles. An 'analectic' approach was also taken. Analects are short indicative passages of 'findings or assertions from the professional literature' (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, 211). Comprehensive citational searches were made in key databases for librarianship and information studies (eg LISA) and exhaustive searching in sources like Social Sciences Citation Abstracts made to ensure access to current statements within the debate. Selectivity was introduced in terms of those definitions of direct relevance to management in library and information services in the United Kingdom between 1980 and 1991 (ie the present).
Two definitional or semantic characteristics soon became apparent in this operation: first, that the concept of 'effectiveness' acts as the centre of a 'cluster' of concepts - performance, goodness, efficiency, quality, excellence, cost-effectiveness, value for money, user benefit. Specific applications derive from these (eg performance indicators such as 'output quantities to staff hours')(COPOL, 1989; Beeton, 1988; Powell, 1988; National Consumer Council, 1986; Goodall, 1988; Combe, 1987). Meanings are complicated by the existence of a parallel, larger debate in the public sector as a whole on what effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability mean in a public sector undergoing political and administrative change (Jowett & Rothwell, 1988; Audit Commission, 1986; Scottish Centrally-Funded Colleges Committee of Principals, 1991).

Analectic information reveals a wide diversity of meaning and ideology, from accountability to political masters (eg value for money) to strictly localised applications (eg comparing a library's intended outputs with the actual use made of its products and services by users). Five representative analects are reproduced in Appendix IV, intended to reflect the kinds of definitions and statements made by documentary sources. Readers may identify other sources referred to for this purpose from the bibliographies to this and other chapters. Analects such as these both reveal and imply paradigmatic knowledge, offering meanings for debate, providing instances (and revealingly disallowing non-instances) of what they mean, concatenating ideas in particular orders, and making revealing assumptions about what is what.

For example, effectiveness is defined as 'achieving government objectives' or 'goal attainment', widely different, both explicit, both needing further elucidation. For instance, the first concerns doing what paymasters seem to want, while the second may refer to the setting, measuring and achieving aims internally determined by the management of the library. Another interesting
dimension is the extent to which effectiveness is usually regarded as achievable through experience and judgement, rather than through quantitative measures (e.g., financial or statistical analysis).

Instances range from achieving performance targets to providing user satisfaction, giving evidence of the way in which, for practitioners, knowledge is indeed directed heavily towards action (i.e., it is pragmatic and conative). Revealing distinctions are made (e.g., between efficiency and effectiveness), efficiency simply being doing things right (e.g., allocating funds, delegating tasks) while effectiveness is doing the right things to ensure the best outcomes for document availability and user satisfaction. More widely, the way the analects arrange their ideas and assume logical and referential connections between the parts may be said to highlight common professional ways of thinking about effectiveness. The plurality of definitions is acknowledged. So is the fact that key aspects of the definitions are susceptible to change. For the researcher there is valuable evidence here of major ways in which managerial meaning is made, as well as what it is.

Yet paradigms are 'bodies' of knowledge made up not just of concepts and meanings but 'complex networks or structures or maps of meanings'. These networks draw on denotation and connotations, associations and referentialities, shared and individualistic. Institutions and professions embody and influence them, external factors like politics and culture and ideology impact upon them. They contain street and practitioner knowledge, and theoretical and academic knowledge.

Often they are exteriorisable by getting people to express them as definitions or propositions or more extended forms of discourse. For instance, Auckland (Auckland, 1989) identifies what library manager 'experts' regard as the most
important aspects of 'performance' through a survey at a conference (in which such criteria as user satisfaction, speed of delivery, and relevance consensually came top). Such ideas are not always instantiated in words (discoursal or semantic phenomena like concepts, propositions, and stories), for much knowledge is symbolic or imagistic, although in Auckland's survey, and in this research, it is argued that such discoursal forms do in fact form a major way of representing such meaning.

Methodologically, paradigms in management and organisational studies demonstrate a movement from a reliance on positivism and rationalism to interpretative and contextualistic approaches. Burrell and Morgan (Burrell & Morgan, 1979) contrast the paradigms applied to organisations, the functionalist (objective, based on regulations and assumptions of social order, nomothetic), interpretive (aiming to understand the management world in terms of subjective experience and inter-subjectively shared meanings), radical humanist (subjectivist and sensitive to the cognitive wedge between power and individuals), and radical structuralist (looking at power relationships and change through crisis). The practical and historiographic implications of these are important. The thesis takes up strands of all, placing particular emphasis on the difference between the first two and consequential responses and exteriorisations through discourse by those affected (Georgiou, 1973).

The functionalist approach stresses 'rationality'. Managers have traditionally been associated with this, and have often attributed it to their work. It implies acting after calculating and deliberating, planning and controlling activity, being ratiocinative and efficient. Models of management often reflect rationality when they speak of planning and controlling and coordinating (Diesing, 1973). It is a popular recommendation for successful management thinking (Adair, 1985, 29-48). The ideas of Weber (Weber, 1968; Mueller, 1979)
are influential here. Bureaucracies are rational structures and people are economically motivated to work in them. Rationality shows itself in purposiveness (when managers show a will to power), value (when values and ideologies are used to underwrite management activity), and being systematic (in the technocratic and formal structures designed to concentrate the energy and effort of work).

Such an approach has influenced large-scale industrial management, and 'classical' management theories from writers like Taylor and Fayol underlined the high degree of scalarity (people reporting to other people in tightly organised structures) and departmentation which were found effective. Managerial autonomy was rated highly insofar as it was able to achieve organisational objectives, which were primarily economic. Cognitively, emphasis was placed on the predictability of individual activities (eg employees worked for predominantly economic reasons). We know how critiques of this paradigm appeared in Marxist writers (Baldamus, 1976; Mattick, 1986; Forgacs, 1988).

The debate is described by Child (Child, 1969). It is reflected in key management studies through this century, as when Simon (Simon, 1945) stresses rationality as being concerned with decision making based on information and consistent with values objectively examined, as dealing with the construction of means-ends chains. Studies of 'the rational manager' (eg. Kepner & Tregoe, 1976; Tannenbaum, 1949) celebrate analysis and feedback in decision-making, and planning and control. Quantitative applications in 'management science' reinforce this view. Yet this rationality is bounded (hence 'bounded rationality'), by circumstances and contingencies, by human characteristics and idiosyncratic elements in human interaction and choice (Elster, 1986).
Recent approaches emphasise the subjectivity and constructivism of the management process, suggesting that paradigms are 'subjective world views' (Astley, 1984), competing explanations of management, concerned with 'the formulation of ideas rather than the reporting of objective truth'. The contestability of meanings, the inherent dialectic in organisations, coupled to the multi-paradigmacy and pluralism of the domain of management itself, has changed the way in which management is carried out and written about.

With growing knowledge about organisational cultures (see chapter 3), and changing patterns associated with excellence (Peters & Waterman, 1982), there is now greater knowledge of the diversity of types of knowledge and meaning (much of it discoursal, but much symbolic also), notably those forms of cultural knowledge which take up assumptions and ways of handling routines, as well as 'knowledge how' and definitional knowledge (Sackmann, 1990). It is as if organisations may be best understood if we see them as exchanges between individuals pursuing a diversity of goals (Georgiou, 1973).

At the same time, characteristics of rational management seem permanently sited in the practice of management, not just in the need to make decisions on full information and efficiently monitor product and service control, but to accept complex linkages between the social structure of an organisation and the ways in which people know and decide there (Burnes, 1991). But it is a bounded rationality (Schwartz, 1989), bounded in that it can deal with only part of the complex truth, and to act rationally may curtail the effectiveness of our actions (Ingalls, 1976).

Denhardt (Denhardt, 1981) suggests that organisations 'use rational outcomes and rules at the expense of our identity'. The ideology of progress and assumptions that people work for economic motives provides a merely partial
interpretation of the context of management. Mere efficiency 'impugns' the valuational concerns of the individual, so that there is a 'conflict between individual creative value and organisational logic' (loc.cit..85). By imposing collective knowledge, and by treating people instrumentally, bureaucracies ritualise order and obedience.

Beyond the rational organisation, he says, 'the realities we accept are products of forms of social interaction', the organisational meanings which we use to help us to express those realities. He moves through Husserl's phenomenology to suggest that people derive meaning through action, and embed action in meaning, so that meaning is 'constituted intersubjectively, and knowledge based conceptually and preconceptually (ie as symbols or images)' (loc.cit.,103).
Organisations are meaning structures seen through the eyes of their members (Silverman, 1971).

Managers are not just instruments in organisations: they are 'stakeholders of the organizational mind' (the title of Mitroff's book, 1989). Stakeholders are 'those interest groups, parties, actors, claimants, and institutions - both internal and external to the corporation - that exert a hold on it' (loc.cit., 4).
They affect, and are affected by, 'a corporation's actions, behavior, and policies'. They tend not to share the same definition of the organisation's 'problems', and, as a result, operate in a far from consensual manner. Such initial disagreement, Mitroff argues, should be regarded as a strength 'since it informs us of different options - and works toward a final point of shared commitment to a set of possible solution alternatives' (loc.cit.,5).

For him the personalities of the stakeholders are important, for they know and think differently. He uses Jungian categories which this thesis applies in its turn in later chapters, arguing that from and at archetypal levels the ways in
which managers represent meaning to themselves is a crucial element in creating organisational and paradigmatic meaning, and understanding what research into managerial meaning is about. In other works (eg Mitroff, 1974, on 'the subjective side of science') he argues similarly that we must move beyond strictly rationalistic paradigms, into ethnographic and constructivistic ones, in order to understand the complexity, idiosyncrasy, and evanescence of meaning.

This thesis argues that such knowledge and meaning are exteriorised in forms of discourse, elicitable through and with respondents under controlled circumstances, and that paradigmatic aspects of this knowledge (particularly implications of rationalism), appearing both in theoretical and practical forms, can be incorporated into such a study.
This chapter discusses managerial effectiveness and competence. It suggests that being effective means knowing what to do, knowing what is real, and knowing what should be done.

Meaning and knowledge often arise in situations of conflict. Opposing viewpoints abound in organisations. From this it is possible to suggest that meaning is 'negotiated'. Ways in which this takes place, and reasons why it does, are given. Burawoy's ideas on 'manufactured consent' are described and it is argued that this approach is important and helpful to an understanding of the negotiation of meaning in management.

Meaning and knowledge vary not just with types of situation and decision but also with types of manager (or managerial viewpoint). Generalist and specialist managers are identified and compared. The hypothesis is put forward that 'craftsman' and 'gamesman' managers are dominant managerial types, and types of particular importance for contemporary research into managerial meaning and knowledge. For library and information management, recent times have thrust such a dialectic to the foreground.

It is in such a context that managers construct and use knowledge and meaning, expressing them in forms of discourse.
Managers often regard being good and doing well as high qualities. The 'goodness' usually involves being effective (knowing your job, being creative and committed). 'Doing well' involves being successful (in getting work done, getting people with you, getting up the promotional ladder, winning in the competitive stakes). Knowledge is required to achieve these things, as is knowledge of knowledge (i.e., the 'helicopter mind', able to rise above what is going on and review it, an ability to reflect on practice and theory).

This chapter aims to open up the ideas and historiography on effectiveness and competence, in the particular context of the conflicting views of different types of manager, and investigate the extent to which contemporary meanings in management are negotiated, forms of 'manufactured consent' (Burawoy, 1979). Empirical investigation of these ideas takes place in Chapter 5, and ideological and values/beliefs dimensions of the issues are explored in Chapter 3. It is argued, later in the thesis, that these conflicts emerge clearly when managers represent meaning in forms of discourse.
'The prime function of a manager is to know what day-to-day operations are necessary in the area for which he is responsible and to arrange for people to perform them within the framework of what he understands are the general values, objectives and strategy of the company' (Sieff, 1990. 156). Picking out what managers do, Mintzberg (Mintzberg, 1980) distinguishes three major roles: the interpersonal role (exercise of authority and contacts with other people), the informational role (processing and disseminating information), and the decisional role (making decisions, balancing trade-offs, allocating resources, handling conflict). These roles helpfully identify major strands of management activity. They imply that management is busy, fragmented, up-to-the-minute, pragmatic, ad hoc, highly verbalised, and often gregarious (eg team-building, entrepreneurial).

Stewart (Stewart, 1983) reinforces this when she says that managerial behaviour is often 'a reactive, instinctive activity ... incompatible with long periods required for planning', a political activity taking place in a 'network of reciprocal relationships', placing the study of management firmly into a contextualistic and constructivistic setting. One of the aims of this thesis is to move from this position to ask what research issues arise out of such definable roles and skills.

Of assistance was the taxonomy of Burgoyne and Stuart (Burgoyne & Stuart, 1976), who highlight the issues of pragmatism (investigating the effectiveness of managers in a practical setting), universalism (defining managerial skills as contextual and contingent rather than as a toolkit of canonical skills), individualism (what the particular manager brings to his/her work from their personality, and how this interacts with environment), definitions of skills (these are not always functional, eg 'leadership or planning skills', and are often much more complex, eg 'conceptualising or creativity for innovation'), and
managerial learning (the levels and complexity of which are often underestimated, see chapter 4).

A simple account of being competent might well entail being good at exercising these managerial roles, as well as doing this in a realistic way. In his study of competences, Raven (Raven, 1984) identifies key concepts as participation, delegation of responsibility, and accountability. He suggests the 'competence' is made up of the ability and wish to take the initiative, 'engage in value-laden activities' which influence what happens in an organisation, contributing to the 'climate of support and innovation', understanding how the organisation and society work, and 'understanding the key concepts of the organisation' (such as 'accountability'). For Raven there are close links between what managers do, and what and how managers think and learn: the cognitive, affective, and conative (connected with the desire to perform an action), a position adopted by this research with its emphasis on experiential learning.

Other competences may be recognised and nurtured by the organisation or profession or the manager himself/herself. It may be discretion (Davenport & Cronin, 1991) or detachment (Coulson-Thomas & Wakelam, 1991) or demonstrating specialist skills (Kanter & Stein, 1980) or intellectual edge (McClelland, 1973) or innovativeness (Roberts, 1968) or a belief in quality and excellence (Clutterbuck & Crainer, 1990, 195-231) or conflict handling (Burgoyne, 1984; Robbins, 1989) or enthusiasm (What Management Needs..., 1987) or an ability to learn from experience (Cox & Cooper, 1988). Competence may be seen as economic success (Furnham & Lewis, 1986). It may be contingent on the job (eg specialist or generalist, Rees, 1984) or the level of the job (eg senior strategic or middle supervisory management).
External political and ideological factors may impinge, such as competence as viewed by management or unions (Poole & Mansfield, 1980), or as regarded by a traditionally service sector in a state of internally and/or externally induced change (like the library and information sector at the present time) (Cherns, 1980; Hunt, 1972; Cheng & McKinley, 1983; Emery & Trist, 1969). Issues such as these as investigated further in Chapters 5, 8 and 11 in the context of ways in which managers can be encouraged to represent their knowledge of the meaning for them and their work, and the meanings, in forms of discourse.

Continually it is found that 'competence' or 'effectiveness' are discussed with reference to the difference between 'what is' and 'what should be'. For instance, the rationalistic view of management argues that decision making should take place once information has been gathered and reviewed. Yet, often, decisions are taken in states of imperfect information. Indeed, effective management may arguably be defined, in some cases, as being able to take risks in such situations (Watson & Buede, 1987; Janis, 1959; Mann, 1972; Kahnemann & Tversky, 1979; Janis & Mann, 1977).

Implicit here, too, are the epistemological grounds for believing that particular things are 'true', 'real', 'plausible', 'practicable', or 'acceptable to other people'. The difference between 'what is' and 'what should be' characterises management, for management strives to conquer difficulties, impose ideas or procedures on nature, get work done through people, meet deadlines, come out the best of the bunch, convince people that the impossible can be achieved. More, groups (organisations, professions, and the like) develop complex bodies of knowledge about what it is best to know, how things should be done and why. These usually contain practical elements (eg 'to be an effective manager you need to know... and do...') as well as taking in many attitudinal and ethical factors.
More localised and immediate still are the many instances in which managers feel and/or express and/or assert that 'things should be done a in particular way'. This may be based on internally- or externally-generated expectations or accustomisation or training, on specialist knowledge and understanding, or on a reading of the textures and needs of a particular situation. Moral and ethical pressures (e.g. the Protestant work ethic, the capitalist philosophy, the service ideal of the public library) may be found at work, affected by what managers think is 'right' as well as 'good' and 'true'. Many of these issues link up with the beliefs and values which managers hold (see Chapter 3), yet at their base lies what managers know, and know or think they know. For example, knowing that charging for library books will exclude large numbers of the local community from access to the library will affect library policy.

As far as managerial effectiveness is concerned, it may be argued that it only exists if certain things are present. That is to say, certain things should be present in order for us to say that a manager is effective, that a manager should do certain things in a certain way for us to adjudge him or her effective. Managers apply these criteria to themselves and to what they know, and what they think they should know (Von Wright, 1968). The rationalistic approach would suggest that managers should plan and control in a deliberate way, but real life is often different (Mintzberg, 1975): there is already a difference between theory and practice, between rationalistic and practical management. It may be that a manager should treat staff or users in a particular way, allocate funds and services preferentially, exercise his or her opportunities for action in particular ways.

The double strand of 'what managers should do' and 'what managers think they should do (and should have done, or should do in the future)' is an important one for this research. It will take us into the deontic domain, where managers
refer, directly or indirectly, to what they think they should do in order to compare and assess present practical action and thought. Arguably, more expert or effective managers will perform in different ways from novices, and arguably the various types of 'shoulds' will emerge through the forms of discourse which managers are encouraged to use in order to represent meaning, as well as in decision making where decision making and providing or assuming warrants for decisions interweave. The deontic will be used as a dimension of knowledge representation later in the thesis.

Aspects of conflict in management

The political and psychodynamic tensions and conflicts within formal and informal groups have attracted wide discussion from researchers into organisational behaviour. Organisational conflict (i.e., behaviours and attitudes hindering effective group performance) is ambivalent in its effect: both its presence and its absence can destroy success. It may be perceived or felt by participants, and can become overt (Robbins, 1989, 366-94). Conflict-handling behaviours include competition, collaboration, compromise, and avoidance. Successfully managed, it can improve the quality of decisions, stimulate creativity, and encourage interest among members. Yet incompatibility between competing parties characterises conflict. The incompatibility may occur as ideological and be based on values and beliefs (see Chapter 3). It may be rooted in what different groups know about themselves, their task and mission, and their environment.

Effective managers should be able to handle conflicts, particularly substantive and formal ones (Rhenman & others, 1970) and channel them into creative
channels (Sherif, 1966). Habermas's emancipatory knowledge, finding common
ground between technical (events) and practical (the interactions of people), is
suggested as a way through by Matejko (Matejko, 1986, 229-91) in his
examination of new managerial paradigms. Only by understanding the socio-
technical relationships fully, he argues, can we break down the traditional
dichotomies of the power game. This moves us beyond merely functional (eg
skills) approaches to those 'praxiological' aspects of organisational behaviour
which include how managers interact and communicate, how they respond to
organisational culture and regulation, whether they organise or manipulate, and
how they regard their effectiveness in relation to the client or customer. A
praxiological understanding of the managerial role is most important, and it is
discussed later in Chapter 12.

Yet there is much to suggest that conflict is endemic in management, in
relations between management and unions (Davies, 1983; Poole, M & others, 1981;
Dunkerley & Salaman, 1982; Diesing, 1973; Blake, R R & others, 1965), between
leaders and subordinates, between 'line' and 'staff' management (Rhenman &
others, 1970), between the various 'stakeholders' in the organisation (eg
managers, shareholders, investors, customers, the community at large). Many of
the conflicts (eg of power and communication) are affected by, and help to
create, the organisational structures which exist (Burnes, 1991).

They also arise from the fact that organisations of any size may be regarded
both as sets of 'nested identities' in which the participants identify
themselves in a multiple manner (say, to their organisation, their profession,
their home, their career and personal aspirations) and sub-sets do the same
(Feldman, 1979), and that most contemporary organisations, big and small, are
loosely-coupled systems (rather than Weberian bureaucracies) with scope for
diversity and change. These factors have direct implications for the ways in
which managers demonstrate and exercise effectiveness, and in turn for the ways
in which they define and understand it.

An aspect of conflict of central concern to this research is that between
specialist and generalist managers. The assumption in this dichotomy is that
specialists are professionals (say, librarians in positions of management)
trained in skills and attitudes associated with their specialism. Even if they
have moved to positions of more general responsibility, they tend to define
themselves and the purpose of their organisation in terms of this knowledge and
value-system. Generalist managers, on the other hand, tend to refer to a body of
knowledge associated with management skills applicable in any work situation
(eg leadership, decision making, financial management, handling meetings,
assessing market share, strategic policy) and, arguably tend towards a more
politically opportunistic and entrepreneurial model of their own and their
organisation's role. Examples of these types may be found in library
management, teaching, and hospital management at the present time.

Of course, one type of manager can become another (eg specialists often become
generalists by promotion), and an individual manager can show characteristics
of both. At times there is resistance (Miller, 1967; Sheldon, 1971; Friedlander,
1971; Westin, 1981; Kerr & others, 1977; Raelin, 1984a; Raelin, 1984b; Raelin,
1985-6) However, in this thesis, by ethnographic and grounded theory research,
it was hypothesized and then confirmed that, in the domain of library
management, there was a peculiar dissonance or attrition between the two
approaches, and their associated knowledge and value-systems. Of particular
relevance to this investigation is that the library and information 'profession'
itself is in a state of structural change and redefinition (see Chapter 1), and
that many of the middle managers interviewed were poised at skills,
intellectual, and ideological watersheds in their own careers. Contingent on
This upheaval may be that many such managers had had their first and formative exposure to professional knowledge and values during the 1960s and 1970s, an era of expansion and relative liberality (although a full social study of this was not undertaken) (Raelin, 1985-6).

This may be contrasted with changes of the public sector through the 1980s and into the 1990s, and the growth of entrepreneurial and commercial (e.g. 'privatised', 'contracted out', 'value for money', 'quality assurance') models and philosophies. This has practical implications for role and skill redefinition (see Keat & Abercrombie's discussion of the 'enterprise culture', Keat & Abercrombie, 1991). Such change has affected all areas of library management, as can be seen in the 'adapt or change' retrenchment dilemmas currently in library education (Mingle, 1981). Similarly, when the research redirected its attention to students of library management, similar states of transition and redefinition became evident (as they moved from naive or 'lay' knowledge paradigms of management to more informed and pluralistic ones) (see Chapter 4). Both groups, practising managers and students, appeared to have in common the notion that 'librarianship was a profession intended to serve the community' and exposure to generalist and entrepreneurial approaches induced paradigmatic change.

Professional knowledge, through all its changes (Bledstein, 1976), is both practical and theoretical. Elliott (Elliott, 1972 & 1973) argues that the more substantial this body of knowledge is the 'better able (the profession is) to convince society of the need of their right to take responsibility for them (i.e. members of that society)'. The way in which professionals interpret and exercise their knowledge is 'an important aspect of the autonomy of the individual profession' (loc.cit. 1972, 127).
We have already discussed how pluralistic and segmented the library profession is in the information world, and how multi-paradigmatic management itself is. There is the further difficulty that some aspects of library work do share these characteristic, while some (e.g., simply clerical tasks) does not. Society itself holds divergent attitudes and definitions about nature and importance of management. An important part of the knowledge library managers have will be knowledge of what the public thinks of them. This helps to make this area of professional work difficult to define and its central meanings protean and contestable.

Conflict in organisations, then, may be associated with 'the clash of cultures' between what Raelin (Raelin, 1985-6) calls 'professionals' and 'managers'; what are called here 'specialist managers' and 'generalist managers'; what Paris (Paris, 1988), talking about schools of librarianship and information studies calls 'professionals' and 'politicians'; what Toffler (Toffler, 1985) calls 'incrementalist' and 'radical' executives; and what Gouldner refers to as 'locals' and 'cosmopolitans' (Gouldner, 1957 & 1958).

Spybey (Spybey, 1964; Spybey, 1989), talking about industry, identifies such differences between those managers who derive their frame of meaning and their knowledge (particularly their 'know-how') from experience of the industry, and those generalist managers who derive it from their 'universalistic and profit-orientated' knowledge of management. Given these opposing frames of meaning, there is conflict on what is a 'good' method or policy or response to change, and evidence of professional paradigms under structural change. The change becomes more interesting still when cultural knowledge frames are involved, as in publishing houses under such change (Lane, 1970) ('literature' or profit?); and when, in the service domain, there are divergent views about being effective. Key meanings and practices, like effectiveness and accountability,
quality and service, are then all thrown into a melting pot (Kouzes & Mico, 1979), one where meanings have a powerful effect on decisions and perceptions.

Later in the thesis, the two kinds of manager are referred to as 'craftsman managers' and 'gamesman managers'. They both use knowledge. The kinds of knowledge referred to include knowing how and knowing that, since professional management knowledge takes in both theory and practice. Historically, craftsman or artisan knowledge (arguably more how than why) was the 'technical' domain on to which the 'managerial' domain (more why than how) was superimposed with the advent of 'scientific management' in the late nineteenth century. Hayes (Hayes & others, 1988) argues that a dislocation set in, attributing depth to technical knowledge, and breadth to managerial knowledge, and that, for contemporary organisations to succeed, to become adaptive, this dislocation has to be recognised and broken down through use a holistic perspective, an emphasis on customer value, and on continual reflective learning.

We can push this forward to a further point : that the effective manager will be one able to move from one area or domain to another easily, analyse and synthesise, and handle multi-paradigms and intellectual as well as interpersonal conflict (Hunt, 1991). This is the conclusion later in the thesis (see Chapter 11) when various types of manager are investigated. Such managers may well demonstrate an ability to handle the positive and negative aspects of power and authority in the organisation, and those pluralistic and contradictory meanings by which realities are socially constructed, and operate effectively in that setting.

At the same time, such a manager needs to be able effectively to draw on the established and relevant body of professional knowledge, recognise its substantive and procedural meanings and norms, manipulate its associative
networks and subject boundaries, probe and personalise its epistemological and ontological grounds and assumptions, and operationalise its information-richness in decision making (McClure, 1980).

To this extent, then, the effective manager demonstrates an ability to identify with and utilise hegemonistic knowledge (i.e., that knowledge attributed to and used by most dominant groups in its sphere) and handle the semantic and socio-technical dialectic inherent in most managerial activity (Wilkins & Ouchi, 1983; Riley, 1983). Such a 'dialectic' derives from the oppositionality, in terms of knowledge and interpersonal relations, professional and political differences, endemic between two such approaches. The dilemma appears to go deep within individual managers and students of management, and so it is suggested as a pervasive theme of central importance for a study of managerial knowledge and meaning.

Issues such as these lead Benson (Benson, 1977) to draw, from a post-positivistic (one no longer wedded rootedly to traditional positivism, yet distrustful of thoroughly going qualitatively analysis) and Marxist position, what he regards as a coherent critique of organisational dialectics based on four basic principles. These are 'social construction' (e.g., groups, power, meaning, productivities), 'totality' (where the component parts and the context of the social construction are regarded and studied 'post-deterministically' as interrelated wholes), 'contradiction' (between multiple social constructions and their implications for change and the discovery of alternatives), and 'praxis' (with its emphasis on actual social forms).

These principles have an explicit and implicit place in any ethnographic and constructivistic approach to managerial meaning. At this point, they highlight the way in which management (particularly effective management and the ways in
which effective management can be represented) may be regarded as a process of
de- and reconstruction both on an organisational and individual level. It is in
such a context that the divergent and convergent roles of the two broad types
of professional manager, the craftsman and the gamesman, are examined.

The Negotiation of Meaning

We might reasonably call an organisation 'a negotiated environment' (Pfeffer &
Salancik, 1978). Relationships and linkages exist through its fabric,
transactions and exchanges are made, there is a 'normative coordination of
interdependence' (loc.cit.,147). The notion of negotiation is familiar in
management. It is designed to accomplish goals through bargaining, 'goals which
are people's cognitive representations of states of affairs that they wish to
bring about or maintain' (Wilson & Putnam, 1990). Such transactions are
susceptible to threats and subterfuge and deceit and power (Janis & Mann,
1977), to the Machiavellian, and to the spirit in which negotiation is entered
(cooperation or conflict)(Mastenbroek 1983 & 1984). Negotiations can be mapped
as 'texts' following logical sequences (Raiffa, 1982; Watson & Buede, 1987, 117-
18), and shed light on the broader social exchanges and power-plays in
organisations (Blau, 1964) and relationships (Hinde, 1979).

We may characterise organisations as milieux where reality is constructed in a
'negotiated' manner, as individuals experience and review transactions that take
place (eg giving orders, making policy, serving customers), and try or come to
understand situations in which routines take place or are overturned by the
unusual, or events which confirm the collegiality or dividedness of employees.
As such, we are able to suggest that managerial reality is 'constructed and
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negotiable' and the uses and sources of knowledge highly context-specific (Scheele, 1975).

Such constructivism indicates how much the strictly positivistic and rationalistic approaches to management constrain ethnographic research of this type, and confirms how important it is, when carrying out ethnographic research of this type, to build in appropriate interpretative caution when gathering and examining transactions between researcher and respondents during the times when meaning is being negotiated and exteriorised.

Implications for the study of knowledge and meaning include (a) the notion that there will be levels of expertise at work (in terms of complexity and truth [realism?] and understanding of causality); (b) that some knowledge will be associated with elites and others with marginal or minority sub-cultures (Gregory, 1983); and (c) that the interfaces between types of knowledge (and knowledge about their character and interaction) will continually change.

By this token, Wenger (Wenger, 1987, 14-19, 24, 29-32, 44-5) speaks about 'multiple models' of domain knowledge. Knowledge is an important element in negotiation because what you know may be more or less than what someone else knows. You may think you know more, or believe that the other person knows more. In management, the knowledge you have draws on the range of professional knowledge we have described as well as on specific information arising idiosyncratically in the situation itself, supported as it may be by information from any management information system. Interest, too, is implicated heavily in the negotiation process (Lax & Sebenius, 1986, 290-305).

Yet the process is not entirely relativistic because, even in conflictual situations, the participants may know — and accept — a commonality of rules and
norms and purpose, as well as the pragmatic and experiential knowledge of the profession, workplace, or situation. This is Burawoy’s (Burawoy, 1979) thesis of ‘manufactured consent’. Harmony at work is assumed but does not exist, particularly under capitalism, and so workers and managers handle consent through the negotiating process by making uncertainty as small as possible and by securing mutually acceptable outcomes on pay and productivity. Consensus (see Chapter 8) is reached by both sides agreeing to mutually tolerable interpretations of the substantive and procedural knowledge intrinsic to the workplace, even though partisan forms of knowledge may be at work (Lindblom & Cohen, 1979, 62).

It is created within bounded rationality (Elster, 1986; Harrison, 1987; Taylor, 1975; Minkes, 1987) and with reference to ‘strategic degrees of freedom’ surrounding the key factors of the enterprise, ‘the critical axes along which such a strategy can realistically be worked out’ (Ohmae, 1982). In the case of libraries under the financial stress of change, Oulton (Oulton, 1991) identifies such critical axes (options to lower performance, reduce costs, redefine services) as characteristic of strategic choice, a process in which all sides, however divergent and conflictual, must recognise as the ‘facts’ of the organisation and the environment, developing subject to dominant coalitions and the hegemonistic effects of the very knowledge which they know they have and have to use (Child, 1972).

Such knowledge needs to be exercised to make right choices for efficiency and effectiveness. Essential to this process is adaptation (Shoham, 1984; Bate, 1984), by the manager (‘the adaptive manager’ able to move among and beyond paradigms) and the organisation (‘the learning organisation’, see Chapter 4) (see Chapter 8 for a discussion of decision making and probability, and see Chapter 11 for aspects of the nomothetic as it appears in storytelling).
Within this negotiated reality and manufactured consent lie a negotiation emphatically related to the ways in which managers represent meanings in forms of discourse - concepts and propositions, scripts and stories. This is the rhetoric of management, by which the realities of power and practice and symbol are embodied paradigmatically and ideologically in the discoursal forms used by management, oral and written. Meaning is captured in key concepts (like 'effectiveness') and propositions (eg 'He works hard because ... he is well paid ...[or] because he is afraid of being fired', Van Maanen, 1983, 261) and stories, in which events are sequenced, regarded as relevant, and intended to manage meaning and reduce uncertainty, socialise or persuade (Brown, 1990; McMillan, 1990). Here, negotiating reality involves observing and defining the individual's (and their alter ego's) situation in the work situation (Mangham, 1975), deriving key (or, to use Ohmae, 'axial') definitions for central working concepts, ideas and themes, and accepting their protean and negotiable meaning.

Many writers and practitioners accept this negotiation of meaning as natural. It is inherent in the contestability of social science concepts (see Chapter 3), in the paradigmatic diversity of the ideas and themes in management, and in the dialectical way in which people interact and meaning is created in organisations. Meanings are therefore always changing, even though consensual or paradigmatic meanings may reside underneath ('hypostatic' meanings, on the analogy that, within the triunity of the Trinity, there is 'one God'), coming into being and being superseded, being understood in adumbrated or interim ways, being employed collusively or excludingly by elite groups or experts, being used with varying degrees of error or over-simplification by novices (Hannabuss 1987a, 1987b, 1988b, 1988c, 1988e, 1988g, and 1989b).

In this process, too, impressionistic and subjective connotations are widely used, particularistic applications are collaboratively agreed (eg in the - 63 -
'excellence' culture in recent management), meanings are dynamically created or surreptitiously suppressed or ostensibly under-valued in reciprocal exchanges, practical factors allowed to impinge to change meaning or purpose, and meta-cognitive factors ('knowing that we know or do not know or should know') work in complex and often mutual ways.

These issues are investigated in the thesis in Parts 3 and 4. The argument is that managers represent their knowledge and views about what it is to be 'effective' in forms of discourse, and that, by drawing on the negotiatedness and contestability of meaning, ethnographic research in management can find reliable ways of representing how this is achieved.
An understanding of ideology, beliefs and values is an important part of knowing what managerial meanings and knowledge are, and how and why they matter.

Management may be regarded as a socially constructed reality. It reflects the meanings and knowledge of the many people involved in the management process. In this, ideology plays a formative role. It accepts that knowing what things really are and making decisions are both affected by the ways in which people negotiate their environment. For example, many central concepts are contestable in terms of meaning. Often, the ideological dimension of this is political. There is often an ideological basis for regarding knowledge as true, and decisions as good. We need to acknowledge the pervasive role of ideology in management if we are to understand what effectiveness is.

It is also important to understand what beliefs managers hold, particularly core beliefs. Managerial values, which may be regarded as preferences for courses of action, are also important, emphasising how rooted in experience and action the activities of managers are. An approach which takes full account of the beliefs and values which managers hold is called an axiological or valuational approach.

These issues play an integral part in the complex working of organisational cultures, affecting the thinking and behaviour of managers, and helping us to understand how meanings and knowledge come into being and get changed. There is good reason to say that the meaning of management is, to a large extent, the management of meaning.

When managers say and do things, and can be encouraged to talk about them, meanings and knowledge are said to be exteriorised. Research aims to achieve this and monitor and record the results. Much of this 'talk' takes the form of discourse. The major elements of this discourse are concepts, propositions, scripts, and stories.

The thesis investigates these forms of discourse by means of a 'referential hierarchy', a device which organises the analysis hierarchically by those four elements, and argues that, at all stages, such discourse refers to the reality of management. Sociology and cognitive psychology both help us to understand and analyse the meaning and knowledge in this domain. The chapter points forward to the empirical research discussed later in the thesis.
CHAPTER 3

FROM IDEOLOGY TO DISCOURSE

Whatever managers are thought or known to know, much of what they know will be made up of ideology, beliefs and values. This is clear in any conversation about customers and products, policy making or personnel practice. This chapter aims to open up a frame of ideas and approaches, as well as the historiography, so as to expand and enhance the essentially 'knowledge' based approach of the first two chapters. The intention will also be to suggest how ideology, beliefs and values make their presence known in the forms of discourse which managers use, and shed important light on any conception or articulation of 'effectiveness' which they hold or make. Of specific interest will be the argument that such forms of discourse can be differentiated into concepts and propositions, scripts and stories, in other words a 'referential hierarchy' used in various ways in the argument in the remainder of the thesis.

Ideology, Beliefs, and Values

Strictly 'ideology' means the study of ideas, but, after specialised usages in the nineteenth century (particularly in religious and political settings) (Plamenatz, 1970; Goldie, 1989; Eagleton, 1991; Barrett, 1991; McLellan, 1986), came to refer to 'a set of closely related beliefs or ideas, or even attitudes, characteristic of a group or community' (Plamenatz, 1970, 15). For
Mannheim (Mannheim, 1936) 'ideology' refers to an empirical type of knowledge, often political, and often identifiable when researchers examine social action. Not only are they sets of beliefs binding their adherent together: ideologies imply 'desirable activities and outcomes', and 'link values and realities, suggesting cause-and-effect linkages that make purposeful action possible' (Brown & Tandon, 1983).

In his Ideology and Utopia Mannheim defines 'ideology' three ways: first, as a world-view ('Weltanschauung... including ... conceptual apparatus ... and attempts to understand these concepts as an outgrowth of the collective life of which he [a person] partakes', loc.cit.,50); second, those particular meanings held by a group with their base in the psychological individualism of members; and third, pejoratively, a body of ideas or beliefs which are lies or falsehoods (Dant, 1991). The last meaning reminds us that ideologies are often in conflict with each other, situations in which opponents tend to deprecate or dispute the validity of views other than their own (eg commercial and service ideals in library work, Christian and secular views of work).

In taking up political and personal meanings, the study of ideology valuably encourages researchers to examine actual events and meanings, the social conditions of thought (Plamenatz, 1970, 46-71). 'Ideology is the means by which a society reproduces the social relations that characterize it. Regarded as a corpus of ideas or a pattern of thinking, it is the cognitive residue of the practices of social, cultural and economic relationships which sustain society. More dialectically, ideology is created and sustained through definite practices of work, communication and decision-making. Ideology is created and laid down in these practices and, therefore, may be transformed by transformation of these practices' (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, 193).
It suggests that social facts are best examined and explained as deriving both from general 'reality' and individual psychology (Durkheim argued that such facts derived from only the first, Durkheim, 1938), and implicates the 'interests' about which Habermas spoke (Habermas, 1972). This suggests also that an examination of ideology sheds light on three key aspects of managerial meaning:

(a) the ideological is part of the socially constructed or negotiated 'knowledge' reality which management is (ie there is an inherent 'dialectic' involved in the creation and representation of meaning in management), and that the forms of discourse used by managers will reflect this 'dilemmatic' (Billig & others, 1988), 'agonistic' or dialectic there (Meyers & Seibold, 1990; Fairclough, 1985);

(b) the ideological and paradigmatic together predicate a 'body of knowledge' and 'constellation of belief' which spotlights the existence of leading ideas, preferred practices, respected expertise, power cadres or elites which lead change (or resistance to change) and determine the hegemonistic meanings, such meanings intermeshing politics, power, culture, symbolism, and language (Popkewitz, 1984), being both formal and informal (Berger, 1992, 61-4) or even 'public fictions' in the sense that they are widely used but rarely questioned, and being assumptive and tacit (and even, until exteriorised by research, subconscious). Some (such as novices) in such groups and communities will little know how much they know, or little know the extent to which their views are affected by ideology: 'If individuals know nothing of alternative perspectives, they will likely assume that "all reasonable people" have similar commitments' (Brown & Tandon, 1983); and
(c) in the ideological domain we find evidence for the *legitimation* of knowledge and belief: 'ideology is the the justificatory dimension of culture... it refers to that part of culture which is actively concerned with the establishment and defense of patterns of belief and value ... commitment ... it seems to motivate action' (Geertz, 1973). For Gellner (Gellner, 1974) theories of knowledge are normative 'because self and validity are correlative' (loc.cit., 42), and 'epistemology tries to ex-cogitate convincing norms' from what people experience (and infer from what they know and experience). We are here in the domain of legitimation and norms, what managers regard as 'true' and 'real'. This is the domain of the *epistemic*, and 'warranting' takes place not just from knowledge (theoretical and practical, intellectual and common-sense) but also from ideologies, beliefs and values.

Here, the 'epistemic' dimension to knowledge and ideology is regarded as an important constructivistic component of the ways in which informants represent knowledge about managerial effectiveness. As such, there is no attempt in the thesis to identify some 'ideologies' as true and others as false, so much as to probe two dominant and divergent ideologies currently obtaining in library management as a result of change. These two ideologies take up position broadly as the craftsman and gamesman approaches to managing library and information services. The methodological implications of acknowledging these features of legitimation include how the kinds of meaning are identified (eg is the knowledge 'useful'?), and how knowledge representation is regarded as reliable even if only ostensibly consensual to the group studied.

In management dominant ideological issues have hinged around capitalism and its critique by writers such as Marx and Gramsci, Althusser and Weber (Giddens, 1970; McLellan, 1986; Abercrombie & others, 1980; Hall, 1977). Ideas on wealth
and production, and social class and accountability, form part of the wider
debate within which specific managerial practices have been developed and
argued over (above all methods of production and implications for social
equity). Dichotomies between the 'managers' and the 'workers' both caricature and
characterise this debate, and have led recent writers to argue that, with the
manufacture of consensus and the breakdown of class, there is 'an end to
ideology' (Bell, 1968; Bell, 1979; Abercrombie & others, 1980). Recently, changes
from command to market economies in Communist countries have illuminated the
picture globally.

For management, however, these overarching factors are of secondary interest to
the way ideologies operate in the workplace. There they are 'ideas concerning
work, the authority of employers and the reasons for subordination' (Reed, 1989,
72), 'articulated in response to the logic of authority relationships in economic
enterprises and formed through a constant process of formulation and
reformation by which spokesmen identified with a social group seek to
articulate what they sense to be its shared understandings' (ibid.).

Hegemonistic ideas weave with these when we consider how managers or employees
seek to impose meanings on each other (eg when managers articulate
organisational objectives, or when specialists use professional knowledge).

Much of this implies what is 'right', 'good', and 'effective' (Raven, 1984), and
how people rationalise what goes on, hope for change or bring it about, and, in
some cases, induce knowledge and ideological (as well as as behavioral) change
in themselves for reasons of power and self-protection. Efficiency and
effectiveness may themselves become ideological (eg when linked with plans to
change public services to commercial enterprises, or when 'cost before care'
philosophies dominate in hospitals, schools, and libraries) (Collier, 1982). From
this grows a pervasive organisational dialectic in the domain of meaning,
reflected directly in the thesis with its arguments about craftsman and
gamesman managers (see especially Chapter 11).

If people resort to particular beliefs (eg about life after death, or education
for all) on most or many occasions, such stances may fairly be regarded as
ideological (Plamenatz, 1970, 72-92). Such beliefs are identified by Putnam
(Putnam, 1973) in his study of democratic beliefs among politicians where he
suggests cognitive predispositions (eg how much people like conflict) are
important for fully understanding such beliefs. Beliefs can change (eg evidence,
induction, persuasion can induce it, Quine & Ullian, 1970) and they may be
In management, beliefs powerfully influence the ways in which managers manage
(eg their roles as leader) and what they want to be distinctive about
themselves as managers (eg getting on well with people, hard work,
adaptability) (Stewart & Marshall, 1982).

The management of such beliefs can cause or lubricate (or prevent) change in an
organisation (Nystrom & Starbuck, 1984), can ensure the success of an
organisation (as Watson asserts for IBM when he says that 'respect for the
individual' and 'customer service' made them great, Watson, 1963), provide
rationales for managers (eg frameworks about the work ethic, or Marxist views
of exploitation, or a humanistic view of management, Dickson, 1983), and link
with the national ethos of the culture within which the organisation operates
(eg notions of freedom, enterprise, and individual initiative which contextualise
the market economy).

For the individual manager, we might argue for the existence of a 'core belief
system', anchored in a particular understanding of social reality (Billig, 1988).
This system becomes clearer to see when managers act, or are seen to act, or
can be encouraged to talk about how and why they act. Such things occur naturally during the process of work, and can be objectively observed and recorded in management research. It also draws on factors like a view of the self, reputation and conscience, as well as beliefs about society, religion and politics, Lane, 1972, particularly 170-90).

Values are often referred to as 'preferences for courses of action', convictions 'that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence' (Robbins, 1989, 117). Often they are frameworks (Leys, 1962) or systems, 'internally consistent constellations of individual judgments which define appropriate beliefs and behaviors and which provide an underlying continuity to behavior and beliefs' (Fightingale & Toulouse, 1977).

Robbins (Robbins, 1989, 120) identifies the Protestant work ethic (hard work, loyalty), existentialism (quality of life, autonomy), and pragmatism (success, achievement, ambition, hard work) as characterising respectively the 1940s-50s, the 1960s-70s, and the 1980s, a taxonomy which suggests some social and cognitive reasons for the organisational dialectic theory developed by the thesis. Such values are set firmly in the world of managerial action (Young, 1977; Lewis, 1946): actions and interactions imply normatively regulated behaviours and goal-setting, says Parsons (Parsons, 1951; Cardwell, 1971), need-dispositions and role expectations, all affected by the value-orientation of the manager and the context.

Research into values has to accommodate apparent contradictions between, on the one hand, the view that values are not facts and are therefore unreliable and subjective (Kaplan, 1964; Brandon, 1987, 63-74; Grene, 1966; Fopper, 1976; Doeser & Kraay, 1986; Subramaniam, 1963 & 1971), and, on the other hand, the view that
values are held by groups, are determinants of explicit and implicit meanings, and provide an important insight into the knowledge, ideology and legitimation of such groups (Kaplan, 1964; Meddin, 1975) (eg a member of staff might give primacy to family rather than the organisation).

In management, such values are often expressed as statements or contentions such as 'people are essentially lazy and need to be externally motivated' or 'leaders should not involve themselves in the personal affairs of their subordinates'. Hegemonistic values, expressed through discourse, ritual and symbol, are an important element in representing meaning in organisations (Hage & Dewar, 1973).

Moreover, Hodgkinson (Hodgkinson, 1978) argues for the existence of different levels of value, a kind of instinctive level (eg influencing our preferences), a rational level (operating consequentially and consensually within the pragmatic milieu of the workplace), and trans-rationally (at the level of principles, existentiality and ideology). The formal study of values is called axiology (see eg Frondizi, 1971; Paterson, 1979; Morris, 1964) and includes how we experience and express values, as well as values in relation to means and ends and to each other.

In the context of this thesis, an axiological or valuational approach is taken to meaning in that

(a) it is argued that, for a comprehensive view of managerial meaning, values (and beliefs) must be incorporated in knowledge representation about effectiveness, and
(b) it is argued that a major aspect of reflective practitioner (ie effective and adaptive) managerial knowledge-handling involves identifying and assessing the value of 'lessons' learned (and to be learned) (Lindsey & others, 1987).

As such, axiology will form one of the elements in the model constructed and applied to managerial discourse later in the thesis. Since values affect the choice of alternative actions, and this choice allegedly reveals unexeriorised knowledge on the part of managers, the axiological approach is of direct importance in understanding decision making (Pitz & Reidel, 1984; Buede, 1986; Carley, 1986; Raelin, 1985-6; Lewin, 1973). Management presents dilemmas about ethics (eg Niebuhr's opinion that companies are essentially selfish) and is replete with valuations such as those about quality and excellence (Harvey-Jones, 1988, 248) or support for the corporate view (Woodcock & Francis, 1982, 53).

Schein (Schein, 1981) suggests 'basic career anchor' categories of manager as a result of value testing: 'if your career anchor is a technical or functional area, your primary concern is to exercise your talents and skills in that area...', it managerial competence 'to integrate the efforts of others, to be fully accountable for total results, and to tie together different functions in an organization'. He draws a contrast between, on the one hand, security/stability ('to stabilize your career so that you can relax and feel that you have "made it"') and service / dedication ('to achieve some value... helping others.. you would refuse promotions or transfers unless they permitted you to work on your cause'; and on the other hand pure challenge ('to solve seemingly unsolvable problems, to win over tough opponents, and to surmount difficult obstacles... novelty, variety, and challenge become ends in themselves...') and
entrepreneurship ('to create something new, involving the motivation to overcome obstacles, the willingness to run risks, and the desire for personal prominence').

The anchoring of career in beliefs and values is implicit in such an exercise (there are many in management, suggesting their importance), and the different orientations serve to reinforce the view that managerial meaning is dialectically created and sustained. It is assumed that the clarification of values (and a fortiori a holistic and reflective approach to one's own values, Marshall & Stewart, 1981), as much as their character, increases effectiveness.

Values have been systematically classified by Woodcock and Francis (Woodcock & Francis, 1989) into those associated with managing the task (eg being effective such as having a many perspectives in a team, or being efficient such as taking pride in doing things well), managing relationships (eg being fair, and lawful, building teams [based on values of human relationships]), and managing the environment (eg being competitive [based on values like 'all employees are winners' and 'competition does not need to be destructive'] and opportunistic [the 'who dares wins' value system]). Links between values, beliefs, skills, and actions are clearly evident.

Value-systems about the 'economic' nature of work are relevant, not just because Taylorian (ie classical management theories about the economic nature of work, and the organisation of work in large hierarchical structures) practices existed once upon a time (historical developments summarised by Willmott, 1984), but because 'value' is enmeshed in the choices, decisions and meanings made and created by managers today. Economics is about choice and valuation (eg what the consumer wants, what should be a merit good), and issues take on sharp focus when localised in traditionally public sector service domains like
librarianship. Service beliefs and values get redefined and re-contextualised by the injection of economic or commercial ones (Lamont, 1955; Broome, 1978; Mooney, 1977; Stewart, 1983; Sharpe, 1970; Mannheim, 1952, 230-75). Attitudes to innovation (Ettlie & O'Keefe, 1982), to the organisation (Hage & Dewar, 1973; Posner & others, 1985; Hunt, 1987), and to one's profession (Child, 1982) are all affected by the position, before and during and afterwards, of the manager with regard to these factors.

I ideology, Discourse, and Organisational Culture

Knowledge and ideology, as described, are situated firmly within experience and action. Management is a generic practice within society and culture, though with specific applications. Things are given names (referentiality and signification) in language as thinking (reasoning, inference, the search for coherence and meaningfulness) takes place, and this occurs in a socially constructed manner. The words (and forms of discourse) which we use are thus crucially impregnated with the meanings we give them, and many of the meanings are created in an ideological way (Kress & Hodge, 1979; Pecheux, 1982; Hodge, 1984; Macdonell, 1986; Fairclough, 1985 & 1989; Frow, 1985).

Seminal was the work of Foucault (Foucault, 1966 & 1969; Eisenstadt & Silber, 1988; Heckman, 1986; Hannabuss, 1989a; Ingersoll & Bronitsky, 1987), who argues that hegemonistic meanings get 'concretised' in the institutionalised and documented knowledge formations of an age. Truth and meaning are inextricably woven: Dant (Dant, 1991) rightly stresses that texts need to be deconstructed (in the sense the critic Derrida recommended) so that we can get inside them
and question their logic by 'exploring (deconstructing) their central components in terms of their claims of presence' (loc.cit., 135).

Structuralist and post-structuralist critique has utilised such ontological implications of signification in narrative. Such an approach compels the analyst to take on board the existence and complexity of idiosyncratic and collective implicit meanings. Later the thesis uses structuralist approaches for the investigation of discourse. Foucault's insistence on the epistemic aetiology of any key societal or professional meanings is a key idea in considering what managers 'mean' when they mean, and to the extent to which, if it is consensual, it may be regarded as 'true' or 'real'.

From this it is logical to conclude that knowledge, ideology and discourse are intimately related: 'accounts of discourse are not simply "accounts of" the world; they are also among those human practices that constitute the world. They cannot be interpreted as simply static reflections on the state of the world but have to be seen as current performances that construe the world, interpellate [i.e. give identity to] subjectivity and attribute agency within it. References to the past not only speak of the past but also construe the present by establishing how it was in relation to how it is' (Dant, 1991, 207-8). In this way, knowledge is closely contextualised into time and action.

There is thus 'an ideological and discoursal shaping of reality' (Fairclough, 1989, 13) in which discourse embodies 'socio-cognitive reality'. Meanings are 'not just lexical but interpretative, ideologically invested' (loc.cit., 15). Stohl and Sotirin (Stohl & Sotirin, 1990) summarise the approach when they say that ideology is important for the creation of identity (interpellation) and 'for privileging interest configurations (legitimation)' and for the handling of meanings (the 'dialectic of control'). Ideology thus 'plays a constitutive role.
in the formation of situated identities and understandings of self-interest'. Stohl and Sotirin cite the ways managerial discourse represents employee interests, sense of identity, perceived threats to current values, and the exercise of choice.

It is for this reason that writers refer to managerial discourse as 'the rhetoric of power', and, within its dialectic, seek to identify and (in the case of this research, analyse) the pluralistic or alternative meanings emerging from the rhetoric in forms like concepts and stories. It also works within the assumption that professional groups like managers have identifiable social and therefore discoursal characteristics, drawing on the knowledge and ideological norms previously discussed (Barley & others, 1988; Becher, 1987; Bernstein, 1990; Greimas, 1987).

The social construction of reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Ingersoll & Bronitsky, 1987; Cantor & others, 1982) is at the heart of any analysis of organisational culture. Defining 'culture' as the way of life of a people, 'conventional patterns of thought and behaviour, including values, beliefs, rules of conduct, political organization, economic activity... which are passed on from one generation to the next' (Kuper & Kuper, 1985, s.v. 'culture'), or the common 'folkways' of dealing with problems (Sumner, 1913), within it we see both social processes and the development of the individual. Culture is collective, 'supra-individual' (LeVine, 1984), working within consensus and using common meanings and symbols, but at the same time more multiplex than a Kuhnian paradigm like normative science, because it cannot be reduced to its explicit or implicit dimensions' (loc.cit., 77), making it highly eligible for ethnographic research.

Organisations construct social reality in numerous ways (Thompson, 1980; Salaman, 1980; Mant, 1977), through their use of rationality and control,
ideology and technocracy, sept or clan partisanship, autocratic or participative leadership, how they define their client and value their product or service. It is embodied in the way in which institutions think: for instance, Douglas (Douglas, 1986) argues that individuals harmonise their views because the institution is the only setting within which they can make really big decisions.

Language comes in here (Douglas, 1982) when we suggest that people believe in the social context of their lives and so 'daily invoke [such beliefs] as ways of dealing with people and getting promises [and the like]'. This is accountability, and such systems create explanations which need to be coherent (eg explain the promotion of particular managers). Organisations are therefore pluralistic domains of understanding, interpretation and explanation, affected by authority and structure, and by individual characteristics and cognitions. A complex 'arbitrage' (loc.cit., 183-254) takes place between interests over time. An individual's subjective experience and conception of social context is influenced by their objective definition of it and by 'cosmological' values to which the individual adheres' (loc.cit., 247).

For Deal and Kennedy (Deal & Kennedy, 1982) corporate cultures consist of 'the rites and rituals of corporate life', the how and why people do things (eg promotion or customer relations), the values which reflect progress or capture the collective imagination, the heroes who epitomise the values (around whom stories accumulate, reinforcing the process), the rites and rituals (eg bonding, reward, esteem, public decorum), and how all these get communicated. They suggest that 'storytellers' of various kinds propagate and disseminate the corporate culture formally and informally through their networks. In this way organisations work as a tribe, diagnose their problems, appoint and follow leaders, and cope with change.
This approach indicates how pervasive organisational culture is to the thinking and behaviour of managers. Indeed, Pettigrew (Pettigrew, 1979) calls organisations a form of 'social drama', while Weick (Weick, 1979) refers to them as 'bodies of thought', with recurrent schemata routinely invoked, causal textures (eg with clusters of beliefs like 'staff who work late are likely to get promoted'), and with sets of reference levels (eg a conception of what the organisation is, and its norms, act 'as sets of reference signals around which actions are organised and sensations adjusted' (loc.cit.,60) (see also Weick, 1976; Louis, 1983; Ouchi & Wilkins, 1988).

Such cultures differ in as much as the culture is based on autocratic or bureaucratic or team/ task approaches (Garratt, 1987), as do their structures. As learning organisms, organisations change and adapt. There may be more than one culture at work within the organisation, ie culture is pluralistic and may be dialectical, particularly if ideology and power are implicated (as they usually are).

The thesis takes this idea on board in focussing on an area (library management) in a state of knowledge, ideological and cultural change (as a result of invading commercial philosophies. In addition, in this world many managers fear for the obsolescence of their skills and values (Kakabadse, 1982; Reeves, 1980), as they see themselves confronting new strategic and personal choices (Thompson, 1990, Oulton, 1991). This forces them to de- and re-construct traditional meanings like 'effectiveness', 'performance' and 'quality'.

Morgan (Morgan, 1986) identifies traditional (Protestant work ethic), excellence-based, and Japanese-influenced conceptions of effective organisational behaviour, and metaphorically likens organisations to brains which process information and decide with varying degrees of success, to
political systems where coalitions and conflicts develop, and to psychic prisons where mind-sets can trap individualistic constructions of reality (eg patriarchalism, pre-oil-crisis car manufacture).

He suggests organisational analysis as a way of escaping or eluding this trap, just as other writers warn against the exclusively rationalistic model of management. Such reflective practitioner thinking will include analysing the way in which we think about problems. Morgan's own metaphorical approach (he calls it 'imaginizing') is one way to look realistically at one's effectiveness. Yet organisational culture is characterised by the sharing and negotiating of meanings, so there will often be many systems at work, competing at the workface and on a methodological or analytical level. To avoid anarchy, Smircich (Smircich, 1983) asserts that such cultures share cognitions and regard (or decide to accept) the organisational culture as 'a master contract', a kind of 'core paradigm' or reference level around which communication and structure, beliefs and values, interpersonal interaction and co-orientation operate.

In coming to know the culture, many managers are socialised into accepting or co-existing amicably with it. Groupthink and hegemonistic power may compel or induce such responses (eg to commitment, motivation, self-esteem, perceptions about promotability, effectiveness), and may overbear or repress problems of role ambiguity and cognitive dissonance. Yet organisations, too, are places of conflict and change, in which individuals seek to 'meet their own needs and manage their situations' (Fine, 1984) and where the boundaries between the 'jurisdictions' (ie groups or locales in which particular interpretations of norms are practised or where managers tend to think in particular ways).

Such interactions set off (and can be represented as) chains of events. This may be known or not known in advance. It will almost certainly be detectable in
retrospect. This brings the negotiation of power and meaning to centre stage, both formally (e.g., negotiations between management and unions) and informally (those countless negotiations of meaning taking place between individuals in various combinations in offices, at meetings, in canteens and in their own time).

From this it is fair to suggest that 'the meaning of management' and 'the management of meaning' are not too far apart (Hannabuss, 1989b; Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Gowler & Legge, 1983; Reed, 1989; Astley, 1985; Barley, 1985). If the process of management involves not just getting things done but handling 'the intentional meanings comprising the techno-social order' (Gowler & Legge, 1983), then on a deeper level those meanings imply meanings of a 'moral-aesthetic order' (ibid.).

This is particularly important when we come to examine how meanings, discoursal and symbolic, are established and manipulated by leaders and accepted or rejected by subordinates, and how such hegemonistic meanings affect the success of the organisation and represent the broader paradigms and ideologies of the circumambient profession, if there is one (as there is in librarianship). Arguably, where there is pluralism and unresolved semantic conflict in both organisational and professional milieux, then the management of meaning is highly complex, responding with destabilising unevenness and sensitivity to change. Since the meanings are given externally recognisable forms by actions and words, it is logical for us to move to the final section of the argument in this chapter, that the negotiated meanings which managers hold and exchange are, within the context of knowledge and ideology and organisational culture, expressed through forms of discourse.
Two allied contentions of this thesis are (1) that managers represent their knowledge of effectiveness in forms of discourse from concepts to stories, and (2) that pragmatic ways can be found reliably to elicit or exteriorise this knowledge. It has been argued that the 'knowledge' includes ideology, beliefs and values, that it draws on practitioner and theoretical elements, and that the grounds or legitimation for knowing and doing are important.

A 'programmatic' needs to be found, therefore, in order to investigate knowledge exteriorisation systematically. In ethnographic and constructivistic ways, based on grounded theory principles, a 'referential hierarchy' was devised and implemented as such a programmatic. A referential hierarchy is an instrument which represents the key ingredients of the methodology, in this case the forms of discourse into and through which managerial knowledge and meaning are being channelled and communicated. The forms of discourse are concepts and propositions (or statements or axioms or 'rules'), scripts and stories. They are hierarchical on the grounds of complexity, each one, in the manner of Maslow's pyramid, subsuming the preceding (ie propositions incorporate concepts, stories incorporate scripts). In fact, stories, as the most elaborate form, subsume all the other forms of discourse.

The hierarchy is 'referential' in the sense that it 'refers to or signifies' the 'realities' in the world and thought-world of management under investigation. Its referentiality has social and cognitive roots, and is predominantly experiential or pragmatic, characterising the practitioner emphasis of the profession, the close links between thought and discourse and action, and the ethnographic research methodology. The validity of its referentiality rests on
the ability of the hierarchy to reflect and encompass the major forms of discourse used and discovered, and to embody the criterial dimensions of those forms of discourse.

These are, for stories above all, the experiential and axiological, deontic and teleological, epistemic and praxiological dimensions developed step by step through later chapters. These dimensions are built into an evolving model and are called progressively by the acronyms: ETAD, ETADE, and PETADE: see later chapters. Through using a programmatic like the referential hierarchy, it is argued that sociological, semio-narrative and psychological approaches are synthesised into a coherent approach for research, one which is, incidentally, operable as an analytical tool not only by management researchers but also by practitioner managers in the workplace and teachers of management in academe.

Throughout the duration of research leading to this thesis, central or key meanings kept implying questions about themselves: what do they mean, how are they used, how and why do they change. Such meanings were fulcral and criterial in practical and academic discourse, typically as in discussions of policy or profit, where the concept of 'effectiveness' is arguably one of the most important of all. Respondents professed to know what they meant by such concepts, although, ironically, there was in fact great semantic diversity (denotation and connotation). Usage and context and expertise were three major factors affecting this.

At the same time, paradigmatic and ideological changes were taking place (eg 'value for money' philosophies in libraries change managerial meanings of 'effectiveness'). The pluralistic and subjectivistic character of such concepts, in distinction from many scientific concepts, make them 'dispositional' (Bulmer...
& Burgess, 1986, 249), 'referring to a tendency to act in a particular way under certain conditions' (making contextualistic research methods highly relevant).

Moreover, many such concepts are 'sensitizing' as well as 'definitive' (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, 180): definitive concepts refer precisely to classes of objects and their attributes, while 'sensitizing' concepts 'give the user a general sense of reference and guidelines in approaching empirical instances' (ibid.). Often such concepts are in states of emergence and/or change, and form germs or bases for new theories. Links between them exist, or can be discovered or established, particularly as empirical evidence mounts up and encourages the manager to de- and re-construct reality. As such it is a heuristic and ethnographic approach, characteristic of Kolbian experiential learning and double-loop reflection (see Chapter 4).

This fluidity derives also from sociology as a discipline, empirical and multi-paradigmatic like management itself, with many frames of reference, norms, and perceived roles (Harris, 1980). Focussed on social action and meanings, we should expect a variety of intentionality, expectation, and attribution of value and truth. Political factors encourage particular interpretations and meanings, while knowledge itself may be defined in relation to ideological and epistemic cross-currents embedded in idiosyncratic or generic contexts. Furthermore, participants may be sceptical, surreptitious, Machiavellian, or ignorant, all states affecting the use and exteriorisation of meaning. These points refer us back to earlier chapters in which an emphasis was placed on the interpretative (or hermeneutic) and the critical approaches to management research, and where particular emphasis was placed on experiential meaning, the shaping of meaning through action, the constitutive role of interests, and the role of discourse in explanatory understanding (Bredo & Feinberg, 1982).
The concept-dependence of social activities is emphasised by Outhwaite (Outhwaite, 1983) when he suggests that 'concepts precede rather than follow successful causal hypotheses' (op.cit.,45) about the phenomena of social life. In consequence, such concepts are used heuristically and zetetically (searching for types of 'truth') both in practice (at work and/or teaching and learning) and in research into practice. Given this, concept analysis is implied, taking in 'the semantic import' (Sartori, 1975 & 1984), the term and the referent, the denotation (extension) and the connotation (intension), degrees of concreteness and abstraction, amounts of redundancy or parsimony, areas of ambiguity (the term may be equivocal) or vagueness (the referent may be undenotative, ie not revealing its denotation). Such features can be individualistic or collective, work in different ways in different settings (theory, discipline, 'field') and over time (Koselleck, 1985) and with different value-loadedness (Myrdal,1961).

With such principles in mind it is possible to analyse key concepts like 'power', 'community' and 'revolution' in the social sciences (Dahl, 1957; Clark, 1973), as well as examine the ways in which concepts change, constitute social and political discourse (Ball, 1988; Ball & others, 1989), and reveal evidence of norms, paradigms and over-arching ideologies (Oppenheim, 1981; Shapiro, 1981) (say in political parties or, with moral overtones, in concepts like 'freedom', 'equality', 'good', and 'real'). It is with concepts like these, clustering round the idea of 'effectiveness' (itself a key concept), and with methods like these, that the thesis deals in Part 3, with denotation and connotation and subjective meanings (in Chapter 7), with ways in which professionals define it (in Chapter 5), with attributes describing and instances exemplifying effectiveness (in Chapter 6), and with ways in which such concepts come into being and change (in Chapter 7).
Since such concepts are pluralistic and protean, it is natural to regard them as 'negotiable' or 'contestable'. A concept is contestable 'if it has no single definition or criterion of application upon which all competent speakers can agree' (Connolly, 1983, 13). So concepts of effectiveness, success and quality are likely to be contested (Gallie, 1955; MacIntyre, 1973), particularly if they are given political overtones (Shapiro, 1981, 206-11) or are contextualised in variant paradigms (eg 'effectiveness' in the rationalistic and post-rationalistic management paradigms: see Chapter 1). It is this contestability which, conceptually, lies at the heart of the ideological dialectic between types of manager discussed elsewhere in the thesis.

At the same time it was important to recognise the cognitive setting of concept analysis. Meanings are thought about, labelled, categorised, associated and causally related, stored and retrieved in complex ways. With concepts we are able to define states and events and make representations of social reality. Smith and Medin (Smith & Medin, 1981) define the classical way of analysing concepts as the one which emphasises categories, instances and features, and argues that concepts can be defined by their having (or not having) these (Penzias calls them 'property lists', Penzias, 1989, 55). And so, on the principle that a 'robin' is animate, feathered, and flies, that makes it a 'bird' (although the concept of 'bird' itself must be qualified when we consider that, say, ostriches do not fly) (Rosch & Lloyd, 1978; Rosch & Nervis, 1975; Rosch & others, 1976; Pulman, 1983), so 'effectiveness' arguably can be 'defined' by listing or eliciting its features (eg team-building, being good with figures, and so on).

Some features will be 'core' features, others peripheral (eg library managers appear to agree that people and policy skills were core but marketing skills peripheral). Some features may or will be regarded as more 'important' or 'essential' than others, leading to a rank order of features or descriptors.
Different orders (hierarchies and heterarchies, Lincoln, 1985; classical and egregious arrangements, Hannabuss, 1985), and different selection of instance and non-instance, may occur as a result of different knowledge or valuation or ideology (Stockinger, 1988). Arguably, too, the more 'organised' the schematic and semantic knowledge is, the more effective the manager is in, say, decision making and interpreting his/her environment (eg by the citing of 'legitimised instances', Anglin, 1977, and the extent to which the manager can generalise from new and even unique instances, Billig & others, 1988, 144).

In such activities, valuable insights into the conceptual frameworks of respondents can be made. This idea is itself a representation of how we believe information is stored in long-term memory, and retrieved from it. It is argued that, in converting information to knowledge, organisation takes place, so that the knowledge is organised schematically by association and meaningfulness, as well as by intellectual principles (eg the meanings of the terms within a field, a discipline or a profession). By this token, schematic knowledge may be said to be generic, organising things in classes (eg features form a face, episodes form a routine or script).

Networks of meaningful interconnections are built up called 'semantic networks', representing 'logical' connections between concepts and beliefs, connotations and denotations, so that larger structures like propositions and events and stories make sense to us and can be created by us. These enable us to interpret external reality and react to it, and their effectiveness depends in turn on the way in which they represent real and predictable phenomena, ie how they instantiate ontological knowledge (Keil, 1979). We are also able to represent much of this schematic and semantic knowledge in forms of discourse, particularly concepts and propositions and stories. Such networks also enable
us to assign truth to things, and are essential components of mental models (see chapter 4).

Schema theory sheds light on the way in which people create scripts and stories, and understand them. Organisational scripts are routines which occur again and again, and stories, while never heard in their textual or tonal or interlocutory idiosyncrasy before, tend to be easy to recognise and understand. When we consider that schematic knowledge consists of meanings encoded in and for particular situations (which instantiate particular concepts and datastructures), then it is fair to suggest that storying entails encoding and chunking information, recognising causal sequences, constructing coherence, understanding the nesting and embedding of episodes and states and events and sub-plots within the storyline, using inference, relating the current discourse to others known and heard (intertextuality), and affiliating story-reality with real life. Given this, it is natural to utilise a cognitive schema and semantic network approach for this research (Schallert, 1982; Sowa, 1984).

For concepts and conceptualising in management the cognitive approach is illuminating. Key concepts (like 'accountability' and 'delegation' and 'enterprise') are not regarded as being just widely discussed but as being used reflectively as ways of probing meaning (Hirsh & Bevan, 1988 (eg how do we know our methods are valid unless we define our roles and meanings?). Key concepts emerge through the literature, often as descriptors of processes like 'production' (Clough, 1963), often hingeing around 'effectiveness' (Reddin, 1970; Hannabuss, 1987a; Deming, 1982; Beer, 1981; Gratton & Taylor, 1988; Shapero, 1985; Margerison & McCann, 1987).

Often too, they are complex concepts, multi-layered and full of negotiable or contestable meaning, such as 'corporation' in Drucker's seminal work The concept
of the corporation (Drucker, 1946; Ohmae, 1982; Klein & Murphy, 1973; Simon, 1964; McGuire, 1961; Blau & Scott, 1963; Bittner, 1965; Maclagan, 1983; Schein, 1971; Lenz, 1980). Concepts (like 'structure' and 'process') are used to organise conceptualising about organisations (Nightingale & Toulouse, 1977), are valuable in implying the existence of larger paradigms in management (Loasby, 1971), and form starting points for the formulation and reconstruction of new theories and interpretations (Line, 1990).

Of particular interest are

(a) the ways in which managers represent their conceptual knowledge both deliberatively and 'in passing' (i.e. public and private, objective and subjective/assumptive expressions of meaning respectively), and

(b) the extent to which such meanings reveal themselves as 'indexical' (i.e. particularistic [a necessary presupposition of any contestability of meaning]) (Barnes & Law, 1982; Bar-Hillel, 1954) within purposive discoursal structures which yet appear to confirm the existence of paradigmatic expertise (or patterning on pre-existent orderings). Riffaterre, 1978, terms such orderings 'hypogrammic', and Hannabuss, 1985, 'hypostatic').

In such a way, notions of contestability and schematic instantiation, renewal and retrieval, combine to offer valuable explanations for what is happening at this level of the referential hierarchy.

The second level of the referential hierarchy consists of 'propositions' (used here generically to suggest a linguistic and grammatical structure including
sentences and statements, rules and axioms). Managers often express their knowledge in statements, axioms, cliches, catchwords, slogans (eg 'who wins dares', 'never knowingly undersold'). In academic management, propositions are often used and tested (eg types of organisational structure or managerial personality tested as variables in decision making are used propositionally by March & Simon, 1958, in their study of organisations, enabling them to test such claims as 'the larger the rewards offered by the organisation, the less the conflict between job and self-image', 'the greater the manager's experience, the less probable that inter-group conflict will arise in decision making').

This shows how typical it is to represent key meanings, like that of being effective, in propositional ways. These derive from, and are testable in, practical situations, giving them plausibility, if only from a falsifiable (ie Popperian) viewpoint. Price (Price, 1968) argues that organisational dysfunctionality (or managerial naivety) can be inferred from 'incorrect' implicatures to canonical propositions (on the grounds that, as axioms, they offer a falsifiable 'truth') (Meehan, 1988). In other words, we might infer that an experienced manager 'might know better'.

These imply the existence of 'rules', connections between knowledge and belief/value-based concepts which may well take linguistic forms like sentences or logical forms like propositions. Rules embody knowledge as 'givens' about how to do things and influence behaviour. They imply a knowledge of contingency and consequentiality, and are therefore both experiential and teleological. Petrey (Petrey, 1990) argues that, when rules are constitutive, they 'cannot be violated under penalty of abolishing the activity to which they apply', as opposed to regulative rules which 'may govern but not constitute a form of behaviour' (eg the rules of rugby compared with what jerseys the players wear). Lyotard
Lyotard, 1984, 65 calls constitutive rules 'prescriptive', organisationally and in terms of knowledge.

Expertise is often made up of the mastery of rules. Decision making uses rules of many kinds. Often rules in management are stated and explicit (Black, 1962, 95-139). They can take artificial intelligence or logical forms like 'if [condition]...then [consequent]', implying causal implicatures or entailments situated firmly in practice and experience, and implicit representations of categorisation. Indeed, rules may be regarded as propositions warranted by the pragmatics of experience. Axioms tend to encapsulate some perceivedly important meaning or 'truth' about this experience, and therefore may be regarded as propositions warranted by the epistemic (though susceptible to change and multi-paradigmatic dislocation).

Warranting, or finding grounds for a declared position, is, and probably has to be, endemic in the propositions employed by managers, and forms part of the epistemic structure of their discourse. In decision making discussed later in the thesis, warrants (or legitimating 'grounds') are built into action maze analysis, which is used to represent how managers make their way through sets of decisions. Toulmin's warrants are probably best known (Toulmin, 1958). He suggests that data or information, used in propositions, are warranted as claims are made. The warrant may be made beforehand (Hunt & others, 1984, 254-5), may be founded on knowledge or belief or both (Eden & others, 1983), and imply the existence of contextual paradigmatic knowledge (Roberts, 1982) and the existence or absence of consensus (eg in describing 'success', see Chapter 11). After all, organisations and professions may be regarded as 'bodies of thought'.
Methodologically, propositions form a convenient and accessible instrument for representing meaning, and eliciting the representation of meaning, and are used in tests used in Chapters 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11. In such tests, people attribute properties to things and express relationships (eg 'good managers build teams'). Assumptions are made, revealing useful and tacit knowledge (eg 'Libraries are used mainly by the middle classes, so it makes sense for library managers to introduce forms of charging'), and connections made of varying degrees of validity and truth. Fallacies are always of interest in ethnographic research.

Many propositions are declarative, given in answer to (or even - perhaps defensively - in anticipation of) a question (Dillon, 1990). Often they reveal, or revealingly conceal, domain knowledge and ideology, and may adopt an eccentric 'logic', common-sense or not, or allow emotion to affect the reasoning (Halpern, 1984; Evans, 1989). As such they may be the form of social representation called propositional attitudes (eg assertions about beliefs or hopes), revealing axiological (valuational) as well as deontic (what they think should be) elements (Von Wright, 1968; Thomason, 1980; Richard, 1990; Zetterberg, 1965) (on which a separate thesis might be written).

Propositions are also important components in decision making structures. An recurring major aspect of effectiveness involves making effective decisions (and being effective entails knowing how effective your own decision making is). This involves defining and reaching goals (hence 'goal analysis' on staff performance in Chapter 6, and 'goal conflict' in Chapter 8), the formulation of consensual plans and goals (eg about staffing levels or the effective use of databases in Chapter 6), and an emphasis on managers being able to see their actions in ends-means or teleological terms (Von Wright, 1968; Pitz & Riedel, 1984). Routes or choices through the decision making process are important.
indicators of expertise and viewpoint and form a key element in determining the
difference between different types of manager (see Chapter 11).

This process involves judgement and discrimination, the evaluation of any
warranting 'truth' or feasibility (ie how 'factual' or problematic an assumption
is). Arguably at this point, it is often with that assumptional knowledge
revealed in or implied by the warrants in propositions that we get an idea
about how managers construct reality (Mitroff & others, 1979; Mason & Mitroff,
1981; Rosenberg, 1985; Diesing, 1973), try to cope with ambiguity and risk, with
the effects of time (Sevon, 1984), and elucidate the dialectical nature of
managerial behavior, including their own (Mason, 1969; Tillers, 1986).

It is possible to characterise scripts (like going into a restaurant, or, in
management, carrying out a basic routine) and stories as decision making
structures (Goldman, 1982), in the sense that they form event chains which both
narrator and audience need to understand for it to have effective meaning and
referentiality. Information is provided, expectations aroused, inference
encouraged and assumed, decisions enjoined, questions raised and answered. Such
scripts and stories may regarded as sequences and arrangements constructed and
orchestrated by both parties. Narrative research and discourse theory have
identified many of the concept and proposition components used in more
expanded forms of discourse like scripts and stories.

The thesis concentrates on them in Part 4, suggesting how scripts 'grow' (some
fail to grow and remain anecdotes or 'storybook' explanations of reality) or are
'grown into' stories, how stories contain annalistic and scriptal features, how
effectiveness is represented in scripts and stories, how meanings are
constructed and negotiated, and how reference to experience and causation and
time are important aspects of using such discourses, operatively and self-
referentially, to understand the meaning of management. It is suggested that effectiveness entails, among other things, understanding effectiveness itself. Such understanding derives in no small part from a manager's ability, flexibly, configurationally (i.e., thinking in coherent 'wholes'), and realistically, to represent his or her understanding of effectiveness through story.

Scripts and stories form the third and fourth levels of the referential hierarchy. They are integral modes of communication and cultural performance (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983), concretise many forms of knowledge and ideology and argument within an organisation (Weick & Browning, 1986), express the organisational culture (Myrsiades, 1987), and instantiate political and ideological realities (especially dialectical and hegemonistic ones)(Mumby, 1987; Toolan, 1988, 226-62).

They are key vehicles for legitimation and reflection, and for the researcher they are important ethnographic instruments (Van Maanen, 1979; Lindberg, 1987). They enable managers to reflect upon and represent their understanding of events in time (past, present, and future)(Georges, 1987), to share (and impose) their meanings (Brown, 1985), and consider what happens in relation to what should happen or should have happened.

As frameworks of meaning, stories subsume scripts, concepts and propositions, are devices by which managers remember and consolidate meaning (Haberlandt & Bingham, 1982), reify often intricate and personalised schemata or semantic networks in socialised public forms, represent meanings vividly and demotically (or in appropriately esoteric forms for elites or fellow experts), articulate directly or indirectly their plans and fears and expectations, parody and slant perceived reality, build up actual or speculative or 'fictional' 'pictures' of themselves, their organisations and, beyond that, their environments.
The power of the story as a device for representing meaning lies largely with the power of story in culture generally. Indeed, so hospitable is story that this thesis concentrates on only those aspects which most assist in the understanding of managerial meaning, in structuring and articulating experience and the manager's response to it. The structure of the referential hierarchy is intended to rein in the open-endedness of story as a research instrument and structure its roles systematically in the context of management.
PART 2

CHAPTER 4

ABSTRACT

The process of management involves doing, thinking and learning. This is so for both experienced practitioners and for students coming to know what management is.

This chapter discusses learning in management. It refers to the conditions of learning, to knowing what 'is' and knowing what is 'true' and 'practicable' (which managers usually emphasise). Reference is made to 'experts' and 'novices' in the domain of managerial learning. Major commentators on managerial learning are discussed, particularly those like Kolb who have influenced the way in which people currently think about learning, and try to understand and facilitate it.

The chapter then discusses thinking in management. The various styles of thinking are identified and described, and attention is paid to analysis, holistic, and creative / innovatory thinking. Their roles in problem solving and decision making are indicated. The ideas of Jung on thinking styles is noted in a discussion of thinking, feeling, sensing, and being intuitive. This approach, developed by writers on management such as Mitroff, prove important for the current research, and a signpost is provided to the ways in which these ideas will be used at a later stage in the thesis.

Mental models and mental content are described. It is argued that, without an understanding of these, no comprehensive understanding of the ways managers learn and think is possible. Finally, the reader is invited to move from Part 2, which aimed to set the scene in terms of ideas, arguments, and existing research, to the empirical investigation concepts in Part 3 and scripts and stories in Part 4.
CHAPTER 4

THINKING AND LEARNING IN MANAGEMENT

This thesis concerns itself with managerial effectiveness and what managers think effectiveness actually is. If we are what we do, and if actions speak louder than words, then effective managers are able to get things done, the 'right' things in the 'right' way. They are able to identify what is 'right' (e.g., based on specialised knowledge or know-how, acceptable in terms of custom and usage, ethically tolerable, consistent with plans and policy). In order to achieve this, managers need information and knowledge, and to regard managing as a learning process.

At the same time, managers need to reflect on what they do, what they plan to do, and bring a range of thinking skills, analytical and holistic, practical and creative to bear. Management is also a thinking and reflective process. The assumption here is that, despite the demands of the practical situation and the often reactive character of management, learning and thinking are integral components and skills of effective management. The effective manager is an effective learner and thinker.

The aim of this chapter is to explore these ideas, and provide both a development of previous chapters and a prospective introduction to the arguments and empirical work presented in later chapters (particularly Chapters 5, 6 and 7 on concept exteriorisation, use and change among managers and among 'novice managers', i.e., students of management). Managerial learning and thinking
will be discussed. Then the argument will briefly examine mental models which play a central and unifying role in 'representing objects, states of affairs, sequences of events, the way the world is, and the social and psychological actions of daily life' for managers (Johnson-Laird, 1983, 397).

Finally, it is suggested that any adequate model of managerial learning and thinking, especially about 'effectiveness', should find a way of explaining the relationships between 'knowing', 'believing', and 'acting'. It should also incorporate pragmatic, semantic, linguistic, teleological, and epistemic elements. It is argued that the PETADE model developed and applied by later chapters, by way of the referential hierarchy, to managerial views on, and usages of, 'effectiveness', is a way of satisfying this challenge.

Managerial Learning

Most generally, managers need to ensure that the organisation or business serves its basic purposes. These include producing goods or services, providing structures for such production, adapting to changing environments, and being accountable in some way to community (customers, shareholders, Mitroff's 'stakeholders') (Lorsch, J W & others, 1978; Mitroff, 1989). Mintzberg's classical division of the roles of the manager divided them in three categories, interpersonal (concerned with leading and authority), informational (concerned with collecting and disseminating information), and decisional (concerned with making decisions, handling conflict, and allocating resources) (Mintzberg, 1973). To do this well is to be effective (although what 'do', 'this', and 'well' all need definition and contextualisation, and the knowledge and ideological characteristics of the situation need to be explicated).
We have discovered no shortage of statements on what effective managers are. Management textbooks are full of them (eg Bittel's 'nine master keys of management' include analysing situations, identifying targets, and developing self-knowledge, Bittel, 1972). Black (Black, 1987) recommends 'knowing your personal style' as the way to effective management (eg in dealing with people, knowing when and how to use telling or selling, participating and delegating leadership styles). In his study of how chief executives succeed, Margerison (Margerison, 1980) identifies as major influences in developing top managerial skills 'ability to work with a wide variety of people', 'early overall responsibility for important tasks', 'a need to achieve results', 'ability to do deals and negotiate', and 'willingness to take risks'. Mant (Mant, 1977, 80-99) emphasises how career success or failure may be affected by an ability to 'manage' these factors.

Burgoyne and Stuart (Burgoyne & Stuart, 1976) describe the qualities of an effective manager as including an inclination to respond purposefully to events, emotional resilience, social ability, and problem solving and decision making skills. These show in the 'outer world' of management but reflect an 'inner world' consisting of creativity and mental agility, 'balanced learning habits and skills', 'relevant professional understanding' and a 'command of the basic facts of a situation'. The interaction between the two worlds is crucial to our understanding of managerial thought, learning and action.

In related research (Burgoyne, 1976), Burgoyne suggests direct links between particular skills and learning processes (eg relevant professional knowledge derives from planned and unplanned discovery as well as being taught, while social skills come from modelling, vicarious discovery, unplanned discovery, and being taught). Implicit in this explanation is the way in which managerial knowledge is highly experiential and idiosyncratic, and how it is influenced by
context and personality. Effectiveness may be driven by motives (e.g., power, collegiality, economic comfort) and behaviours (e.g., a thirst for information, wanting to help other people, a need to change with changing events, particularly if one is new) (Luke, 1981; Gabarro, 1985).

Learning involves exposure to, and the active search for and arrangement of facts and beliefs, ideas and patterns, theoretical and practical, concrete and abstract. Our awareness of what is known is always changing, so learning involves transformation, constructing, de- and reconstructing 'reality'. It involves language and memory and perception, stimulus and feedback, encoding and decoding information.

Analogies between the human brain and computers have encouraged a cognitive model of information handling to become popular in recent years, and the plausibility of this model is accepted here (Hannabuss, 1987c). Consistent with this assumption is the view that 'knowledge' is organised information, and that external social representations demonstrate linkages between ideas and beliefs and actions and events (through what professions know and believe, in our understanding of time and causality and free will, and in plans and outcomes) and have internal representation in the form of the schematic and semantic knowledge (concepts, images, symbols, propositional attitudes and the rest) we have in our heads (Lindsay & Norman, 1977; Entwistle, 1981; Griffiths, 1986).

The conditions of learning are important, since we recognise differences before and after learning. Such conditions are both internal and external to the learner (e.g., a manager's grasp of the principles of quality control, compared with the ways in which training is made available in the organisation). Change is induced by learning (what Gagne calls 'learning outcomes') (Gagne, 1977).
which often takes the form of a learning hierarchy, as knowledge and understanding get progressively more complex.

This view of learning is implicit in the thesis in that not only is the cognitive model accepted but also the notion of a manager 'coming to know', 'learning to learn', provides the conceptual backdrop to the empirical work on managers and student managers in Part 3. There, it is assumed that learners move through various 'positions' of understanding, taking in the 'facts' (the knowledge, belief and action-based realities of their situation as learner managers), internalising them and 'fitting' them to what they already know (and know they know), coping with inconsistencies and ambiguities and error (Hannabuss, 1988), discussing and applying ideas in new combinations, personally committing themselves to particular viewpoints, and accepting the existence of multi-paradigmacy and the negotiatedness of managerial reality (Ferry, 1968; Stewart & Roter, 1989; Kanfer & Goldstein, 1986; Feuerstein, 1980). Feldstein calls it a search for 'integrality' (Feldstein, 1978).

Management research (eg Jaques's famous 'Glacier' project, Jaques, 1977; Wild, 1990, 62-72; Burgoyne & Hodgson, 1983) emphasises the diversity of ways in which managers learn to handle complexity, and suggest correctly that a simple developmental continuum ignores some of the more complex personal learning and task difficulties. Yet it is a sound working approach for management generally, and appropriate as a framework for the investigations into the sedimentation and accretion of meaning conducted later in the thesis (above all in Chapter 7).

Further, as an approach it reflects the ways in which individual managers and students of management bring personal and arguably inchoate (or 'naive' or 'lay') world-views to bear upon management problems (Osborne & Gilbert, 1980; Driver & others, 1985; West & Pines, 1985; Svensson, 1985; Thelen, 1982). Such
world-views interact attritionally with authoritative (or canonical) views (when paradigmatic knowledge is communicated authoritatively, say, through training or teaching), with corresponding revolutions in language and meaning used by participants.

This argues for the existence of 'a world of meanings' in management as a whole, and in any part of it (e.g., middle management in academic libraries, the understanding of 'effectiveness'). Such a world is changing, and known to be in states of change, by and for and between participants, a truly negotiated socially constructed reality (Ramsden, 1988; Heywood, 1989).

It is argued, furthermore, that effective managers, whatever else they do, are able to use, constitute and reformulate 'expert' knowledge, say, in making decisions. (See Chapter 8 on the choice of routes through action mazes, as a result of learned knowledge) and getting work done with and through people. Such 'expertise' derives from both street and academic knowledge, in particular from an ability to think holistically and flexibly using both in generalising and focussed ways. It also bears on the effectiveness of individual managers in specialised or generalist, weak or strong (knowledge or political), positions in the organisation (Spitzer & Denzin, 1965; Noelle-Neumann, 1974). If we attribute expertise to groups of experts or professionals, it is appropriate then to regard such groups as social representations of consensual or conflictually negotiated meanings, and these characterise both the organisations examined in this thesis and the view of knowledge and ideology posited by it.

Implied by this is the existence of legitimated knowledge and belief, the grounds being variously intellectual and practical, general and specific. The process of learning may be regarded not just as an attempt to know and understand but also as a search for what is 'true': knowledge-seeking is
essentially epistemic. What managers truly know needs 'epistemic fidelity' (Wegner, 1987, 312-13), 'a degree of completeness to which the physical realization of a representation brings a rendition of expertise defined at the epistemic level'. This 'completeness' may be subjectively or objectively meaningful or relevant, known for what it is or not, distinct for managers at different stages of their career, is certainly influenced by beliefs and ideology, and a central idea for any model of practitioner-based learning (Van Maanen, 1977, 15-45; Binsted & others, 1980; Beck, 1980; Ribeaux & Poppleton, 1983; Richardson & Jordan, 1979).

Learning as essentially experiential characterises Kolb's work on learning styles (Kolb, 1984). Learners grasp and transform their knowledge, he argues, but learners themselves vary, and this affects the effectiveness of the learning. His four learning styles are (a) the converger (who likes abstract conceptualisation and is better with things than with people), (b) the diverger (who likes to generate ideas, relates well to people, but tends to have a diffuse approach to problem solving), (c) the accommodator (who likes doing things and trying things out, and adapts to given situations), and (d) the assimilator (who prefers concepts to people, and likes reflecting on things rather than getting them done).

No one manager employs exclusively one learning style, and different tasks call for different styles. Nonetheless, the styles shed valuable light on how people solve problems in learning, and on managerial approaches to learning. For instance, committing resources to a particular situation may call for strong accommodator skills, handling finance for converger skills, considering alternative courses of action for diverger or assimilator skills, and formulating strategic policy for an amalgam of all four. Effective training of managers, and self-reflection by them, should certainly take these factors on.an
board (Hannabuss, 1988b), as it should for the distinctions between activist and pragmatist, reflector and theorist managerial learning styles of Honey and Mumford (Honey & Mumford, 1983 & 1986; Mumford, 1987; Margerison, 1981).

While not directly applying the Kolbian styles, the thesis acknowledges their importance for a full understanding of how effectiveness might be defined and recognised, and attributes characteristics of each style to distinct managerial types involved in the management of meaning in the context of paradigmatic and ideological change. It is argued, in fact, that effective managers are able both to draw on all styles (and recognise their existence in others) and move from style to style as need arises: learners need concrete experience, reflection, observation, abstract conceptualisation, and active experimentation to be effective.

Important also for the thesis is the Kolbian view that learning (and research too) may be seen as a cycle, moving round from practical experience to reflection, testing and inferring, generalising and then returning to practical experience. Given that the sources and grounds of managerial knowledge are both experiential and theoretical, such a cycle needs to be seen as enterable at any point, and able to be travelled in either direction.

It is important also not to disregard the emotional effects of managerial learning. Snell (Snell, 1988) alerts us to the importance of acknowledging successes and failures, mastering pressures, being flexible, discovering one's limitations, and analysing one's past. He found that the effective manager combines proactivity, realism and opportunism in his or her learning, and that being flexible and handling information are crucially important for personal and personnel management. Such effects reveal to scope of beliefs and values in managerial learning.
Managerial Thinking

It would be natural to regard managerial thinking as rational because of the popularity of the view that management is a rational activity. Yet we know that management combines rational and intuitive and experiential approaches, and that effectiveness needs to be seen in that light (Hannabuss, 1989b). Much written about management thinking emphasises its analytical qualities (being logical, breaking things down into constituent parts, using quantitative methods).

Rightly, Adair (Adair, 1984 & 1985) extends this view to include what he calls 'holistic' thinking, which enables managers to use ideas configurationally (i.e. with an understanding of the whole, interconnected, scheme of things), imaginatively and creatively). Such thinking takes in 'value', consisting both of intuition and emotion, and also of a 'faculty for perceiving truth'. An important field of criticism is that on creativity and innovativeness, both characteristics of the effective manager (Kirton, 1976; Kirton, 1980; Lindaman, 1978; Shapero, 1985; Journal of Library Administration, 1989; Woodcock & Francis, 1982; Basadur, 1990; De Beaugrande, 1979; Rothenberg & Hausman, 1976).

The various styles of thinking have been associated with convergers and divergers, with the assimilator and accommodator learning styles, and with particular types of work in organisations (e.g. quantitative people like accountants considered as convergers, marketing managers as divergers, and so on). Certainly, effectiveness in management has to be judged, in part, by the extent to which a manager uses and demonstrates an appropriate thinking style in a particular situation or appointment. In library management, for instance, what makes an effective cataloguer may be widely different from what makes an
effective reader services librarian, not merely on the grounds of behavioural
differences (one is far less social than the other), but also by way of the
thinking styles required of each post (and the post-holder's perception or
interpretation of the thinking styles appropriate to it).

For the purposes of this thesis, thinking styles have been applied in two major
ways.

(1) The first of these refers to the ways in which such styles reflect the
self-concept and anchoring knowledge-base and ideology of the manager (Schein,
1977; Coulter, 1989), and in particular the extent to which managers define
effectiveness, and represent their knowledge of effectiveness in various forms
of discourse, with reference to those underlying styles of thinking (see Chapter
11). This idea is developed in an argument that managers in public service
librarianship are caught in a transition from service to entrepreneurial
philosophies and practices, and react differently by reason of thinking style.
This is represented quintessentially by the discussion about the ways in which
craftsman and gamesman managers represent knowledge in forms of discourse.

(2) The second refers to the ways in which such styles form part of
effective managerial performance in the workplace, at junior, middle and senior
level. So, for instance, it is argued that, at senior level, an 'intuitive' style
of thinking, integrated with action, typifies the successful executive. Such
managers may even 'know' what is right before they can analyse and explain it,
and often act first and think afterwards, suggesting that they use what is
called 'aha!' knowledge ('we instantly recognise it - and recognise it as
entirely suitable - when it appears) and work and think in schematic wholes,
like chess grand masters.
The ability to see problems as interrelated is said to characterise the way senior managers in particular use thinking (Isenberg, 1984; Gupta, 1984), and later it will be argued that, the greater the holistic and adaptive qualities of thinking, the more effective will be the manager (Reddin, 1970; Ewing, 1964).

Popular wisdom about thinking styles in management often receives expression through simple taxonomies of types of manager. One such taxonomy distinguishes between 'consolidators' (who look at their resources and their own task, and prefer to minimise the effect of others on their ability to perform) and 'innovators' (who look for opportunities to capitalise upon, and are willing to dismantle traditional structures to achieve them) (Stevenson & Gumpert, 1985; Garfield, 1986; Peters & Waterman, 1982). Often theoreticians or 'ideas people' are differentiated from practical leaders. One famous distinction is between work- and people-orientation in managers, reflecting both thinking styles and value systems in managers. Some managers equate busy-ness with effectiveness and there are rigid and flexible thinking styles when it comes to coping with ambiguity or change (Heirs, 1986).

An influential cognitive model has been McKenney and Keen's (McKenney & Keen, 1974), which argues that managers solve problems and make decisions in terms of two vectors:

1. **Information gathering** (how the mind organises information, preceptively by looking at the relationships between ideas, or receptively by concentrating on details and attributes), and

2. **Information evaluation** (how managers solve problems, systematically by structuring problems and following them through, or intuitively by trying various methods and using trial-and-error).
This has influenced thinking about thinking in the thesis. As well as stressing how important dealing with information is for an effective manager, it has encouraged the development of the referential hierarchy of forms of discourse in and through which managers, particularly those faced with problems eluding straight-forward structuring, and demanding intuitive solution or explication, can begin to cope with the problem of not being able to cope with problems.

Another influential model of thinking for the thesis has been that originating with Jung's psychology of individuation (Jung, 1923). This distinguishes between introverts (who are orientated towards subjective values, self-absorbed, and creatively dominated by ideas) and extraverts (who prefer objective facts and intellectual conclusions, and prefer to 'fit' to the general moral viewpoint). These ideas are of particular relevance to management when we examine thinking (of the analytical kind, preferring logic and objectivity) and feeling (which stresses the importance of values and subjectivity in making decisions).

Jung's ideas have been used by many writers to examine how managers relate to their reality and how they can make better decisions (Morgan, 1986, 225; Ingalls, 1976, 26-37). They have also been developed into theories about thinking on the right side (imaginative) and the left side (analytical) of the brain. Psychological tests of the Myers-Briggs Indicator type (Myers, 1962) have been used to identify how managers think in key activities like recruitment, training and appraisal, and are particularly valuable in times of change or crisis for the individual or the organisation.

Extended so as to pinpoint thinking (T) and feeling (F) styles, as well as sensing (S, which emphasises a practical approach to routines and details) and intuition (N, which takes an imaginative or creative approach to relationships between things), four major thinking styles emerge: (1) sensing and thinking
such people prefer facts and handle them impersonally, and move into production and applied science), (2) sensing and feeling (preferring facts but making them with personal and practical sympathy, and move into selling, nursing and teaching), (3) intuition and feeling (such people prefer possibilities, handle them with personal warmth and insight, and move towards teaching and the arts), and (4) intuition and thinking (such people prefer ideas and possibilities, handle them objectively, and like working in science, research, and analytical areas of management).

Following the work of Mitroff, these ideas have been directly applied and developed in the thesis in the context of the types of knowledge used by managers in storytelling. They are called 'axiomatic' and 'impressionistic' in a discussion later (Chapter 11). There it is argued that intuition-feeling thinking styles tend to characterise holistic managers, who are more adaptive than other kinds, and arguably more effective, particularly when they work in and for an adaptive, 'learning' organisation, and can influence its creativity and flexibility (Garratt, 1987; Schon, 1967).

In the context of thinking, effective management may be seen as 'acting thinkingly' or a form of action learning (Brookfield, 1987, 141). This suggests that effective management goals can and should be defined, and that some of these at least will be articulated in behavioural (or Magerian) ways (Mager, 1972; Mager & Pipe, 1970). Such an approach is used later (in chapter 6) in investigating the way in which managers represent concepts and attitudes about 'goodness' (ie effective performance).

Related to this is the importance of being able to reflect upon your own thinking as a manager. Pedler (Pedler & others, 1986) calls this 'developing a helicopter mind', learning theorists term it 'meta-cognition' (Redding, 1990),
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and philosophers associate it with the dichotomy between productive and reflective knowledge (Habermas, 1972, 56). Competence is not just knowing what to do and why; it entails knowing about, and reflecting upon, such knowing.

Argyris (1976 & 1982) refers to single- and double-loop individual and organisational learning. The first of these is 'achievement or error correction without re-examining the underlying values [or knowledge]' of the learning, while the second involves such a re-examination. He bases his views on reasoning in the sphere of action, of useable knowledge and rules, and suggests how often managers use the wrong reasoning processes and then compound ineffectiveness by not reflecting on them.

Typically, he says, we fail to use double-loop learning when, when things go wrong, we attribute the fault to other people (a 'them-and-us' or 'storybook' explanation of reality commonplace in organisations). Such re-examination involves looking at the concepts used, at the texture and causality of the context, and at how inference and meaning were employed. It looks at actual meanings (eg what it is to be effective) and situations (eg meetings and acts of decision making, effective and otherwise) in organisations, and so is rooted in experiential or pragmatic reality.

Collaborating with Schon (Argyris & Schon, 1974), Argyris asks if the professions really are as competent as society thinks. For him, 'competence' combines the ability to develop theories of what to do in new situations, and the ability to behave humanely and effectively in the give-and-take of practitioner-client relationships. People often act 'according to the requirements of the governing variables of their theories-in-use' (op.cit., 35), often leading to win / lose perceptions of outcomes, excessive rationality, group-think, and rare questioning of assumptive 'truths'. Greater effectiveness
can be built into organisational events and decisions, he claims, if we move beyond that state so as to maximise valid information, free and informed choice, and internal commitment to decisions made (op.cit., 89).

These ideas are taken further by Schon, first in his study of *The reflective practitioner* and then in his *Educating the reflective practitioner*. Reflection-in-action has, in his word, replaced rationality as a guiding principle of management thinking.

The professional practitioner brings the following constants to reflection-in-action:

- the language repertoires which practitioners use to describe reality and conduct experiments;

- the 'appreciative systems' that they bring to problem setting, the evaluation of inquiry, and to reflective conversation; overarching theories by which they make sense of phenomena; and

- the role frames within which they set their tasks and through which they bound their institutional settings' (Schon, 1983, 270).

Schon claims further (Schon, 1987) that such an approach bridges the hitherto wide gulf between theory and practice, an essential problem in evaluating and explaining practitioner domains like management.

Close links between the reflective practitioner approach and the content and methodology of this thesis will be noticed, particularly in the ethnographic.
contextualistic approach to action, and the constructivistic approach to the
management of meaning.

As well as arguing that reflection or reflexiveness is an important quality in
effective management, such reflection has been used in the thesis as an engine
for illuminating and elucidating the ways in which managers, through
representing meaning in and through forms of discourse, attempt spontaneously
to understand what they know and know they know, what they believe is true,
what they believe did happen or should happen, how they think what happened
resulted from prior conditions and events, and the extent to which their
revelation of these things affects, and even improves, their short- and long-
term effectiveness.

Knowledge of one's effectiveness is an integral part of one's effectiveness. This
takes specific form in Chapters 10 and 11 when, in reflective storytelling, an
investigation of the role of the narrator is made, and when the reflective
elements in storying (creating forms of story) take particular strategic forms
(eg the hermeneutic circle) within the time-frame of narrativisation.

Mental Models and the Representation of Effectiveness

Throughout the chapters in Part 2 an implicit message has been that "social
reality is not objectively "out there", but exists only as a series of mental and
social constructions derived via social interaction" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, 137;
see also Moscovici, 1984). The variety of representational models which people
construct of the world is large, and consist of ideas and impressions,
hypotheses and perceived connectednesses of that larger world.
For investigative purposes, 'mental models' are useful because knowledge and beliefs can be inferred and attempts made to elicit and interpret them. In practitioner domains like management, the mental models are based on the experience of the workplace (Payne, 1991). Insights into mental models have been offered by cognitive psychologists (eg in the magisterial collection by Gentner & Stevens, 1983), drawing on schemata and semantic networks, suggesting how such models grow and change, have functional utility (because with them we can decide, recall, predict, infer, re-assess, reflect), and play an important role in deciphering what people appear to know.

Of greater value still has been the work of Johnson-Laird (Johnson-Laird, 1983). In his study of mental models, he offers a comprehensive review of how they represent objects and states of affairs, sequences of events, and the way the world is in daily life (op.cit.,397). Such models enable individuals to make inferences and predictions, decide what action to take and experience events by proxy, and 'allow language to create representations comparable to those deriving from direct acquaintance with the world' (ibid.).

His emphasis on the way in which the mental content is represented in language is important: 'a discourse model is a surrogate for reality' (op.cit., 385). We use propositions in reasoning (eg when we make logical statements or try to explain causal connections); we draw on lexical and semantic stores to formulate conceptual meanings; we look for coherence in the discoursal representations (particularly the stories) which we hear or create, and we want them to be true reflections of external reality. Loar (Loar, 1981) extends this into the area of beliefs and propositional attitudes, in the setting of language, communication and truth (what Fodor calls 'epistemic boundedness').
Mental content is influenced by mental states, which are in turn governed by the relations between the subjects of those states and the world beyond the subject (McGinn, 1989). This means that concepts become *indexical* (or used in particularistic ways). It also means that subjects, and investigators of subjects' meanings, are impelled to ask for the warrant that lies 'underneath' the knowledge and beliefs indicated by the concepts. Within ostensibly simply concepts, and certainly in complex ones, lie layers of constructed meaning, usually given individual significance or application ('individuated') by the antecedent mental reactions in the subjects themselves (op.cit., 49). The content of these states of mind help our understanding of other people and ourselves, especially in a teleological (simply, in an 'means-ends') way: knowing what something is for tells us why it does what it does, and it enables us to derive predictions about what else we can expect it to do (op.cit., 146).

When researchers examine mental content and succeed in exteriorising it in 'truth-evaluable' ways, as arguably it is possible through ethnographic and constructivistic semio-narrative methods adopted by the thesis, then insight into the structural character of mental content becomes available.

Clearly, too, when this occurs, as here, multiple viewpoints of knowledge, belief, 'reality', will appear, cogent or partial, biased or authoritative, and professional in various (and possibly negotiated) ways. Such multiple viewpoints are expressed in and through decisions, incorporate both knowledge and belief systems, and demonstrate characteristics of continual change. In this way, it is logical to argue for the existence of hegemonistic and dialectical meaning, and to set the concept of 'effectiveness' at the heart of the debate.
It also appears reasonable to argue for a programmatic which enables the systematic representation of representations. This has been suggested in the form of the referential hierarchy described fully in Chapter 3 (Block, 1981) and a research methodology which draws on appropriate ideas and techniques from management, librarianship, sociology, psychology, narrative and discourse theory, semantics, educational research, and pragmatics. For what is being devised here is indeed 'a syntax of social life' (Abell, 1987), and so any adequate model of managerial meaning should encompass the following elements:

(1) **action**: this deals with what we do and experience, with the pragmatic or the empiric (which refers to the means through which the pragmatic is actually achieved, say, the pragmatics of decision making are achieved through the empirics of the organisational structure). It also deals with the conative, which is that area of managerial experience concerned with attempting and converting decisions into action. Practitioner knowledge, beliefs and values are represented through forms of action. They are also underwritten by warrants drawn from managerial experience (Kolb’s ‘experiential’ learning) and from practice itself (hence, such action received a praxiological warrant).

(2) **knowledge and belief**: this deals with what we know, know we know, what we believe, what we regard as valuable lessons, what political or ideological position we take or are forced to take, what we negotiate as agreed or true meanings, what we can identify as having led to where we are now, and what we can infer for the future; and
(3) instantiated meaning: this deals with the forms in which meanings can be represented or exteriorised. These are, here, those forms of discourse—from concept to story—which appear in and constitute the referential hierarchy. In and through this programmatic, the thesis seeks to represent the ways in which managerial meaning and knowledge take the form of discourse.

It is suggested that such a research model should formally identify and explain roles of and connections between the praxiological, the experiential, the teleological, the axiological, the deontic, and the epistemic. All these are defined and discussed later in the thesis, and together form the model (acronymically called the 'PETADE' model) which the thesis argues as a way of making coherent sense of the complex and varied ethnographic evidence.

After Part 3 which is devoted to the meaning of the central concept of 'effectiveness', this model is developed in Part 4, with references to scripts and stories. It goes through several stages as the dimensions come to play their part.

Ultimately, it is argued that, whatever the intrinsic character of the discoursal forms, they are predicated on, and warranted by, these six dimensions, and revealed by a methodology based on ethnography, contextualism and constructivism. Since the meaning of management is the management of meaning, and since meanings are constructivistically created in this domain, it is entirely logical that this should be so.
PART 3

THE MEANING OF EFFECTIVENESS
This chapter describes and discusses the ways in which the concept of 'effectiveness' is used in library and information management. Effectiveness is compared with efficiency, and attention is paid to the way in which managers often used terms like 'good' and 'real' when referring to effective management. Literature and practice are examined for definitions and usage. Inferences are made about what successful managers or 'experts' appear to do and think.

It argues that concepts of effectiveness are created, used, and adapted by managers. Such managers are affected in their turn by changes in knowledge and meanings, ideologies, beliefs and values, in their own workplaces and professions, as well as in society at large. They also know these changes are happening and wish to make sense of them.

Changes like these are happening in library and information work. It is currently taking the form of a transition from 'service' ideals and practices to 'entrepreneurial or economic' ideals and practices. Into this setting is set the idea that managers may anchor their knowledge and values in traditional professional expertise or develop them in the direction of general management knowledge and values. The differences between these approaches have presented managers, as a group and individually, with many challenges. This changing situation is reflected in the ways managers define effectiveness.

A report is given of a survey into what managers think effectiveness actually is in terms of competences. Middle and senior managers in library and information services in Scotland form the respondent group. Evidence suggests that key competences can be identified and a coherent picture of what managers regard as 'the effective manager' can be constructed. The chapter ends by introducing ways in which stories about effectiveness in the workplace can be utilised by researchers to provide an insight into what managers regard as success.

Reference is made throughout to the knowledge paradigms, ideologies and forms of discourse introduced by previous chapters. It is suggested that the evidence obtained from the survey and from the examination of manager's stories confirms how meanings exist in a context of change, how they are constructed by stakeholders in an enterprise, and can be reliably elicited by ethographic research.
The process of management emphasises getting things done. There are ways to achieve this. People can be trained, and can train themselves, in these ways. To succeed is to be 'effective'. This can usually be recognised when it occurs. Yet paradoxically, so many are the ways in which being effective can express itself, that there are often divergent views about the ways and means of the success implied in being effective.

This arises partly because definitions and conceptions of success change with time, partly because they change with circumstance. There is a continual need to exteriorise views of effectiveness in any professional cadre, since it is used as a powerful valuational and normative measure of what people should do and how they should perform. Implicit in this are the assumptions underlying how such performance is measured, qualitatively or quantitatively.

The literature to any professional activity provides some guidance on how such things can be exteriorised. This chapter will review some of the major trends, and pinpoint particular definitions and preferences among selected
professionals. Special reference will be made to 'effectiveness' as revealed through a survey of preferred competences (i.e. that an 'effective' manager will have, or not have, particular competences), and through an investigation of storying by such managers.

Effective and Efficient

An action may be regarded as effective if 'it accomplishes its specific objective aim' (Barnard, 1966, 20). The ends of such aims may be physical or social. Barnard characterises human conduct, in this context, as a dialectic between two positions: the first argues that we respond to external forces or pressures and make of the facts and social situations what we can; and the second emphasises freedom of choice and action and an ability to change and shape events and outcomes. There is an assumption with both views that such human behaviour has a rationalistic foundation, that for instance managers can recognise the facts, reason their way through events, and arrive at sound conclusions.

We may take up the themes introduced here in the following manner. Clearly, being 'effective' must be seen in context. It should be seen in relation to any exhibited control over events or social interactions outside the person, yet into which the person is causatively and pragmatically fitted. Effective action or decision-making can reveal itself in terms of changed outcomes. Such outcomes are made known to others through such action. Actions and outcomes exist in relation to assumptions about rationality.
Since managerial activities are usually cooperative, and the meanings socially constructed, it is by no means certain that either the external actions or outcomes on the one hand, or the internal assumptions or implied norms on the other, will be commonly agreed. Finally, since the process happens in a time frame, all parameters may change or come to be seen as valid or true or not in retrospect.

Given this, it is not unnatural for writers to suggest important differences between 'effective' and 'efficient'. An epigrammatic distinction between these two concepts is that 'efficient' is 'doing the right things' and 'effective' is 'doing things right', a distinction based on the notion that mere efficiency can keep things ticking over tidily in an organisation but ultimately such an organisation should emphasise its intended impact on its customer or community, something which efficiency can only serve but not ensure. This distinction is underlined by Armstrong (Armstrong, 1983, 96) when, citing Reddin, states that, when a manager concentrates on mere efficiency, he solves problems rather than produces creative alternatives, safeguards resources rather than optimizes resource utilization, and lowers costs rather than increases profits.

Already, an interesting set of connotations is forming about what effectiveness is and is not. In differentiating it from efficiency, and suggesting that it is in some way superior to efficiency, the literature strongly implies that effective managers succeed to the extent to which they operate, and operate in, an open system. Such a system is highly responsive to market and competitive pressures, and alert to customer or user needs and behaviour.

It is also a highly open or collaborative system internally, drawing on the views and commitment of its management participatively, and successfully avoiding the limitations of groupthink (Woodcock and Francis, 1989).
implication is that systems based on efficiency alone lack these qualities and fall short of success.

Yet, even at this initial level of meanings, there is evidence of diversity of practice. Not only must true effectiveness be based on efficiency: there is a strong case for saying that efficiency itself is most important. For Woodcock and Francis (op.cit.) efficiency is both a sign of the merits of the Protestant work ethic ('If a job is worth doing, it's worth doing well') but also a measure of quality and performance. Both are essential to success and profitability, and both are important vis-a-vis the value system within the organisation.

Woodcock and Francis (op.cit.) cite companies like IBM and Jaguar, and more recently those oil companies certificated by quality assurance auditors, where quality has had this effect. There are distinct customer advantages in having efficiency, including customer satisfaction and greater consensus among management over standards of performance.

Qualitative and Quantitative Effectiveness

The distinction between 'effective' and 'efficient' is important. So is the distinction between 'effective [qualitative]' and 'effective [quantitative]'. This highlights in particular the difference between profit and not-for-profit organisations. Examples of the latter are hospitals, schools and colleges, and most library and information organisations. Many profit organisations would regard effectiveness or efficiency as measurable in terms of profitability or cash-flow or market share. Some, but not all, library and information services fall in this category.
Effective managerial behaviour is therefore orientated towards the achievement of things like these, and managerial competences and attitudes will emphasise toughness, a willingness to take risks, financial acumen and the like as aspects of effectiveness. On the other hand, a not-for-profit organisation is likely to place high value on service and community benefit. The 'customer' is a 'client' or a 'patient' or a 'user'.

The exchange relationship is based not on the economic nexus of trading goods or properties but on notions of service and benefit and value, such as the 'benefit' of good health or relevant information. Costs can be attributed to such commodities, as we shall see below, but this does not detract from the main contention that the exchange is primarily not economic. An alternative explanation might be that, rather than private goods, such goods are merit (or even public goods), with emphatic externalities or spill-overs (eg under normal conditions, my access to information from the public or university library does not deprive you of getting access to it too).

Both semantically and pragmatically, of course, the situation can change, and it is this which has caused both a paradigmatic shift and a professional dilemma for many library managers. The dilemma consists of the fear that information, hitherto 'free', may increasingly become 'chargeable', that information as a merit good may turn into a private good through administrative and ideological changes resulting from charging. Administrative pressures exist when, say, libraries are encouraged or compelled to earn more money through 'marketing' their services, while ideological pressures exist, from central and local government and from competition from private sector substitutes (eg in the provision of video libraries or services to the elderly) to charge and earn money.
The situation and arguments of the last two paragraphs have had a direct effect on the semantics of effectiveness. The last decade has seen increased emphasis on the idea that, if a thing can be measured, it can be managed. Measurability implies quantitative management (e.g., in terms of how many for how much, how many over how long, how good compared with other people). It has induced much heart-searching about both meanings and procedures, for many a manager for whom the service ideal was central has been obliged to reformulate his assumptions about what accountability actually means. Not merely responsible husbandry of public money but the development of financial and marketing skills up to then associated with private sector enterprise. Not merely the exercise of professional skills such as bibliographical or information-gathering expertise, but the display of entrepreneurial skills such as income-generation.

Semantically, it has posed several dilemmas, not least of all whether many information-centred activities can be measured (e.g., how can one measure the effectiveness of an information inquiry or the benefit a child derives from a work of imaginative fiction). Such meanings translate into practical problems, like how one can measure the output of particular library activities (especially those which, unlike acquisition or accessioning, cannot be measured in standard units).

It is of particular interest to assess how far exclusively 'professional' activities can be measured in these terms. At this point, too, ideological factors come in, when, for instance, professional library managers feel and express doubts whether practice is becoming politicised by an entrepreneurial or private sector philosophy to which traditional knowledge and values are increasingly alien or irrelevant.
The survey of professional opinion about managerial competences (see below) reveals a view of current opinion in Scottish library services on these matters. The reader is also referred back to Chapter 3 for introductory, contextual, and methodological discussion on the ideological dimensions of such knowledge and opinion.

**Effective Managers**

In defining and describing effectiveness, many writers on management choose to illustrate their views with examples. 'If you want to see what I mean by "effective", then look at the time when...' or 'Bill or Susan are what I mean by "real" managers. Look at what they said when...'. Such an approach is widespread. Many implications for the researcher exist here.

First, there is the fascinating conundrum of what they really mean. Schein (Schein, 1980) rightly states that 'effectiveness' in organisations is a highly complex concept. It might relate to the achievement of goals, but the goals themselves may be wrong, or not commonly agreed upon. Many managerial situations consist of many goals all working together and even against each other. Deceptively simple, and hugely revealing, are valuational adjectives like 'real' and 'good'. In interviews with managers of many kinds, researchers find respondents using these terms to suggest ways in which things SHOULD be done or the kinds of personal traits and competences managers SHOULD develop.

Second, there is the recurringly important fact that respondents tend to cite examples when they speak about effective managers. Often, they are people they admire or dislike. Situations may be referred to, or re-visualised, in order to
demonstrate a particular problem and the way in which it was handled, effectively or otherwise. The same manager may be shown handling one situation effectively and another one ineffectively, and circumstantial or psychological reasons might be provided to account for the difference. A situation handled badly, which was also a turning point for that manager, or in that characterological area of that manager, may be treated as important for the growth of managerial effectiveness.

Such is the scriptal or storying emphasis of such a tendency among respondents that we may claim that many managers, when talking about being effective, are talking about 'learning through doing, and that, when they talk in this way, what they are really doing is reflecting on their own daily actions and decisions. This is called a 'reflexive practitioner' approach, and is classically written about by writers such as Schon, Argyris, and others. It will form the focus of attention in later chapters of this thesis, as when subjects like using stories to make sense of work are described.

Many writers on managerial effectiveness take a naturalistic or realistic approach. Many of their examples are set in the workplace, and are personified by actual, pseudonymous, characters. Some characters, created or described in such situations, can come to represent 'all' kinds of 'typical management behaviour in such situations, and may be termed 'eponymous' (or even, on levels of group or race memory, 'archetypal'). Actual characters are often gurus or famous stars in the managerial firmament, like Lee Iacocca (who turned Chrysler round) and Victor Kiam. Some have 'storied' their own version of their 'success' in biographies and autobiographies (eg John Harvey-Jones's Making it happen, 1988). The reader is directed towards the following entries in the bibliography: Garfield, 1986; Goldsmith & Clutterbuck, 1984; Pilditch, 1987; and Blake & Mouton, 1986).
Pseudonymous characters tend to be disguised for reasons of confidentiality or discretion, as in Maccoby's seminal work *The Gamesman*, 1977; eponymous characters represent character types within particular types of management, often with archetypal dimensions which tap deeper psychoanalytical or sociological levels taking characterisation beyond mere stereotype into projections to which managers consensually appear to attribute eternal or perennial managerial qualities. (See 'Stereotype' in Kuper & Kuper, 1985).

At their deepest level, archetypal characterisations are, like heroes of myths and legends, likely to tap into the race consciousness of human beings, not just managers, and point to qualities (such as successfulness or effectiveness) which may be attributed to 'human' (rather than merely 'managerial' success. Plainly, managerial risk-taking, dogged hard work, spectacular failure, charismatic leadership, all fall into these archetypal characterisations, although they can be found, in real or attributed form, in all these others too.

Management as Something People Do

Writers like Drucker (eg Drucker, 1967) emphasise what managers 'do'. He argues that the effectiveness of 'the effective executive' is a habit, a 'complex of practices'. Effective executives have 'the ability to get the right things done'. This can be broken down into practices like knowing where time goes, concentrating on contribution and those areas which will produce outstanding results, building on strengths, and making effective decisions. Valuational aspects of effectiveness include looking at problems as if they are opportunities, developing commitment and leadership, knowing what to postpone and abandon, and making sure that the right decision is relevant.
Many other taxonomies and shopping lists exist of what effective managers do and should do. Probably the most well-known is that Mintzberg (Mintzberg, 1973) which identifies the following roles for the manager: figurehead, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokes-person, entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator. Equally convincing are the characteristics about organisational effectiveness provided by Woodcock and Francis (Woodcock & Francis, 1982): effective recruitment and selection, clear organisational structure, adequate control, competent training, high motivation, practical creativity, good teamwork, mature management philosophy, lucid aims, clear rewards, and positive individual development.

For managers Rosemary Stewart (Armstrong, 1983) recommends willingness to work hard, to take risks, to inspire enthusiasm, and to be tough. Often effectiveness is characterised in scriptal or story form. Kotter (Kotter, 1982) builds up his paradigm of effectiveness from the narrative timetable of a typical general manager's day from arrival to departure. A day consisting of conversations and meetings, decision-making and reading papers, examining issues from bonuses to marketing brochures, is categorised into different kinds of work. Conclusions are drawn that much work is hit and miss, and much not entirely appropriate to that level of management. Much activity is not planned, not proactive but reactive, not agenda-setting or network-building, and often not strategic.

Zaleznik (Zaleznik, 1977) characterises effective management as a process of enabling people 'involving some combination of people and ideas interacting to establish strategies and make decisions'. He emphasises the way in which such managers calculate the interests of the opposition, use timing to handle controversial issues, and negotiate and bargain using rewards and punishments. He cites the example of Alfred Sloan, whose effect on General Motors (and management education generally) is well known. Henry Kissinger is remembered
for similar skills, and Strobe Talbott (Talbott, 1985) represents this quintessentially in his discussion of tensions between Perle and Burt in the Reagan administration in the 1980s.

Research into what effective managers do and what effective organisations are reveals many semantic and procedural problems. Consensual definitions of efficiency and effectiveness are difficult to find, but the importance of goals, organisational and personal, emerges as a generally agreed feature. Distinctions need to be made between middle and senior managers, between men and women, and between British and foreign practice. Measures need to be found as to what, say, a consistently good performer is, and careful differentiation made between what performance is vis-a-vis the products and services which management produces, the actual process of management, and the personal qualities which managers demonstrate (Bennett and Langford, in Williams, 1983, 61-81). Further ideas on methodologies will be mentioned later when the examination of managerial competences and stories is discussed.

Effectiveness is often associated with 'success'. Luthans (Luthans, Rosenkrantz & Hennessy, 1985) focussed on what activities successful managers actually perform. Fifty-two managers in three organisations (a state department of revenue, a medium-sized manufacturing plant, and a police department) were observed. Two activities above all were associated with success: interaction with outsiders and socialising/politicking. Successful managers showed an ability to handle conflict, and, at higher levels, effective decision-making.

These findings fit neatly with those of Margerison and Kakabadse (Margerison & Kakabadse, 1984) on how American chief executives succeed. They identify that success derives more from personal drive than family and education, from a willingness to take risks and rise to a challenge, from a proven track record
in positions of middle and senior management, form developing skills in handling people and dealing with problems. Training implications were clear: to develop practical leadership experience early and combine this with 'tasks in which they can exercise their personal drive, determination, and ability'.

Training implications are highly relevant here, since many managers work hard ineffectively or sing their songs unseen in the organisation. Effective behaviours might be contrasted with ineffective ones (e.g., effective managers communicate well with people, ineffective ones keep information to themselves or fail to recognise good work and do not give good feedback (Margerison, 1987, 145-59)). This way of defining any concept, by showing example and non-example, or positive and negative, will be utilised in the examination of narrative later in this chapter.

Competing ideas about expertise

An important dimension to effectiveness is 'expertise'. Traditionally this has been defined as an ability to carry out some specialised skills or apply specialised knowledge. Expertise, in these senses, is recognised in the stone mason and the taxation lawyer, the research scientist and the systems analyst. It has been well said that experts 'come in all shapes and sizes'.

Trotter (Trotter, 1986) suggests that, despite their variety, what experts have in common is the way they think and master their chosen fields. He argues that a good chess player and a Nobel Prize-winning physicist and a concert pianist have interiorised complex intuitive pattern-recognition and information-handling skills. This gives expert mathematicians or taxi-drivers, in their given areas
of expertise (say, model-building or route-knowledge respectively) the ability
to reach decisions very much more quickly than novices. It is suggested that
novices are so caught up in rules that 'they have no sense of the overall task'.
Trotter's view then is that expertise results from holistic cognitive thinking.

Such holistic thinking can be observed in writers such as Bateson (Bateson,
1972, 73-87) where he unself-consciously demonstrates how he thinks about
ethnological material: 'Let me try to build up a picture of how I think by
giving you an autobiographical account of how I have acquired my kit of
conceptual tools and intellectual habits'. Significantly using a storying format,
that of autobiography, Bateson describes the influence of his geneticist father
as that of growing awareness of patterns in nature, and then develops it by
saying how important hunches and analogies are. He uses this in his
anthropology when he draws on metaphors from zoology to describe social
segmentations in tribes in New Guinea. From this he builds up what he calls a
conceptual frame, an idea which others like Minsky were to develop, and was
able to construct abstractions 'which refer to terms of comparison between
entities'.

There are close links between this argument and more general knowledge about
how people learn. Chapter 4 was devoted to managerial thinking and learning.
Yet we need to register some points here on this subject. Research (eg Murphy &
Wright, 1984) appears to confirm that experts and novices think in different
ways about subjects (regarding 'subjects' as identifiable areas of academic or
practical knowledge). They suggest (from tests using attribute listings and
tested for significance using analysis of variance) that in the conceptual and
knowledge structures of experts there are far more concepts at work at any one
time. They also suggest that, between experts there tends to be more consensus
(pace Mazur, 1973).
H and S Dreyfus (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986) have broken down the process by which novices become experts into five steps, where at first the novice has no knowledge or perspective of the context, makes analytical decisions and is rarely committed to the decision. Through the stages of novice - advanced beginner - competent - proficient - and expert, these factors change, so that, when an expert, we see that thinking is context-free, can be applied flexibly to any situation, the perspective is experienced, the decision-making intuitive (by now subsuming all analytical or rule-based knowledge), and the decision-making highly involved. These characteristics can be applied equally well to managers who regard their expertise as resting in a body of specialised wisdom as to those who pride themselves on their protean managerial skills, with people and situations, anywhere in any work (or non-work) situation.

We are able to identify novice comments (eg in physics) from such responses as 'This is a block on a slope', and expert comments from such responses as 'This is Newton's second law'; or novice ('The plumber is trying to charge me more than he said and caused damage while doing the job') and expert ('The issue is whether the price he gave you was an estimate or a quotation for the job') (Hart, 1986, 133-4). In educational terms, the transition from novice to expert can be termed the 'attainment of subject-matter autonomy' (as it is by Candy, in Boud, 1988, 59-76), where distinctions between private and public knowledge, deep and surface learning approaches, dependency and autonomy, and epistemic doubt and certainty need to be considered (Krimsky, 1984; Larkin and others, 1980; White, 1959; Koriat, Lichtenstein & Fischloff, 1980).

Another major feature associated with expertise is that of epistemic authority. This idea takes us back to the ideas discussed in chapters 1 and 2 on paradigmatic knowledge. There it was suggested that such knowledge is organised information, that it is often represented through 'established' knowledge (eg
'scientific' knowledge, or that knowledge embodied in established subject disciplines), and that it is both substantive (ie the content of knowledge) and procedural (ie the methodological dimension, how research is carried out, what methods are regarded as valid and reliable) (Hannabuss, 1988a; Hannabuss, 1989).

De George (De George, 1985) emphasises 'de facto epistemic authority' as a characteristic of the authority and competence of experts. 'A person is a de facto epistemic authority if he is considered to be an authority by another or by others with respect to some field or area of knowledge'. He says that we predicate willingness to attribute authority in these cases, and an acceptance that we have less knowledge than the authority. He stipulates certain conditions under which such attributions can validly be made. Authority might even be attributed to the class of person the alleged authority is (eg a doctor), possibly because of the situations in which people meet the expertise or the state of expectation which people have when the encounter occurs. Characteristic of such authority is the professor-student relationship.

The legitimacy of the authority is based on the recognition of the knowledge on which the authority rests, and how difficult it is to acquire. In Handy’s words (Handy, 1990, 117) expert power is 'unusual because the power is effectively given to you by the very people over whom you are going to use it'. People need good reason to believe in the authority of others, and proven veracity is one sure basis. If we come to see that the knowledge on which authority rests is 'true' (ie testably, practicably), then we are willing and able to call it epistemic authority.

Cognitive authority, according to Wilson (Wilson, 1983), is 'influence on one's thoughts that one would consciously recognize as proper'. It is closely related to credibility, which in turn is made up of competence and trustworthiness. Such
authority is attributed to those who 'we think know more than others'. It is not just intelligence, or stock of information, or knowledge, Wilson argues, but an authority which 'can be exercised in areas where all questions are open and [can be] expected to remain open indefinitely'. The basis of such authority may lie in subject knowledge: hence the term 'the expert witness' in a trial. Experience and reputation matter, as does demonstrated competence.

Wilson correctly differentiates between 'expertise' and 'authority', partly through suggesting that expertise is given authority if it is expertise in 'some field of real knowledge' (whatever we regard as 'real'), and partly through pointing out that there are many kinds of 'expert', and some contradict the others. These points emphasise for us the importance of (a) acknowledging the dependence of the criterion of expertise on what is regarded (by both experts and non-experts) as an area of experience or knowledge which is consensually regarded as important (eg we might distinguish physics from astrology); and (b) accepting that experts will express diverse views and only some will have authority.

Such experts may share the prevailing paradigm (eg a view about the origins of matter or the applications of artificial intelligence, or the virtues of taking Vitamin C to stop ageing, or the desirability of using quantitative methods of analysis to run a good library service). They may have not just expertise but authority because their work is accepted by gate-keeping editors of learned journals, or because their management consultancies have led to radical improvements in company productivity (ie their expertise comes to be regarded as authority by being accepted by other experts who themselves have authority).

Given these criteria of expertise, based on holistic knowledge and epistemic authority, we should be able to detect similar qualities in effective managers.
Arguably, their effectiveness is their expertise. Managerial expertise may be of two kinds: first, that associated with professional qualifications and technical skills, such as that of a professional librarian, a systems analyst, an accountant, a master mason or mariner; and second, that associated with managerial and political know-how.

The second of these can be seen in the entrepreneurial manager able to handle committees, wheel and deal for budget allocations, manipulate people, flexibly move about an organisation using the first kind of expert instrumentally. These two kinds are not necessarily mutually exclusive, although we have argued (in Chapter 2) that they are potentially adversarial as competing elements in a changing paradigm of management.

The holistic knowledge and skills of the professional expert draw on the professional base he or she has developed. It could be the expertise associated with 'being' and 'learning to be' an accountant, lawyer, or librarian. It almost certainly is accredited by a professional body, developed through a formal programme of education and training, and embodies ideals and standards of service to customers or clients, the relationship with whom is regarded as a unique or confidential kind. Maccoby (Maccoby, 1977) calls this 'craftsmanship' in an important distinction to be discussed below. The holistic knowledge and expertise of the craftsmen lies in his/her knowledge of the linkages and applications of professional and technical knowledge (eg of what it takes to be a 'good' librarian, or what a competent set of accounts looks like as judged by one who 'knows').

It is possible to represent the expertise of the second kind of expert as 'political', 'flexible', 'environmentally aware'. The environment here is that of
the organisation, for such expertise expresses itself through action, often manipulatively, often perceiving people instrumentally in terms of what they can offer, what opposition they might present, what strengths and weaknesses they have.

Such managers are usually information-rich in terms of the information (formal and informal) in the organisation: they are 'privy to much more information and at a higher level in the organisation that you [the traditional manager] are' (Skivington, 1987, 87). They have up-to-date political information about appointments, plans, gossip, liaisons, financial deals, potential competition from other organisations. They are flexible in that they have successfully decoupled themselves from any residual base of professional expertise they might have had (although they often feel they can return to that base in the face of danger).

Because they are placed in this position, they can use their expertise entrepreneurially to build teams, set agendas, devise networks, construct financial and political alliances, and identify supernumerary craftsmen. This is, now, not the traditional dichotomy between unions and management, although historically these are themes which feed into it. This is a present-day realistic distinction to be made between different types of manager. It represents a key element of the way in which effectiveness in individual managers is changing and being seen in different ways; in other words, it represents one major way in which the 'paradigm within the paradigm' is changing.
Antony Jay (Jay, 1967) once made a distinction between the manager as thinker and the manager as 'man of action'. He called these two roles the 'yogi' and the 'commissar'. Yogis are typically found in R & D labs or planning offices, are often creative in their own field. Often they are forced to be other than they are (eg to bid competitively for funding or supervise large staffs), which leads to job dissatisfaction, role ambiguity, and ineffectiveness. The commissars or men/women of action sort out muddles and organise things effectively and push things along. Their dependence on other people with ideas is often underestimated, and this leads either to mere efficiency without impact, or a redefined version of where the company wants to go.

This reflects well the different aspects of character which contemporary managers are expected to develop and reveal. The effectiveness of organisations depends on the marriage of these qualities, in a department or in an individual manager. There are strong parallels between Jay's dual characterisation of the manager and Maccoby's craftsman/gamesman distinction cited earlier. For this discussion it highlights the importance of seeing how, in a working environment, managers are expected to exhibit qualities (and even possess or acquire qualifications) in both spheres.

Many managers encounter this dichotomy when, through promotion, they reach that watershed between professional management and general management. Typically, it may be seen when an accountant, lawyer, teacher, or librarian, hitherto carrying out a range of duties associated with their professional skills and attitudes base, moves into the domain of the generalist manager. There historical competences become obsolescent or marginalised as new demands are placed on
them to be effective - in building effective teams, getting staff to achieve results, setting strategic priorities for the organisation, negotiating financially with paymasters.

This transition may expose many of the incompetences or ineffectivenesses of a manager. Yet such exposure is not exclusively dependent upon a transition like this. Without promotion, a manager may have to face up to the fact that he is ineffective because he does not fully exercise 'political' skills. In his definition of 'the politically competent manager', Hayes (Hayes, 1984) argues that effective managers are proactive, and continually ask themselves the question: 'What do I need to do to bring about the state of affairs I desire?' They have ideas about achieving these ends, can control resources (energy, time) to that purpose, and have the skill to influence others and exercise power.

Many professional managers reach a point, perhaps in mid-career or for other reasons, where they become 'conscious of their own incompetence'. Professional skills alone will not ensure success (arguably a criterion of effectiveness), and authority (another such criterion) unless the manager develops political competences. The manager needs to be seen to be competent by others. Other people have to be aware of their dependence on him. Such dependence can be induced by convincing others that 'they need the information or other resources he controls'.

This reflects the way in which effective managers manage meaning by defining the controls of the organisational reality within which management takes place. This theme is discussed in earlier and later chapters where managers are seen to manage meaning, and where management is characterised as socially constructed reality. Thus, the effective manager is able 'to assess,
realistically, what it is he/she can offer to others and what it is that he/she needs from them.

By this token, the ineffective manager tends to be the person who constantly enters into explicit or implicit agreements that are to his disadvantage. Not only does this ensure that he is exploited and unable to fulfil his own goals (the problem for the traditional professional, the yogi/craftsman), it means that he is unlikely to be able to adequately fulfil his role in the organisation and contribute to its success. In short, therefore, the advice is to possess a well developed set of political skills.

Changing paradigms in library management

It is possible to characterise organisations as 'profit' and 'not-for-profit'. Traditionally, business and industry have come into the first category, and hospitals and schools and libraries into the second. From this we might represent a major aim for a profit organisation to be profitability, returns on investment for share-holders, market share, or effective cash flow. We might contrast the not-for-profit organisation as aiming to provide community benefit (e.g. health, education, information), to be financially accountable rather than profitable, and to emphasise professional values or ideals in its service philosophy.

We might regard this as changing structurally over the decade of the 1980s. Political and ideological pressures from government, central and local, have accelerated this change. There has been increased emphasis on value-for-money strategies in the area of public services, hospitals and doctors' surgeries have
been encouraged to organise themselves as businesses, schools and colleges to run as income-generating concerns.

Libraries, too, have been asked to generate income from non-traditional sources, develop public-private cross-sector joint enterprises (eg in microform publishing, local history, the provision of online information services), and adopt a commercially-orientated marketing stance.Instances are widespread: university libraries charging local businesses for value-added information services, special areas of public library services being contracted out (eg services to the elderly, video libraries), school libraries under local management of schools seeking to justify their place by means of contribution and time saved (criteria hitherto reserved to commercial and industrial departments).

It is impossible for changes like these to occur without their reflecting in the body of knowledge, and self-reflecting knowledge, in the professional cadre serving the sector. The concept of 'effectiveness' in library management, accordingly, mirrors these changes.

It is directed often towards, first, the effective organisation, and, second, the effective manager within it. Organisational effectiveness is often recorded as an ability to achieve particular goals or to optimise resources or to generate a high level of user satisfaction. Individual effectiveness is seen, within that, as being a combination of decision-making, team-building, and user service. As a briefing paper on costing and performance from the British Library for the Office of Arts and Libraries (British Library, 1990) suggests,
Library managers have to reconcile the contrasting pressures and problems created by declining resources, the demand for improved levels of service and greater accountability. In order to do so, they need better financial information to support applications for resource allocation and to demonstrate value for money in the services they are providing... There is an increased awareness of the benefits of effective costing systems, and performance measurement is now accepted as a vital management tool in many areas of local government...

Clearly, 'effectiveness' is equated with a new set of techniques and attitudes, managerial rather than professional in the traditional sense. It is also regarded as a mind set changing in this area of work along with parallel changes in cognate areas of work (eg in local government). Indeed, the briefing paper compares the education service and the NHS.

Systematic corroboration for these trends was sought through content analysis of twenty widely-used textbooks and of ten key journals in the field of library and information management. This analysis reveals widespread recognition of effectiveness as an ability for an organisation to achieve its aims at least possible or reasonable cost. At the same time, the notion of doing this, particularly at minimal cost, is seen as concentrating on the inputs, as opposed to the outputs or outcomes, such as staff numbers and funding. This as seen from the viewpoint of library management tends to stress 'efficiency' rather than 'effectiveness', the latter focussed very much on the impact on the user, ie outcome-orientated.

This distinction, between inputs and outputs-outcomes, characterises the difference between efficiency and effectiveness. It is a distinction, moreover,
which receives underpinning from a systems theory approach to the management of such services, usually in the form of whether the efficient organisation being mechanistic (or closed), and whether the effective organisation is organismic (or open). As Revill says (Revill, 1987, 200-29), libraries may have both open and closed structures within the same organisational structure, in all likelihood associated respectively with professional and non-professional (or clerical) activities. It is essential, Revill states, to take account of the political and policy context of the library: its adaptiveness may be its guarantee of effectiveness.

Given that library and information services usually operate in unique environments, and are often heterogeneous organisations in their own right, reliable comparisons and hegemonistic definitions are difficult to find. By this token, Du Mont (Du Mont, 1980) suggests we should define library effectiveness 'in terms of each library's level of ability in responding to its own unique situational and environmental contraints.' Drawing on contingency theory, she argues for the use of a flexible systems model, stressing contingent factors such as type of clientele or size of book stock. It is important to include changes over time.

To this end she tests four propositions: first, 'that libraries that adopt forms of administrative structure consistent with the expectation and perceived needs of their personnel will tend to achieve higher levels of performance and be judged by their personnel as more effective'. Second, that libraries 'able to learn and to perform according to changing contingencies will tend to achieve higher levels of performance, ie. be more effective'. Third, that 'libraries able to supply timely, relevant, and accessible service to all users will be considered more effective than those that do not'.
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And finally fourth, consisting of the effectiveness of a library showing itself in the ways in which it maximises social satisfaction against social expectations, gets funds, and 'mobilises its resources efficiently so that its ... constituent groups [its employees and users] are satisfied with its performance'.

As well as being good examples of how knowledge representation can reveal itself in propositional terms, such statements take on an axiomatic status. This interestingly suggests how examples of 'holistic thinking' and 'epistemic authority' can be both found and expressed in this area of professional expertise. They demonstrate, too, the way in which efficiency is subsumed by effectiveness, indicated by the emphasis both on managerial efficiency and the effectiveness as suggested by the satisfaction of the users. As a recent library annual report stated (Cumbria County Library Annual Report 1989-90):

It has always been a principle of the service that everything we do must contribute to the effectiveness of the service on the ground. Efficiency comes later, when the strands of experiment, innovation and change are made as effective as possible, usually through co-ordination of economies of scale. Thus, effectiveness is from the ground up and efficiency from the top down. Effectiveness must come first, efficiency second. There are numerous managerial examples of purposeless efficiency. That is what we have always sought to avoid.
The scholarly paradigm-within-paradigm

There is much to suggest that one of the major paradigmatic changes in library management over recent years has been the move from 'scholar' to 'economist'. This has been accelerated by the shift from book-centred information to information technology, and the development of computer applications in acquisition, circulation control, management information generation, and online searching. Political and economic factors have contributed also to the change. It is a shift which can be seen in the appointment of senior library managers, once appointed for scholarship (particularly in university and college librarianship), now appointed for proven managerial ability and familiarity with computerised applications.

This is a microcosm of the larger paradigm shifts which we have been discussing in previous sections, and reiterates the importance of examining both paradigms and paradigms-within-paradigms (i.e. the very composites which make up the people caught up in, and acting as catalysts for, the larger paradigm itself).

The meaning of the paradigm-within-paradigm here is captured elegantly by Frances Spalding in her biography of the poet Stevie Smith (Spalding, 1988) when she refers to Ronald Knox, the writer of religious and detective material, as 'a paradigm for her [Stevie Smith] attitude towards belief', encapsulating a complex of qualities, values and beliefs about a particular aspect of epistemically established knowledge. In this case, Ronald Knox represented this for Stevie Smith, but the implications are general, and have repercussions for our perception of ourselves and others as various forms of stereotype (see above), as well as our and their portrayal in various forms of storying (see
below). In the same way, Socrates is noted as 'the paradigm of that fully human being..."the individual"...' for Kierkegaard in Manheimer's study of Kierkegaard as an educator (Manheimer, 1977).

The message is that the paradigm-within-paradigm is as crucial for our full interpretation of the concept of effectiveness as is the paradigm. The changes to and in individual managers are an important focus of interest for research.

Isaac (Isaac, 1983) acknowledges the dilemma by way of a historiographic discussion of the academic status of librarians (in college and university libraries in the United States). What he says applies in Britain. If we are looking for ways in which librarians can be regarded as 'effective', it may be suggested that scholarship might be one criterion. It would be demonstrated by publishing research and by having academic tenure like professors and lecturers.

Isaac expresses it in terms of whether librarians are to be considered 'a professional group within the university setting, with special skills that deserve recognition' or 'as secondary personnel on campus, subject to a different set of rules and circumstances from both teaching faculty and other members of the campus body'. As for publishing, it was found that a very few people in the profession contributed most of what was published, implying ineffectiveness on the part of the majority. Many actively did not have time to publish, and expressed concern about the effects of research on 'our traditional, service-oriented jobs'.

Many felt that performing outside their particular work area was 'not what we are paid to do'. Isaac rightly argues that this could be self-fulfilling defeatism for it leads to a reluctance even to carry out research into library
and information matters which should be researched! 'Hiding behind the simplest definition of the work will not help us'. Low self-reflexive image might lead librarians, in another piece of American research in this area (English, 1984), to express views like 'Librarians ...simply are not trained well enough to even approach the level of research we expect and get from the basic disciplines' and 'librarians do not conduct research as it is conventionally viewed' and 'librarians have never been required to demonstrate scholarship or research' (English, 1984).

For our analysis of effectiveness, we find therefore that (a) not only is there an assumption that librarians are scholarly because they handle information but also (b) that they do not regard themselves (and are not regarded) as scholarly for the reasons cited above.

The paradigmatic shift described above, by which increasing emphasis on management and cost-effectiveness (often politically or ideologically inspired) caused a change in professional self-concept and values, has made itself felt on the paradigm-within-paradigm level. The scholarly attributes, arguably associated with Maccoby's craftsman-professional, have become marginalised as these new qualities have become desirable. The scholar has had to become an economist, the craftsman a gamesman.

Increasing emphasis on entrepreneurial skills, like imagination, flexibility, and a willingness to take risks (Stevenson & Gumpert, 1985), in the workplace and in training, can be seen in not-for-profit organisations.

One key channel for this has been the belief that any organisation should know its market better in order to ask the question 'which activity should be undertaken?'. Minkes expresses this well when he says that 'much of the
discussion about the management of non-profit organizations turns on the question of how far it is possible to translate into their environment the types of measure which managers are able to use in the business world' (Minkes, 1987, 181-2).

This has been so in higher education, where, in Edward Shils's words (Shils, 1983) 'the obligation of knowledge' and 'the Humboldtian ideal of the unity of teaching and research' associated with the academic elite have been reformulated so as not only to encompass a broader conception (Birch, 1988) of the academic ethic (by which we can mean paradigm) as one responsible directly to society, but also to encourage the introduction of performance indicators (like number of hours taught and percentages of graduates with 'good' degrees) (Rutherford, 1987). It has meant also that traditional connotations of 'quality' or 'effectiveness' have been subjected to new managerial criteria, some imposed from without by 'external judges who use procedures, a frame of reference, criteria or yardsticks which those inside the institution regard as inappropriate or partial, because they take little or no account of insiders' assessments of the quality of the academic work of the institution' (Cuthbert, 1988).

This suggests how paradigmatic change can be induced by non-professionals on professionals, or even imposed upon them, an environmental political and ideological change which can be seen in higher education, health services, and local government, all areas in which the politicisation of the traditional craftsman-manager has been substantial within the last decade, and where efficiency and effectiveness have both been seen in terms of managerial rather than professional skills (Gunn, 1988; Whynes, 1987; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1969).
If the effectiveness of an organisation is 'its ability to create acceptable outcomes and actions', and is regarded as 'an external standard of how well an organization is meeting the demands of various groups', then it follows that its effectiveness is 'sociopolitical' and 'the acceptability of the organization and its activities is ultimately judged by those outside the organization' (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978, 11).

This comparison with paradigmatic change in higher education is relevant in that it provides evidence of how effectiveness is undergoing change, and how the semantic movement is from scholarship to management. The debate about performance indicators reveals how trust in business-like methods and quantitative techniques has grown. 'Quality' appears to be passing from the Shilsian definition to that associated with quality control, defined as 'giving the customer what he wants today, at a price he is pleased to pay, at a cost we can contain' (Price, 1990).

The concept of performance has been examined by the researcher (Hannabuss, 1987b : reproduced as Appendix V), showing how, in its migration from profit to not-for-profit contexts, it has departed from notions of scholarship to those of management, taking the perception of the effective manager from one who can conduct a good reference interview (professional skills, a Maccobian craftsman-like skill) to one who can handle and generate managerial performance. Such managerial skills tend to be increasingly quantitative, as the emphasis on financial control, performance indicators, and operational research models implies (Lancaster, 1977, 373). The same challenge lies in the teaching of students of library management (Hannabuss, 1987e). Conceptual change reflects semantic and attitudinal changes within the professional cadre or elite, as a response to the external pressures for change from outside the group.
An economic effect on the professional paradigm

We have noted the changes effected on the paradigmatic knowledge in the profession of librarianship. Much of this has arisen from the reformulation of traditional techniques and values by applications of management and information technology. Very much at the heart of the effect which management has had has been an economic view of information and information services. This has arisen partly because of right-wing government ideology about the market place and the untenability of welfarism during recent years.

It has taken focus in factors like the alleged inefficiencies of public services, and the alleged inability of traditional professionals to manage for value-for-money. It has also had the effect of changing notions of public library services as being 'free' (ie paid for indirectly via taxation, national and local), of library and information work being a 'service', and of the information being, not a public or merit good, but potentially a private good to be exchanged with customers rather than clients.

The semantics are crucial to an understanding of the changing paradigm, and have had more than a little effect on practical interpretations of how such services and products are to be provided. If, for instance, information is to be regarded as a product, then effective management will deal with it that way, at least in part. This will entail setting up ways of pricing and costing specific services and products, identifying target groups in the community likely and able to pay directly for them, assessing price and demand elasticities, and making sure that services and products are competitive and build in value-for-money (for now, competitors, the market, and quality assurance matter). Such changes reduce externalities, so that traditional assumptions about libraries
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being available to the whole community (the law, the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964, states 'a comprehensive service...available to people in the area') are altered.

Turning information into a product can arguably reduce access for those unable to pay, even though it might improve the product for customers. Further, the effect of libraries generating income from such a source may not only threaten traditional professional skills (and force the development of new ones), but it may also change the budgetary base on which libraries work, so that funding from public sources is correspondingly reduced as income-generation increases.

These changes can be noticed dispassionately, for the argument here is not primarily about the politics but about the way in which issues like this effect the way managers define 'effectiveness'. Efficiency gets less and less associated exclusively with organising routines like selection, acquisition, circulation and reader services. It has had to take on board techniques and skills such as handling cost centre budgets, designing support structures to underpin differentiated and fee-based services, and adapting new priorities to incorporate these changes.

Effectiveness, always a user-directed activity, has absorbed new marketing dimensions so that value-for-money and competitive awareness are built into any accountably effective provision of services and products. It can be seen in the extent to which managers identify new customer targets, generate income from value-added services, introduce staff training to support these initiatives, demonstrate competences in forward budgetary planning.

With this in mind, increasing numbers of appointments to head public library services in the United Kingdom have been made from non-librarians. Concern
about this (and this reflects proof of the paradigmatic change) comes in statements such as that from the Employment Committee of the Library Association (November 1990) when, in speaking about the appointment of such chief librarians, it is stated: 'many other professions are equally worried, as top jobs in all fields were regarded as being primarily "management" rather than professional'.

It goes on to argue that only by political action generally, and training in the profession, will this trend be reversed. Semantically it is clear how 'manager' and 'professional' are regarded as distinct and separate, and how, politics aside, how profound is the disquiet that craftsman-like qualities are being superseded by gamesman or generalist manager qualities.

With increasing incentives to delegate responsibility down to cost-centres (eg departmental, branch or site libraries, and the like), these conceptions about efficiency and effectiveness have had wide influence in all levels of management. It has had a particularly noticeable effect on those middle and senior managers who, having been professionals for ten, twenty, or more years (ie are in mid-career), have been forced to re-examine their mind set. In many cases it has been an Maccobian encounter between craftsman-like and gamesman-like skills and attitudes. This is tested below in a survey of managerial competences among such professional groups in Scottish library and information services.

But what actually is the economic paradigm which appears to be inducing such change in work patterns, knowledge, beliefs and values? We might characterise the economist’s paradigm (Cohen, 1986) not merely as an amalgam of historian, mathematician, and politician, but also as a rationalistic way of looking at the world and notions of scarcity and choice. The social mechanism of the market is
assumed, and participants in it are motivated by self-interest. Already we are
meeting views which work apparently in opposite directions to those
traditionally associated with professional library service.

It allows us to suggest that a major difference lies between an economic view
of effectiveness, dependant on exchange and allocation and cost, and a
professional view of effectiveness, dependant on community benefit and value
and accountability (Spence, 1974).

Between these two in practice there is an overlap, as we have seen, particularly
where professionals devise a modus vivendi in which managerial or economic
ideas or practices can be made to work well with traditional ones. Examples of
this lie in how many libraries have actually improved their service levels by
examining cost allocations and objectively identifying areas of unmet need and
either prioritising there or contracting out. By from the viewpoint of
paradigmatic dislocation and reformulation, a Kuhnian revolution (or at least
'evolution') can be seen in the profession.

For Cohen (Cohen, 1986) the economist's paradigm is constructed around ideas
about cost. People behave self-interestedly if they see an economic benefit to
be made, but they weigh costs against benefits. He stresses the importance of
benefits forgone (opportunity cost). Even in activities like learning to read, he
claims that we can find costs - not just those associated with the effort of
achieving what you want, but also those associated with doing something else,
being embarrassed if you are no good at it, and those linked with upsetting
other people (the cultural cost).

Given such relocation or 'migration' of concepts in changing settings about
economic meanings, it becomes possible, intellectually at least, to see how valid
some of them are in a host domain like that of library and information work. Getz (Getz, 1980) develops this in an economic view of public libraries. He argues that public libraries are large enough to take advantage of economies of scale in the provision of services and products. He suggests that, although they may be seen as labour intensive, they are run cost-effectively, particularly in view of cost-saving innovations (such as automated circulation systems).

Yet, given these apparent advantages, and even because of them, the public libraries could be the cause of their own undoing. Any cost-savings could undermine the traditional funding structure. Any improvement of services and products to specific groups could merely serve to accelerate the need to specialise away from any general public service. He speaks about conflicting objectives arising because of these opportunities and threats. This is interesting in view of the fact that the formulation of aims and objectives is possibly one of the best ways in which professionals or managers can articulate not just what they believe the library should do, but also what they think they think. Issues arising from this will be examined in the survey below.

Getz (op.cit., pages 73 et seq.) defines 'efficiency' as 'deriving as much benefit as possible from expenditures..."getting the most for your money"'. His analysis is predictably economic: 'Benefits are consumer valuations of services; expenditures include the full social cost of activities. In competitive private markets prices convey information about social costs. Consumers judge the level of service that makes them best off (eg if the price of a service is higher than they want to pay, they decide they are better off without the service)'.

However, when goods are provided collectively, as with public libraries, other means must be used to determine the efficient level of service'. Critical to making a judgement about efficiency is the valuation of use: 'We want to know
what library use is worth to consumers'. When charges are not made, other ways need to be found to identify such things as the consumer's next best alternative and its cost to him/her. 'The cost of the next best alternative is an approximation of the value of the service actually used'.

The practical determinations of these ideas need not be followed through here, since the aim of mentioning them here is to indicate how knowledge from the economist's paradigm is reformulating the traditional professional paradigm of the librarian. Resistance is apparent on many levels, from ideological and political, to practical. As many people will query the ideological implications for a 'free' service to all as will query how ostensibly complicated techniques like cost-benefit analysis and zero-based budgeting can be applied to collection management or user studies (Kent and others, 1979).

However easy it is to demonstrate that numerous economic (and indeed accounting) techniques can very readily be so translated (eg notions of marginal cost and break-even to, say, the organisation of a subscription video or compact disk library, or a premium new hardback novel service), it does have the effect, in a revolutionary or incremental way, of inducing change in the traditional knowledge and valuational paradigm in the profession.

Social change has induced some of this change. For instance, there is a genuine increase in the provision of information for payment, and, on the part of many corporate information users, a growing willingness to pay. Bibliographic utilities (like Dialog and OCLC), CD-ROM services, financial and legal databases, and value-added consultancies and brokers demonstrate how easy it is to 'sell' the 'product' of information.
Given that, criteria about efficiency and effectiveness are certain to realign from traditional configurations about 'service' and 'value' to economic ones in which clients become customers, externalities are severely reduced, information nichemanship replaces generalised provision, and only certain kinds of information (such as that held within the covers of popular fiction) will remain the merit good traditionally associated with public library services. In that environment, where the general public are increasingly familiar with paying for public services (prescriptions, parking, entry to museums and art galleries), the competences demonstrated by the efficient and effective manager are certain to be different.

**Popular Management and Managerial Competences**

Mintzberg and many others, writers and practitioners, have sought to define those qualities or skills which go to make an effective manager. Often such qualities and skills are called 'competences' or 'competencies'. For instance, Morgan's study of 'riding the waves of change' (Morgan, 1988) seeks to identify key 'emerging' managerial competences connected with managing change. Nine areas are picked out as being crucial:

1. Reading the environment (eg scenario planning)
2. Proactive management (eg developing proactive mindsets)
3. Leadership and vision (eg communicating an actionable vision)
4. Human resource management (eg developing abilities to relish change)
5. Promoting creativity, learning, and innovation
6. Skills of remote management (eg managing ambiguity)
7. Using information technology as a transformative force
8. Managing complexity (eg managing multiple stakeholders)
9. Developing contextual competences (eg building bridges and alliances)

Books exist to help managers develop such qualities or skills. Self-evaluation quizzes are popular devices to this end. Typical are problem-solving and decision-making, planning and project management, communication and negotiating, time and stress management, technical knowledge, finance-handling skills, team building, conflict resolution, and delegation. It is possible to work out how good a manager one is - from weak to strong, proactive or reactive, flexible or rigid, innovative or reactionary. Of greater interest is the fact that effectiveness in a manager can be defined in terms of particular competences, and that, procedurally, it appears to be widely accepted in management for managers to assess themselves with such instruments.

Many competences are focussed, for instance, on personnel management, and emphasise such skills as being able to motivate staff, deal with people, show sensitivity to individual needs, find alternatives to problems, and take control of your own career (Jurow, in Gherman & Painter, 1990, 57-73). Some work in conjunction with perceived personality types or the career aims of the manager, like Handy's 'organisation gods' questionnaire (Handy, 1990). This assumes that managers will be Zeus people (entrepreneurial, using power and impulse to manage), Apollo people (liking routine and order and bureaucracy), Athena people (problem-solvers who like to work in teams and who are achievers), and Dionysus people (who dislike organisations and stress the value and interest of
the work above all), and accepts that, in different managerial situations, the same manager can reveal a mixture of approaches.

Given these categories, Handy's questionnaire presents a range of questions (on what a good boss should be, what success is, control and competition in organisations, and the like). Answers are classified according to the four 'gods', organisational versus personal results, to determine what the dominant impulses are. Often a lack of 'fit' emerges between the manager and the organisation (eg a manager might prioritise competences of an individualistic, creative kind [ie Dionysian] while working in an organisation which highlights competences suited to bureaucracy [Apollo] or entrepreneurial gamesmanship [Zeus]).

An influential example of the ways of identifying and testing managerial competences is the team roles self-perception inventory. In response to such statements as 'What I believe I contribute to a team ... (a) I think I can quickly see and take advantage of new opportunities, (b) I can work well with a very wide range of people, (c) Producing ideas is one of my natural assets...', or 'I gain satisfaction in a job because...', or 'When involved in a project with other people...', and so on.

Answers are classified according to eight characterological types or team roles, based on the work of Belbin and developed by writers like Margerison and McCann. These are company worker (who turns decisions into manageable tasks and is disciplined), chairman (who moves teams forward and establishes team roles), shaper (trying to unite ideas into action, but impatient), plant (source of good ideas and insights, but can drift egoistically off the point), monitor-evaluator (good at analysis, and can see flaws in plans), resource investigator (sociable, enthusiastic in short bursts, likes to go outside group and bring
back ideas), team worker (works well in team, builds on ideas, but can be uncompetitive), and completer-finisher (picks out workable ideas, good at detail, can worry about meeting deadlines).

Guidelines about organising teams can be inferred from this: eg that any effective team should have a mixture of shapers, chairmen, and team workers; or that having too many shapers and plants in any one team can lead to a lack of focus and disagreement; or that having exclusively team workers can lead nowhere at all because there are too few ideas.

Again, it is interesting to note that such instruments exist and are widely used among practitioners of management. Their psychological and interpersonal reliability is of lesser interest here than their role as practical devices which serve to identify those competences which effective managers will/should demonstrate in teams. This is, arguably, one of the most important component qualities or skills in effective management. Moreover, the widespread use of such tests and questionnaires, formally and informally, in the workplace argues strongly that managers are continually 'testing' themselves against measures or conceptions of effectiveness, and that reflective management is widespread, even if it not called that.

Various tests were applied in the course of this research to see how students of library management fared under such role inventories. Applied in a controlled situation to three groups of students of library management (N = 65, median age 21), results were as follows: 24% company worker, 7% chairman, 7% shaper, 18.5% plant, 3.5 monitor-evaluator, 3.5 resource investigator, 40% team worker, and 0% completer-finisher. These are findings which could be associated with personal self-perception as well as, more generally, with professional self-image.
On the paradigm-within-paradigm or personal level, results suggest that there is a strong preponderance of team and company workers (i.e., people who reflexively regard themselves in this way), suggesting that 64% of respondents do not regard themselves as idea-generators or team leaders. In addition, in tests conducted over three years, there were similarities between what the test suggested and what students said they experienced (e.g., the way plants and shapers can compete in groups, or that too many team workers in a group led to indecisiveness and a search for a leader).

This might imply in turn that students entering the library and information profession do not regard those competences associated with shaping and planting ideas and chairing as central either to themselves or their putative jobs/careers. By inference we might suggest that professionals in this field in general might regard themselves in this way, that, in other words, there is a broader, paradigmatic, meaning to these data, that of a profession linking its key competences with diligent service and conscientious tidiness. Clearly, there was a need systematically to examine what practising library and information managers did think were the essential or desirable competences of an effective manager.

These possibilities could be seen to emerge in earlier discussions about conceptions of effectiveness, first as professional/craftsman, and second as scholar, both of which harking back to traditional professional knowledge and values roots, and arguably suspicious of or unreceptive to managerial roles and competences. To this we might add features from another area of the discussion, that of a perception of library managers as competent in areas other than finance, economics, and marketing, from which stems the appearance of a paradigmatic shift.
Investigation into Management Competences of Library Managers

In recent management education in the United Kingdom, debate has been stimulated by the work of the National Forum for Management Education and Development which started the Management Charter Initiative (MCI) in 1988 (Management Charter Initiative, 1990). The aim was to promote the idea of a coherent structure of educational qualifications for managers (eg from Certificate to MBA). Core competences have been identified in order to make education and training for junior and middle managers less theoretical. Such competences drew on workplace rather than on purely academic management textbooks. They were gathered together under various heads, including managing resources, finance, and people.

The principles underlying these competences and this taxonomy were used as a starting point for a research investigation into middle and senior staff in library and information management in Scotland during the winter of 1990-91. The sampling frame consisted of library and information services in Scotland. Five sectors were identified: public libraries, library services in further and higher education, library services in the health sector, other 'special' library and information services (eg in oil companies), and school library services.

The principles of selection were those of the quota sample (to identify the five sectors by size, type, and geographical distribution), and, within that, quasi-random weighted sampling to pick out representative samples from each group. One hundred questionnaires were sent, asking respondents in middle and senior management to identify and rank competences. The response from all sectors was 49%. Replies from library services in the health sector were disregarded on the grounds that they were too few and/or spoiled.
Implicit in the questionnaire were two assumptions:

first, that terms like 'middle' and 'senior' would be intelligible as
generic labels, despite diversity of practice and nomenclature in different
library and information services; and

second, that many managers in middle and senior positions would probably
be in mid-career.

The would make them highly eligible for an examination of paradigmatic change
on the ground that they would, in all likelihood, have undergone the transition
from professional to manager in the normal course of promotion. This means
that, although they started as professional librarians, they would have, in
recent years, have moved into 'general management'. This move would imply the
development and use of competences different from those developed before,
characterised by team-building, strategic planning, and financial skills now,
and subject-orientated competences (eg in stock selection or user education)
then. Even if such promotion had not occurred, then they would have arguably
have been exposed to similar pressures to move from professional to general, or
alternatively they would have observed such a transition in the promotion of
their peers.

A 'competence' was defined as being 'a skill, a revealed complex of knowledge or
set of attitudes and values, which has been identified as being appropriate in
the world of work, or as being worth developing in anticipation of entering the
world of work, in the library and information service area'.
The focus consisted of those competences regarded as being appropriate for middle and senior managers. Competences were divided into three types: those associated with managing the service, those associated with managing the finance, and those associated with managing the people. The types emanated in part from a larger (and to a large extent inappropriate taxonomy from the MCI competences), in part from an informal Delphi-style survey of fifteen practitioners and academic (other than those surveyed by the main instrument), and in part from competences identified, by content analysis, in a selection of twenty major textbooks on library management.

Unobtrusively the competences were arranged so that distinctions could be made between those competences which were regarded as being of 'general' utility (ie directed towards others in the workplace) and those which were regarded as being 'personal' (ie directed towards personal development and self-reflexive change for the managers themselves).

The elicitation of responses was predicated on two ideas:

first, that respondents would find it realistic to evaluate competences expressed in the form of statements; and

second, that respondents would find it straight-forward to record their responses in terms of a semantic differential (five points on a scale, one each for middle and senior managers).
The testing instrument is fully represented as Appendix VI, 'Survey of Managerial Competences'. Readers are referred to that at this stage. An analysis of the survey results follows below.

**Analysis of the Survey Results**

Analysis consisted of the following stages:

1. recording and annotating responses in each sector;

2. calculating the points awarded for each competence (each competence was numbered, from 1 to 39);

3. placing competences in rank order for each sector;

4. determining standard scores in order to compare rank orders from each sector;

5. placing competences in rank orders for all sectors; and

6. identifying highest and lowest competences
   
   6.1 by managerial level (middle/senior)
   
   6.2 by general and personal criteria.
Since quota sampling is non-parametric, it was unsuitable to test for significance by t-tests or ANOVA etc. Nevertheless, drawing on the nominal data, results were tested using the chi-square test, and each set of data - for the four sectors 'public libraries','libraries in further and higher education','special libraries', and 'school libraries' were found to be non-significant at levels 0.05, 0.01, and 0.001.

Points were allocated to each response. The assumption was that, when a respondent attributed 'important' characteristics to any competence, then that weighting should be reflected in a point score. Accordingly the following scale was used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placing given</th>
<th>Points awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this way it was possible to calculate the points awarded by all respondents to all competences in both middle and senior manager categories.

It was then possible to rank competences in each sector, as follows:
### HIGHEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4=</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4=</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4=</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOWEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2=</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Ranked competences for public library managers
By checking the original list of competences, it is easy to identify which came highest (4 = Ability to set up procedures, etc) and lowest (21 = Knowing how to generate income for the service).

Highest competences for MIDDLE managers in public libraries are in order:

1. Ability to set up procedures for service delivery.
2. Ability to organise the service for use.
3. Understanding the needs of others.
4. Ability to utilise computerised systems.
5. Ability to keep procedures up-to-date.

Lowest competences for MIDDLE managers in public libraries are in order:

1. Knowing how to generate income for the service.
2. Knowing how to handle the budget.
3. Knowing how to get adequate funding.
4. Ability to formulate plans for the service.
5. Familiarity with marketing techniques.
Highest competences for SENIOR managers in public libraries are in order:

1. Understanding the needs of others.
2. Ability to define aims of service.
3. Ability to identify key objectives.
4. Knowing how to set priorities.
5. Ability to allocate money to activities.

Lowest competences for SENIOR managers in public libraries are in order:

1. Ability to keep procedures up-to-date.
2. Ability to utilise computerised systems.
3. Knowing how relate well to others.
4. Knowing how to get your staff to achieve results.
5. Ability to monitor user wants.

Certain indicators emerge to corroborate the impressions made earlier about the changing knowledge and valuational paradigms present in the library and information profession. It appears, so far, that those competences regarded as most essential or desirable in managers are those rooted in professional qualities and skills (eg organising procedures, making sure users get a good service, making sure the aims and objectives of the service are effectively formulated and carried through).
Distinctions of level can be detected between middle and senior managers, particularly in respect of strategic planning and decision-making, yet the essential distinction is clear. It is, in fact, the distinction between the qualities and skills of the Maccobian craftsman and gamesman discussed earlier in the chapter.

Managers in libraries in further and higher education:

Similar analysis was carried out in this sector. The following results were obtained:

Highest competences for MIDDLE managers in the FHE sector are in order:

1. Knowing how to build effective teams.
2. Knowing how to achieve results.
3. Knowing how to negotiate effectively.
4. Knowing how to set priorities.
5. Knowing how to get your staff to achieve results.
Lowest competences for MIDDLE managers in the FHE sector are in order:

1. Knowing how to generate income for the service.
2. Knowing how to get adequate funding.
3. Being able to write effective reports.
4. Knowing how to handle the budget.
5. Familiarity with marketing techniques.

Highest competences for SENIOR managers in the FHE sector are in order:

1. Knowing how to negotiate effectively.
2. Knowing how to build effective teams.
3. Knowing how to get your staff to achieve results.
4. Ability to make decisions from management information.
5. Knowing how to cost services and products.

Lowest competences for SENIOR managers in the FHE sector are in order:

1. Ability to set up procedures for service delivery.
2. Understanding the needs of others.
3. Knowing how to get adequate funding.
4. Ability to keep procedures up-to-date.
5. Ability to allocate the right jobs to staff.
Again, there is a strong bias towards professional competences in the highest categories (e.g., building teams, setting priorities, making decisions) and a tendency in the lowest competences to identify those qualities and skills associated with the economic paradigm-within-paradigm (e.g., generating income, getting funding, using marketing techniques).

One apparent contradiction might appear to be the inclusion of 'knowing how to cost services and products' in the highest competences of senior managers; but this could be accounted for by its meaning that craftsman-professionals regarded knowing what services and products cost (e.g., books to buy, issue desks to man, user education programmes to mount) as essential professionally applied knowledge. It could arguably be de-coupled from any direct need to be entrepreneurial, economic, or political with organisational finance. It might be noted that it is in this area, colleges of further and higher education, that the debate about academic status of staff, and therefore the dialectic associated with paradigmatic tensions between the roles of scholar-professional-manager' have been most acute.

Similar analysis was carried out on managers in special libraries. Highest competences were (for middle managers) identified as being the ability to set up procedures for service delivery, being up-to-date, using computerised systems, and organising the service for use. Lowest ones included knowing how to handle the budget, knowing how to generate income, knowing how to run the service as a cost centre, and ability to understand and utilise numeric data. Highest for senior managers included ability to define aims and objectives, to formulate plans, and set priorities; while the lowest were keeping procedures up-to-date, use computerised systems, and allocate the right jobs to staff.
(possibly because such tasks were delegated, or because they were regarded as obvious, needing no special training).

For managers in school libraries, highest competences were identified as including defining aims and objectives, planning, achieving results, and effective personnel skills (competences such as 28 to 33). Lowest included familiarity with marketing techniques, negotiating effectively, costing services and products, getting adequate funding, and showing self-confidence and drive.

Consolidating the results across sectors

It then became necessary to determine which competences were regarded as highest and lowest across all sectors. To achieve this, individual rank scores of highest and lowest competences in each sector were standardised. This procedure works on the principle that any variable from any sample has a special relationship with the parameters (above all, the mean and the standard deviation) of its own sample distribution. We are able to compare such variables from different samples by standardising. The procedure is to take the mean from the variable, and divide the result by the standard deviation. This was carried out for both highest and lowest competence point scoring in all sectors, with the following results:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.399</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.684</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[because responses were low in this sector, and differentiation between options was impressionistically recorded, numerous competences were registered as equally high: others included 8,14,15,28,29,30,31,32,35,36,37,and 39 (middle) and 14,15,17, 18,20,25,26,27,31,33,45,35,36,37,38,and 39 (senior)]

School Library

[similar conditions and results apply here: highest competences were 1,2,4,9,14,26,27,28,29,32,and 39 (middle) and 1,2,3,7,13,14, 18,19,20,26,27,30,31,32,33,38,and 39 (senior)]

Table 2: Competences: standard score comparisons of highest scores

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

From these results, the following competences were identified as highest scores across all sectors:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHE</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.229</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHE</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.685</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.399</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHE</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHE</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Highest competences across all library sectors

These competences (all sectors, middle and senior together) can be decoded in the following way:

1. Knowing how to negotiate effectively.
2. Knowing how to build effective teams.
3. Ability to set up procedures for service delivery.
4. Knowing how to build effective teams.
5. Understanding the needs of others.
In the same manner, lowest competences across all sectors were determined and organised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-3.588</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-2.766</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2.662</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHE</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-2.656</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.503</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.059</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.059</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.059</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.059</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.059</td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Lowest competences across all library sectors
These competences can be identified as

1. Ability to keep procedures up-to-date.
2. Ability to keep procedures up-to-date.
3. Knowing how to handle the budget.
4. Ability to set up procedures for service delivery.
5. Ability to organise the service for use.

Statistically a large number of the lowest competences were attributed to senior managers. For this reason, competences like 1, 3 and 4 receive low ranking on the very probable grounds that senior managers delegate professionally routine tasks to middle managers, and therefore do not regard such competences as being immediately or directly related to themselves. However, the political and managerial implications of suggesting that being up-to-date are important. As are the implications of suggesting that being efficient and effective (by having and developing efficient and effective procedures [competences 1 and 4] and skills and attitudes [competence 5] might not include emphasis on the competences concerned.

Knowing how to handle the budget emerges as a low competence. This may reveal that it is not carried out by many library managers who are, on that account, not efficient and effective. In order to become so, it could be implied that further training in handling budgets might be needed, or should be supplied, to rectify the situation. Alternatively, it could suggest that library managers still regard themselves as craftsman/professionals, concerned with information and users rather than with the managerial and economic aspects of the paradigm-
within-paradigm. Given this, it may arguably be implied that there is some evidence here to underwrite the view that these professionals in a state of knowledge and attitudinal change are likely to these views. A fortiori, it may be possible to claim that they speak for a larger population of similar professionals in the United Kingdom.

**Distinctions by managerial level**

In order to make full sense of these findings, it is essential to differentiate between middle and senior managers. There is good evidence, for instance, to suggest that many responses about senior managers, for good or for bad, attributevaluations to particular competences on pragmatic grounds. For example, it is possible that a senior manager may regard competence 4, an ability to set up procedures for service delivery, as a competence which he or she would delegate to a middle manager, while retaining the broader strategic aspects of organisational development to themselves.

Similarly, it could be argued that there are some senior management competences which should be performed at senior levels and not at other levels. Such a competence could be competence 1, an ability to define the aims of the service. It may be that, in the area of managing finance, different circumstances exist which would influence responses: some library managers, with an otherwise large degree of professional independence, are entirely dependent on the accounting and financial control procedures of superior managers, many of whom may not be professional librarians. The further education, special, and school libraries, this situation is often the case. Moreover, many middle managers would regard
day-to-day budgeting as usual in their own work but strategic planning as an activity carried out uniquely by senior management.

From the foregoing data, it was then possible to identify the highest and lowest competences across all sectors by middle and senior manager criteria.

**Highest competences by managerial level:**

**SENIOR**

1. 33 Knowing how to negotiate effectively.
2. 31 Knowing how to build effective teams.
3. 36 Understanding the needs of others.
4. 32 Knowing how to get your staff to achieve results.
5. 1 Ability to define aims of service.
6. 2 Ability to identify key objectives.
7. 14 Knowing how to set priorities.

**MIDDLE**

1. 31 Knowing how to build effective teams.
2. 4 Ability to set up procedures for service delivery.
3. 8 Ability to organise the service for use.
4. 36 Understanding the needs of others.
5. 13 Knowing how to achieve results.
6. 33 Knowing how to negotiate effectively.
Senior managers are expected to be able to negotiate, and their effectiveness is probably seen in terms both of being able to do this with their own staff (i.e., internally) and with external bodies like paymasters, local authorities, political bosses and the like. Professional acumen, we may infer, can best be demonstrated when a clear idea of aims and objectives exists, and when there are reflected in efficient structures and procedures (e.g., results, teams). These efficient structures and procedures should, through aims and objectives and priorities, through effective negotiation, and through understanding the needs of others (which includes the needs of the community served), show effectiveness.

In this way we can pin down one way in which senior managers may actually conceptualise 'efficiency' and 'effectiveness'. It has been possible to exteriorise some of their views through using a testing instrument which the group investigated found intelligible, since it was familiar to the kinds of survey and test which they themselves would use in gathering information on behaviours and attitudes in the library and information service.

By this token, we might consider middle managers where the emphasis for efficiency and effectiveness is on getting good work done by their immediate staff for the benefit of their immediate users. The revealed importance of setting up procedures for service delivery, organising the service for use, and understanding the needs of others, puts the other competences firmly in the context of a user-orientated 'effectiveness'. Only in relation to these competences are others, like achieving results, building effective teams, and negotiating (here, most probably, with senior managers and middle managers...
We find, with middle managerial competences, a strong emphasis on Maccobian craftsman/professional qualities and skills. Again, these have been revealed by the testing instrument, and serve to confirm the complicated manner in which, when managerial effectiveness is investigated, factors like professional/managerial qualities and skills, and functional levels in the organisation operate in tandem.

The importance of 'personal' competences

One more element is important for an examination of competences. This relates to the unobtrusive (ie unknown to the respondents) distinction in the questionnaire between general and personal competences. General competences were those which were regarded as being directed mainly towards others in the workplace, whereas personal competences were more directed towards the managers himself/herself. They were self-reflexive in the sense that managers know that these were competences which they had or lacked, and the presence or absence of them induced positive or negative self-consciousness. The argument is that effective management starts with effective self-management, and that, from this perspective, the effective manager is likely to be aware of the meta-cognitive dimensions of doing his job.

Highest competences were then differentiated by managerial level and general/personal criteria:
### Table 5: Highest personal and general competences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uncoded, these are as follows:

2 Ability to identify key objectives
4 Ability to set up procedures for service delivery
8 Ability to organise service for use
13 Knowing how to achieve results
14 Knowing how to set priorities
31 Knowing how to build effective teams
32 Knowing how to get your staff to achieve results
33 Knowing how to negotiate effectively
36 Understanding the needs of others

From these findings, it is fair to conclude that understanding the needs of others is that area of competence where most self-reflexive (or meta-cognitive) activity concerning 'effectiveness' takes place in library managers. It is expressed in a generic way, and this may account for its wide application and relevance. After all, understanding the needs of your own staff, and of the community which you and your staff serve, is a very demanding, thought-provoking complex of managerial ideas.

The corollary for senior managers is that, having acknowledged that understanding the needs of others is important, then the effective manager should know how to set priorities. For middle managers, this corollary is knowing how to achieve results. This highlights the essentially Schonian or Kolbian view of managerial learning (discussed in Chapter 7), which regards learning and effectiveness at work as an experiential loop process.
It also identifies that particular locus of managerial self-examination as being where coming to understand the needs of others confronts the manager's own need to (a) analyse the situation, (b) decide upon priorities, and (c) bring into play what knowledge and experience he/she has of how practical managerial activity meshes with any reflective analysis of such activity. In other words, we have been able to identify key competences in managers. We have also been able to identify that point of most concern and interest to managers themselves when they make decisions at work and, more interesting still, when they step back and think of the decisions they have made or need to make.

Representations of 'effectiveness' in storying

The concept of effectiveness can be embodied in stories. This has already been seen in the ways in which managers, in practice and books, illustrate management principles through example. Quick-fix manuals for effective managers abound. In the hagiography of management practice, success stories, from Lee Iacocca of Chrysler (Iacocca, 1985) to Giovanni Agnelli of Fiat, are peddled as 'paradigms' (ie paradigms-within-paradigm, in the sense that Manheimer (Manheimer, 1977) referred to Socrates as a paradigm for Kierkegaard).

The close personal nature of many guides to management emphasise management as a learning experience. This is reflected in the structure and style: often advice and principles interplaid with instances and stories. There is often a direct, conversational relationship between author and reader, making the experience a shared story (Goldsmith & Clutterbuck, 1986; Cox & Cooper, 1988; Goldsmith & Ritchie, 1987; Garfield, 1986; Ouchi, 1981).
Kotter (Kotter, 1982) presents 'a manager’s day' through the events which happen to him, the meetings he attends, the decisions he makes, the conversations he has. It is as if the textures of his daily work are reliably represented that way. There is, after all, always a difficulty in representing managerial knowledge because it is dual in character - part theory and principles and analysis, and part experiential and 'a thing done rather than said'. By this token, much of the knowledge used in managerial decision-making appears to be not only holistic (in the sense that 'experts' use knowledge, see above) but also of an 'aha' type.

'Aha!' knowledge is a complex amalgamation of knowing and learning what to do, involving a recognition that 'that' is the best or only thing to do in the circumstances. The circumstances are recognised as a context for such a decision. It may be that the manager recalls similar experiences in the past when such decisions worked in such circumstances. It may be that the manager creatively extrapolates from prior knowledge and recognition of circumstances to an entirely original type of decision-making.

The ability to recognise the circumstances for what they are (either having been known before or recognised for what they are at the time of experiencing them) is not only effectiveness in terms of acumen and intelligence (ie street-wisdom): it is also an epistemic activity, in which 'true' answers are both sought and found and applied, and where, in acting it out, and later in retrospect, the manager may be said to use and demonstrate 'authority'. This is the de facto epistemic authority which De George (De George, 1985) talks about.

Peace (Peace, 1986), in an article called 'I thought I knew what good management was', shows this kind of knowledge at work in his description of his new appointment to the post of general manager at Westinghouse Synthetic Fuels
Division. He arrives, feels a sense of challenge and opportunity, reacts to the employees and notices their reaction to him. Further down the track, he comes to understand the facts and figures of the business - the production, financial, and marketing information. He notices divergent views about change in research and development in the company, and sets up meetings to improve communication. Morale is low. Vandalism occurs. Peace got angry and knew it.

He sought to balance his own impressions with findings from a consultant's research which suggested employees were keen to work but felt that management lacked commitment. New practices were introduced: eg 'we asked almost everyone in the division to describe the way the people they worked with behaved and the way they would like them to behave. Then they met together in their work groups to discuss the discrepancies and prepare action plans to correct them... People recognized that dramatic actions were needed to break down old walls of distrust'.

What is noticeable from this account is its 'lifelikeness'. It reads like a story. Events occur in sequence, and participants are continually trying to make sense of the sequence and affect it. They are aware of adversarial factors and a diversity of ways and means to reach goals. There is apparently no clear consensus about goals. There are several possible solutions or outcomes. No one is in entire control. No happy ending is certain, but an appropriate resolution is found.

During the course of the sequence of events, Peace is continually stepping back from the situation and from his own responses to it, trying to understand it and reflect on it. It is then written as a account, afterwards, confirming Weick's (Weick, 1969) view that managerial storying is often retrospective (an idea central to the understanding of managerial storying and discussed fully in
Chapters 8 to 11). Moreover, it is a story which serves to underwrite the idea that management is the management of meaning, and that that meaning is collaboratively arrived at, both in the series of actions or events that take place, and in any account of them afterwards.

It can be argued that some of the most important events in a manager's executive life are acted out in this way (Lindsey, Homes, & McCall, 1987). The account may be like an autobiography in that, in retrospect, the series of events can be represented positively, while at the time things may have been otherwise. In the situation, too, central organisational values were being acted out (such as fairness, the exercise of authority, ways of dealing with people, notions of commitment). During the series of events, time and time again the participants appear to recognise and demonstrate that these experiences are happening to them. Finally, any managerial reader of the account is likely to share in any meta-cognitive wisdom or after-knowledge, and is likely to reflect on that, probably for decision-making in his own actual or putative situations.

Investigating managerial storying in practice

An investigation (part of the wider research strategy into managerial storying, developed more systematically in Part 4) was carried out into ways in which the concept of 'effectiveness' was embodied in managerial stories.

Consistent with the ethnographic and constructivistic approaches outlined as central to the thesis in Parts 1 and 2, interviews with experienced practitioners ('middle managers') were carried out. The basis of each interview
was a structured interview schedule.

The aim was to open up spontaneous story-telling in the respondent. It was not tape-recorded for reasons of confidentiality, but prompt-notes were taken carefully throughout the conversations. These were expanded immediately after the meetings took place, and then subjected to systematic analysis. Themes and patterns were identified, and areas of experience represented in story forms were extracted for detailed investigation and comparison. Grounded theory approaches were found to be very useful at this stage of the research, and vindicated the choice of the qualitative and ethnographic methodologies described at the start of the thesis.

Respondents were to be asked to characterise what they thought effective management meant. It was realised in advance that this research question, though central, was unaskable in that form tout court. This was confirmed in early discussion during the interviews. The first issue on the structured interviewing schedule was one of semantics: 'if the respondent could easily work with the concept 'effective', fine; but, if not, would another term work better?' The respondent examined in detail here is typical when she expressed the wish to use the term 'good' (as in 'Tom is a "good" manager'). Others used this term or others like 'real' (as in 'The "real" thing to do was ...'). These strategies confirm the thesis that in management the collaboration over meanings is pervasive (Hannabuss, 1987a, 1987d, and 1991).

The collaborative nature of managerial meaning poses an even more acute — and interesting — challenge when we realise that it operates in an arena of competing areas of knowledge, belief and valuation. Such competing values can be seen in what staff in an organisation regard as 'good' or 'real' for control and
flexibility, or relative emphasis on the well-being of the individual or that of the organisation as a whole, or what are regarded as fair means and ends for the organisation.

A further characteristic emerges as important for an investigation of this kind. Among practising managers, as opposed to academics, there appears to be a preference to use 'demotic' terminology rather than with the hieratic jargon of management. Writers on practical management show this, as when Blanchard and Tager (Blanchard & Tager, 1986) talk about a 'bad' boss 'making people 'sick' by being unpredictable or 'whittling away at their self-esteem'.

This appears to exist independent of the circumstances in which respondents were invited to speak spontaneously and in story-forms about their experiences and values. Because of this, the preference to use 'good' or 'real' rather than 'effective' is understandable. However, this is not to suggest that demotic terms like 'good' and 'real' are anything less complex or have fewer connotations than 'effective'. In fact, the opposite: if anything, the central terms like 'good' and 'real' proved semantic and polemic cruces in the interviews as a whole. They were seen openly as important for clarification, and the clarification was seen openly as important for communicating the meanings the respondents appeared to wish to convey.

The central task of each interview was to encourage the respondent to discuss freely some recent incident at work which caused them a lot of thought. They were asked to consider the incident in terms of whether it was managed well or badly. It could be an incident in which they were personally in charge, or a subordinate, or a marginal party.
Twenty minutes were spent in open discussion clarifying what the task actually was. Then respondents were invited to write down the incident. They could disguise any names, and were assured that any research based on the findings would anonymise their responses. Ten minutes were allocated for this final task. Time was kept short in order to focus the minds of respondent on just what they knew they MUST say. The story, in this case, was treated as an 'episode'. The interviews then concluded.

In the discussion we shall consider the story which emerged from one typical interview, and then evaluate it in terms of how effectiveness is represented in three ways:

1. by means of paradigms
2. by means of competences
3. by means of story.

Story here will be regarded as a vehicle for a set of strategies:

A. reflecting the texture of experience at work

B. illustrating holistic and aha! knowledge of that experience
C. demonstrating how meanings are used collaboratively particularly in situations where knowledge and values compete (reference will be made to the Maccobian distinction between craftsman and gamesman management types/styles).

The situation provided by the respondent was one in which, after years of managerial experience, the respondent was faced with a changing economic climate and consequent changing values. Traditional professional qualities and skills, built up as a professional librarian in the acquisitions department of an academic library, and hitherto regarded as 'sufficient' and 'appropriate', were now regarded as obsolescent. Two major external triggers for this change were (a) the introduction of automated systems and (b) the instruction to be 'cost-effective'. Internally, there were both triggers (eg mid-career despondency at the 'plateau' effect) and catalysts (eg a realisation that a transition to higher, generalist management was beckoning for anyone with healthy ambition).

From this 'climate', the respondent was invited to select a 'typical' event. Its typicality would mean that it characterised the major tensions, feelings, interactions, problems, rewards, of a period of chronological and psychological time far greater than the event itself. In the manner of stories investigated in later chapters of the thesis (see Part 4), 'characters' were employed to develop the story and to articulate the various viewpoints.

Such characters were represented as mouthpieces for these viewpoints, and, as such, whatever their basis on real-life people, became effective projections for the representation of the meanings which 'collaborate' and the paradigms which
'compete'. In addition, since this respondent used the term 'good' as an operator for the concept of 'effectiveness', then viewpoints tended to get polarised as 'good' and 'bad'. Reflection on what was said and done appeared not just in the act of recall and story-telling but also in the developing self-awareness as the narrator exteriorised the incident.

The story was as follows:

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

It was last year when things really got bad. I had been running the acquisitions department for over ten years by then. We did what we could even though the budget allocation was never big enough. I knew what academic staff wanted in all the various departments - students, research people, lecturers and the rest. I didn't even mind the introduction of the automated system: we'd known for years that it was coming. After all, we got lots of training - well, enough anyway.

I wouldn't have minded if X [the manager's direct superior in line management] hadn't interfered so much. She was always coming in, asking questions about how we were getting on, pretending she simply wanted to know. All she wanted to do was interfere. Show me up in front of my own staff. Her remarks that day were not likely to put confidence into us. I sailed in and saw us working on a screen entry [of the online public access catalogue] - I think it was an order for Farries [a book supplier], some economics book that had not come through, American I think...
...She came right up close, watched us for a minute, and said something to the effect that it wouldn't be long before it was all done by machine. Much more cost-effective! And then the bomb-shell that we were, in any event, going to be merged with cataloguing for reasons of economy. We would be told very soon what that would involve. And, with that she just left. That's not what I call the act of a good manager.

---------------------

Analysis of the story

The respondent took literally the advice to represent the experience as a story, adopting numerous narrative forms. She chose first-person narrative, giving immediacy to the scene which is remembered with cinematic clarity. Conscious structuring, event by event, is clear.

Effectiveness paradigms are implicit and explicit here, largely through the values represented by the characters, the narrator and her superior X. There is a 'once upon a time' paradigm of service and scholarship, implied in the narrator's portrayal of his own skills and values, and 'new' paradigm of competitive change and economic management, implied in her portrayal of the managerial style and values of X. In terms discussed above, strictly speaking this is a change of the 'paradigm-within-paradigm'.

Effectiveness competences are as clearly dual, traditional qualities and skills being represented in the knowledge which he has built up through experience, a knowledge of books and readers and service, and innovative qualities and skills
being represented in the knowledge X shows she has of political decisions about
the future of various departments in the library, as well as of changes in ways
and means for the future of acquisitions.

Both paradigms and competences are exteriorised through the mechanism of story.
The claims of story are that it reflects the texture of experience at work. This
is found in the detail about the department and its procedures, the
idiosyncratic minutiae of acquisition work, the pride which the narrator takes
in knowing her job and getting her staff to work well with her. Managerial
knowledge has its origins in both theoretical and practical information, and for
this manager the two are inseparable. Hypothetically, an analyst could infer
management principles from this story (e.g., that training and development are
essential to maintain a high sense of job satisfaction among staff), just as
easily as, in this case, the narrator has been able to instantiate a story out
of her knowledge, theoretical and practical, of the situation.

The extent to which this story illustrates holistic and aha! knowledge of the
experience may be seen not merely in the narrator’s own holistic knowledge of
the work she does (e.g., how she has a comprehensive picture of the clientele she
serves and their reading needs) but also how she realises (the aha! knowledge)
that there are very real differences between her own view of ways and means
and those of her superiors. This knowledge is enhanced by the retrospective
manner of the story-telling, which is likely to build in hidden rationalisations
and self-protective devices with respect to the narrator’s own self-esteem.

Meanings are used collaboratively as the narrator seeks to work out that all
new things are not necessarily bad. After all, she acknowledges that training in
the use of the new system was desirable. But collaboration is often adversarial
in situations of managerial change. The presence of competing value gives the
impression that, during the episode (and during the extra-narrative time since), an effective consensus has not yet been reached. Competing values can be seen in (a) the ways of managing the computerised system, and (b) the ways of managing the staff of the acquisitions department. On both these, the narrator and X are opponents. Interestingly, the most overt form of collaboration comes through an extra-story element, the narrator's 'wooing' of the interlocutor (in this case, the researcher, but, by extension, any reader of the story itself).

To what extent, then, does the manager consider the story is an example of 'good' (ie 'effective') management? There are two answers. One concerns X (the storyteller's superior) and her management: she interferes and cannot delegate, she is insincere and fails to inspire her staff with confidence, she is competitive and looks for win/lose situations, she is dictatorial and reluctant to discuss plans with her staff, and wants to induce change by force. All examples of 'bad' management, according to the narrator. After all, at the start she says that things got 'bad', and at the end she says 'That's not what I call the act of a good manager'.

The other concerns herself, or her perception of herself. She may regard herself as a 'good' manager for not having the bad qualities or or least being able to recognise them in others. Her hostile response predicates his 'goodness'.

We may apply the competences, as elicited by the survey (see above). For middle managers, key competences were identified as building effective teams, setting up procedures for service delivery, organising the service for use, understanding the needs of others, knowing how to achieve results, and knowing how to negotiate effectively. We can unpack these for this situation. There are
paradigmatic and competence differences between the narrator and X on a professional level, so that priorities about service delivery, and organising the service for use, are certain to vary. Beyond that, there are differences about what results to achieve and how to achieve them. It can be argued that X appears to fall short on the others, paying scant regard to teams and staff commitment and communication.

At the same time, we have been able to learn these things from another person, implicated enough to know the situation and issues well, and at the same time likely to recount them in a way likely to reveal their own perceptions and prejudices. Arguably, the free-flowing character of story, coupled with an expressive and confidential interview situation, can elicit something of the rich and complex mixture of 'fact' and 'mediated fact', and in this way yield for the researcher valuable ethnographic evidence from which prognostication about management, and generalisation about the knowledge and values of managers, can be made.

Conclusions

Beyond that still, lies a crucial further element, characteristic of the rich complexity of storying about effectiveness. Stories are told to readers and listeners who know that the plausibility or truth of things varies with the storyteller. Knowing what we do about effectiveness, craftsman/professionals and gamesman/politically competent managers, expertise and authority, and economic changes to the paradigm of library management, we have the duty to be ultimately careful about, as well as fascinated by, the de facto epistemic authority of the narrator. The epistemic authority may lie with her or him, but
It may lie with the alleged 'other' (like X in this story). It may lie between them.

Faced with this epistemic dilemma, the reader now is forced into the constructivistic task of interpreting the discourse and meanings presented here. Such a reader is as susceptible to the various elements of storying as is the narrator as he or she (the reader of this thesis or, by extension, of any managerial story) notices that the story he or she is reading or listening to is not just full of the details of the workplace, the behaviours and states of the characters, and broader issues about management and the organisation, but is also susceptible to 'interpretation' and idiosyncratic constructions of meaning. This can emerge in content (eg how the narrator's perception of events is represented) as well as in tone (eg ironic, laconic, confessional, self-enhancing).

Effectiveness is a pervasive concept in management. Its various meanings and roles have been examined in the specific field of library and information management. Under changing paradigms, its meaning (denotation and connotation) has taken on new applications in recent years. Often, practising managers instantiate their version of the concept of effectiveness in character-stereotypes (which we may regard as coming in the ambit of paradigms-within-paradigm) or incidents (which have been regarded here as stories or episodes). Managers are generally practical people and tend to represent abstract concepts like effectiveness in hard or applied terms, hence the emphasis on competences. It has proved possible to elicit some of the most highly and least regarded competences in the field of library management.

It has been argued that, under conditions of political/ideological change, professional views of the effective manager have undergone change too. An
experiential watershed for the professionals as a group can be seen in a parallel one for individual managers, as many of them reach positions where they are faced with promotion from professionals to generalists or where, in their career, they are faced with the dilemma of obsolescence.

It has also been noted that, when managers speak about effectiveness, they often use demotic terminology (like good or real) and embed valuational and experiential complexities into their analysis. They demonstrate a continuing tendency to reflect upon their own experiences, to tale-tell about their victories and defeats, to dispute the meanings that are commonly used in the domain of management and what these meanings mean when they are applied and then reflected upon.

It will be argued that the complexity of meaning and experience is represented by managers in various forms of discourse. These forms include the major concepts which managers use, how such concepts are used in propositional forms of knowledge, how routinised knowledge gets represented in the form of scripts, and finally how managers represent meanings and knowledge, beliefs and values through and in story-telling. Throughout the argument it is suggested that a major aspect of the validity for the managers themselves is the way in which these forms of discourse grow in and out of practical work experience. This means that the stories have an epistemic authority, for the narrators themselves and arguably in the context of ethnographic research.

*****
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PART 3

CHAPTER 6 : SECTION A

ABSTRACT

After discussing approaches to meanings and knowledge, ideology and discourse in Part 2, and, in chapter 5, conducting a survey of managers to find out what they mean when they speak about 'effectiveness', now we investigate what a sample cohort of managers mean when they call something in management 'good'. This, like 'real', is a popular synonym for 'effective' in the professional workplace.

This chapter tries to identify those characteristics which managers use in calling something 'good', and how they categorise the characteristics. Concepts of 'effectiveness' are elicited and organised by simple grouping methods.

Hypotheses, about 'good' managers believing that their effectiveness is 'above all' dependant upon using particular skills and qualities for the good of customers or users, are tested. It is concluded from the investigation that such managers appear to attribute greater weight to the efficiency required to attain effectiveness than to the effectiveness itself, and that the reputation for effectiveness is often looked for inside the organisation, rather than outside it. Implications for traditional and progressive, specialist and generalist managers are suggested.

The chapter suggests that such definition and organisation of the characteristics of 'good' managers can be assisted by identifying goals or aims which such managers know they have. Since management often involves doing things, this practical approach is reflected in the goal analysis applied here. This emphasises performances or observable activities, and readily lends itself to the analytical and reflective approach used in the elicitation of characteristics earlier in the chapter.

These methods are intended to illuminate the ideas and principles laid out earlier in the thesis and point forward to further tests in later chapters.
People who tell us that they don't know much about art but know what they like seem to have it all worked out. Good management is like this. It appears self-evident that a good manager will show qualities of leadership and technical ability, and probably know a great deal about customer needs and behaviours as well. In service sector organisations like hospitals, schools and libraries, the emphasis on the caring, client-orientated approach of the manager is clear. Even under conditions of change, where entrepreneurial factors are at work redefining this orientation, there is emphasis on customer or user satisfaction when ever 'effectiveness' examined.

Putting the user first

Literature on library management is full of the need for managers to know the community, put the user first, maximise accessibility to information,
optimise document delivery systems, ensure availability for people regardless of type, class, or creed. Library and information systems succeed, it is argued, if they make it easy and attractive for people to use them: the branch library with good opening hours, the academic library with helpful user education programmes, the database with user-friendly instructions on how to search and find information. Emphasis is placed, in training professional librarians, on skills and qualities to this end: handling inquiries well, understanding user needs and demands, indexing and arranging documents intelligibly, assisting novices to frame viable queries.

It is possible to speak of these practices and values as part of the ethos of the profession of library and information practitioners. They are built into the literature, and implicit and explicit in many of the statements and assumptions of people who work in these fields. It is logical to suggest, therefore, that good managers are regarded as good, and to the extent that, they prioritise the claims and active presence of their user communities.

It has been implied that any survey of this, among practising library and information managers, or among trainees, would reveal that. In public conversation, for instance, fellow-professionals tend to corroborate and underline views of this kind. As part of the consensual 'wisdom' of any professional cadre, the central position of the user appears to be firm, whether because it matters to managers to offer a high professional standard, or because the customers are ultimately the paymasters. Even when such conversations become litanies of complaints, many provocations for the complaints rest with users, perhaps not satisfied because their demands were unrealistic or because the service would ideally have liked to do much better for them.
Other managerial skills and activities

Implicit in this must be the view that, whatever the manager does, he or she should use a range of skills and activities to support service provision for the user. Such skills are regarded as very important, more and more as managers work their way up the professional ladder, and involve making decisions and handling problems.

These may be associated with staffing (e.g., recruitment, deployment, rotas and duties, job satisfaction, training and appraisal); with finance (e.g., constructing and arguing the budget, getting value for money); with collections and documents (e.g., stock selection, keeping collections safe and fresh, monitoring stock circulation effectively, devising and implementing effective indexing and cataloguing procedures); and with space and design (e.g., getting and using buildings and furniture, accommodating the conflicting needs of books and people in one space). These are some of the specialised managerial skills in library and information work, and managerial activities are those which ensure the skills have some appropriate outcome.

Much of a manager’s time is spent dealing with plans and schemes, weighing up alternatives, considering implications and strategies. There may be the departmental budgets to collate and send back for review, or the summer holiday staff rota to get agreed. There may be options for covering evening opening hours, or ensuring that an unfrozen post is advertised. There may be Jane to see about persistent lateness, John to appraise, and the increased costs of requests and inter-library loans to explain to committee. The decision-making and negotiating skills implicit in this range of managerial activities are clear.
Since managers often have many parishes, and are often technical specialists promoted into generalist administrative positions, this range of skills and activities would characterise managers in many other fields. A distinction has to be made here between the generalist manager and that professional who stays at the level of specialist (eg systems or children's or local studies librarian). The 'managers' discussed in this chapter are employees who have (or are or think they are about to) become generalists, leaving behind their exclusive duties associated with areas of professional expertise (like cataloguing, stock control, reader services and user education).

Testing views about good managers

We have discussed the widespread view in this field that managerial skill and activity should be directed towards making service provision sound for user groups. We have also considered the range of skills and activities covered by managers which have to be carried out competently if such service provision is to be achieved.

From this we might formulate a hypothesis that 'good' managers believe that their effectiveness is above all dependant upon using those skills and activities for the good of users. In turn, we might then consider a further hypothesis: that 'experts' (ie experienced professionals in the field) would, when asked, agree that that is so, if not in the case of themselves, then at least with most of the managers they knew. It was to test these two related hypotheses that this research was carried out and documented here.
The researcher conducted a pilot consisting of structured telephone interviews with five practitioners aimed to (a) identify reaction to the issues of effective management and (b) clarify ambiguities of layout and language. Then ten experts (excluding the pilot five) were selected by the researcher on the grounds that they were experienced practitioners with a reputation for integrity and professionalism. The five pilot and ten survey experts held middle management positions in a representative range of library and information services (public, academic, special, and school).

The basis of knowing that they were known was that of having (a) served with repute as managers in the field for at least ten years and/or (b) published material on management in the field which indicated their serious concern about and commitment to the operation and application of management approaches in the workplace. There were six responses, numbered here 1 to 6.

The respondents were invited to complete an exercise called 'Characteristics of a good manager'. Simple fill-in sheets were posted, with explanatory correspondence. Respondents were invited concisely to fill in five such characteristics in spaces provided. Confidentiality and anonymity were assured. Responses given below reveal the structure of the exercise.

Respondents were asked to use natural language (not technical jargon or colloquialism), ie to express their views in linguistic formulations which were undirected and spontaneous, and to make each response clear in its own right (ie not elliptical or too localised to the workplace to be intelligible to an outsider). Formal propositional statements (eg. 'A good manager will be one who gets staff to work well with them'), or even more elaborate forms of discussion, were tacitly discouraged by the layout of the sheet. In this way, an attempt was made both to elicit natural meanings from
respondents and yet validly and reliably control the parameters under which responses were formulated.

Respondents were asked not to rank their answers in order of priority or perceived effectiveness, though the extent of unconscious ranking in the answers cannot be known. They were asked to fill the form in quickly, not using second thoughts or burning the midnight oil, and send it back to the researcher. In this way, there was a reliance on the validity of eliciting spontaneously provoked knowledge and attitudes. It was assumed that the assurance of anonymity, and the overt character of the exercise, contributed to the honesty of the responses. Responses are shown in Table 6.

Classifying characteristics by category

These data were then subjected to several forms of analysis. First, simple clustering of the concepts was carried out. This involved gathering the responses into thematic clusters. The choice of clusters can lack reliability if wholly researcher-generated, and so, in order to provide reliability for this part of the testing instrument, the original five pilot experts were invited, in a separate manoeuvre, to supply three concise categories under which, in their view, managerial qualities could be classified. Responses are shown in Table 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Respondent 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Respondent 2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ability to relate to users</td>
<td>1. organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. knows what makes people work well</td>
<td>2. consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. stable temperament</td>
<td>3. able to make tough decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. good judgement</td>
<td>4. able to work under pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. realistic view of one's self</td>
<td>5. commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Respondent 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Respondent 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. has good information</td>
<td>1. politically astute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. encourages the trust of staff</td>
<td>2. good with money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. technical knowledge</td>
<td>3. up-to-date with techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. helpful to users</td>
<td>4. able to meet deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. good team member</td>
<td>5. able to inspire staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Respondent 5</strong></th>
<th><strong>Respondent 6</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. good leader</td>
<td>1. uses modern ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. creative thinking</td>
<td>2. ability to delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. able to get things done</td>
<td>3. an achiever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. calm under stress</td>
<td>4. knows what users need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. well-trained in professional methods</td>
<td>5. ability to anticipate change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: Characteristics of a 'good' manager**
Expert 1

1. people skills
2. things/processes skills
3. ideas skills

Expert 2

1. materials
2. money
3. people (users & staff)

Expert 3

1. providing for community
2. getting library running smoothly
3. looking to the future

Expert 4

1. making decisions
2. sorting out problems
3. getting staff with you

Expert 5

1. organisation of services
2. management of staff
3. management of self

Table 7: Categories for characteristics of a 'good' manager
These expert category suggestions were collated so as to bring out closest similarities in one amalgamated set. Common to all responses was the notion of managing entities. These could be sub-divided into managing people (i.e. staff), managing things (i.e. materials, money, services, the library), and managing things for people (i.e. users). The middle category of managing things could be sub-divided into abstract (e.g. ideas, skills, looking to the future) and concrete (e.g. things/processes, skills, making decisions, materials, money).

The arrangement is protean in the senses that (a) each category is inter-dependent with every other, (b) a perspective shift (e.g. if we were to visualise management from a dominantly user viewpoint) would induce changes in the arrangement, and (c) modifications to the configuration would have to be made with further responses.

The entire array is represented in Figure 1.

Now we have established working categories for the original responses on what characterises a 'good' manager, it is possible to organise the characteristics provided, by the six (of the ten) respondents in the formal exercise, under those categories. This is demonstrated in Table 2.

We are able to examine these findings in the following manner. It is possible, first of all, to consider the distribution of the responses: managing people 6, managing things (abstract) 11, managing things (concrete) 10, and managing things for people 3. Without further analysis, this would encourage us to re-examine the hypothesis that 'good' managers believed that their effectiveness is above all dependent upon using their skills and activities for the good of users.
Figure 1: Array of categories for classifying a 'good' manager
Managing people (staff)

1.2 knows what makes people work well
2.2 encourages the trust of staff
3.1 good leader
5.5 able to inspire staff
6.2 ability to delegate
2.5 good team member

Managing things

Abstract

1.4 good judgement
4.1 organised
4.2 consistent
4.5 commitment
1.3 stable temperament
3.4 calm under stress
1.5 realistic view of one's self

[Note: the numbers refer to respondents 1-6 and their responses 1-5]
3.2 creative thinking
6.1 uses modern ideas
6.5 ability to anticipate change

Concrete

3.3 able to get things done
6.3 an achiever
5.4 able to meet deadlines
4.4 able to work under pressure
4.3 able to make tough decisions

3.5 well-trained in professional methods
2.3 technical knowledge
5.3 up-to-date with techniques
5.2. good with money
5.1 politically astute
2.1 has good information

Managing things for people (users)

6.4 knows what users need
2.4 helpful to users
1.1 ability to relate to users

Table 8: Characteristics of a 'good' manager by category
We should also consider the second hypothesis that experts, when asked, would agree that it really was so, for them and for most of the managers they knew, that 'good' managers believed that their effectiveness was above all dependant upon using those skills and activities for the good of users.

Only three responses refer directly to users, while as many as twenty-seven referred to those managerial skills and activities which existed to serve the major aim of user service. This suggests that effectiveness appears to be focussed on what steps of efficiency need to be taken in order to ensure effective service for users, rather than directly upon effective impact on users in its own right.

This implies that, on the evidence in this exercise, both hypotheses are by no means proven. This is because the respondents appear to place so much emphasis on the 'means' (ie efficiency) to achieve the 'ends' (ie effective service to users). It is clear that many 'good' managers evaluate their 'goodness' not only (and certainly not 'above all') in terms of the impact of their products and services on users but also in terms of internal ('technocratic' in the Galbraithian sense) organisational processes and procedures. In no sense, apparently, is it clear that they regard their goodness in terms of the good of users 'above all' (as the first hypothesis stipulates).

In ethnographic analysis like this, in the interests of reliability the researcher should ask about the extent to which responses from experts about characteristics of the 'good' manager might be influenced, in the manner of the Hawthorne effect, by the structure of the testing instrument itself. As explained above, efforts were made to constrain undue distortion of results by building in the pilot for two key organising strategies, and by enabling
respondents in the main part of the exercise to operate flexibly and interpretatively within the overall structure (which itself drew on understandings about what they would think, and how, in the work environment).

We may argue that, at no time at all, were respondents led to suppose that the questions and answers were directed at anything other than the pragmatic truths of the workplace. All the respondents were experts in their own right, familiar with management as an activity both theoretical and practical, and an activity which drew its reality above all from being 'done'. By this token, therefore, it is fair to allege a close relationship between the truth conditions of the workplace and those of the research investigation.

Managing people

Turning to the detailed arrangements of characteristics under categories in Table 8, we see that a thematic cluster emerged under 'managing people [staff]'. Of the six entries there, five refer to the exercise of leadership: knowing what makes people work well, encouraging staff to trust you, being a good leader tout court, being able to inspire staff, and to delegate. Related, but significantly outnumbered, is the characteristic of being a good team member. Commentary on this might include the suggestion that, where five out of six entries of managing people relate directly to leadership, the respondents reveal a strong perceived relationship between the concept of managing people and that of leadership.
Moreover, there appears to be doubt about the wisdom for a good manager of becoming a good team member. This may reflect the ostensible consensus that managing people should consist more of leading them than being one of them, and may in turn reflect a hierarchical mentality, and even experience of working in hierarchical organisations. The aetiology of such views could itself be investigated through localised organisational research, and suggests how important are the teleological ('ends-means') aspects of managerial thinking (to be developed by later chapters).

It may arise also through the paradigmatic difference noted by Raelin (Raelin, 1985-6) and other writers between general managers and professionals. This argument suggests that in many professional work milieux, such as that in a law partnership, a corporate doctor's practice, or an academic department in a university, the exercise and perception of authority is based on professional expertise rather than organisation-given status, and makes for more negotiated power and flatter decision-making structures. It is even possible that in such settings power resides in knowledge and expertise rather than in bureaucratic position.

Managing things

Examining the category 'managing things', the rationale of the distinction between abstract and concrete is that a qualitative difference appears between 'qualities' (like 'good judgement' or to be 'calm under stress') which a good manager may have, and 'activities' (like being 'up-to-date with techniques' or 'good with money'). Between these poles, as it were, it is possible to see a gradualistic spectrum, since qualities are inferrable in
circumstances where they are used, and examples of where they are used predicate the existence of the qualities. This being so, the concepts have been arranged so as to represent this. Further research on the arrangement of characteristics might reveal important information about conceptual boundaries between abstract and concrete.

A striking feature of this part of the analysis is the extent to which respondents were prepared to characterise good management by reference to the management of things. In all, 21 characteristics have been classified in this position. Of these, a number are generalised or abstract qualities like good judgement and commitment. It is interesting that respondents were prepared to admit to thinking about the good manager using abstract or pervasive characteristics such as these.

It may be argued that some of the other characteristics could be said to exemplify these characteristics (eg 'good judgement' is needed if a manager is to make tough decisions, while 'commitment' is required if he is to inspire staff). We may add to that the general inter-dependence of characteristics: eg in order to exercise good judgement to make good decisions, a manager needs good information, political acumen, and the trust of his staff. In the same way, characteristics like consistency and being organised are valuable in and prerequisite for effective working under pressure and meeting deadlines, and dependent on being well-trained in professional methods and up-to-date with techniques.

In view of the number of characteristics from the respondents, and in their close compatibility, it is fair to infer a degree of revealed consensus between the respondents over what constitutes a good manager. Such a manager
is able to get things done, keep calm under pressure, and come up with good relevant ideas. There is a mixture of nature and nurture in such a manager, some temperamental qualities like stability, cognitive qualities like good judgement, and imaginative qualities like creative thinking being somehow there 'in' the manager, and others (like proper training, effective access to information, and political and financial skills) developed in and through his working life as a manager.

We can infer from this composite view of the good manager what respondents regard not only what is important for such an employee to have but also what such an employee might most typically encounter in his work as a manager. These include situations where systematic and calm thinking are needed, where deadlines are common, where getting behind with information and expertise is disabling. A 'bad' manager will therefore be unable to cope with situations like these.

The position of users

Finally, there is the category 'managing things for people'. We should remind ourselves of the fact that the people here refer to users, ostensibly the major reason for managers to be there. This category has received a mere three entries. Its position at the end has no unusual significance: it could as easily come at the start.

Another important feature to note is the alignment of the characteristics, all from the manager's point of view: it is the manager who, after all, will make professional claims to know what the user needs (which may, and
arguably should, coincide with what the user wants); and it is the manager who will set out to be helpful to users, having been socialised in the professional value system to believe that, and make claims that he relates to the user well.

This interestingly coincides with perspectives adopted by many professional cadres (eg nurses, police, social workers, teachers) about their client groups. It could point to tribal (eg normative knowledge and attitudes, as well as boundary-defining between groups and insiders and oursiders) social conditioning at work, or to perspectives absorbed in training (eg coaching or mentoring on ways of dealing with the customer and letting them know that an understanding of effectiveness entails understanding the customer’s needs and perceptions).

We return once again to two hypotheses about 'good' managers being or thinking themselves so in as much as they handle services and products for the benefit of users, and find ourselves in a better position than before to evaluate their plausibility. From the investigation into what managers regard as characteristics of a good manager, classified under categories which have a measure of consensual authority and research reliability, we are able to argue that the first hypothesis can be accepted and the second rejected.

The first argued that 'good' managers believed that their effectiveness was 'above all' dependant upon using their skills for the good of users, and the second that this approach was characteristic of the good managers they knew. Yet from this evidence the respondents revealed that their major preoccupations hinged on getting the management of the 'system' right, and that, whatever the derived effect of that activity in terms of impact on and
benefit for users, the organisational dimension was often uppermost in their minds. It appears from this evidence that experts hold the view that goodness or effectiveness has at least, or even primarily, to be seen in terms of one's effect on and within the organisation (say, to peers, competitors, bosses).

It may be possible to suggest that here lies one of the reasons why managers are (a) regarded as good or bad by their peers, and (b) good or bad performers in relation to customer care. It points forward, too, to an argument made later in the thesis: that many managers are arguably effective or not, or see themselves or each other as so, to the extent to which they are able to escape from the constraints of traditional knowledge and attitude paradigms. This challenge exists for all managers at times of change, like the current situation, and in particular for middle managers moving from positions of specialist to generalist manager.

Tolerance of ambiguity in paradigms

Assumptions have been made in this discussion which should now be made clear. One is that groups of professionals, at any period in history, may be said to hold certain knowledge (about what is worth knowing and how new information should be found) and values/beliefs in common. This may be typified by the professional values and systems of accreditation held by bodies like doctors, accountants, teachers and librarians. These are never fixed, because new ideas emerge to reformulate the way things are done and thought about, and because there is often controversy or ideological conflict between fellow-professionals. At times, there is a profound shift
in the way people know and think about things, exemplified most strikingly
by the effects of the Copernican way of looking at the universe, Darwin's
way of looking at evolution, and Einstein's view of physics and matter.

And so it is characteristic of knowledge, as held by groups like this, or by
society as a whole, to undergo change, to entertain divergent views, and to
tolerate degrees of ambiguity. It is possible, for example, for modern men
and women to accept, at the same time, a world of chance and the existence
of miracles. Similarly, it is possible for us to see the United States as
both aggressor and upholder of freedom, to see big business as a multiplier
in the economy and a conspiracy against personal freedom, to see our own
jobs as both enablers and constraints. At this last level, we are more in
the domain of localised knowledge than knowledge paradigms, but nevertheless
the tolerance or ambiguity is essential for human beings trying to make
sense of meanings.

Implications for library management

In the context of library management, this tolerance of ambiguity arises
when we confront the apparent contradiction between two points. First, that
professional library managers tend to assert the central importance of the
user. Second, that, from research such as this, the underlying 'truth'
appears to be that managers are preoccupied with efficiency (doing things
right, making sure the organisation works) rather than with effectiveness
(doing the right thing, making sure the organisation impacts upon its
community).
No value judgement should be made at this point, either about which a library manager should set as his target, or about the respondents who appear to have revealed or discovered the contradiction. What it might point to is the perennial way in which professionals make public claims, and believe them themselves in all sincerity. But how, in the day-to-day pragmatism which is what most managers grapple with, rather more introverted concerns dominate, that Galbraithian premise that technocrats work ultimately to keep themselves in work.

It may not be as Machiavellian as this. After all, most management deals with the making of products or provision of services for customers or clients. Much of this necessarily involves work on design, production and distribution; much of it deals with the financial consequences of alternatives, in the future and the past, and with persuading others, above and below, to follow certain behaviours or adopt certain attitudes. Because of this, there is bound to be a decoupling between actual and ostensible work, between what is done and what is preached, between practice and theory.

In focussed terms for this research, we may wish to highlight some central conclusions before moving on to some practical implications for staff analysis and training. It is always useful for professionals in any field to re-examine their practices, knowledge base, and values and beliefs. This research exercise has explored one way in which this might be done. The process of eliciting information from respondents has been deliberately kept simple, so that it can be regarded as feasible in the action-based research which is all most managers can achieve. There are wider ramifications, as we have seen, in terms of the ways in which professionals regard 'goodness' in
managers, and appear to tolerate contradictory viewpoints on what good
managers are there to achieve.

Implications for staff analysis

Throughout the discussion it has been assumed that the instruments at the
researcher's hand consist of concepts in various forms. One form consists of
labels (eg that a good manager has 'commitment' or is 'an achiever').
Another is a phrase or ellipsis of a statement (eg 'able to get things done'
or 'has good information'). These resulted from the instruction to
respondents to be concise, and in the survey form from the provision of
concise spaces for answers. At the same time, no linguistic or semantic
restriction was placed on responses (eg that they should be adjectives, or
abstract qualities, or concrete abilities). By chance, no negative entries
appeared, probably due to the cast of the survey in which good
characteristics were sought rather than bad ones denied.

Ways in which characteristics and qualities are verbalised are legion. The
diversity of demotic as well as professional discourse makes devising and
interpreting such codes very difficult. Increasingly too, there is a trend
towards the expression of activities in terms of characteristics. Examples
range from the competences or objectives advocated as ways of defining
learning objectives in education to the qualities regarded as essential or
desirable in a new recruit in personnel selection. The reader is referred
back to Chapter 5 for an analysis of professional competences.
This emphasis on characteristics and qualities is useful when managers are involved in job analysis and description. Here, jobs are defined in terms of their constituent tasks and areas of responsibility. An assumption is made that a competent post-holder will possess particular qualities (e.g., be able to use a computer, drive a car, operate a lathe, teach French to a class, play the cello, work with other people, report back to superiors, observe time-keeping). All these are observable characteristics. They might be called performances because they are activities which are directly visible or assessable. From them, observers can infer knowledge and attitudes, beliefs and values.

Staff performances

An employee's performances can be illustrated when we look at a librarian working in a reference library. Let us call her Anne. We see her handling reference materials and directories to answer users' questions. We see her interrogating a database to get information on books and articles published recently on the poll-tax in Scotland. We see her directing readers to sources in family history so that they can explore their ancestors. All these are observable behaviours or performances. They can not only be seen but assessed too. If Anne's supervisor were standing by, she could see how well Anne did these tasks. They are accompanied by performative discourse (e.g., instructions, requests, expressions of preferences, disclosures of information).

Assessment profiles can be devised using criteria drawing on characteristics such as knowledge, speed, and courtesy. Specific tasks or encounters can be
observed and assessed: for instance, the way Anne dealt with an irate reader, or showed good judgement by asking a more knowledgeable colleague, or how reliable was the information she was able to supply from a work of reference.

These performances may be simple or complex. They are component tasks in Anne’s job. A job analysis may have identified them. Anne’s pattern of work may be being examined in order to create a job analysis, itself a basis for a job description. Many tasks will subsume other tasks: for instance, reporting to her supervisor will include a range of cognitive and attitudinal tasks for Anne.

In this, it may be difficult to differentiate between those ‘external’ tasks which Anne successfully or unsuccessfully fulfils in that situation, and those ‘internal’ characteristics which she shows there. These characteristics may be cognitive (eg she is knowledgeable and a bit of a know-all, she is unsure of her knowledge and therefore diffident) or attitudinal (eg she may be highly motivated to impress, she may regard her job as a waste of time, she may dislike the supervisor).

Some of these performances will be explicit. If she gives a good clear account of what she does when inquiries for information about local doctors are made, or if she muddles up the account completely, both will be plain to see. Some of the performances, particularly those associated with attitude and belief, however, will remain implicit or entirely hidden. Anne may successfully hide her dislike of the supervisor, or her view that the job is boring. These feelings may emerge, eg through her body language or tone of voice or choice of words. They may as well be intangible by a skilled and intuitive supervisor, they may be not.
For this, and at this stage, the research procedure sought to examine and consider the findings from the concepts exercise in terms of the practical performances of a typical professional (specialist) manager in library and information work. In this way, it would be possible both to provide a commentary on, and context for, the ideas from the concept exercise, and also root these ideas in actual events in the workplace.

The assumption was made that it was useful and possible to exteriorise characteristics of, say, a good manager, a good reference librarian, a woman such as Anne, known as she is to numerous people she works with and for. In the case of the good manager, we draw not only on any parochial and idiosyncratic information about any particular job or person, but more generically on information from experts or practitioners (at ANY level!). We can investigate characteristics associated with good and bad practice, and with knowledge or attitude or value/belief areas within that practice. Any one of these factors can be built into action-based research in a library and information service, or indeed any management situation.

Goal analysis

An important part of exteriorising the characteristics involves being open, or finding ways or encouraging staff to be so. Goal analysis, a set of techniques originally devised by Robert Mager, the authority of instructional objectives, will be utilised as a way of demonstrating how this can be achieved.
Mager illustrates a 'goal' with examples like 'develop successful industrial relations' (if you are a company) or 'develop awareness of children's potential' (if you are a teacher) or 'be a good citizen' (if you are yourself). Goals include performances, which are observable activities, and attitudes and beliefs. He admits that attitudes are less easy to observe than are performances, but nevertheless they can be inferred from circumstances.

He suggests five steps can be taken to apply goal analysis. First, write down the goal, however vague it seems. It might seek to express what a good manager might do. It might be the goal of a library itself, perhaps that of 'providing information, education, and recreation for the community' or operating a quality assurance programme for customer service. Goals are broad, and some writers term them mission statements. They are distinguished from objectives, which tend to have more focus in space and time: eg 'our objective is to increase the computer stock in the school library within the current academic year'.

In goal analysis, it is important from the start to involve key personnel. They might be a group of supervisors, or the team or 'family' segment of staff involved in providing the service under investigation. Mager states that they should be encouraged to write down things which 'you would want someone to say or do to cause you to agree that he represents the goal'. These 'things' are performances. For instance, if the goal is to appreciate music, then one performance would be the regular playing of a musical instrument. In management, the goal might be to improve on service delivery to users, and a performance might be to finish work on time. His question is: 'What performances do you want to see to convince you your goal is achieved?'.
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Such performances can be positive or negative. They may also be purely psycho-motor (ie push a lever every five minutes), cognitive or affective, or mixtures of these. Examples like 'report safety hazards', when the goal is to make employees more safety conscious, might entail a mixture of knowledge, behaviour, and attitude, even though some of these, particularly attitude, might only be intangible from observed behaviour.

The next step is to sort out the list, crossing out repetitions and organising the items, say, from abstract to concrete, separating goals from performances, and discriminating between types of performances. Then 'make coherent statements to describe what you intend for each of the performances on the list': eg these should make it clear what outcomes must be achieved in order for you to say your goal has been achieved. In the musical example, a goal such as 'to appreciate music' is both defined and tested by performances like 'plays an instrument regularly'.

It is important that there is a focus on a manageable area of work. It should not be too broad. The focus in this research was that of the goodness of the manager. It could quite as easily have been 'what makes a reference library manager "good"?' or 'what would be regarded as a "good" circulation procedure for journals?'. Being focused in this way is necessary because a number of people are involved and the process of elicitation, elimination, and agreement is complex and can be time-consuming. Yet it is essential that people in the workplace take part, because then (a) they feel that they have been included, and (b) the goal and the performances are perceived as relevant to their situation.

For his goal of making staff security conscious, Mager cites typical performances as when an employee (a) does not leave sensitive documents
lying about and (b) locks filing cabinets when he is off the premises. Both these are observable and assessable (ie he can be watched, reminded, warned, encouraged). Then, managers can get an idea of how security conscious staff actually are, and find ways of keeping it that way or improving it.

Concept analysis and goal analysis

It may at first sight appear to be a leap from concepts to goals and performances, and from the research analysis of how people think to the practicalities of what staff actually do. But it is not a leap: it is a continuum.

The process of defining goals and then performances can only be achieved by hard thought. It presents the participants (supervisors and other employees, researcher and respondents, lecturer and students) with the challenge of defining the target and remit of inquiry: the goal of goal analysis, the over-arching topic (of the 'good' manager) in the research. It then invites us to put into words, however inexpertly or subjectively, those component parts which contribute to the achievement of the goal. In goal analysis, these are performances. In concept analysis, they are the items elicited from the respondents, organised into the categories provided by the experts. In both procedures, the participants have knowledge of the procedures and issues referred to by the analysis, and take an active part in formulating both the answers and their structure.
Methodologically, too, there are similarities. The stages through which goal analysis proceeds consist of (a) putting up the information, (b) refining and discussing it, (c) organising it, and (d) agreeing to implement it.

These stages are similar in the form of concept analysis used here, in which respondents were asked to put up the information (about the 'good' manager), and to supply a way of organising it. Different was the way in which the researcher carried out the refining, although discussion could have taken place if versions had been refined and reformulated with respondents, face to face or more remotely.

The outcome was similar, too, in that, working from the assumption that respondents took part knowingly and willingly, supplied information on matters they knew a lot about, and organised it in ways which they were able to assert was lifelike, outcomes were reached which they were intimately party to, and which arguably they were prepared to accept as workable.

Practical research could be extended on this last dimension of the investigation, the extent to which, having carried out the concept analysis, it is possible to get practising managers to incorporate findings like this into programmes of staff review and training.

Conclusion

This chapter has concentrated on ways of getting and using information in research and work situations. An attempt has been made, by linking concept and goal analysis, to suggest that the methods used in both are complementary and useful as a method of getting managers to look at their
work, express their views about work, define the key elements and objectives of it, and reflect upon their knowledge about it.

It has been argued that both techniques, in their examination of observable and hidden aspects of meaning, are useful for practising managers. Such meanings make their presence felt not just in the domain of managerial thinking but at the sharp end of management when people come to define their goals, agree on what skills and activities and attitudes matter at work, and make decisions.

The approaches explored in this are applicable at any level and across levels of an organisation, and in many spheres of management, profit and non-profit, production and service sector. In trying to get meanings out on to the table, where they can be seen and reviewed by everyone concerned, it may be claimed that they offer a revealing insight into the practice and meaning of management.
This section of chapter 6 is devoted to finding out what qualities junior managers in library and information work attribute to a 'good' supervisor. The purpose of the test is to identify further aspects of managerial 'effectiveness' and examine implications for further ethnographic research in this area of management.

Concepts or characteristics of the 'good' supervisor were elicited from the respondents, first, working individually, and, second, working as a group. The findings were identified and organised, weighted responses were elicited and reviewed, and then the information was classified and presented through the use of semantic differential analysis.

The findings were then considered comparatively, and individual and group (or consensual) meanings and knowledge discussed. It is suggested that the results highlight both diversity and conjunction of meanings and viewpoints on central characteristics of the effective manager. They also shed light on the deeper paradigmatic and ideological aspects of professional meanings and knowledge indicated in introductory chapters of the thesis.

Finally, it is argued that further information is required, this time about people approaching management ideas and practice for the first time, the task of chapter 7, the remaining chapter in Part 3; and about more elusive aspects of practitioner meanings and knowledge, such as those gathered by examining scripts and stories, the task of Part 4.
Managers are busy people. But not too busy to be interested in what makes a good manager. This is not as self-evident as management textbooks imply. Each person develops an idea of what seems to work in particular situations, and how mistakes can be made. Books about the success formula in management are full of qualities which need to be developed to get to the top.

This section of Chapter six investigates what managers think good management actually is. Its aims are to elicit, from a sample of junior managers in libraries, information on what qualities they perceived a good manager to have. It then aims to examine (a) the extent to which there was a compatibility between their views, and (b) the extent to which their responses were different when, first, they answered individually and then, second, they answered in a group.

We argue that (a) it is important to find ways of eliciting information from busy practitioners on how they see themselves, and (b) such practitioners reveal different viewpoints when interviewed individually as opposed to in a group. It is suggested that such differences derive from the pressures of group-think or a consensuality implicit in any professional elite.
The suggestion is made that decision-making, when examined in this way, reveals the extent to which apparent accept/reject dichotomies (ie when managers think in terms of 'yes-no' or 'example-non-example' polarities) hide a complex variety of viewpoints and preferences.

Research design

The plan was to design a tightly-focussed piece of action research of the type which would achieve these research objectives and at the same time be the kind of research which a busy manager could apply in the middle of his or her various duties. This secondary parameter was built into the plan on the grounds that participating managers would understand the exercise, sympathise with it, regard it as 'true' and 'real', and therefore respond in valid and reliable ways. Assumptions were made that (a) the manager was able to get the trust and cooperation of the other participating managers, and (b) the organisation in which the managers worked was large enough to allow for a valid random sample.

In this case, thirty-five junior managers (ie librarians working in professional posts, in all kinds of library, either with fewer than five years' experience or at levels at or below A.P.III or its equivalent) were identified. All were working in or near the Aberdeen area. From this sample, randomly, three were approached to pilot the testing instrument. After modifications were made, ten more members of the identified sample were approached at random with the revised test. Five agreed to take part.

The procedure consisted of the following stages:
(1) design of research instrument, namely

(a) form asking for five qualities which respondents claimed to admire in supervisors (this term was defined as 'managers in charge of at least ten FTE members of staff')

(b) form using 15 most-recurring qualities as factors for a weighting analysis

(c) form using weighted qualities as factors in a semantic differential analysis

(2) the dissemination of the research instrument to respondents so that each respondent worked independently on each of the three stages, without knowing what other respondents were saying, apart from anything which may have been inferrable from the forms.

(3) the gathering and analysis of the data from these stages and their presentation as findings.

(4) the use of forms (b) and (c) with respondents now working as a group, in order to elicit (i) information about the order of factors, (ii) information about the group rating of the factors.
Respondents were asked in the 'individual' stages to work completely independently. The time frame of the procedures was as follows: form asking for qualities (from sending it out to receipt of answers) five working days; analysis and amalgamation of data from this form one day; form using factors for weighting analysis (from sending it out to receipt of answers) ten days; integration of factors with weights on to form (one day); form using weighted qualities as factors in a semantic differential analysis (from sending it out to receipt of answers) twenty working days; analysis of data, time left for memory of exercise to fade among respondent managers, invitations [memos] to respondents to meet as a group (from sending out to agreement on a day, five days) (25 days in all); meeting for one hour during which respondents discussed and filled in a new form (c); final analysis of findings.

The determination of qualities

When managers, or indeed non-managers, are asked what qualities managers should or should not have, it is important to decide in advance what form the researcher wants the answers to take. Answers can readily take the form of anecdotes, intended to illustrate particular qualities like risk-taking or tenacity. At the other extreme, it is possible to ask for concepts, which may take the form of adjectives, like 'decisive' or 'participative'. In between come phrases (like 'gets things done' or 'leads from the front') and propositions (like 'he is good because he tries to get the commitment from the staff' or 'I feel that he really listens to your point of view').

In this research, simple adjectives, nouns or verbs were used. This choice was based on two assumptions: first, that busy managers would find this method
most accessible, and second, that there is a general familiarity with such descriptors in management documentation (eg interviewing and appraisal documentation). An additional reason was that the descriptors were to be gathered, amalgamated in terms of meanings, and later re-evaluated: being simple and concise was regarded as a valid way of guarding against undue ambiguity arising because respondents misunderstood purpose and instructions.

The first part of the research instrument was a form designed to get respondent managers to record five qualities they admired in supervisors. The results are shown in Table 9.

With this information, it was then possible to draw out the major concepts. The intention was to find fifteen concepts which comprehensively reflected the major emphases of these free-recorded viewpoints. The fifteen concepts were then to be used in the second part of the research instrument, Form (b). These concepts are represented in Table 10.

Weighting the qualities

It is one thing to elicit the qualities which managers appear to 'good' supervisors. But this needs to be taken further so as to reflect the weight which managers attribute to the different qualities. Some will matter more than others. Here, too, the managers concerned all worked in library and information services, where, arguably, sets of qualities might differ in kind or emphasis from those traditionally working in business (eg in terms of working for profit). No particularised distinction was made between supervisory qualities essential or desirable for specific types of work in libraries (eg handling
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager 1</th>
<th>Manager 2</th>
<th>Manager 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. know-how</td>
<td>1. experienced</td>
<td>1. up-to-date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. consistent</td>
<td>2. involves others</td>
<td>2. fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. fair</td>
<td>3. trustworthy</td>
<td>3. solves problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. good humour</td>
<td>4. decisive</td>
<td>4. likeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. trouble-shooter</td>
<td>5. knows his job</td>
<td>5. young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager 4</th>
<th>Manager 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. knows things</td>
<td>1. doesn't flap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. fair to staff</td>
<td>2. can make hard decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. democratic</td>
<td>3. team builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. can be trusted</td>
<td>4. sense of fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. light touch</td>
<td>5. street-wise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Managerial qualities admired in supervisors
1. fair
2. democratic
3. handles pressure
4. sympathetic
5. imaginative
6. decisive
7. gets results
8. modern
9. hard worker
10. consistent
11. team builder
12. problem-solver
13. knowledgeable
14. experienced
15. sense of humour

Table 10: Concepts representing viewpoints of respondents
routines, dealing with staff, planning for the future), and an assumption was made that many of these qualities were central enough to be regarded as generic.

Having amalgamated the qualities supplied by the managers into one list of fifteen concepts, it is now possible to elicit the weights which managers are willing to attribute to each one. The way in which this was accomplished is described here.

Each manager was asked to allocate 50 units to the 15 concepts. This could be done in any combination of '1,2,3,4 and 5', but the total had to be 50 units. The results from this stage of the research were collated in the manner indicated in Table 11.

A number of interesting inferences can be drawn from these data, before we move on to use them further. Above all, five distinct profiles of the 'good' supervisor emerge.

Manager 1 emphasises getting things done, being modern and decisive, and handling pressure. His perception of the supervisor is that of someone mainly task-orientated.

Manager 2 emphasises people skills. We might notice the high allocations given for qualities like a democratic (ie participative management) style of leadership, team building skills, experience, a sense of humour, and imagination.

Manager 3 places greatest stress on being hard-working, consistent and democratic. High weightings, too, go to qualities like experience, knowledge, and sympathy (ie an empathetic way of dealing with staff problems). The profile of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. democratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. handles pressure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. sympathetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. imaginative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. decisive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. gets results</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. modern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. hard worker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. consistent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. team builder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. problem-solver</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. knowledgeable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. experienced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. sense of humour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UNITS</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11: Weighted analysis of qualities of 'goodness'*
the 'good' supervisor in the mind of Manager 3 appears to be somewhere between those of Managers 1 and 2, combining task- and people-orientated management styles. These approaches to leadership and management style, influenced by the work of writers like Belbin and Blake & Mouton, are widely recognised in practice and in the management literature.

Manager 4 emphasises getting results, being decisive, hard work and team building, associating these qualities with being modern (young? - compare Chapter 7), and soft-pedalling qualities like experience and fairness.

Manager 5 appears to reveal a confused profile, stressing fairness and participative approaches, but also rating decisiveness high. The spread of allocated weights for this manager appears to suggest that he is prepared to regard most of the qualities as desirable, but is reluctant to let getting results undermine a pleasant interpersonal atmosphere in the workplace.

Conclusions from the weighting analysis

From this analysis, we are able to say that already we are getting a glimpse into the explicit and assumptive beliefs of the five managers interviewed. The extent to which we can infer the existence of preferred models of the good supervisor could be the subject of further research. However, from the findings here, three points of importance may be noted:

(1) that the polarity between task- and people-orientation, common in many analyses in the workplace, is evident here;
(2) that there appear to be divergent emphases between the respondents; and

(3) that it is possible to detect explicit and implicit features in the analysis.

It is with the last of these points in mind that we can continue this analysis one more step. If we look at the average weightings, a rank order (high to low) can be found. The highest rated qualities are:

1= consistent
1= team builder
3= modern
3= experienced
5 problem-solver

We may conclude from this that a consensual profile could be built up containing these qualities. Such a supervisor would combine task and people skills. Such a supervisor would also, interestingly, cut across the apparent age distinction implied by Managers 3 (who emphasised experience) and 4 (who emphasised being modern). The 'ideal composite' emerging appears to combine experience with being up-to-date.

Lowest rated qualities are also of interest. These were (from lowest upwards) being imaginative, then being sympathetic, having a sense of humour, and getting results. From this we may conclude that being imaginative is viewed as rather
unrealistic, not 'having one's feet on the ground', 'being too theoretical': if
that is indeed so, practical busy managers may well distrust its effects in the
workplace.

Almost paradoxically, there appears to be a low rating for two highly people-
orientated qualities (sympathy and a sense of humour) and one highly task-
orientated quality (getting results). It may be that it is believed that
sympathy can be taken too far, can intrude in a personal way on relationships
and tasks in the workplace. It may be that a sense of humour might be regarded
as frivolous or even unprofessional.

It may also be that there is a distrust of getting results if that is decoupled
from a fully-rounded management style. All these need further detailed
investigation. It may even be, given evidence like this, that something of the
'librarian's perceived self-stereotype' is emerging. More on this will be
investigated later when we consider the alleged effects of group-think on the
views of the managers.

Semantic differential analysis using weighted qualities

The third part of the research instrument involved getting respondents to
participate in completing a semantic differential exercise. This used the
weighted qualities from the second part of the research instrument. Results were
gathered and analysed.

In Table 12 data are brought together from this analysis. Qualities with average
weights are listed. The responses from the five managers have been collated on
Table 12: Semantic differential analysis of scores of five managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Av weight</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handles pressure</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sympathetic</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imaginative</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisive</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gets results</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modern</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard worker</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team builder</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem-solver</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experienced</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense of humour</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[key: ——— = Manager 1 ———— = Manager 2 ———— = Manager 3 ———— = Manager 4
——— = Manager 5]
the semantic differential area of Table 12. There are five ratings, allowing for a middle position. The results allow us to consider a number of important issues.

The semantic differential is a direct and accessible way of representing the views of the managers in this test. Assumptions are made about the validity and reliability of the qualities involved, but, because of the procedure implicit in carrying out the first part of the research instrument, these have arguably been addressed. There may also be some intellectual difficulty associated with the examination of concepts along a dichotomised scale, and doing this with five points on a rating scale. However, the method is well-established in this style of qualitative research (eg in testing for attitudes and opinions in organisations), and has the advantage of being easy to explain to respondents and easy for them to carry out. The method itself is extensible in any number of ways (eg the scales can be larger, there may be no middle position, and stratified or cluster samples can be analysed and compared).

From the findings we are able to observe evidence which appears to corroborate and extend our knowledge of managerial viewpoints determined so far in the weighting analysis stage of the research. We may push this forward by examining the 'top rated' qualities emerging here.

These were identified as 'being consistent, team building, modern, experienced, and a problem-solver'. From the diagrammatic part of Table 12 we observe a distinct clustering effect towards a high rating for the quality of being 'experienced'. Manager 4 is the eccentric respondent in this case. There is a similar, if more diffuse, clustering effect towards a high rating for the qualities of 'team building, consistency, and problem-solving'. The divergence on the quality of being 'modern' is clear to see.
Low-rated qualities were identified as 'being imaginative, sympathetic, having a sense of humour, and getting results'. In all cases, there is an interesting divergence of opinion. For 'imagination' Managers 1 and 2 rate high, while Managers 3, 4 and 5 rate low. For 'sympathy', there is a similar pattern. There is also a strong relationship for each manager between high and low ratings for both qualities.

A similar pattern is established for 'getting results'. It appears that 'having a sense of humour' provokes divergence too, but the impression from this, as opposed to the simple average weight determined earlier in this chapter, is that the managers think more highly about it as a 'good' quality than might have been concluded at first. In all cases, there is a distinct downward movement from the quality of 'experience' which precedes it.

The analysis has confirmed our findings and highlighted a number of subtler gradations of viewpoint which the reader, and indeed the participants, can inspect at a glance. It is now necessary to use the weights and the rating together to determine a score for the managers.

Giving the qualities a score

We have spoken about divergence between the managers' viewpoints. There are times when this is so. The semantic differential, by reflecting the different sets of viewpoints in the way it does, has a tendency, characteristic of many graphical techniques, to over-simplify the arithmetical divergence between the findings.
This becomes evident when we consider the managers' scores. These are constructed in the following manner: the weightings for the original qualities are used, in their average form, and each is multiplied by the value (from 1 to 5) that each manager gives to each quality. So that, if the five managers give respectively weightings of 1, 5, 4, 1 and 5 to the quality of 'fair', and the average weighting is 3.2, then the score for Manager 1 (who gave it 1) is 3.2, the score for Manager 2 (who gave it 5) is 16 (i.e. 5 x 3.2), and so on.

In this way it is possible to construct a table of scores for each quality and each manager. Of course the scores for each quality are merely a multiplier of the original weightings, and their relativity remains the same. The scores for each manager are however of greater interest.

When we consider the weightings attributed to the concepts, and the way in which some concepts earned more weight than others, it is fair to say that the higher the total score a manager gets, then the more that manager is orientated towards higher, rather than lower, concepts. The higher concepts are those which have emerged as being 'most preferred or favoured' in this particular forum of respondents, those qualities most admired by these respondents in a 'good' supervisor.

We may care to remind ourselves of the viewpoints of the five managers. Manager 1 stressed getting things done, Manager 2 stressed people skills, Manager 3 stressed experience and hard work, Manager 4 stressed being modern and consistent and solving problems in teams, and Manager 5 was rather mixed (mixed up?), stressing fairness and a democratic management style and being decisive, but, apparently contradictorily, disapproving of getting results and solving problems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. fair</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. democratic</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. pressure</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. sympathy</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. imagine</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. decisive</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. results</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. modern</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. hardwork</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. consistent</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. teambuild</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. problem</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. knowledge</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. experience</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. humour</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS   | 172.8| 167.2| 172.8| 175.6| 172.0 |

Table 13: Managers' scores using weightings
Manager 4 comes out with a slightly higher score than the others, followed by Manager 1 and 3. Lowest is Manager 2. We notice that the allocation of points (from 1 to 5) by Manager 4 accounts for this: he has highlighted qualities like hard work and consistency and being modern with the maximum of 5 points. He has eight '5s', more than anyone else (1 has five, 2 has five, 3 has four, and 5 has three). Manager 4's viewpoints have had a powerful impact on determining the order of the qualities because of this. By this token, it is important not merely to consider the total scores but also how they are made up, the extent to which particular managers allocate highest scores to any quality.

Consensus between the respondents

A feature which is readily noticed in the managers' scores is how close they are. This is particularly so in view of the arithmetical likelihoods of the various combinations of numbers 1 to 5 allocated in this way. Up to a point the differences can be explained by the different emphases on higher order (ie more preferred) qualities. We have already seen how Manager 2, by stressing person qualities, has diverged some way from the trend of the others.

Yet it may be more appropriate to ask why the total scores are so close together. It may reflect a deeper similarity of perception or viewpoint by the managers than we first realised. All we could assume at the start of the research was that the five managers did something like the same job and had many life and work experiences in common. But nothing in detail was known at that time. Now we have elicited some detailed information about this ostensible similarity with reference to what they regard as good in a supervisor.
In order to find out more about any possible similarity, it then became necessary to identify those qualities which attracted exactly the same verdicts from more than one manager. Arguably, those qualities which show this could be used as evidence to suggest such a similarity of viewpoint. The findings are represented in Table 14.

Before analysis of these findings takes place, it may be interesting to look back to the conclusions from the weighting analysis to see what qualities came highest and lowest. Highest were 'consistency' and 'team building', followed by 'being modern', 'experience', and 'problem solving'. Lowest were 'imagination', 'sympathy', 'a sense of humour', and 'getting results'.

A comparison between the highest in Table 14 and these earlier results reveals that all five ('consistency', 'team building', 'being modern', 'experience', and 'problem solving') attracted two '5' scores. Yet two other features may be clearly seen. First, that qualities like 'fairness', 'handling pressure', 'getting results', and 'being a hard worker' also attracted two '5' scores. What is implied, therefore, is that looking at the consensus of viewpoints, rather than looking simply at the highest score, some qualities emerge as being regarded as 'good' in supervisors which are NOT flagged by strict numerical analysis.

We can conclude from this that there appears to be a noticeable attraction towards the qualities of 'fairness', 'handling pressure', 'getting results', and 'being a hard worker' by the library managers who took part in the research. High scores are important: how many high scores is also important. In addition to this, we should notice that two qualities, not cited in the list of highest qualities, namely 'being democratic' and 'decisive', attracted THREE '5' scores under these conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>INCIDENCE</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>handles pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gets results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hardworker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>team builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>problem-solver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
team builder
knowledgeable
experienced

and at the bottom end...

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gets results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 14: Incidence of similar points allocations to qualities of 'goodness'*
We may infer from this that these qualities, above all others, are regarded as being desirable for or characteristic of a good supervisor in library management, and that, with its balanced amalgam of task- and people-orientation, it appears to imply that sound management is based there on the proper combination of being able to work with people and make decisions they can respect, understand, and live with.

We may examine the way in which particular qualities attracted more than one lowest score of '1'. Earlier evidence suggested that these were the qualities of 'imagination', 'sympathy', 'a sense of humour', and 'getting results'. Looking at these, and what emerges in Table 14, we see that the qualities of 'imagination', 'sympathy' and 'getting results' occur in both lists. But there are also interesting disparities between the lists: for instance, 'a sense of humour' has not attracted more than one '1' score, and we can conclude that it does not appear to show that, because it is a low score, that does not necessarily imply it is consensual.

Furthermore, we notice that qualities which attracted consensually low scores do not occur in the other list - 'being fair', 'democratic', and 'decisive'. Not only does this then suggest the extent to which the numerical calculations have disguised the effect of consensuality in the viewpoints, but it also disguises something else.

This is how far viewpoints can vary among managers. We can see this clearly when we compare the qualities cited both as high and low in Table 14. For instance, the quality of being 'democratic' attracted three '5' scores but also two '1' scores. For instance, the quality of being 'decisive' attracted three '5' scores but also two '1' scores. These represent the greatest polarities in the
research data, and suggest how much divergence lies between the five managers on this key concept.

It appears to be a 'fulcrum' concept in that meaning and opinion hinges on it, some managers regarding decisiveness as highly desirable in pushing the management process along, others seeing it perhaps as arbitrary or dispassionate, disregarding people's feelings or need to participate.

This hints towards some of the broader paradigmatic and professional assumptive knowledge which the managers have. The quality of being 'democratic' appears to fall into the same category and play the same dual role.

In addition to these qualities, others appear as both high and low (though a little less high). 'Being fair' is one of these, regarded by two managers as desirable (a kind of just strength?) and by two others as undesirable (equated with being weak?). Another is 'getting results', regarded by two managers as desirable (any work activity needs to be done properly and finished on time?), and by two others as undesirable (going for results often tramples on people and disregards quality at the expense of speed?).

Analysis of concepts which emerge in these ways could be extended to other samples of respondents, other domains of management (eg middle management, areas of professional activity like human resource management, situations involving team or matrix management, and different sets of concepts such as those based on purely ideological or financial criteria). Very little systematic work of this kind exists in the field of library and information management, either action-based research in the workplace or academic commentary and analysis.
Conclusions

Throughout this part of the research programme, recorded in the two sections of Chapter 6, there has been an attempt to involve managers in framing the meanings on which they were to express viewpoints. This was achieved by means of asking for their own supply of qualities for use in the analysis. Implicit in this was a search for validity and reliability in terms of what qualities are chosen and how they were elicited. Information was organised and subjected to a number of critical techniques, like weighting and the application of semantic differential analysis. Findings were then reviewed in the light of further evidence and inference resulting from examining how consensually the viewpoints had been expressed.

Many areas remain hidden still. Ethnographic research is preeminently a search for understanding, particularly of the constructed realities and meanings of the subjects, and the context within which those realities and meanings evolve and get applied. Interpretations of the findings, from individual managers and then from the group, have been suggested in this section, but it is accepted that more detailed research would be necessary formally to determine what assumptive meanings lay behind or below all the decisions and agreements or disagreements which emerged in the research. The assumptive domain, that area of assumptive knowledge and value and belief which forms a powerful shaping force on how people express viewpoints as well as what viewpoints they express, remains only partly visible. This highlights both the importance and the elusiveness of the phenomenological dimension in such qualitative research as this.

The discussion has aimed to identify and elicit relevant evidence on what managers think good about a good supervisor. It has sought to pin down
concepts which are used, and establish how much weight practitioners attribute
to them. It has attempted to suggest how far consensus, intentional or not,
affects the results. Ways in which such research can be extended have been
suggested. Certainly, work on more specific groups, responding to particular
stimuli (e.g., forms of training and education), would be likely to indicate the
ways in which concepts are used, attributes formulated and reconstructed
according to changing circumstances.

In addition, research like this has to ask what claims may be made as to the
generalisability of any ethnographic analysis of specific groups. It is a
dilemma characteristic of qualitative research associated with the ideographic
nature of much data, and the need, for researchers and readers of research
alike, to develop the skill of inducing from (particularistic) exemplars to more
generally applicable principles and likelihoods.

Later in the thesis we ask another question: whether asking respondents for
concepts, or labels, such as these on 'goodness', is holistic or configurational,
as well as natural, enough for respondents to provide reliable evidence. It is
with this question in mind that the referential hierarchy (of concepts and
propositions, scripts and stories) was developed, and is implemented further,
particularly in the area of scripts and stories in Part 4. In the meantime, an
important strand remains to be discussed before that: this concerns the
meanings and knowledge of people new to management, the 'novices', and it is to
this topic that Chapter 7 turns.

###
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PART 3

CHAPTER 7 : SECTION A

ABSTRACT

It is easy to believe that the meanings held and used by learners (or 'novice managers' as opposed to experienced 'practitioner managers') are objectively what teachers of management think they are. Yet such meanings are often highly subjective, impregnated with assumptions.

This chapter describes an investigation into these assumptive meanings of student librarians studying management. It is a study carried out with three cohorts of first-year students over three years.

The study attempts to elicit from respondents key meanings about how 'good' things are in relation to how 'old' they are. It takes focus on the ages of managers in the profession of library and information work, and whether, in the respondents' views, such managers are 'effective' or not in relation to their age.

Concepts of age and goodness are examined. Then characterisations, called 'composites', of typical library managers or library workers are used to elicit further information about respondents' knowledge and assumptions. Such composites are found to be valuable devices for drawing out hidden meanings and knowledge.

Finally, respondents are asked to complete propositions, enabling the researcher to identify and infer important features of meaning, knowledge, and causality from them. It is suggested that such methods as these are reliable and flexible testing instruments in both management research and practice.
ELICITING ASSUMPTIONS FROM LEARNERS.

It is often believed that learning takes place objectively and rationally. The picture is one of coming to know, perhaps from a position of lesser knowledge, or from an awareness of more to be known. Knowledge, in the form of information or opinion, is acquired or experienced, gets integrated into current knowledge stores in the learner, changes that knowledge, and alters the learner's conception of what it is to know such things. Such information or opinion is often formulated in concepts (eg 'revolution' in history, 'momentum' in physics) or propositions (eg 'that a computer works or does not work like a human brain', 'that boys are more aggressive than girls').

These are often building blocks used in teaching and learning. Concepts are used as labels to define the denotations and connotations of things. Propositions are used as statements or contentions, implying and suggesting linkages and causal relationships, making claims, delimiting meanings, asking questions. These, and many more devices, are widely used in both spoken and written discourse, in formal and informal situations.
Types of meaning

Characteristic of this view of coming to know is the way in which we can be beguiled into thinking everything is as it seems to be. For instance, that the labels or concepts we use mean the same, as the ones used by other people. These meanings operate on two levels at least. The first is the explicit, denotative meaning, so that 'information' means 'organised data', 'aim' means 'what we intend to do', and 'policy' means 'where an organisation intends to go'.

Definitions will vary, but, in order to have productive and meaningful discourse, we take it for granted that there is an overlap between our meanings and other people's. Misunderstandings and errors can occur at this level (eg someone may not know the English language, or may not have come upon a particular word or a particular meaning), or they may mis-hear what is said).

The second level is implicit and connotative, taking in a potentially wide range of primary and secondary meanings and associations. Many of these may be subjective and idiosyncratic to the user or hearer. I may mention 'roses' to a friend, and she may associate them with a prior messy affair, with the thorns of the medieval romance of the rose, or bushes in her garden that need pruning. 'Mission' is widely used by churchy people to signify an outreach of faith to the unconverted, and has deep apostolic or Pauline overtones. 'Mission' in management refers to those aims and purposes for which the organisation provides products or services to the community.
The first meaning of 'mission' is imbued with ideological values, as being 'good', a 'fight' against opponents, while the second is 'good' in the sense that management needs to have a clear notion of what it's there for. The word may evoke memories of failures and successes in the past, and both are nodes in a semantic network of other meanings particular to a person or a group of people involved or interested.

These opening ideas are intended to make three main points: first, that it is easy to assume we all mean the same thing; second, that many of the problems that occur hinge on the concepts and propositions we all use; and third, that connotations are complex and unpredictable.

Assumptive meanings

Given this background, it is possible to add another point. Assumptions are always being made about meanings and the ways in which we handle and exchange them. Such assumptions may arise from the pragmatic context within which concepts and propositions are used (like an authority structure in a firm where commands or requests are made, or a close relationship where sarcasm or self-reference or ellipsis are common).

Assumptions can be made from juxtapositions of statements (eg 'And he didn't last long!' following 'If I were to hit you!' makes the assumption clear), and from the tone of voice used by participants in a conversation. Some of them are to do with semantic meaning, others actions, yet others both. Many expressions presuppose assumptive meanings, eg that someone will understand
what we say even if we're not clear or if we're irritated, or that someone will know that a particular expression has a secret or special resonance.

An investigation was made into some of the assumptive meanings used by students of library management. The starting point was the familiar realization that many people equate 'recency' with 'goodness' and therefore 'being old' with 'being bad'. Under this, for instance, being young is an inherent advantage over being old, being up-to-date is a virtue in itself. It can be seen when people speak about history, and equate changes with 'developments', assuming that change brings about improvements, and that history has always got better.

Accordingly, we are better off as a community than the nineteenth century, because we have fewer diseases, more amenities, higher literacy, larger suffrage, greater equality. By extension, people who are young are better than those who are old, things that are new are better than things that are old.

These could be little more than facile and sententious if it were not for the fact that they can (and should) be tested. Intellectually, it is possible to question all and any of them. But here this of lesser relevance than knowing that this kind of subjective thinking is common. It is not intrinsically right or wrong, for, even when lay views of what cancer is or smoking does prevail generally, it does not necessarily mean that partial knowledge of any subject is morally culpable.

It may, of course, mean that a student finds it difficult to learn something: for example, grasp the meaning of 'significance' in statistics or 'suspension of disbelief' in literary criticism. It may lead to personal
mistakes, like a gambler believing that the tenth time the wheel is turned, after so many reds, that the next will be a red. It may mean that we assume the opposite, knowing that Susan always talks in riddles, or turn left and then right because that’s the way we’ve always done it.

What people appear to choose to make meanings mean

Only the deficit model of learning, in which the learner's knowledge, being inadequate, is reformulated and improved through the process of learning, would claim that there is any necessary 'fault' in any of these assumptions. Some may be strictly and factually wrong, some may represent only a partial or peculiar understanding of what happens, some may express a view which has many opponents. But often it is assumed that learners either know or do not know something, without investigating what people choose to make meanings mean.

Typically, we might say that Student X 'appears to misunderstand' why the Bastille was stormed when it was, or why Hitler's plan for the Jews was so popular, or why a 1940s film appears to stereotype women. It could be that the misunderstanding arises from lack of knowledge in the first and second, and enlightened liberalism in the second and third. It could be that sets of attitudes and opinions formed in the framework of another age (ie now rather than then) account for the subjective knowledge we find in the learner. And so, the Bastille was taken by a democratic movement of freedom fighters set on pulling down symbols of feudal tyranny, Hitler's success shows how gullible the Germans were because we would not be so misled, and sex
equality is so obvious nowadays that it is a miracle how sexist males in early films ever 'got away with it'.

Interpretations like this might be right or wrong, by whatever code of accuracy or truth we care to use. They embody a set of meanings which can be substantially true to a learner holding them. Were we now to start to unpack these interpretations, we would have to explore what assumptions were being made: what concepts were being used, how they were being used, and how they were built up, consciously or not, into theories explaining social reality, interpretations of history and human experience.

With reference to the notional 1940s film, there may be concepts about 'male heroism', 'superiority to foreigners', 'female submissiveness', 'fair play'. Specific concepts about stereotyping may include 'gender roles', 'feminine appearance', 'romantic love', 'reward for being faithful'. A full study would differentiate between how such concepts work in such a film at the time of production and now. Many of the assumptions would be figurative, in terms of scenes we would expect to see and be shown, sets of semiotic messages (like love scenes, parting scenes, confrontations, mise en scene shots). In this complex manner, then, do meanings, from definitions to narrative interpretations, appear to work.

Investigation into subjective meanings

However, study of this type should start with simple factors, like what people mean and appear to mean when they use definitions. This investigation sought to elicit how learners appeared to equate things that
were 'old' with things that were 'bad'. It was devised in order (1) to test the hypothesis that such respondents, exposed to learning about management in higher education for the first time (in nearly every case) tended to perceive youth and age in this way, and (2) to elicit information about the assumptive meanings (in concepts and propositions) that they held.

It was conducted with a sample group of 20 first year students of management in the School of Librarianship and Information Studies at RGIT in Aberdeen. The sample was selected over three years of such students (ie three successive cohorts)(122 students in all), randomly choosing seven from each year. One response was spoiled and unusable, leaving 20 responses.

The average age was eighteen years six months. A full copy of the test is provided as Appendix VII, to which the reader is now referred. Its design was such that the key concept of 'age' (generally and in the workplace) was tested, associated with specific age bands of employees, embodied in seven character portraits (or 'stereotypes'), and finally translated into propositions which respondents were invited to select and complete.

Respondents were invited to reveal private knowledge through the questions about 'age'. When eliciting private meanings for such concepts, ways have to be found to draw them out in a meaningful and analysable manner. Popular is the 'example-non-example' technique in which instances which exemplify (or do not) the concept are presented to the respondent. In this way, semantic boundaries can be established (say between 'profit' and 'non-profit' organisations in economics). This approach was adapted when respondents were invited to consider the concept 'old' in relation to five items (car, coat, college degree, woman, and man), all firmly in daily and demotic usage. Responses are displayed in Table 15.
Table 15: Responses on items considered as 'old'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. CAR</th>
<th>2. COAT</th>
<th>3. DEGREE</th>
<th>4. WOMAN</th>
<th>5. MAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: years = y responses = r)
From the information in Table 15 we are able to note the following key findings: for a car, the most common verdict on when it became 'old' was 5 years; for a coat, it was 2 years; for a degree, it was 10 years; and for a woman and a man, it was 60 years. Other research conducted by the researcher with respondents in older age groups has suggested that degrees last much longer than ten years, and women and men tend to be considered old at a greater age (70+). Systematic correlations between ages and other circumstances of respondents, perhaps constructed by factor analysis or Kellyan personal construct analysis, would be necessary in order to build up a fuller understanding of the behaviour of this factor.

Already in this present analysis, there appears to be a developing link between age and competence. In ordinary language, we speak of things that are 'past it', 'past their shelf life', 'set in their ways', 'too old to change', 'cannot teach an old dog new tricks', and so forth. With typical tolerance for ambiguity and an ability to cope with double standards, we also speak with awe of things being 'really old' and people who are 'old and wise'.

The findings suggest a view of time making things less relevant and useful, that 'being old' is 'being bad'. Indeed, some of the respondents gave the test the cordial and revealing name of 'the Oldbad test'. That said, it needs to be analysed more subtly. The respondents were asked (in question 2) to record their view of when professionals in their own field (ie librarianship and information work) appeared to be at their peak. A range of age groups, organised by five-year intervals, from 20-25 to 55-60, was displayed in the testing instrument. Respondent choice was indicated by ringing the interval preferred. The findings are recorded in Table 16.
(a) Women: rank order by responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year interval</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Men: rank order by responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year interval</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Responses on professional librarians 'at their peak'
Examining Table 16, we may note that, for women, the period when they are perceived to be at their peak is 30-35. We may assume, from the falling away of responses, that after 35 women are perceived to begin to fall away from that peak. Of course, before 30, it appears to be assumed that such women will not have yet reached their peak. For men, on the other hand, the period when they are perceived to be at their peak is 35-40, interestingly later than women. At 40 men fell away from their peak, confirmed by the views on the two intervals 40-45 and 45-50, while up to 35 they have not yet reached it.

Interviews were conducted, using structured interview schedules, with three randomly chosen respondents from each cohort (ie 3 x 3 = 9 respondents over 3 years). The intention, using ethnographic conversation recording techniques, was to elicit reasons underlying these assumptions. All respondents asserted that their decisions had been based on observation of fellow and older professionals, and these had clearly been very influential in helping them to form their impressions of the truth.

Eight of the nine interviewed respondents admitted that they had been influenced by what they had read about 'people at the top', 'people who get to the top', and inferences from how old people would normally be in order to qualify for particular posts (eg 'chartered librarians with three years' experience' would, they suggested, be likely to be in their late twenties or early thirties, while most Chief Librarians would, in their view, be in their late forties or older). It is possible too that the Hawthorne effect was at work, since the respondents knew they were taking part in a test organised by a lecturer, and that this lecturer formed, consciously or not, a model, along with his colleagues, for the respondent group. Nevertheless, testing reliability and validity were not undermined, since at all times
respondents appeared to understand the procedures of the test and evinced enthusiasm to take part and later know some of the results.

Comparisons might be made about differences between genders here (ie the gender of the 'men' and 'women' implied in the testing instrument, not the gender of the respondents). This is of particular interest when we consider why men appear to reach their professional peak later than women, and what 'peak' this actually is (eg highest capacity to work hard, innovate imaginatively, hold down high-pressure appointments). It would be interesting, too, to put this inquiry in the context of the gender of professionals who do 'get to the top'. Biological and social factors, in particular career expectations and opportunities, are also relevant here. Such research could be corroborated by information from actual practitioners, or actual practitioners as subjects being observed by student researchers. The boundaries of this part of the thesis were strictly defined by the criterion of what meanings and knowledge could be elicited from students of library management. Interesting ramifications can only be noted for other research projects in the future.

Meanings based on personal choice

Since this information is, after all, highly subjective, and since it is the subjectivity or 'connotativity' that we are investigating, then it seemed appropriate to ask whether respondents would like to work with people their own age, older or younger than they were, or a mixture. Responses to this inquiry revealed an overwhelming preference to work with people their own age, and strong preference against working with people younger than them.
There were mixed views about working with older people, and a mixture of ages. The data are presented in Table 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>1st choice</th>
<th>2nd choice</th>
<th>3rd choice</th>
<th>4th choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 17: Responses to choices of people to work with*

The data are interesting for two reasons: first, for what they appear to tell us about what respondents thought about ages of people in the workplace; and second, for what they appear to tell us about the
respondents' own preferences for what age people they wished to work alongside.

Since sampling was conducted on random principles, it was considered appropriate to test for significance. Chi-square tests were used, building in Yates' correction because the samples were relatively small. Such tests revealed that there was a difference between the data arising from factors other than that associated with statistical chance. At a level of significance of 0.01, with nine degrees of freedom, the $\chi^2$ value of the data is significant; and even at a level of significance of 0.001, it is significant. Both suggest that we might reject the null hypothesis which attributes such significant findings to things other than the working or random chance in the sampling process.

However, rejecting the null hypothesis is one thing: quite another is to account, in real life terms, for what factors may be at work causing these readings. We may be able to infer, from our general argument as well as from these specific data, that the respondents' assumptive world of meanings is affecting the response, based as it is on a view that ages other than their own have less credibility than their own. Again, through interviewing, this was raised with each respondent, concentrating on the age or ages of the people which they would most like to work with (other things being equal).

It was found that, for all nine interviewed respondents, greatest credibility was attributed (in a boss) to someone up to five years (but no more) older than they were, (in a colleague) to someone two or three years either side, and (in a subordinate) someone likely to be five or more years younger than they were. We are able to suggest that the beginnings of a
'naive' paradigm become apparent, in which the age and position are characterised as parallel factors within a hierarchical framework.

Further research (not conducted here but arising from informal tests on students studying job satisfaction, promotability, grade and pay levels) appear to confirm the existence of this hierarchical paradigm. Yet, paradoxically, it appeared to be virtually impossible to ask respondents directly about the existence of such an implicit paradigm, partly because such a question is difficult for most respondents to understand, and partly because of the likelihood of such a question affecting individual responses (once respondents learn that the researcher assumes that such a paradigm exists, or that the researcher is indexing responses according to such a researcher-imposed framework).

Returning directly to the investigation about age and goodness, it is interesting to note how strong the prejudice appears to be against younger people, perhaps on the ground that, not having reached even the stage that they, the respondents, have reached, then little is to be learned from them or gained from working with them. This however does not imply a clear preference for working with older people, as the data reveal. Finally, it is interesting, too, that, even though most respondents are likely to know that the world of work consists of people across a spectrum of ages, their own preference, from the position where they are at the moment, is to gravitate to their own age cohort. This could be the result of 'conditioning' as students, of course, where this graduated process of socialisation is commonplace, despite increasing access and a more catholic age participation rate in higher education.
Apparent, and highly explorable, contradictions also emerge. For instance, we may wish to compare these preferences with perceptions of when professionals reach their peak. For women, this was 30-35, and for men, this was 35-40. From the data, it is interesting that third choices were evenly distributed between option two (to work with older people) and option four (to work with people of any age). This shows how, despite the strong preference for their age group and against younger age groups, there is a noticeable acknowledgement of the presence of older people in the workplace. Obvious enough, perhaps, but in the elicitation of preferences quite often realism gets lost. Apparently not here.

Meanings explored through response to composites

Dealing with subjective knowledge, it is quite common to get complex and unpredictable divergences over definitions and concepts. In the same way as the response to the 1940s film discussed above, the investigation attempted to elicit knowledge using a less word-centred technique. It consisted of character portraits, called 'composites' or 'stereotypes', short almost to the point of caricature but easily recognised by respondents.

Seven such character portraits were devised. To give this part of the exercise validity, five experienced practitioners were consulted, and asked to comment on how representative and recognisable each composite was visi-a-vis their perception and knowledge of typical professionals. The implicit argument was that typicality tended to ensure 'evocativeness' for any likely respondent to such a test.
The portraits were intended to represent types of people who go into the library profession, types recognisable to the respondents from their perspective on the profession and with their experience of it, and to offer up a range of ages, gender, and experience. In this discussion the portraits will be called composites. Such composites draw on and evoke a wide range of meanings and knowledge, about word or concepts (denotative and connotative), as well as metaphorical or figurative meanings, and mental pictures or images.

Like Enid Blyton characters, their very elliptical description compelled fleshing them out. A major task for the test was to elicit subjective knowledge, a domain where associational knowledge and assumptions work pervasively, consciously or subconsciously, with the aim of eliciting meanings and knowledge which could be interpreted. In fact, reading 'between the facts' becomes a key research activity. The reader is referred to question 3 of the test in the discussion below.

For instance, if there is likely to be a prejudicial reaction to age, mention of it should act as a trigger, and responses should reveal some effect. For instance, an intuitive reaction to 'facts' like Stephen's experience in public libraries or Muriel's time as a housewife is just what such an exercise as this seeks legitimately to exploit (i.e. exteriorise). Simple characterisations were used, although in this, and in more elaborate exercises like case studies, more complex, less two-dimensional characters can be devised.

In terms of ethnographic research technique, the composite is a way of exploiting the categorisation and pattern-matching procedures which characterise grounded theory approaches, and representing such researcher-
generated or Delphi-originating themes in 'characterisations' to respondents can respond.

There are seven such composites. Respondents were given time to familiarise themselves with them, and then asked which of them would, in their view, have the greatest difficulty in coping with change in a library. Each respondent was asked to rank the seven characters in order of perceived ability to cope with change. No explicit agenda of age or gender (except what could be inferred from other questions) was mentioned, although it is clear from the conclusions that factors like these were heavily influential in respondents' choices.

This set of choices was extended in the form of two open questions, in which respondents were invited to explain why, in their view, the character chosen as best and worst would cope well or badly with change in the workplace.

The findings from this part of the test are recorded in Table 18. Each respondent was asked to record their answers as a series of ranked choices. Looking at the data, once it had been collected and displayed, it was clear that Stephen emerged as the character who attracted most first choices, and Isobel the one who attracted most last choices. More systematically, points were attributed to each choice, from first to seventh, on a scale easy to use in calculation but sensitive enough to reflect the importance of giving any character a high (ie first, second, or third) choice. A first choice earned 20 points, second 15, third 10, fourth 7, fifth 5, sixth 3, and seventh 1 point. Using this as the basis of our calculation, the characters emerged with the points and rank order indicated in Table 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alasdair</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isobel</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Responses on points and rank order of composites
Next, those factors which were commonly held to characterise those people who could cope well or badly with change were selected. This form of factor analysis can be carried out in various ways. Here, freedom was given to the respondents to use their own natural language, rather than introducing a menu of factor terms for them to choose (which could arguably have influenced their expressed preferences).

The factors can be separated into 'best cope factors' and 'worst cope factors', and can be grouped within each in the following manner according to responses (from most to least).

**Best cope factors**

1. Being (newly) qualified and up-to-date.
2. Being adaptable and used to a changing work environment.
3. Being innovative and ambitious.

**Worst cope factors**

1. Being old and consequently set in your ways.
2. Being too long in one job and liking status quo.
3. Having too little practical or high tech experience.
4. Being interested in, or doing, the 'wrong' professional things.
It is now possible to examine how these factors apply to the particular composites. We should bear in mind the rank order indicated above.

(1) First was Stephen. According to respondents' comments on 'who would best cope with change because...', Stephen was young but experienced, recently qualified and therefore up-to-date, knowledgeable about information technology, ambitious and eager to do his best, and innovative.

(2) Second was Carol, whose background in an information unit in the oil industry, regarded as a pressure post, along with her recent qualifications, led respondents into regarding her as capable under change.

(3) Third was Alasdair, recently qualified again, and, after what was regarded as stimulating experience in a university library, showed himself ready for change.

These demonstrate the 'best cope factors' at work, showing a dominance in the portfolio of factors associated with the characters. The other four characters demonstrate an increasing emphasis on 'worst cope factors', although it is important to see how this is a spectrum, not a dichotomy.

(4) Fourth was Karen, who, despite recent qualifications and computeracy, had the drawback of having little library experience.

(5) Fifth was Muriel, whose qualifications were regarded as impressive and up-to-date, but who was regarded as lacking experience. For her, respondents appeared to allow her time as a housewife and age to overshadow her recent professional achievements.
(6) Sixth was Duncan, regarded as unlikely to cope well with change because he was 'older and set in his ways', had qualified 'long ago', worked in a low tech environment, and was interested in an area of professional work (local studies) viewed as stick-in-the-mud.

(7) Seventh and last was Isobel, the oldest character, who was regarded as old, set in her ways, fond of the status quo, behind the times, qualified long ago, outdated in her ideas, and with no experience of information technology. It was felt by one respondent that there would be little point in offering training to Isobel.

What led respondents to conclude may be based on the view that part-time work was regarded as only part-committed work, and this was disapproved of. It may be that twenty years as a library assistant was regarded as culpably unambitious, as a model with which respondents (who were after all young professionals-in-training) did not choose to identify. She may have even been regarded as a wasted (professional) life!

In this way, some important aspects of the respondents' assumptive meanings network have been revealed. They have declared their preferences for particular characteristics in imaginary but plausible composites. In doing this, they have implied something about their own self-concepts and ambitions. They have also declared these things in terminology chosen freely by themselves. Drawing on the principles of grounded theory, it was only later that the researcher organised the factors into a systematic codification, represent in this discussion.

The many avenues of further research are clear, for instance, into examining more deeply why respondents reacted as they did, and the extent to which
these findings might be corroborated by exposing respondents to more comprehensive case study materials.

Propositional meanings

Meanings can consist of concepts, and can be elicited in response to composites. They also reside in propositions. Many of these are inherent in the natural sentence structures which appear in ordinary dialogue and speech acts. Suggestions, reactions, injunctions, questions, answers, proposals, denials, concessions, statements, are some of the roles that sentences play. Using concepts, they imply relationships, many of them causal.

We see this when we start with 'The man drives', move on to 'The man drives the car', and end up with 'The man drives the car at the woman'. Here, not only are there definitional or conceptual meanings at work, dependant on the linguistic and informational abilities of the reader, but there are narrative and causal meanings at work, dependant on the reader's ability to infer (from what has now become the plot), construct coherence from discourse (ie make what is read mean something coherent), and relate all this to the pragmatic life context within which the act of reading takes place. This context includes both the referentiality of concepts and represented acts and meanings, and the meta-cognitive awareness the reader has that, while they are living, they are also reading, and vice versa, and that, as they read, their view of the text changes. This is the constructivist research position described in the introductory chapters of the thesis.
One of the ways in which personal meanings can be elicited is by asking people to complete propositional statements. At this stage of the test, the researcher assumed that respondents had full competence in handling meanings in this form. For instance, with children it may be the completion of sentences as simple as 'The boy played with the ---'. In a student multiple choice paper, it is not merely the completion of the statement but the application of knowledge: eg 'At conception the egg travels down the --- [Fallopian tube] --- to the womb'. Many propositions are much more abstract than this, in this style: 'Examine the view that technology is a precondition of revolution', relying on complex interpretative and knowledge skills.

In a domain like management, it is possible to use structures like this to elicit meaning. Often, the researcher can devise structures which draw on the respondents' knowledge of this domain. This knowledge is not just objective but subjective too. Typical objective knowledge might involve features like how organisations work, how Jack gets paid, the hours of Jane's nursing shift at the hospital, or Tom's ability to log into the mainframe computer.

There is also subjective knowledge, like how fair we think a supervisor is, how Mary felt after her rejection for promotion, how we feel about ourselves as we reach mid-life and know that the top job will never be ours. Apart from confidentiality and the element of invasion, subjective knowledge can be elicited effectively by this method.

This approach is revealed in the test by means of question five, which consists of two statement structures, each of which has to be completed. The first offers three options for completion, the second four. Both draw on
objective and subjective knowledge. Both are intended not merely to draw respondents' knowledge out, but also to examine their chosen ways of handling causal inference. This last factor is most important in most forms of work.

Causality, after all, is a major characteristic of human experience, and is represented pervasively in narratives, from stories to minutes of board meetings. For instance, Company Y invested £Nm in 1990 and profits in the following financial year were £Qm. For instance, when Bill said that the Dundee plant should be closed, Alex opposed him on the grounds that 400 people would be made redundant. For instance, Bill then counter-argued that 200 of them would be redeployed, and the other 200 painlessly lost through natural wastage over the succeeding five years. For instance, the chairman said 'Unless the contract is completed, then the firm will find itself in difficulties'.

In them, knowledge of 'the facts' as well as a knowledge of causality and time-frames are important. These issues, under the heading of the teleological dimension, will be explored more fully in Part 4 of the thesis when scripts and stories are investigated.

Such statements, in their various ways, demonstrate how propositional structures work. Some are concise linguistically, stating that something is so, or that, as a result of that, something else will be likely. Others are complex webs of meaning, sets of actions with many, often contradictory, outcomes.

Respondents were asked to complete the first statement, 'She had worked there for ten years and...', with any one of three options, the one which
they thought most likely. The theme of age and goodness was still being explored. One option stated that she would therefore be reluctant to change her ways. Another that she would be keen to change the way the job was done. The third that she felt she did a very satisfying job. All are possible, all plausible. The choices made by respondents were intended to reveal which they considered most likely. These choices are reproduced in Table 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>option</th>
<th>responses</th>
<th>rank order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. was reluctant to change her ways</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. was keen to change the way her job was done</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. felt she did a satisfying job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Responses to completion of a proposition (1)

From this we are able to infer a 'layman logic' in the respondents' inferences, given the initial stimulus of the unfinished statement. In assumptive terms, the majority inference is that if 'she' had worked 'there' for ten years, she would be reluctant to change her ways. A nested assumption is that her ways were ways that were due for change. Another is that any period of that length in one job would result in an inability or
disinclination to change one's ways, regardless of what the job was. In the interviews, all these assumptions were confirmed through Socratic inquiry.

Second to this comes the view that such a person would stay because she found it satisfying. Again, interviews confirmed that options could be either complimentary (ie the job was worthwhile and her opinion of it realistic) or pejorative (ie the job was dull and she had become dulled through doing it). Finally, the least preferred (and likely?) option was that she would stay because she patiently wanted to change the job. Interviews confirmed that there was a close affiliation between what respondents 'preferred' and what they regarded as 'true'.

Clearly, a long time spent in one job appears to imply to respondents that the postholder is - or progressively gets - more inert, less professionally active, less responsive to change. Only then are respondents prepared to accept the possibility that such a postholder might genuinely regard the job as satisfying. Other research, conducted in parallel with this but not recorded here, addressed itself to older people, both non-professional and professional working in library and information services, suggested different results, arising probably from different perspectives on holding down jobs for long or short periods.

The other statement which respondents were invited to complete read as follows: 'He was approaching forty and...'. Four options were offered as ways of completing it: first, 'felt he had passed his best'; second, 'looked forward to 30 more years of productive work'; third, 'wanted to change the world, at least his part of it'; and fourth, 'was content to let younger
better people pass him by'. Deliberately, two were broadly optimistic, two pessimistic, otherwise an implicit ageist bias might influence responses.

All options drew on objective and subjective knowledge, from what respondents might know of older professionals to the extent to which respondents might be able to empathise with them. The natural language overtones were deliberate for reasons of lifelike-ness: the hope or wistfulness or determination were conscious ingredients in the content and tone of the options.

Responses in this section of the investigation are represented in Table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. felt he had passed his best</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. looked forward...productive work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. wanted to change the world...</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. was content to let... pass him by</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Responses to completion of a proposition (2)
These findings suggest that respondents are prepared to accept the likelihood of a man approaching forty being both optimistic about his future and capable of many more years of productive work. This fits well with the finding from question two about when men reach their professional peak: there the majority preference was for the age interval 35-40 years of age. Less credence or preference was attributed to the pessimistic options.

It would be interesting to carry forward research in this area along two axes: one, increasing his age and exploring the extent to which this influenced opinion; and two, adding to age the factors of (a) how long in post and (b) what kind of post. For instance, following the character 'composite' analysis above, it might emerge that such a man of forty, who had been in only one job for twenty years or who was currently working in a low tech job, would be regarded as more pessimistic about his future. This is really to say that the respondents attributed such pessimism to him, or what they thought he was, or that imaginary character who was easy to identify with. When we get to this level of response, it is virtually impossible to differentiate between objective and subjective knowledge at work.

The meaning of the meanings

The elicitation of meanings from hidden subjective knowledge domains of respondents is not easy. Not only are there challenges associated with the knowledge which respondents may have or be alleged to have, but there are also problems linked with how subjects put topics into words, what these words are intended to mean, and what kinds of reasoning are taking place. It
is easy to influence responses and make assumptions about the assumptions that are being made.

Many difficulties are connected with respondents' states of mind - cognitive in terms of what they know and how they think and how they think they think, and affective in terms of their motivations and feelings to the topics being investigated, or to the investigation itself.

At the same time, elusive though these meanings are, qualitative research of this kind can detect or reveal a great many points of interest. Among them may be included (a) something of what learners know about a topic like management or a professional career, (b) something of what they feel about it, and, drawing on both, (c) something of the assumptive world out of which, and within which, respondents formulate and enact their decisions. Research assumptions have to be made that respondents will respond to language or situations which are themselves assumptive to an extent, and how far this invalidates the findings is always a matter of scrutiny and discussion.

In this test, validity and reliability derive from the controlled situation in which the test was conducted, the consistency with which questionnaire and interview findings were gathered and codified and interpreted, from pre-test Delphi-style advice on the choice and nature of the composites from 'experts', and from the enthusiastic and apparently fully-informed participation of the respondents.

To summarise the findings of the investigation in this section of the thesis, we have been able to detect the following tendencies in the sample of respondents:
(1) that there is a clear conception of when things of various types are regarded as 'old';

(2) that there is a clear conception of when men and women may be regarded as being professionally at their peak;

(3) that there is, for this sample, a strong bias in favour of working with people their own age, and against working exclusively with younger people;

(4) that the respondents have a clear idea of what 'mix' of age and experience best and worst fits people for coping with change at work; and

(5) that, through analysis of the implied causality in propositional structures, some aspects of respondents' reasoning and inferential characteristics have been elicited, particularly relating to age, experience, and attitude.

Methodologically, exposure of respondents to concept, composite, and proposition analysis has been able to draw out, from willing and arguably honest subjects, much of relevance to our investigation into the nature and operation of meanings and knowledge in management. In particular, the nature and operation of such meanings among learner or novice managers. Such methods can be applied and adapted flexibly in terms of scale and situation, and can be conducted as elaborate observer/participant or simple action research. More straightforward forms of qualitative research like this can be used.
for team-building when outcomes are published in the workplace and overtly become a trigger for organisational change.

The ultimate outcome from the point of view of qualitative research into the meanings and knowledge of managers is that researcher and researched get a fuller, and more fully consensual, perspective on the management of meaning, without which the meaning of management - and the management of meaning itself - would continue to elude us. We are able to start adding such knowledge of knowledge to our knowledge of the knowledge of practitioner managers (say, that elicited in chapters 5 and 6). We may also refer the entire discussion of Part 3 back to the issues of paradigms and ideologies introduced earlier in the thesis.

However, more detailed investigation remains to be done on learner or novice managers, and, using 'before and after' experimental approach, and drawing on the techniques of scalogram analysis, the second section of this chapter directs its attention at eliciting information about concept change in such subjects.

***
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This section considers the ways in which what learners know appears to change when exposed to new information. Meanings and knowledge throughout the exercise concentrate on what managers do, and what respondents thought managers do.

An investigation is carried out into a sample of novice managers. The aim is to identify what changes take place when tests were carried out, then new information was provided, then tests were carried out again. This takes the form of a 'before and after' experimental model applied to a qualitative setting.

Data are elicited and then organised using the scalogram analysis technique developed by Guttman. It is concluded that, when learners encounter new information in this canonical (or authoritatively educational) way, changes occur which can be monitored. Of particular interest are those changes associated with how novice knowledge becomes more paradigmatic and professional.
Exposure to new information is a commonplace in our lives. At work and through the media, in conversations and by way of books, new information stimuli bombard us daily. This forces or induces us to reformulate the information which we already have. Much of this, consciously or unconsciously, deliberately or automatically, has been organised into knowledge, so that we can use it, make sense of it, communicate to other people through it, understand and withstand our environments. Evolution is said to have been based, to an important extent, on our ability to adapt to new information, and then adapt it to our needs.

Information and knowledge

Our instinct is to try to make sense of these new stimuli, to render them intelligible, to make them compatible with what we already know and are prepared to accept. Getting to know novelist Primo Levi, or Sandra next door, or the characters of 'Dynasty', all involve cognitive readjustments like this. What we know already is, of course, based on what we have come to know, having putatively 'known nothing' in the beginning (pace Chomsky).
Then, as further exposure occurs, new information is not merely added to old like sediment, but has the active effect of transforming the patterns and character of existing knowledge. So, our knowledge of Sandra might be changed when we learn, from her or from someone else, that she is getting a divorce, or is really unhappy as a teacher, or has won the pools. This change in our knowledge is not only in what we know, but also in what we know we know, and in what we know we feel.

Making sense of new information tends to lead us to filter it so that it fits to existing knowledge. This can result from what we can understand: if new information is beyond us, then it is likely, unless we persist, that it will be relegated to something we do not need to know. It can arise when it appears to be unpalatable, like the irritating habits of loved ones which we can pretend not to see, or like the brooding 'fact' that we will never get the promotion at work for which we have been longing.

It also involves our ability to tolerate ambiguity. It is possible, for instance, that we have a view about Christians. It might be that they are good and thoughtful people. New information may come in the form of our getting to know Christians who are not good and thoughtful, but dogmatic and thoughtless. We can accept this readily if we accept that Christians can be both, to us as opposed to others, at particular times (such as when we see them), in general because they are human.

These three points about new information, of being (1) understandable, (2) palatable, and (3) potentially ambiguous, are important when we examine the learning process. They acknowledge that learning involves objective and subjective factors, and cognitive and affective factors.
Objective and subjective factors bear upon the learning process in many ways. In particular, we speak about objectivity being desirable in understanding a problem or a dilemma, being able to stand back from it, not identify too emotionally with it, use valid and reliable ways to test it. Subjectivity, if it involves feelings in a creative, self-aware manner, as in literary, art or music criticism, can draw on and out the intuitive and belief-laden dimensions of knowledge and intelligence. Pejoratively, it can also immerse learning in self-centredness and idiosyncratic bias.

As well as these commonly understood issues, objectivity and subjectivity can be used about knowledge. Using the view of knowledge as a paradigm, or organised network of information content and procedures consensually held by experts or practitioners or a craft or discipline, then it is possible to call knowledge 'objective' when it is used or demonstrated by such experts. We might call the knowledge in a textbook on personnel management or systems analysis 'objective' if it reflects that broader paradigmatic knowledge which is generally recognised, by experts and laity alike, to characterise what people need and appear to know when they claim to know that knowledge (see Chapters 1-3).

Paradigmatic knowledge

More broadly still, paradigmatic knowledge is associated with the thought-world or world-view knowledge, say post-Freudian psychology or pre-Copernican astronomy, which enabled practitioners to explain their mystery to themselves and others, and articulate content and procedures connected with it. We might add other paradigms, like the monetarism of the 1980s or
post-John Robinson conceptions of God, which pervade not just our thinking but our lifestyles generally, and are not restricted entirely to elites or groups of experts.

This can be applied specifically to learning when we consider the types of information and knowledge there. It would be simplistic to argue that teachers have a canonical paradigm (or one which they use for active teaching and even indoctrination) into which learners are progressively initiated, although there is some truth in that view. Teachers themselves are learners, are intermediaries, with problems of understanding, bias, low or high tolerance of ambiguity, and feelings and attitudes associated with what and how they learn and teach.

Nevertheless, it is possible to suggest that beginning learners of a subject like statistics are likely to hold a 'layman's logic' view of topics like probability and significance. This lay view may be based on ostensibly sound empirical principles (like experience of gambling) and on an experiential knowledge of likelihoods. But it is likely to ignore - and scorn - the assumptions of statistical randomness which account for distributions, and comparisons between expected and observed phenomena which account for statistical significance. We see this when people assert that, after ten reds, a black will be 'chosen' by the whirling ball on the roulette wheel.

If we then assume that the knowledge required to understand statistics as a statistician is different from what is required to have a layman's logic view of some of its principles, then we should accept (a) that learning is a process of coming to know something of the paradigmatic knowledge associated with this area of expertise, and (b) exposure to this knowledge, and
knowledge of such exposure, entails coping with change as new information reformulates old.

Further down the track, new information is integrated into current knowledge, or rejected from it, or exists in a process of transition from short term to long term memory, or from a state of understanding to one of rejection, or from a fuzzy state to clearly defined, or from merely abstract to usably meaningful and meaningfully usable. In this way, learners come to accept paradigmatic knowledge, such as that associated with professions.

First new, then inchoate, then absorbed, the information becomes knowledge, the knowledge required by a doctor or lawyer to practise. In situations like these, learners learn not only 'expertise' knowledge but 'value-based' knowledge too, knowledge a professional knows about things and how to do them (eg a physicist knows physics and can adopt accepted investigative procedures to find out more physics), and those values and beliefs associated with the profession.

It would be wrong to imply that expertise is exclusive to traditionally conceived professions or disciplines. The learning process which characterises coming to know there has much in common with coming to know many ordinary things: how to change the wheel of a car, burp a baby, bake a cake, read a map, decorate a room, water a plant, keep a goldfish, keep a tactful silence. All these may well contain a formal element (eg a set of instructions on fishtank care, or a recipe book, or advice from someone who knows). The extent to which new information interacts with and reformulates existing knowledge in the learner is similar to the many stages involved in learning to be a lawyer or the manager of a university library, if not as systematised.
Investigation into concept change

The principles outlined above were presupposed in an investigation into concept change among learners. Such learners were exposed to new information in the academic/professional discipline of management.

In terms of paradigmatic knowledge, management presents some problems of definition and methodology. Among these can be included (a) its identity as a social science, taking in other 'subjects' like social psychology and computing, statistics and financial planning, (b) its identity seen by practitioners and by theorists, and its mixed character to both groups, and (c) its diversity in relation to product and service sectors, and profit and not-for-profit sectors (see Chapters 1-3).

Methodologically, there are problems associated with (a) its ineligibility for strictly experimental design-based research, because its 'laboratory' tends to be the workplace, (b) the reluctance of 'experts' to disclose knowledge for reasons of confidentiality, and (c) difficulties about generalising from examples because of the diversity of practice, organisational culture, and managerial aims. To these should be added here those problems linked with research in the educational domain, eg eliciting findings from subjects, avoidance of influencing such findings, and designing valid and reliable measures for testing.

The area of knowledge for this investigation was that of management, taught in a college of higher education to students of librarianship. The specific focus of the study was 'what managers do'. It aimed to elicit what learners thought managers did. It then exposed the learners to a short exposition on
the subject. It then asked the learners again what they thought managers did. Three cohorts of first-year students, over three years, took part in the study (N = 128). Thirty of these, randomly selected, were extracted for detailed examination. The test was conducted unobtrusively, partly for experimental reasons, and partly to avoid contamination of the findings over the diachronic span of the test (ie three times, one for each of 3 years).

The design of the investigation was in five parts:

(1) Prior knowledge elicitation ('before'): (testing device: unprompted fill-in sheet).

(2) Short exposition on what managers do.

(3) Posterior knowledge elicitation ('after'): (testing device: unprompted fill-in sheet).

(4) Analysis of prior and posterior knowledge responses by scalogram analysis.

(5) Discussion of analysis and conclusions on concept change elicited from learners.
Prior knowledge elicitation

Respondents were asked to consider eight characteristics of managers. It was possible to confront the respondents' prior knowledge with this since, from general experiential learning, students will have acquired some knowledge of management. It may be the management of teachers in a school, or of supervisors in a previous place of work. The researcher was able, in preliminary research (by structured interview) with all respondents, to confirm that some models of managers derived from television programmes watched regularly or spasmodically by respondents, and to establish a diversity of meanings for the concept 'management'.

It was also decided to structure responses so that they were dichotomous. In this case, responses were either 'yes' or 'no'. In the scalogram analysis (see below), emphasis was given to the 'yes' responses, although it would be equally cogent to emphasise the 'no' responses if the conclusions were appropriately inverted.

In order to build validity into the study, the eight characteristics were drawn from a content analysis of twenty major (i.e., most cited) textbooks in the field of management, published within the last five years of the study.

The criterion of 'most cited' was founded, in turn, on three procedures: (1) identifying major works and/or authors in library management (or in general management regarded as relevant to library and information work) with the assistance of five expert judges; (2) identifying major works and/or authors cited by those works and/or authors; and (3) identifying those major works cited in the respondents' own reading lists, and made
readily available through library provision (especially consultation loan, duplication and offprint collection).

The eight characteristics are revealed in the text of the fill-in sheet reproduced below. General contextual guidance notes for respondents have been taken away for the sake of clarity in this report of research.

---

Look at the following characteristics. Put a ring round YES or NO if you think them to be typical of what a manager does.

1. making decisions		YES	NO
2. handling money		YES	NO
3. giving orders		YES	NO
4. getting to the top		YES	NO
5. being aggressive		YES	NO
6. manipulating other people		YES	NO
7. asking incisive questions		YES	NO
8. acting as a peace-maker		YES	NO

---

Respondents were given these fill-in sheets before a course in management started. No prompting was given by the researcher (also the lecturer, ensuring replicability over the three years of the test). Sheets were
completed individually and handed in. Samples were selected in the way described above.

**Exposure to 'canonical knowledge'**

It was suggested above that management, as a subject of study in a college, is a subject about which students are likely to know something, but it is a subject which at the same time most of them will never have studied formally. Learners, in other words, bring a subjective paradigm, of knowledge and attitudes and beliefs, to the study of such a subject from the start.

It can be argued that in vocational courses, such as many in management where, at the end, successful students hope to practise as managers, learners bring not merely knowledge and value-system perceptions and expectations with them but also those perceptions and expectations associated with what they know or imagine about the 'profession' into which they hope to graduate. By this token, therefore, it is possible to speak of the knowledge paradigm of management, as being that knowledge and value-system, academic and practitioner based, which they see as requisite for student success. But it is also possible to add to that the further dimension of canonical knowledge.

Canonical knowledge is paradigmatic knowledge in use in the learning situation. The characteristics of paradigmatic knowledge have been outlined in chapters 1 and 2. Such knowledge incorporates both abstract and practical elements, and is often equated with the hegemonistic of the initiates or
'experts' or those with power to affect the development of the profession. In the learning situation, there are elements which turn paradigmatic into canonical knowledge. One major reason for this is that, to all the attributed authority associated by the learner with knowledge under paradigmatic conditions, is added that attributed authority associated by the learner with learning.

This second authority is based not on fear by the learner of the teacher (although this can exist), or even the fear of being 'wrong' (although this can be real). It arises in and through the mediation of the paradigmatic knowledge in the learning situation. It encompasses the ways in which the learner has to accommodate himself or herself to the pragmatics (eg the setting and its social demands) of learning.

It takes focus in the discourse used by learner and teacher, whether in its shape, which may be question and answer or extended exposition (like a lecture, with note-taking), or in its tone. Tone implies a range of qualities, from the talker's implicit attitude to his material to his explicit view of the listener. Pragmatic ambiguities may emerge for the learner, like an acknowledged practitioner speaking dismissively about his own profession, or adopting a machiavellian scepticism about apparently self-evidently canonical knowledge.

Finally, canonical knowledge is attributed with 'learnability'. This endows what is told or discussed or discovered with examinable or testable attributes. The student knows he has to know, has to prove mastery, has to remember on demand, has to know in a particular way at a particular time (eg for an essay at the end of fourth week), has to reach a particular level (eg a mark over 50% or for the satisfaction of specific learning objectives). In
this way, therefore, canonical knowledge takes on its own special meta-
cognitive characteristics, being knowledge known and to be known, but also
knowledge traded in a pragmatic setting by learners and teachers who play
roles in a process called learning.

**Exposition on what managers do**

New information is likely to change current knowledge networks in learners.
A **major aim of this investigation was to find out how exposure to particular**
forms of new information can induce such change (or reinforce prior
knowledge). The new information to which learners were exposed was
canonical. A key underlying theme was the extent to which learners revealed
what they knew about managers, and implicitly whether they thought 'good'
managers were or should be able to do or show such things.

The new information took the form of a short expository introduction to
'what managers do'. The exposition had been prepared by the researcher and
was presented, as dispassionately as possible, by the researcher in his role
as lecturer. The content of the exposition had been distilled from a content
analysis of material on that topic from current textbooks in library
management.

Material for this had been chosen in the way discussed above. With this
source, and disseminated in this way, both content and approach were
classically paradigmatic. Given the pedagogic setting, it is safe to assume
that its effect upon participant learners was canonical.
Other factors regarded as important for the content and presentation included the researcher's own experience (ie 20 years of teaching management) of lecturing to students, and knowledge of the aims and remit of courses in library management for students in this area of higher education. Incidentally, the exposition was to form the introduction for an extended course in library management, and so the investigation did not deflect students from mainstream learning targets. No element of manipulation was detected, confirming its status as unobtrusive.

Material was carefully chosen so as to fulfil three major objectives: (1) that it should be strictly and generically relevant to the theme 'what managers do', ie not speculative or sententious, and not biased towards one type of management or another (eg profit or not-for-profit); (2) that it should be structured clearly, well-signposted and jargon-free so as to minimise problems of understanding; and (3) that it should not refer directly or explicitly to the eight factors mentioned in the fill-in sheet.

It was inevitable that the exposition would play the role of an Ausubelian 'advance organiser' for the knowledge and sentiments of learners when it came to the posterior fill-in sheet (see below), and it was with this in mind that the 'before' and 'after' information was compared to determine the extent of concept change.

The content of the exposition can be summarised thus. The topic was defined: 'what managers do'. Two definitions of management were given: 'use of resources for given ends' (where resources were defined as personnel, money, buildings/space, ideas, and time), and 'getting things done through people' (where the emphasis was on human resource management).
Four key activities were highlighted as typical of what managers do: (a) make decisions and set priorities, (b) work with and through people, (c) think analytically and accountably, and (d) act as politicians and diplomats. Short examples of each were provided.

The notion of management principles underlying practice was introduced. Four such principles were briefly discussed: authority, direction, reward, and team/group context. The objective was to show how diversity of practice can be illuminated by being aware of underlying principles. Then 'ineffective management' was defined, in terms of incompetence (not knowing), lack of communication (not telling), favouritism (not being fair), and interference (not letting others).

Finally, Kipling's 'six stalwart serving men' (what? where? when? why? how? and who?) were mentioned, and learners challenged to consider how managers might use them to manage well.

No systematic observation, other than that possible by the researcher, was made of the communicatory or proxemic aspects of student reaction. The complex effects of communication in the classroom, such as reactions to specific statements, responses to statements of different kinds (eg rhetorical questions, axioms, story-examples), tone of delivery, listening behaviours, were not recorded, but systematic research of this kind can be conducted.

No instructions about writing or not writing notes during the exposition were given. No indication that a posterior fill-in sheet would be given out at the end was provided.
Response and analysis

Respondents were presented with a posterior fill-in sheet when the exposition had been completed (it took thirty minutes). This sheet consisted of the same information as the prior fill-in sheet and the method of response was identical with eight factors and YES/NO responses. Of course, there were the same number of respondents for the posterior as for the prior fill-in sheet since, each time the test was conducted, no one left during the exposition.

Analysis of the data was then carried out. From the entire number of participants 30 respondents were sampled. Each had given eight responses to eight factors, one to each. Responses were dichotomous, ie either 'yes' or 'no'. Both were recorded, although in the final stages of the analysis only the 'yes' responses were noted as providing information about the respondents' endorsements of the various factors.

Data were analysed using Guttman's scalogram analysis, a method which allows the researcher to establish from a respondent's score exactly what items he or she had endorsed. Scalogram analysis is, in the words of Oppenheim (Oppenheim, 1966), 'ordinal and cumulative'. This means that, if respondents are giving views on how hard topics in statistics are to learn, ways will be found by the researcher of arranging their responses in order of difficulty (ie the ordinal aspect).

It is cumulative in that the researcher builds up a set of responses, and works progressively through, arranging them first by respondent and factor, by these plus score (say, score of 'yes' responses), then by all these
arranged from major factor (that factor preferred most) to minor factor (that preferred least), and finally, within score categories, an adjustment so that, from top to bottom of the table, 'yes' responses gather to the left and 'no' responses to the right. This final manoeuvre creates a wedge-shaped data arrangement, and enables the researcher to determine a boundary between the preferences for factors and exceptions or errors.

The stages described above can be inspected in Appendix VIII. All the 'before' responses are reproduced so as to demonstrate not just the data but the methodology also. Readers will find that parts (A) to (D) of Appendix VIII reproduce the sequence of 'before' data, and (E) the final stage of the 'after' data.

(A) represents the initial arrangement by respondent, factor and score (unranked). (B) organises the data by ranked score. (C) organises the data by ranked score and ranked factor score. (D) is the final arrangement of 'before' data, ranked by score and factor score (most preferred factors to left), with only 'yes' responses shown. A boundary line has been drawn to indicate the major pattern of these responses. 'Yes' responses beyond (to the right of) the line represent deviations from the perfect scale pattern (or 'errors').

In the same way, data for the 'after' test was recorded and analysed, and finally rendered in (E) in the same manner as (D).

Guttman was concerned with reliability or, as he termed it here, 'reproducibility'. Speaking of the ways in which a researcher could reliably test a given universe of content and rank the items within it, he expressed
the view that a coefficient of reproducibility of 0.90 or over was acceptable. This coefficient can be determined using the following formula:

\[
R = 1 - \frac{\text{number of errors}}{\text{number of responses}}
\]

The number of errors is, in this case, the number of 'yes' responses outside the boundary line, while the number of responses is the number of items (factors) multiplied by the number of respondents. This latter calculation is 240. The coefficients for the tests can be derived easily: for the 'before' test, it is 0.979, and for the 'after' test, it is 0.975. That is to say, both tests have acceptable levels of reproducibility.

Discussion of scalogram analysis of concept change

With reference to the data analysis, particularly that reproduced in (D) and (E) for the 'before' and 'after' tests respectively, we are now in a better position to judge what has happened. These tables provide useful information on respondent's choices or views before and after exposure to the new information of the exposition.

In the tables, respondents (N = 30) are listed as numbers in the left column. Across the table are the items or factors: for example, item 1 is the factor 'making decisions', allegedly one of the things which managers
do, and so on. In the far right column, the scores of the 'yes' responses are recorded.

By the time we reach tables (D) and (E), the data has been rearranged several times in the manner indicated above. Responses are now arranged by 'yes' scores in rank order (from top to bottom), and by item or factor scores in order of popularity (from left to right). Within each interval of vertical scores, respondents have been ranked so that those with more 'yes' responses extending across the table are placed above those with fewer. This leads to the wedge-shape of the data, as indicated by the boundary line.

The most important finding from the data concerns the priority order of the factors. Before exposure to the new information of the exposition, responses conform to this pattern, as indicated in Table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank order of factors:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Scalogram analysis: 'before' responses to factors
This suggests that 'making decisions' and 'giving orders' were regarded as most characteristic of what managers do. These were closely followed by 'acting as peace-makers'. Behind these three dominant characteristics came a 'tail' or 'scree' of other characteristics: 'asking incisive questions' and 'manipulating other people'; then 'handling money' and 'getting to the top'; and finally 'being aggressive'.

Turning to the 'after' responses, Table 22 reveals that there have been changes in the factor ratings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank order of factors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Scalogram analysis: 'after' responses to factors

While 'making decisions', 'giving orders', and 'acting as peace-makers' still come high, and while 'getting to the top' and 'being aggressive' still come low, there has been change in the middle rankings. These changes relate
to factors 2 ('handling money'), 6 ('manipulating other people'), and 7 ('asking incisive questions'). We can see this set of movements if we place the two rank orders of factors side by side, as in Table 23.

Table 23: Rank orders of factors compared

| 'Before' rank order of factors: 1 3 8 7 6 2 4 5 |
| 'After' rank order of factors: 1 3 8 2 7 6 4 5 |

[correlation coefficient (Pearson) 0.5, not significant for two-tail test at significance levels 0.05 and 0.01]

We can detect stability for factors 1, 3, and 8, and factors 4 and 5. We can detect mobility for factors 2, 6, and 7. Both change and NON-change are of interest to the researcher in the context of concept change. Non-change suggests that exposure to new information has not precipitated a
reformulation in the subjective conceptual networks of the learners. Change suggests that such exposure has caused this reformulation to occur.

Non-change appears to reveal parallelisms between paradigmatic knowledge and the subjective or novice knowledge networks in the learners. This could suggest a variety of things all worth further research: the extent to which lay knowledge of management is sedimented by common experience rather than by formal management courses, the extent to which management is common sense on stilts, exactly what learners do know before they start courses on management, and to what extent respondents are good guessers in tests such as these, all with corresponding implications for testing procedure and reliability.

Evidence such as this does appear to confirm the pervasive compatibility between general principles and features of formal management courses and the general knowledge which beginning learners bring to such courses. From this, it could be argued that only in advanced areas of the discipline, pure or applied, does the general knowledge of learners get replaced or reformulated by formal paradigmatic knowledge, mediated canonically in the way described.

Change is arguably more interesting still. The study appears to have revealed that, while some concepts or factors remain stable, some concepts are subject to change.

These are factors 2, 6, and 7. Factor 2 is 'handling money', which attracted nine more 'yes' responses between 'before' and 'after' tests, and moved from position 6 to 4 in the rank order. Factor 6 is 'manipulating other people', which attracted 14 'yes' responses in both tests, but, because of other
factor movement, moved from 5 to 6 in the rank order. Factor 7 is 'asking incisive questions', which attracted 2 fewer 'yes' responses between 'before' and 'after' tests, and moved from position 4 to 5 in the rank order.

The factor which demonstrates most change is factor 2, 'handling money'. Reasons for this are suggested below. Clearly respondents feel, after exposure to the new information of the exposition, that, whatever else managers do, handling money is more characteristic of their work than the respondents first believed. Moreover, they appear to believe that 'asking incisive questions' is marginally less important than at first, and that 'manipulating other people' is less than at first. Relative movements for factors 6 and 7 should be put in the context of the rank order, making the movement of factor 6 possibly more important than than of factor 7 (since 6 moves much closer to the two factors, 4 and 5, regarded as least preferable, and therefore least likely to what managers do).

Another interesting finding from the data analysis is associated with the range and distribution of scores. Before, we find the maximum score is 7 (two respondents), the minimum 3 (one respondent). After, we find the maximum score is 8 (two respondents), the minimum 4 (six respondents). The 'before' average is 4.9 and standard deviation 0.995, while the 'after' average is 5.467 and standard deviation is 1.167. The bulking effect of 4 scores in 'before', and its change to 5 scores in 'after', is of interest in pointing to a greater hospitality, on the part of more respondents, to more characteristics of what managers do.

In other words, it appears that more learners appear to have a wider or deeper knowledge of what managers do, a wider understanding of the range of
managerial work, than before. There has been an increase in knowledge about management, that is to say, about the expert paradigm mediated canonically through the exposition.

Concept change and learning

It is now necessary to examine in detail what in the exposition may have induced these changes. Only the external, textual and presentational, elements can be examined in this way, although further research (say, into recall) would elicit more.

Looking first at the concepts which appeared to undergo little change, and considering 1 ('making decisions'), 3 ('giving orders'), and 8 (acting as peace-makers'): it is possible that factor 1 was influenced above all by three statements in the exposition: managers make decisions and set priorities, one management principle is directing, and what was implied by the six serving men. All underpinned and reinforced, explicitly and implicitly, the concept identified by factor 1, and arguably would have reinforced learner's confidence in it as a characteristic that managers do.

It is equally possible that factor 3 was influenced by two statements in the exposition: one management principle is authority, while a feature of ineffective management, its opposite, is lack of communication. Similarly, factor 8 could have been influenced by two statements: the statement that managers work with and through people', while a feature of ineffective management, is interference (ie poor delegation, bad interpersonal
relations). All these would have been likely to reinforce views held 'before' by learners.

In the same way, factors 4 and 5 were reinforced by the experience of the exposition. Taking factor 5 ('being aggressive') first, the statement 'working with and through people' acted as strong denial of this factor, while the feature of ineffective management, interference, with its implications of breathing down people's necks, looking over their shoulders, finding fault with subordinates, would have reinforced it. This begs questions as to whether these implications were indeed consciously or subconsciously known to the learners, and further research is required to elicit something of this.

As for factor 4 ('getting to the top'), it is difficult to detect a direct stimulus or counter-stimulus, except to suggest that the pervasive ethos of library and information work is not primarily or exclusively involved in aggressive self-advancement but more in satisfactions orientated round service ideals. To substantiate this further, research would need to examine professional ideals and ethos, and seek to elicit concepts, and changes to concepts, among entrants to the profession.

Change was most noticed in responses to factor 2 ('handling money'). Likely influences from the new information presented in the exposition would include the following: the definition of management as 'the use of resources for given ends', in which, among 'resources', money or finance is prominent. Also, a management principle is the notion of reward, and for most workers financial reward is common. By inference, handing financial reward (eg through salaries and wages) is a commonly perceived activity and obligation of management. What we may be seeing here is paradigmatic change.
It is possible that learners were entirely realistic about money as part of management all along. Far from undergoing concept change, in that they saw, after the exposition, that money figured more prominently than they previously thought in the work of managers, it may be that, after the exposition, which openly accepted financial control as an important aspect of management, learners felt able to express their privately held views and perceptions openly. If this was so, what we see here is canonical change. There is, of course, no reason to assume that both paradigmatic and canonical change are not at work together.

Change was also noticed in factor 7 ('asking incisive questions'). Direct encouragement for reconsidering this view may have come from the exposition in the form of the statement that managers 'think analytically and accountably'. It may also have been implied by mention of the six serving men, all questions (like who? and what?) likely to be associated by learners with asking questions, incisive or not.

Finally change was noticed in factor 6 ('manipulating other people'). It appears from its change in the rank order (from fifth to sixth) that learners felt that manipulating other people was not something managers actually did as much as they (learners) first thought. In fact, it moved close to two characteristics, getting to the top and being aggressive, which learners were overtly prepared to admit that they rejected as being characteristics of managers.

Likely statements in the exposition to influence this factor include the statement that managers 'act as politicians and diplomats', that one management principle involves a notion of working as a team or group, and, by opposites, a feature of ineffective management is interference (eg poor
delegation, not giving people headroom, poor relationships with other staff).

In all cases in this section, detailed linkages could ideally be traced between responses and stimuli statements in the exposition to consolidate the contentions laid out here, and even carried through to any written work such as essays or examination questions carried out by respondents. Such research would also take continual cognisance of current research into recall, matters beyond the strict boundaries of this thesis.

Conclusion

Coming to know things involves a complex, multi-layered process only part of which can ever be fully understood. Models of learning clarify only the ground-rules and highlight possible generalities. Assumptions are continually made about what learning is and how it takes place. Here, a broadly cognitive model of learning has been adopted, drawing on ideas about concepts and semantic networks.

Notions of relevance or meaningfulness have been assumed, as have those of meta-cognition. Sociological and epistemological factors have been built into the investigation, in the form of what was said about knowledge paradigms and what experts and learners regard as important and true. Pedagogical factors, with special reference to canonical learning, have been acknowledged.
Very much hidden from researchers in the qualitative domain are the many subjectivities of learners, most of all those associated with what they know, know they know, and think about themselves as knowers. Closely linked with them are the ways in which research can elicit what learners know, or are prepared to tell us about what they think they know. Using this method of elicitation and analysis, this section aimed to open up further the area of meanings and knowledge among novice managers, and identify some of the likely general changes, and their causes, when such respondents encounter new information.

At this stage of the thesis, however, it is necessary to move beyond the concepts revealed and handled by managers expert and novice. The reader will recall how in the introductory chapters mention was made of the overall programmatic for this ethnographic, contextualistic and constructivistic research, viz, the referential hierarchy. This consists of not just concepts and propositions but scripts and stories too. The argument and contention were that, like the elements of Maslow’s pyramid, each larger stage of this referential hierarchy was both complete in itself and subsumed the smaller stages (eg stories subsumed scripts, etc). Given this, it is entirely logical for the discussion to move on to scripts and stories, and seek to demonstrate the importance of understanding the entire span of the hierarchy, with all its dimensions, if we are to have an adequate understanding of managerial meaning.

****
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PART 4

MANAGERIAL SCRIPTS AND

STORIES OF EFFECTIVENESS
PART 4

CHAPTER 8

ABSTRACT

Managers attempt to understand experience, and use forms of discourse (fact and fiction) to express the daily reality of their lives. Discourse is used both to represent what coherence they detect in the workplace, and as a way of structuring experience.

This coherence draws on an understanding of narrative and expository structures. In order to discuss these, we need to consider plans, goals, problems and decisions. With reference to narrative and quantitative techniques, the 'goal-based', 'problem-solving', and 'decision-making' aspects of managerial discourse are introduced.

Effective management entails making judgements and decisions, but often the knowledge, opinions and perceptions of managers are inadequately expressed or even unknown.

Consensus tables are suggested as a way to elicit factors such as these. They are applied, at various levels of complexity, to situations in library and information management, as a way of illustrating how knowledge representation takes place among groups of managers, and by implication what can be known about effective decision making at work. Three typical situations are chosen: the evaluation of databases in a library, the performance appraisal of staff, and an assessment of managerial competences.

It is argued that the characteristics of goal-based decision making form an important element in the ways managers make decisions, and represent, to others and to themselves, the ways in which decisions are made. Ways of extending strictly statistical (or decision tree) methods are suggested, with greater attention to context and the construction of meaning. Action mazes are recommended as a way forward, and these are signposted for discussion in later chapters.

Finally, it is suggested that only through a close examination of the ways in which scripts and stories are used by managers can an adequate understanding of managerial meaning be attained.
It has been suggested earlier that managers know about management, know what and that they know, and seek to represent knowledge and meta-knowledge in appropriate forms of discourse in order to manage meaning. The role of Chapter 8 is to examine how goals, problems, and decisions form an important part of this process of managing meaning. Particular reference will be made to forms of discourse used by managers. Two dominant forms will be identified: expository (or 'factual') and semi-narrative (or 'storied', containing aspects of meaning, narrative, and understanding). The issues raised here are developed theoretically and applied empirically through the later chapters of Part 4.
Coherence for meaning

It is not enough that things happen. It is essential for managers to be able to have a degree of control over what happens, to know what happens, and to know what has happened up to now. These statements imply a complex interaction of experience (control, action, decision-making) and self-awareness (reflection, review). They suggest that effective managers can get things done and explain them as they happen and in retrospect. Management happens in a time-frame of past, present, and future. Aims and objectives, missions and targets, are often set, based on experience and expectation, and progress evaluated. Critically important are whether these (generic) 'goals' have been met.

This evaluative process implies in its turn an ability to see or infer a sense of coherence. Things may have happened as the result of other things, causal sequences or event chains or concatenations of episodes which do not just 'follow' from each other, logically or not, but appear to do so in the mind of the manager. Such sequences may reflect the planning and implementation of an automated system in a library, the legal and interpersonal rituals of a grievance procedure, a series of financial decisions which the manager can now see led to the crisis he is in, or the past year of her managerial life as the result of being passed over for promotion (where perhaps most of the 'events' may be internal).

Coherence may be seen both in the events themselves and in the manager's explanation or interpretation of them. Effective command of reality and effective decision-making may be said to depend on the extent to which a manager can achieve these things. Forms of discourse are used to
'instantiate' (or give concrete form to) the coherence of events: minutes at meetings, annual reports, operational plans for the future, manuals of procedure, records of appraisal interviews, retirement speeches, and informal conversations about relationships. Full instantiation may be impossible, and may draw on an elusive diversity of materials (spoken, written, explicit, implicit).

For anything like full instantiation of managerial meaning, the understanding deriving from the very act of instantiation cannot be ignored (eg managers come to understand their actions and plans better by giving a presentation, writing a report, discussing their career objectives at an appraisal interview).

We may summarise by suggesting that coherence derives from being able to express, explain and understand the experience itself. This draws on the manager's ability effectively to use (1) schematic wisdom (knowledge of the job, its environment and values and beliefs, organised cognitively into semantically meaningful and coherent structures of meaning), (2) a narrative sense (by which an awareness of plot, causality, chronology, contingency is used effectively), and (3) a clear understanding of how real and true events and states, and perceptions of events and states, actually are (use of epistemic authority).

Managerial discourse and goals

The events and states at work are exteriorised in many forms of discourse, text, conversation. Management, and the representation of management in
these ways, predicates an ability to make judgements. These are characteristic of social cognition, and reveal themselves in the many ways in which managers use or reject information for reasons ranging from its being irrelevant or incorrect or incompatible to the intentions or expectations of the manager, to its simply being not preferred subjectively by him. Zukier (Zukier, in Sorrentino & Higgins, 1986, 465-502) suggests that such goals may be cognitive (as we try to understand things), expressive (as we bring our emotions and affective interests into it), and pragmatic (our concrete concerns to understand things in order to get things done). Our selection of events and states, in real life and then as represented in forms of discourse (expository and narrative), is influenced by these goals.

Zukier identifies two goal orientations, the 'paradigmatic' and the 'narrative' modes of thinking, representing 'two forms of knowing...deployed alone or together...as a function of individual objectives and task representation'. He suggests that the paradigmatic emphasises logical explanation, categorisation and context-freedom, while the narrative concentrates on 'developing or uncovering sequential relationships of concatenation, conjunction, or combination... [it] emphasizes "action-related" structuring and the "pulling together" of the available information into a connected narrative and pattern or network; this pattern reveals the common thread and internal coherence of the story - its plot rather than its paradigmatic theme'.

This takes up ideas introduced in Part 2 about paradigmatic knowledge. In this context, we may argue that the paradigmatic goal orientation accommodates much managerial activity where factuality dominates (as in descriptions of procedures and meetings) and where plans and choices are
made in a context of logical explanation and careful differentiation between like and unlike processes and factors. On the other hand, the narrative goal orientation, with its emphasis on action-relatedness and 'plot', argues for a richer, albeit sometimes more formless, structure, containing a high degree of pragmatic and idiosyncratic contextuality, as well as a 'plot'. We may term a 'plot' a causal sequence with the expressive and pragmatic goals very evident.

The paradigmatic approach, furthermore, implies the existence of that 'rationalistic' style of management discussed in Chapter 1 where it was argued that the purely rationalistic view of management had grown richer through 'excellence' thinking, and by reason of belief-laden, phenomenographic and reflective approaches adopted by many managers. It is possible to see how we can move through a simply dualistic view that management is either rationalistic or not by reminding ourselves that through narrative forms of discourse managers are able to instantiate and exteriorise the complexity of their experience.

Similarities between narrative and non-narrative (ie expository) forms of discourse will be examined as a way of going on to suggest that 'intermediate' forms of discourse, above all forms of storytelling incorporating goals and decision-structures, are able to represent the complexity of managerial experience effectively.

The texture of daily experience is both lived through/in and reflected upon. The referential hierarchy (see Chapter 4) argued that referents by reason of which this texture exists take form (things get names and names get expressed in coherent structures from concepts to stories). Goals have an
integral place here. If we say that scripts are chains of routine events and state, what happens when we encounter, or know that we are to encounter, situations which are not routine? Then, our knowledge has to be more adventurous, 'protentive' (open to the future), flexible.

Schank and Abelson (Schank & Abelson, 1977) refer to these as plans, 'general or abstract actions associated with general goals'. There is a strong inferential or inductive quality about this movement from scripts to plans, since it demonstrates that, say, managers able to identify events and reason inductively from them, can apply routine ideas in new ways and apply non-routine ideas in, say, decision making.

Critical for using plans is a knowledge of what would be appropriate. Appropriateness consists of 'what is likely to work in the circumstances' (ie experientially tested, feasible) or 'what could work' (plausible), or 'what should work' (eg given our knowledge of comparable events and states, or given our expectations or motivation or sense of ethics or duty). For example, for an effective manager to declare a plan which entailed getting promotion by killing his boss (Black and others, in Nystrand, 1982, 325-43) would render our view of his effectiveness suspect.

Implicit in the notion of a plan is the further notion of a 'goal'. After all, the plan is aimed at something, and the script (or story) describing or containing it is also. In folk tales, heroes go on journeys to fight monsters, rescue maidens, and bring back treasure. Goals might be based on satisfying simple needs (eg a manager may work hard for money and security) or more complex needs (eg for realising himself as a professional person), a structure reflecting Maslow's famous motivational pyramid. Intermediate goals may be pursued in order to fulfil further goals (eg a manager takes
time to train subordinate staff in order to achieve the further goals of team-building or enhancing job satisfaction).

The principles of the paradigmatic and narrative orientations can be reintroduced here, since the former concerns itself with causal relationships and with the extent to which instances are inductively or testably 'true', and the latter with 'reasons rather than causes' and the 'motivational underpinnings of behavior' (Zukier, loc.cit.). This reinforcement of the bounded nature of rationality, and of the way in which participants in and tellers of managerial discourses are personally implicated in the act of exteriorisation, leads us to suggest, again, that forms of discourse representing plans and goals need to be found, and that forms drawing on narrative and non-narrative traditions are likely to be best.

Goals, problems, and decisions

Many situations have more than one goal. Several goals may present themselves, between which choice might be easy or difficult. Goals may conflict with each other, or be mutually exclusive. Some may be known to work in advance, others uncertain or even dangerous. Furthermore, different participants (agents or protagonists in the situation or storied situation, or narrators) may have different goals.

Within the situations themselves, say in an academic library, manager 1 may want priority funding to chemistry textbooks while manager 2 to the social sciences; manager 3 may want and be offered promotion but at the same time
not wish to stay in the organisation ('goals'). Outside the situations, where managers are talking about it, manager 4 may wish to deceive her hearers about her part in the marketing project, while manager 5 may wish guilefully to imply that it was all her fault ('meta-goals').

It may be said that the effective manager is able to handle the conflict or ambiguity arising from the complexity of having several goals at once. Part of their effectiveness will depend on the extent to which they can exercise the appropriate knowledge, wisdom and tact to make the 'correct' decision. In context, the correctness of the decision itself may be a matter of dispute because the knowledge may be questioned (the characteristic pluralism of multi-paradigmatic environments), beliefs and values may be attacked (eg 'should a manager be regarded as effective if he considers the person rather than the post in recommending a redundancy?'), and the wisdom of hindsight may reveal that unexpected or unpleasant consequences followed from the decision (the implications of retrospection in storytelling are described fully later).

Many management activities show conflict. In fact, between the different power bases in a company or department, group dynamics and the exercise of power and authority will commonly precipitate it. The negotiation of meaning between groups like line and staff, and managerial types like craftsman and gamesman, are described elsewhere in the thesis. The different viewpoints, knowledge domains, political ideologies and value systems go towards confirming that, if the meaning of management is the management of meaning, then the dialectic detected in organisational behaviour can be applied to the decision making activities in which they engage. Lindsey and others (Lindsey & others, 1987) pinpoint the transition from technical to corporate
manager as being a critical watershed for this dialectic in the individual
manager.

Rhenman and others (Rhenman & others, 1970) suggest that conflict pervades
the organisation, and is intimately associated with decision making. They
differentiate between formal conflicts, which are breakdowns in or threats
to cooperation (eg when manager 1 does not, as he is expected, pass
information to manager 2, when in other words actions diverge from roles and
expectations), and substantive conflicts, which are conflicts caused by
disagreements between parties to a joint decision (eg when middle managers
with cognate duties cannot agree on stock management or training
priorities). Substantive conflicts often hinge on facts (which can be
tested) and on goals (which they link closely with values). In consequence,
good-based substantive conflicts are the most complex to resolve.

There is a view that management is problem solving, that issues about
product development, financial planning, staff management, marketing and the
rest all pose problems, which successful managers solve. Typically, managers
in libraries and information services characterise challenges as 'problems',
possibly in the spirit of regarding opportunities as threats, possibly for
neutral reasons of linguistic usage. Seeing forms of discourse as ways of
handling and solving problems is natural (Smyth & others, 1987, 285-311).
Some widely known textual forms (eg detective stories, investigative
reports) are predicated and based on problem-solving, and, at discourse (in
the structure or argument) and meta-discourse (eg disclosing hidden
information within social reality) levels, entail revealing and
understanding a set of choices, searching for the most likely alternative,
and achieving the goal of discovery (or poetic justice, or accountability,
or whatever).
Black (Black & others, 1980) distinguishes between two problem solving representations in narrative discourse, 'the state-transition network' (where problem solving is a series of states and actions, in which means-ends analysis on the part of the solver reduces distance between where he is and the goal state), and 'the problem-reduction tree' (where the solver analyses the problem into a 'tree' of constituent problems 'until only readily solvable subproblems remain'. Both operate in stories, as when John looks for a book he wants (STN) and analyses where to get it (library, bookshop, etc) and then decides to go / goes there (PRT), leading Black to give the name 'hierarchical state transition' to the mixture.

This appropriately accords with the contention, held above, that, for an effective expression of the complexity of managerial experience, discourse should be able to analyse the problems (reaching aims, setting plans, identifying goals, getting things done) and take cognisance of the changing states through which agents (in stories) and narrators pass (eg coping with suspense, cognitive dissonance, pride, retrospective rationalisation, or even the state of half-knowing which impels the narrator to translate the situation into discourse).

Decisions form another crucial element. As a process, decision making entails finding and making choices between alternative courses of action. This can take place even if 'problems' as such do not exist, but often decision making is regarded as a process growing out of problem solving. Drucker (Drucker, 1967) defines an effective executive as one who can identify the most important decisions: 'They try to make a few important decisions on the highest level of conceptual understanding'. Often decision making involves setting aims and objectives (ie goals), finding and
implementing ways of attaining them, and then reviewing progress (ie 'Have we reached the goal?').

The time frame of this is important, for goal formulation is prospective, goal-review is retrospective, and an understanding of what choices there were, what were made, and what the effects were, is the form of understanding which, arguably, encourages managers to express their picture in forms of discourse. Important also is the context of decision making; the organisation, the personalities, how they work as groups, what they know and believe, and how they think.

Rationality and probability

There is a view that decision making is wholly rational. It is based on a classical view of management in which 'rational' managers make optimal choices in neatly defined situations, choices between alternatives which logically represent the best or only ones there, and whose consequences can readily be identified (Harrison, 1987, 76). Traditionally associated with the rational or classical approach is quantification, and for this reason managerial techniques like critical path analysis and operational research, transportation and decision tree analysis are often used.

For example, it is possible (and desirable) to express effectiveness in handling a library budget by using decision theory and calculating pay-offs. This might be achieved by identifying from knowledge and experience, say, four scenarios or policy regimes for the library (A,B,C,D), and, say, three courses of action (1,2,3). This gives a simple matrix of 12 outcomes. An
assumption is made that outcomes (i.e., achieved goals, 'good' and 'bad'), like alternatives, can be expressed numerically. Judgements can then be entered as to what pay-offs are likely for each regime and course of action: e.g., B1 could be said to yield six units (e.g., a 'profit' or 'excess of income over expenditure' of £60000) while C2 might anticipate minus three units (i.e., a deficit of £30000).

Probabilities can be built into this technique, drawing on decision theory. The probabilities of each course of action can be determined (say, course of action 1 = 20%), enabling an agglomerative calculation to be made for each regime for ALL courses of action. Each one might tried (complementary probability) or they all might be tried together (independent probability), so that data could be added or multiplied (respectively) to signal likely pay-offs for one or more years.

Effective management can in this way build in quantitative techniques to its decision making, even though assumptions are made about (a) expressing decisions or judgements in numerical formats and (b) accepting the assumptions of random chance.

The idea of attributing probability to particular information options is common in information retrieval, particularly in automatic indexing, by which terms are identified in searches according to their frequency, and relevant documents retrieved using this method (Ellis, 1990; Willett, 1988; Salton & McGill, 1983). The principle here is that, from among known (and even unknown) sets of available choices, likelihoods can be attributed by the experienced practitioner, which are intended to help locate specific ways of achieving one's goal (here, getting a relevant document). In the same manner, probability can be attributed to choices in decision making.
The classic statement of this, in the sphere of deciding under conditions of uncertainty, is the work of Tversky and Kahnemann (eg Tversky & Kahnemann, 1980).

From the position that 'cause-effect' schemes (or schemata) 'organise' (or represent how organisation takes place) events for managers in search of coherent interpretations of events, it can be argued that we can look for causal (ie causing) and diagnostic (ie caused, ie consequent) data. Tversky and Kahnemann were able to establish that 'the impact of causal data on the judged probability of a consequence is greater than the impact of diagnostic data on the judged probability of a cause'.

Apart from suggesting that observers tend to make sense of events more by saying that 'X caused Y (and then Z...)' than by saying that 'Y happened and so there must have been an X etc', their approach assigns probabilities to the outcomes. Incidentally they are able to determine, using Bayes' Theorem, that many observers assign subjective probabilities different from those arising from random chance, although this is marginal to this argument here.

The Bayesian approach involves calculating conditional probabilities (ie those 'without replacement') when the outcome is known. 'If we already have observed an outcome from an event or activity or decision, then we can estimate the probability that a particular event happened which conditioned that outcome' (Hannabuss, 1990). This is demonstrated, in respect of making effective Bayesian decisions about library supply and then in financial planning, in the article reproduced as Appendix IX.

It provides the manager with a useful technique for determining probabilities when he or she looks back over what has happened up to the
present, ie the point when he or she reviews the process which has led up to the goal. Here the present may be defined as the 'now' when goal review takes place, or that point when the goal is recognised and a sense of a coherent causal sequence impinges upon the manager. This point is called the 'goal recognition point' and is developed and applied in Chapter 10.

We may argue, too, that, if managers are willing or feel able to attribute probabilities to events and outcomes, then they admit that they know something about either or both. This knowledge may be based on experience, learned 'experientially' in a Kolbian sense. If that is so, they may be attributed with enough 'knowledge' to make choices between alternatives, to pick out those alternatives most or least likely to succeed or fail. Such a process may arguably be regarded as an exercise in judgement, picking out most feasible paths. It can be done 'in retrospect' (even though what actually happened cannot be changed, but the past can give us lessons for the future, for that point beyond the present) and 'in prospect', where most managerial planning is done (under conditions of uncertainty!).

Paths might be plausible rather than feasible, as managers think of what might politically look best for them to choose or 'what they could most easily get away with'. If they are recounting their experience to another person, managers might stress 'what might look best for them' (either as a rationalisation of the past or a best bet for the future). Paths might also be desirable, ones which a manager might WISH to follow, or think he SHOULD follow or SHOULD HAVE followed, a state of affairs which might arise from experientially learned knowledge about the causal sequence up to the goal recognition point, or from a wish to impress or conform or not offend (say, a superior, a shareholder, a validating body).
These dimensions of decision making are, in fact, dimensions in managerial storytelling, and will form integral elements of the experiential-axiological-deontic model developed in Chapter 11.

To these points we might add the suggestion that, if managers can be asked to attribute probabilities to different outcomes, retrospective or prospective, then they are attributing truth-valuations to them. Just as under forced choice in zero-based budgeting, managers allocate scarce resources to a portfolio of library services, so here we can argue that, when a manager says that the probability of scenario 1 (under which, for instance, the library continues under zero personnel and building growth and with a budget of 3.1% of university funding) is 0.5 (1 being unity, i.e. 100%), and that the probability of scenario 2 is 0.3 and scenario 3 is 0.2, then the manager indicates that he thinks they are going to be proportionally 'true' (i.e. 'real'), vis-a-vis those probability attributions, for the library in the period concerned.

Predicated here, as the manager knows (although a third party hearing the account may not), is his knowledge of the past and the likely (extrapolated from the past), as well as any beliefs and values (e.g., he or she may be optimistic, may regard that a preferred area of library development is already being treated well, may bid low to ingratiate him/herself with the Library Committee, may know ways of surreptitious virement).

More widely used than Bayesian probability are DECISION TREES, which enable managers to identify outcomes by means of pay-off matrices. These deal with expected outcomes or rewards, and often these rewards are termed EMVs, expected monetary values. Taking the notion that decisions are made to
identify and choose options, and adding the idea that probability can be attributed to each (giving them a derived epistemic status), then we are able to determine EMVs for the various decisions.

Managers need to be able to express their decisions in terms of plans and goals, and a major aspect of practical decision making is the monetary (or cost-benefit) value of the goal or outcome (e.g., budgetary status or cost-benefit ratio or performance level or time-value of the critical path). These examples illustrate the many ways in which goals may appear. Most managers have to work to quantitative goals of some kind (e.g., keeping within budget, maintaining staff-user ratios, logging OPAC terminal usage, generating income, balancing the buy-borrow dilemma of stock, comparing use and cost of journals). An application of decision trees in library budgeting is developed by the writer (Hannabuss, 1987a), arose from this general research programme, and forms Appendix X.

The logic of decision trees is implicit in much Boolean searching by library managers (using AND, OR, and NOT operators for effective retrieval of citations or documents). Its logic is also easy to infer from many simple decision making tasks by library managers: e.g., asking if a book is overdue. Two answers (yes and no) are possible, beyond which are other questions: e.g., if it is an adult borrower, then charge a fine or not, while, if it is not (and is a child or senior citizen exempt from fines), then simply discharge the book.

Decision trees 'anatomise' the decision making process. The nodes and branches represent the choices in a chronological sequence. Probabilities are attributed and calculated for each event, and pay-offs for each choice are shown. So given the tree about borrowing a book, the probability of a
book being overdue to an adult borrower might be 0.6 (ie 60%), and not
(0.4). From there, the probability of charging a fine given an adult
borrower might be 0.8 (and not 0.2). The probability of the first and the
second events both occurring (independent events, therefore multiply
individual probabilities) is (0.6)(0.8) equals (0.48), and so on. The sum of
(all) the final probabilities naturally is 1.

The principles of decision tree analysis are well-known. Applied to decision
making in management, it is important to consider the view that effective
managers tend to make 'better' choices, and that one of the ways in which
these 'better' choices can be identified is by examining how such managers
attribute probabilities to different paths. It may be further argued that,
if claims are made that effective managers can be differentiated from, say,
ineffective managers or from novices, then it may be possible to identify
what these choices are. From that, part of a pattern of consensual knowledge
can be inferred. Comparisons between such managers are made later in the
thesis to test this proposition.

Decision making is often a multi-criterion activity. Many problems in
management are like this, some 'macro' (like ideological differences between
'profit' and 'service' centred library organisation, or between the
traditional professional expertise and attitudes base associated with middle
managers and the generalistic and 'political' corporate expertise and
attitudes base associated with senior managers), some 'micro' (like knowing
whether it is 'effective' to dismiss an employee because his post is no
longer required or retain him for humanitarian reasons).

Some way of modelling priorities and preferences in decision making,
reflecting the multi-criteriality, is needed. Many production rules in the
logic, such as the 'if...then' propositional structures, are useful only up to a point. A comprehensive understanding of the alternatives and choices is required.

Saaty (Saaty, 1980) developed his 'analytical hierarchy process' for this purpose. An example would be to look at choosing a career, identifying factors like salary, job satisfaction, and status, and from there considering what options for each, in combination, might suit you best (e.g. it might be a choice between becoming a librarian, an accountant, or a journalist). A pairwise comparison of the factors can then be represented in a matrix each element of which represents the relative importance of the row and column factors.

From such an array it is possible to identify what factors are regarded as important, and their relative importance (e.g. salary might be four times more important than status). Crucial are the decision maker's attributions of importance, creating an overall rating of the alternatives. This method will be applied in Chapter 11 in a comparison between experts and novices.

Qualitative approaches to problems and decisions

Such quantitative techniques shed much light on the heuristic and evaluative approaches of managers in decision making situations. Yet such are the pragmatic complexities and idiosyncrasies of managerial events and states that many would be reluctant to push claims of statistical probability too far. Furthermore, for managers working in practical situations, experience
and judgement are often regarded as actions embedded in and arising from a socially constructed reality too complex to be 'reduced' to statistical or actuarial rationality.

Bayesian approaches acknowledge that decisions can be made in situations of imperfect information, and weight results accordingly, a point reminding us how managerial decisions are often made without full knowledge of facts or consequences. This affects the decision making and the recognition and interpretation of both choices and goals.

Decision making is affected by other factors. One is the extent to which the manager works within professional paradigms and belief-systems in making decisions. For instance, a decision to trim a library or hospital budget on the grounds that 'cost matters more than care, or vice versa' would show how ideologically preconditioned such decision making was.

Another is what managers regard as important or essential. Wilson (Wilson, 1977) calls this 'essentiality', and argues that for information-gathering (and, a fortiori, decision making) essentiality is a key factor. Effective managers, arguably, with a clearer sense of the 'real' and the 'true' and the 'possible', have a clearer sense of what is 'essential' in making choices. Part of knowing what is essential is knowing reasons for doing things (Rieger, 1985).

A third factor relates to coherence and how managers recall and utilise information (in factual or storied forms) for current decision making. Such coherence may arise from the perceived causality of the sequence of events and states shown (Black & Bern, 1981; Graesser, 1980) or from the comprehensibility of the distance between the elements in a goal hierarchy.
(ie how many steps from the identifiable point when the causal sequence starts to its goal, or the point of goal recognition) (Bower, 1982).

There are close links between the knowledge paradigms which managers have and problem structuring. This is to be expected since paradigms contain both substantive (content) and procedural (methodological) types of knowledge. Managers, like other professional problem-solving groups, use procedural knowledge to structure and solve problems, and make decisions. Many managerial decision making activities can therefore be represented as forms of flow diagram, adumbrating causal sequences within chosen parameters (eg time-frame, perceived relevance, the feasible and preferable).

Arguably, again, effective managers should be able to demonstrate surer command of these sequences, surer choice of preferential paths towards identified goals. They should, moreover, demonstrate an ability not just to structure problems and decisions but restructure or deconstruct/reconstruct such problems and decisions, showing adaptive creativity and an ability to reflect upon success and failure.

The knowledge frame which managers inhabit and (de-/re-)construct is multi-paradigmatic and multi-criterial, and as such represents how pluralistic are the inter-relationships in any meaningful and realistic account of management activity. Clearly, devices like decision trees can play only a small ('micro', as well as 'imperfect') part in assisting a manager to represent the options which he may choose to choose. Set in context of these wider paradigms, then, focussed techniques need to take on at least some of the characteristics of those paradigms in order to be valid and reliable instruments of knowledge representation.
Waddington (Waddington, 1977, 203-6) describes 'scenario-writing' as a useful technique to represent the complex logic of a situation. Used to explore military and diplomatic crises, this consists of a step-by-step analysis of, say, a situation which could lead to war (eg an incident in Berlin during the Cold War).

Knowing key developments in such a crisis helps the analyst 'to pre-plan how more serious consequences may be averted if a similar real-world crisis occurred'. Ideas can be represented in charts like concept maps, emphasising key points and linkages. Such a technique can help decision making and at the same time demonstrate how complex mutual causality is (ie that it is rarely a simple chronological sequence, and it is rarely uni-vocal [one voice, one opinion]).

System dynamics provide other insights: describing the work of Maruyama, Morgan (Morgan, 1986, 247-255) outlines how complex situations (like price inflation or Watergate) can be represented as a system of positive and negative feedback loops between clustered concepts, arguing that loops better reflect reality than do lines, and that complex situations are best represented by 'patterns of relations', they give 'a richer picture' than can flow charts and the like. Morgan concludes that 'we have here a new epistemology for the management of complex systems that shows how we can grasp a better understanding of the processes shaping organizational life'.

Drawing on schema theory, Axelrod (Axelrod, 1973) has devised an influential model for analysing management. Schemas help people make sense of their environment (see Chapter 4) and describe how people process information and try to make sense of it. Findings are represented as forms of flow charts. A schema is defined in terms of 'the set of all specifications which have
certain stipulated properties'. Typically, a schema might contain a paradigm of 'balance' by which a person might assume, as part of his view of the world, that there are friends and enemies, and that friends of enemies will also be mutual enemies.

Using this model, Axelrod says that the process starts with a message about a case (it might be that a manager knows a decision has to be made about Ann, who is alleged to be malingering). He then asks 'whether there is already an interpretation of this case' (to which there are two answers, yes and no). If there is, the old interpretation is used against the new, the results of which may be that it serves or does not serve as useful. 'If the new information does not fit the old interpretation..., then blame is affixed by comparing the credibility of the source of the new information with the confidence of the old interpretation'.

New or old, deconstruction and reconstruction occurs (say, to combine the old and the new information) and, say, a satisficing goal is sought which 'provides a satisficing fit to the partial specification of the case'. (Satisficing is taking a position which accommodates what you hope to do with what you are forced to do by circumstances). If this succeeds, then the source credibility of the new information has been recognised, and greater confidence can then be placed in the interpretive utility of the schema.

Cognitively, the manager is motivated to reconstruct his model or schema of 'reality' because of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957; Brehm & Cohen, 1962). Pragmatically, he is impelled for many other professional and personal reasons (pride in the job, natural curiosity, fear of error, etc).

Taking these ideas further still have been Eden and his colleagues. Working on the assumption that people at work build up a picture of their experience
of work 'subjectively rather than formally', and that 'subjective understanding is legitimate knowledge' (Eden & others, 1975), and drawing on Kelly's work on personal constructs in which values and beliefs play a large part (Coolican, 1991; Reardon, 1991), he claims that value and belief systems play a large part in defining the situation, contrasting a preferred situation, and suggesting a solution to the problem (Eden & Sims, 1977).

Values open up a range of factors, from commitment to how we judge outcomes, from what we regard as good and bad to what we refuse to do. Involving values in this way is a sign of reflecting on one's work, and representing the ways in which subjective factors interpenetrate with objective facts when we make decisions. Digraph theory and reachability matrices are used to determine how to draw concept maps.

A client may have a bad relationship with the production manager (Eden & others, 1975, 78 ff.). Positive and negative features are explored (in Eden's research with a computer programme interactively used with clients) so that factors like 'a need for ongoing attention' or 'regular positive feedback' are identified. The process 'traces all possible paths from the event to any goal and all possible explanatory paths until a concept is reached which has no incoming explanatory concept relationships' and then the path stops (loc.cit., 83). In this way, causal sequences can be mapped from events to goals, with real emphasis on the values and belief-systems of relevance to managers, and positive and negative features of these 'subjective worlds' represented on a cognitive map.

For instance, a councillor's beliefs about finance and staffing in local government might start with the initial event (the idea identified as the start of the sequence, speculative and/or actual), such as 'readiness to try
out modern ideas and techniques' (loc.cit., 131). The council may be prepared to spend money on training or not, may regard training as good or bad, may want high quality staff or not, may have a sound management structure or not, may organise its work patterns well or not. Simply to devise a decision tree with dichotomous choice nodes in a hierarchy or chronological/causal sequence would oversimplify the real-life situation, and ignore the valuations placed by the client upon it (and therefore make the interpretation inadequate).

Eden argues that most ways of representing ('coding') beliefs about causality are often simplistically monotonic (eg an increase in X leads to an increase in Y, 'More usage of the library → longer opening hours') or bipolar (eg 'I believe that B exists because A exists'). He builds in positive and negative signals to indicate how in belief-statements there are perceived correlations: eg the statement 'The more tired I am the more mistakes I make' is coded 'My tiredness ↑ Mistakes I make', while 'The higher wages go, the lower is the standard of living' is coded 'Wages → Standard of living'.

He acknowledges the existence of voids (when something cannot occur as the result of something else), and, using slashes, indicates how 'void linkages' are common in any set of propositional statements. For instance, consider the statement 'Job satisfaction usually results when organisations are well-managed, but poor management does not always have this effect'. 'Organisations' is a concept described by bipolar descriptors 'well-managed' and 'poorly-managed'. Either pole may be void. Here the role of the concept 'job satisfaction' suggests that 'well-managed' is increased and 'poor management' is decreased.
Relationships like these can be represented by superimposing '+' or '-' signs above the arrow connecting the concepts. At the same time, acknowledgement is made that between some bipolarities there will be 'voids'. There is a void against the concept 'poor management' (ie there is no mention of job dissatisfaction'. Such a statement is coded thus:

/Well-managed/Poorly-managed/Organisations \rightarrow /Job satisfaction//

The void (between 'Poorly-managed' and the putative 'Job dissatisfaction') is indicated by the last slash at the end.

When applied to the councillor example (see above), concepts can be organised on a map connected with looping arrows to indicate the sequence. Relationships between concepts can be represented with plus/minus signs and slashes. For instance, the councillor considers that the '/Council is/Council is not/overstaffed', leading to (arrow with minus) '/Money is/ Money is not/ used in the best possible way'. The final statement has different relationships with other preceding statements (for there are others, since the situation is complex and multi-criterial).

Eden's work is seminal in its recognition of the pervasive values and belief-systems which characterise managerial thinking and decision making. In its ability to extend the fundamental design of decision tree analysis and use aspects of schematic thinking to exteriorise ways in which managers
involve themselves with decisions, admit their multi-criteriality and reflect upon them, his work is very important.

There is no inclusion of statistical or subjective probability, which we have argued is an essential dimension to any explication of managerial experience. Moreover, only implied are the many kinds of reflection and self-analysis which effective managers need to develop and apply, except by implication. The ramifications of these issues will receive fuller attention in the succeeding chapters as self-evaluation and reflection are considered in the context of storytelling.

Further to these points is another, pragmatic issue. Many managers are busy and their work is very concrete (as opposed to abstract). Because of this, forms of analysis, of their work or their thinking, need to be approachable and operable in the work environment. At the same time, managers are well aware of the powerful factors at work there, in particular how expertise can effectively be used to get things done with and through people. Variation between expertise and viewpoint characterises most groups of managers, and forms part of the ambiguity within which managers forge and draw on their meanings.

Often the greatest difficulties lie in areas of activity which are commonly regarded as essential. For instance, a key criterion for an effective middle manager in most library and information services today is an ability to use and exploit an automated system or database. Expertise in this area is criterial.

There are different levels of expertise, and different attitudes to the desirability of having it. Value systems are, at this point, crucial for the
full understanding of how such managers deal with the practical, interpersonal, authority-orientated, and reflective aspects of this matter. It is because of this that consensus analysis is important.

In section 2 of this chapter such an analysis is undertaken. Attention is given to key areas of library expertise, from which effectiveness might plausibly be implied (e.g., database management and appraisal), and to explicit managerial competences (drawn from a content analysis of key literature, and serving to complement the investigation of managerial competences which forms the substance of Chapter 5).

The intention is also to provide some insights into how knowledge and views vary between managers, where consensus might be found and why it matters, and the importance of the meaning of the concept of being 'satisfactory [as a manager]'. Finally, the section indicates how important such analysis is for managers who reflect upon their experiences: these are arguably the most effective managers of all.
SECTION 2: SHOWING CONSENSUS AT WORK

It is always difficult to know whether other people really agree with you. Even when they claim to say what they mean, they probably mean what they say only to a partial degree. At work, it is important to make decisions and exchange opinions, and so agreement, or the appearance of it, is necessary in order to get things done.

This section examines one way, that of the consensus table, in which such judgements can be shown. It looks first at how judgements can be represented under conditions of different items and factors. Then it looks at how contrasts may be shown between 'expert' and 'novice/trainee' judgements, and what implications are for managers. Finally, it examines ways in which consensus tables can be utilised to suggest judgements about the very definitions (ie concepts) used in making judgements.

The notion of consensus or agreement is that people agree. Or at least that people holding variant views come to some acceptable compromise. Or even that people have a reasonably clear idea of what the prevailing view actually is. Such consensus can be explicit, like commonly held and often expressed views about the importance of the library to the university, or implicit, like strong but tacit opinions about being fair and professional about time-keeping. It can be as diffuse as to be part of an professional or organisational culture, norms and customs of the work-place, or as focused as how far two librarians agree that reading romance does women any good or not.
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Use of consensus tables

There are many issues on which judgements - decisions or opinions - can be made: levels of provision and service, management styles, ways in which finance can be spent, value-for-money views about the performance of databases. This is well-known. But it is difficult to represent these judgements clearly.

A typical situation is one where two doctors discuss patients. Let's say there are ten patients. There are three verdicts on them: that, after treatment, the patients have (a) improved, (b) not improved, and (c) are actually worse. These data can be represented in the manner indicated in Table 24.

In this way, we can easily represent numerous variables, so that any busy manager, expert or not, could understand and use. Complete agreement between Dr A and Dr B can be seen with regard to patients 1 and 5, who have improved, and patient 9, who has got worse. In other cases, there is disagreement. We can see where and how across the three states. We might even be able to infer that Dr B tends to have a more optimistic view of the patients' recovery, or else that he is more easily deceived or less knowledgeable than Dr A. Such patterns could be repeated with other, and larger, samples. Factors could be far more numerous than three. The whole procedure could be automated.

This can now be translated into the work situation in a library or information service. Clearly, items or units (across the way in the table) and factors (down the way in the table) will be different from the original example. All these should originate from the manager and reflect the parameters of the actual situation or problem.
Patients (Male and Female, with age)

F50  F65  M32  M15  F76  F51  F32  M78  M23  M40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Not improved</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(key: x = Dr A  o = Dr B  * = both Drs)

Table 24: Consensus table for doctors' views on patients
In our first library-based example, we may designate the items as 'service points' and the factors as 'levels of staffing'. Service points are easy to define (branch library, mobile, department, issue desk, etc). Levels of staffing could be bands or intervals actually achieved or achievable during a period. The manager needs to be able to define the underlying question of the exercise: here, it is the extent to which service points are adjudged to function efficiently or effectively given different levels of staffing.

Subjectivity is unavoidable when we speak about criterial concepts like 'effective', and these may need to be defined, or generally agreed, before the exercise takes place (or inferred afterwards). This kind of consensus over definitions is essential if validity and reliability are to be built into the exercise.

Given these items and factors, data can be supplied. These might be judgements by two or more managers. These managers could well be practitioners working in the actual service points, but they may be of various kinds. Indeed, to get a 'profile' of the views of managers involved, some centrally and some peripherally, would in itself be interesting. In this example, there will be five service points (all of which could be defined precisely in actuality) and three levels of staffing (level 1, fully up to standard; level 2, pragmatic working level of two-thirds standard; and level 3, below critical mass of half standard). There will be three managers (manager 1, a deputy chief; manager 2, a zone librarian; and manager 3, a branch librarian). Such categorisations are intended to represent actuality and to be comprehensive and hospitable analytically.

It is important, in examples like this, to work wherever possible with managers whose judgements, perspectives, or presuppositions are likely to reveal useful
distinctions. It is useful, also, to devise situations where combinations of judgements between managers are not too complex. In the doctors example above, two people making judgements led to three combinations (A, B, and A & B). In this present example of three library managers, there will be SEVEN judgements, three individual (Manager 1, Manager 2, Manager 3) and four combinations (1 & 2, 1 & 3, 2 & 3, and 1 & 2 & 3). Probably, any larger array would prove difficult to handle and interpret, and this factor has to be considered before attempting to record and collate too many variables.

In Table 25, + represents the judgement of Manager 1, o that of Manager 2, and x that of Manager 3, A the consensus between 1 & 2, B the consensus between 1 & 3, C the consensus between 2 & 3, and D the consensus between 1 & 2 & 3.

The consensus table reveals at a glance a number of important features about what managers think about desirable or feasible staffing levels for the service points.

We can examine these judgements first by service point. For branch 1, there is consensus between managers 2 and 3 (zone and branch) that staffing levels should be at standard, while manager 1 (deputy chief) believes that staffing levels should be at level 2. No conspiracy theory is needed for us to conclude that managers at grass roots appear to have different perceptions of need or performance from that held by the manager at headquarters.

Alternatively, it could be inferred that the deputy chief has a clearer overall knowledge of what is either required or achievable for that service point, and that his/her judgement is based on more realistic information. The consensus table does not reveal the comparative merits of the judgements, only what the
Service Points (B = branch, M = mobile)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Level 1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Level 2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Level 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Points

Table 25: Consensus table for managers' views on service points
judgements are and how they differ from or confirm each other. It is for the managers themselves to analyse the findings and work out solutions.

For branch 2, the branch manager feels that standard levels are desirable, while zone and deputy chief feel that level 2 (ie two-thirds of standard) are enough or achievable in the circumstances (eg under current commitments). For branch 3 there is consensus between all three managers. It is important to interpret this properly. It can mean one of three things: (a) that the service point has this level at present and needs it, (b) that it needs this level and lacks it, and (c) that it has this level at present and does not need it. Consensus can be merely virtual unless the definitions are worked out in advance or during the analysis. In any event, consensus like this is almost certain to lead to policy decision-making concerning staffing levels at the service point. Use of a consensus table has identified the way in which that decision might go.

For mobile service point 1 there are three separate judgements from the managers. This is important in identifying the variance between them, particularly in view of the fact that practical staffing decisions have been made about the mobile, and will be made again (presumably soon) in the future. What it tells us is that the closer we get to the actual service face, the greater is the perceived need for higher staffing levels.

Alternatively, the closer we get to top management, the greater is the perceived need for lower staffing levels. The rationale and context of these views, whether they are true or cogent or not, remains to be identified and worked out between the managers and other relevant staff. Nevertheless, the consensus table has identified the position prior to some decision being made, and in fact has the effect of demanding that some appropriate decision be made. Consensus
tables, then, are useful for identifying problems like this and sitting up and demanding attention.

Finally, for mobile service point 2, there is consensus between managers 2 and 3 (zone and branch) about staffing level 2, while manager 1 (deputy chief) has apparently identified the need to provide standard staffing levels to that service point. Again, interpretation is needed: it may be that zone and branch managers have a realistic view of staffing needs and they are 'right' and the deputy chief 'over-generous'. It may be that zone and branch managers are fatalistic about getting more staff, and are prepared to battle on with what they have, while the deputy chief has recognised the difficulty and is prepared to put it right.

User-related or demographic information might play its part in the policy decision-making. Staff-user ratios, after all, are not mere theory, but hard-nosed practicality, and, if the user group is increasing or decreasing, then a decision about changing staffing levels will eventually be forced upon the library service. Other factors like funding regimes in the local authority may well play an important part.

The constituent parts of the consensus table can be changed according to circumstances. For instance, a manager may wish to consider various staffing levels (now the items, ie along the top line where service points were in the previous example) with reference to different funding levels (the factors down the left hand side where staffing levels once were). Again, to make interpretative sense, the meaning of the levels has to be clear at the start, and the levels have to bear a perceived close relationship with the real and the feasible.
It may be necessary to use different consensus tables for different purposes: for instance, research may be carried out with junior-to-middle management, and senior management, and summaries of both sets of findings collated. It may be desirable to investigate particular areas of the service, and collate at higher or other levels. It may even be found necessary to compare the actual with the hypothetical, in order to elicit judgements unhindered by the practical restrictions of the present.

The technique can be applied in other areas of library and information work. It is possible, for example, to use it as a way of eliciting from users their judgements about an OPAC. Items (along the top) in such a consensus table could be terminal access points, and factors (down the side) perceived levels of usefulness or accessibility. Alternatively, items could be system characteristics like the menu structure, the help facility, or searching by author or subject, and factors either the extent to which users used them or found them useful.

Inevitably, it would be important, bringing laity into the equation, to make it clear what was being investigated and what terms meant. Terms here would include not just technical terminology (eg menu, keyword search, and the rest), but also what 'useful' meant in terms of locating books or journals in the library. It may be necessary for people conducting the investigation to guide participants, say, by asking them to consider usefulness in terms of relevance. It may even be desirable, in the factors, to graduate, scale or rank the responses (eg 'highly relevant', 'relevant', 'marginally relevant', 'not relevant', etc). It is clear that, as we extend the range of the consensus table technique, we are reaching out into the general domain of the survey by questionnaire, and indeed that might be preferable for wider strategies. It is for the manager to judge.
Consensus tables, experts and novices

Like so many analytical techniques, the use of consensus tables can only be vindicated in its applications and findings. The validity and reliability of the evidence depends on the suitability of the research design to the task in hand. Moreover, the interpretation of the findings crucially depends on meanings, not just those held by the researchers, but those which appear to be held, and can be elicited as being held, by respondents (ie participating managers, users, etc).

Many of the assumptions, terms, and techniques used and referred to in this form of investigation require expert knowledge. Such knowledge is needed for the investigation to hold together, but it is mainly that knowledge which managers themselves have, that knowledge which enables and urges them to carry out research in the first place, knowledge of processes and staff, users and resource control.

Typical might be use of a consensus table to establish judgements about using databases. A library has regular online access to, say, five databases, for purposes of getting bibliographic or financial information. Comparisons between such services are always important, not least of all because cost and value-for-money are important. Actual costs and prices can be worked out actuarially (eg direct and indirect costs).

Consensus tables can be used to elicit what people (here, typically, professional library/information staff) judge to be the performance or value-for-money of the databases. The concepts used here draw on expert knowledge held in the profession, and need to be worked out and defined in advance. More
than that, it may be considered appropriate to define performance in the technical terms of information retrieval, 'recall' and 'precision', knowing that each might be useful in particular situations, that neither is necessarily 'bad' or 'good', and that there are cost and time implications for each which contribute to the perception of whether a particular service is good or not.

In terms of the tables themselves, in situations like this, ways would have to be found of representing the knowledge domain associated with the management dilemma inherent in the situation. The dilemma here might be delineated as one in which database services are provided and managers want to find out how effective these services are. The knowledge domain consists both of the professional expertise the managers have (eg of databases, bibliographic citations, search heuristics, and the rest) as well as the knowledge of finding out and interpreting more information through an investigation of this type. It is, in other words, knowledge about content and procedures, about what we know and know we know, as well as about how we know how to find out more, and judge it valid or relevant or not.

Actual tables to fit this situation might be devised in the following manner. It makes it easier to pinpoint exactly what and who we are asking. By doing this, we not only define the remit of the investigation, but we also define the complexity. This complexity draws, as we have seen, on the process/technique itself as well as on the concepts required to understand it.

By this token, therefore, TWO tables could be drawn up, one for 'experts' (ie those who know, or can be assumed to know, something of the complexity), and another for 'novices' (ie those who do not know, or who would not be concerned to know, like users, most of whom simply want a database or OPAC to find them relevant information with the minimum of fuss). It may be necessary, of course,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Databases (usually named eg DIALOG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recall: good  

|  *  | o  | o  | x  | o |

Recall: poor 

|  x  | x  | o  | *  | x |

Precision: good

|  *  | x  | o  |

Precision: poor

|  *  | o  | x  | *  | * |

R/P ratio: good

|  *  | *  | x  | *  | o |

R/P ratio: poor

|  *  | o  | x  |

(key: x = reader services manager (subject area 1)  
o = reader services manager (subject area 2)  
* = consensus between managers 1 & 2)

Table 26: Expert consensus table: database effectiveness
to differentiate further, say, between expert and novice users (e.g. in terms of information-seeking or keyboarding skills).

We now may interpret the expert consensus table displayed as Table 26. As before with service points and staffing levels, it is better to take it step by step, and consider each database in turn. In real life each database would be named (although the item numbering system along the bottom would remain the same). It is assumed that the library is an academic library and that the managers are reader services specialists in distinct subject areas. This is important because any realistic investigation would wish to make this distinction.

Comparisons between some subject areas might well be pointless or self-evident - e.g. MEDLINE is certain to be a better performer for oncology than for parapsychology, for instance, and INSPEC better than ERIC for citations in electrical engineering. Knowledge of this would, or can be assumed here to exist, as part of the professional paradigm. In certain circumstances, manual searches may be preferable or more usual than online searches. An assumption is also made here that points of this kind would be taken on board by research designers at the start. Accordingly, the judgements here are assumed to derive from reader services specialists working in areas worth comparing vis-a-vis the library users' bibliographic needs.

The consensus table reveals a number of interesting points. For database 1, there is consensus that recall is good and precision poor. An assumption is made here that 'good' and 'bad' have been defined and put in a commonly understood context. It could be, for example, that high recall is what the managers know most of the users want from an online search (perhaps at that field-defining stage early in a student project). The recall/precision ratio
factor attempts to elicit a second level judgement from the respondents, ie one in which they comment critically on the judgements (the first level judgements) of the preceding factors. Here, the judgement is that the ratio is good, from which we may presume that the managers feel that the service from the database, in those particular subject areas, is satisfactory.

For database 2, the situation is different. There is consensus about good precision, but divergence about recall. The second level judgement on recall/precision ratio is consensually good. This apparent paradox can be explained: both think precision is good, but only one thinks that recall is good. Clearly, for this database, one manager wants or expects one thing, the other another. Both are satisfied with the result. It appears that in one subject area, from that database, good recall is considered useful, but in the other subject area, it is not. All kinds of implications follow, not only concerned with users' needs and managers' judgements, but also concerned with the indexing management of the database. It might be, for instance, that database 2 is fuzzily edited in subjects which abut upon the subject being searched by the users served by manager 1 (hence her 'poor' judgement!).

Database 3 receives a mixed verdict, and a consonant second level judgement. Database 4 reveals different things for the two subject areas/managers: for manager 1 (represented in the table by 'x') recall is good and precision poor, and the ratio judgement good, suggesting that she is satisfied with the situation. On the other hand, for manager 2 (represented in the table by 'o') recall is poor and precision good, and the ratio judgement poor, suggesting that he is not satisfied with the situation. Clearly, policy decisions are needed as a result.
For database 5 there is consensus on recall and precision and the ratio. Things appear to be about right. Finally, database 6, like database 4, reveals a mixed verdict. Manager 1 thinks recall is poor, while manager 2 thinks it is good. They agree about precision: both think it is poor. For manager 1, the mix of good recall and poor precision seems about right (possibly for reasons suggested above), while for manager 2, the situation is not right at all. This may lead to some debate about the value of the database, or its use for the particular tasks in the college.

Although a variety of verdicts (i.e., the composite name for the judgements) emerges, all lead to some form of policy decision, even if it is to let sleeping dogs lie for a while. Some of them, notably the judgements on databases 4 and 6, may well lead to fairly urgent policy decisions on the service and its use. It may even have repercussions on how user education is organised and curricula taught in the parent institution. Even if nothing is done, at least the consensus table analysis exercise has thrown up useful insights into what people, in this case, professional librarians, think of the services. The train consists of 'judgements' leading to 'verdicts' leading to 'policy decisions'.

It is possible to design a similar consensus table for 'novices', by which here we intend users. Distinctions between expert and novice users has, for now, been ignored, but it is easily possible to install distinctions between these categories into the design of a consensus table. A typical table design for novices using these very databases might take the form of the items along the top (the six databases) and factors down the side. In this case the factors could be centered around the concept of 'relevance', being the subjective aspect of the recall/precision concept used by professionals.
Relevance might be split, in the style of a Likert or semantic differential scale, into sub-categories like 'highly relevant', 'moderately relevant', and the rest. Again, it may be necessary to define these more precisely, and even discuss terminology with respondents. It may even be possible to build in the users' own terms for relevance (eg covering notions like 'central to my coursework', 'exactly right for my knowledge of the subject', 'good because I can find them in the short-loan collection of the library', 'useful because they are cited in the form I have on the reading list from the lecturer'). In related research (unpublished) the present writer used simple sub-categories like 'good', 'average', and 'poor'. At the level of interpretation, however, if the context (eg who the users are, what they need the information for) is known, much can be done to establish that these sub-categories are valid.

Whatever is done, it is important to have intelligible sub-categories, which are hospitable to all the variations which the investigators need, and mutually exclusive. It is no small point methodologically to consider who you are going to ask (eg size of sample, typicality of respondents, etc) and when (eg is it a typical time for users to be in the library? are they going to rush because they are thinking about lunch?).

Another entirely different situation in which experts and novices come together and judgements emerge in these interesting forms is that of training and appraisal. Only one example will be discussed, but many situations arise where consensus tables are eligible, taking in, as they do, not just objective judgements and opinions, but the rather more elusive feelings and views and perceptions inherent in judgements and opinions.
Experts and novices continually appear in harness at work, because people supervise and are supervised, because some know more than others about task A or process B, and because performance is being assessed formally and informally all the time. More subtly, it is a process going on within each employee, since they are self-aware and know that their own states of knowledge and feeling change from day to day. Judgements can be made, then, by bosses about staff, by staff about each other and about themselves, and by any of them about any task they do or plan to do.

In appraisal, it is common for various factors to be reviewed: a staff member's duties and responsibilities, perceived achievements and failures through the time under review, goals and objectives for the future, and so on. It may be that factors from social psychology are brought into play, such as leadership style, ability to inspire or handle conflict, generate ideas or work in a team. Different factors would be considered relevant for different levels of the organisation (eg supervisors, clerical workers, top management) and different types of work (eg reader services, system analysis, handling trade unions, financial control).

It may be personality and attitude-based, emphasising qualities like stability, aggressiveness, negotiating skills, introversion/extraversion, and identification of personal goals with those of the organisation. The taxonomy is versatile. It should be relevant to the task in hand, intelligible to the investigators and participants, hospitable to the domain of knowledge investigated, and for clarity's sake nicely differentiated one item from another.

A consensus table was constructed in this domain. First of all, five characteristics or qualities which might be considered typical of staff in a service environment were identified. They were (1) ability to generate ideas,
ability to get on with people, ability to carry through a project to a satisfactory conclusion, ability to show leadership, and ability to manage personal stress. These are represented as the items along the top of the consensus table below. These were established by way of content analysis and Delphi-style interviews with ten practitioners (two for the pilot, eight for a comparative series of structured interviews).

A simple semantic differential scale was devised for the factors. It drew on common parlance, such as 'highly satisfactory', 'satisfactory', 'less than satisfactory', and 'poor'. More subtly differentiated scales can be used, and scales can be based on personality constructs, psychometric measurement, and the dynamics of transactional analysis.

Another point should be made before we investigate the table itself. This is based on the typical appraisal situation, where there is an appraisor and an appraisee. We may assume that the two participants are at different levels of the organisation, or are separated in some way by power or knowledge. This begs a variety of questions in turn, like the extent to which position is indicative of power, and to which power is based on knowledge.

It may be, too, that a supervisor is in a position of greater authority but lesser knowledge (eg a department manager dealing with a computer or operations research expert under his authority). Other factors may exist, such as the attitudes each has to the experience and process of appraisal, and mutual respect between the two people placed in that situation. All these factors cannot - and should not - be reflected in consensus table analysis, which, after all, aims to identify important elements in a situation, particularly to assist decision making and ensure effective delivery of services and products.
The purpose of the consensus table in this situation is to elicit or identify judgements of the two parties. The table simply codifies and displays these judgements. There are two composite sets of judgements (the verdicts): the first is the verdict of the appraisor on the appraisee; and second is the verdict of the appraisee of themselves. It may become relevant to elicit the appraisee’s views on the appraisor, but this is unlikely.

We may interpret the findings in the consensus table in Table 27 in the following manner. The individual items represent what appraisor and appraisee thought. We can compare judgements on factors. We can consider the composite and divergent verdicts of both parties. All lead to conclusions and may influence what is done as a result of the appraisal process. Both are, after all, engaged in a search for the effective manager.

Looking at the verdict (ie the combination of judgements) of the appraisor on the appraisee, the following picture emerges. The appraisor regards the appraisee’s abilities to get on with people, lead, and manage stress as satisfactory. He regards the appraisee’s ability to carry projects through as poor. These will clearly be areas in which the appraisor will wish to discuss performance with the appraisee, and probably seek to initiate some form of development or even pressure to change.

Looking then at the appraisee’s verdict on himself, he regards his abilities to generate ideas, get on with people, and carry projects through as satisfactory. He is concerned about two areas, believing that he is less than adequate in leadership, and far from adequate in managing his own stress.

Assuming honesty on both sides, we may then examine the differences and the implications. There is consensus on the appraisee’s ability to get on with
### Staff characteristics/qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>highly satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than satisfactory</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- x = appraisor
- o = appraisee
- * = consensus between them

**Staff characteristics/qualities**

1. ability to generate ideas
2. ability to get on with people
3. ability to carry through a project to a satisfactory conclusion
4. ability to show leadership
5. ability to manage personal stress

**Table 27: Appraisal consensus table**

---
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people: this is an overt behaviour, and, unless both parties are deceived or deceiving themselves, may be taken simply as it is. Comparing item four, about leadership, it appears that the appraisee has doubts about his own capacity to lead, but that these are not shared by the appraisor. It may be that, from what he has seen about the appraisee’s ability to get on with people, the appraisor has inferred that the appraisee could demonstrate more leadership qualities, or be placed in a position where such qualities would be needed or shown. Judgements combine in verdicts which lead to staff policy here.

The differences are revealing also. The appraisee regards his own ability to generate ideas as satisfactory. Apparently, looking round at peers and others in comparable work, or even arguing out of self-ignorance, he believes he is performing adequately. His appraisor does not.

This is clearly an area for discussion and staff development, not in the abstract but in relation to specific tasks and responsibilities. It may be that, in an appraisal interview and its follow-up, development can be inaugurated and monitored in particular areas. There is a clear onus on both parties to sort this out.

More disturbing is the difference detected with factor 3, the appraisee’s ability to carry projects through to a satisfactory conclusion. The appraisee appears to have a blind spot in this area, believing himself to be satisfactory. On the other hand, the appraisor feels that the appraisee’s performance is poor. This is the bottom extreme of the array of factors, and therefore a strong judgement of disapproval. Much room for improvement is indicated here.

Moreover, since there is this difference of perception, the appraisor will have to discuss the matter tactfully and constructively, and should anticipate some
surprise or even chagrin on the part of the appraisee. One of the hardest things to unlearn in training and appraisal is the belief that everything is fine! There may, of course, be a connection between factors 1 and 3 worth investigating further, with detailed tasks and objectives in mind.

Hidden phenomena may also be hinted at by consensus tables. This refers to the judgements on factor 5, the ability of the appraisee to manage his own stress. The appraisor, who presumably sees him regularly, appears to have little idea that the appraisee is having problems with stress management. The appraisee could be the kind of employee who always appears calm, but is in fact seething with discontent and self-doubt deep down. The appraisee has the confidence enough to declare the reality of the situation himself.

Cynics could offer another interpretation: that it is a cry for help from an appraisee who is too tied up in his own small worries to realise that they add up to nothing. Whatever it really is, the important thing is to elicit something about what people feel, and then, by full and proper appraisal, seek to put it right, a process the success of which is only possible when there is true consensus between supervisor and supervised. For the researcher, the elicitation is not just an important management evaluative technique, but one which can be observed as a significant instrument in its own right.

One final observation is that at no time does the appraisee receive a 'highly satisfactory' verdict. This may arise from the natural reluctance of any assessor to give high marks. On the other hand, it may be an indicator that there is much general room for improvement and development for this member of staff. It is possible to target particular areas of training and development to put this deficit right.
An important dimension of using consensus tables is to make sure that people understand the meanings of things. Not only what the exercise is likely to mean, e.g., in terms of decisions taken on staffing levels or staff development, but also the meanings of items and factors. Items may be simple and clear, like service points, but they can be technical or abstract, devised in specialist language unintelligible for lay respondents. Factors, too, can pose problems, not just in terms of what they appear to mean (specialised and demotic usages can differ profoundly) but in terms of each other. And so, 'satisfactory' or 'good' need definition, and relative definition to other terms in the array like 'less than satisfactory' or 'bad'.

Semantic problems like this are compounded when we recall how locked into various levels everything is. In the analysis of the consensus table on databases, for instance, the first level judgements (about recall and precision being either good or bad) were overlain by second level judgements (about the recall/precision ratio being good or bad). Second level judgements were constructed from first level judgements: only by deciding on recall and precision could we decide on the ratio between them. Since such judgements were pragmatically applied to an acknowledged working situation, the provision of services for users in a library, the second level judgements had to take both the logic and the contextual practicalities into account.

Similarly, using the consensus table in appraisal revealed that careful attention was needed to get the items and factors right and clear, particularly since the investigation sought to elicit potentially sensitive information. Any self-consciousness of the respondents associated with casting judgements about...
people was complicated by exposure to an exercise not wholly within their
close, (even though confidentiality can be stressed). Above all, the possibility
of 'halo or horns' responses, from either party, is strong, with important
repercussions for the validity of the evidence.

The final area which this section intends to consider is this area of meaning.
It is one thing, after all, to say that meanings are important in consensus
Tables (and, with appropriate care, this can be overcome). It is another to ask
whether consensus tables may assist us to establish consensual meanings. To be
consensual, meanings have to be expressed and agreed as a common currency, just
as a customer and a shop both accept sterling as currency in the purchase of
goods. This does not mean for one moment that judgements, or the more extensive
verdicts, should be the same. It simply asserts that such judgements or verdicts
should be based on commonly understood, exteriorised, meanings.

Using the consensus table technique, we may now explore such meanings. We can
take up the consensus table used in appraisal above, extending some of the key
elements in a discussion of issues.

One dimension of meaning here is strictly semantic or linguistic. The factors
pivot around the concept of 'being satisfactory'. This may be defined in many
ways. It may be made clear vis-a-vis performance: output, punctuality, quality
of ideas. It may be related to organisational norms: conformity, team spirit,
interpretation of contract, professional values.

There may be two value-systems at work, that of the organisation and that of
the employee, and little compatibility. For instance, objectives set by each may
militate against each other (e.g. the organisation appears to expect employees to
live to work, while employees work to live). Given this setting, definitions like
'adequate performance' come to mean entirely different things to different people.

Within the organisation there may be competing paradigms of priorities, such as that typically represented as existing between bureaucrats (eg generalists) and professionals (eg specialists), that Macobian dialectic discussed in chapter 3. This can be reflected in different value systems with their associated semantic resonances in commonly used terms in the workplace. In consensus table tests, concepts of effective work may be multiple and contradictory. For instance, bureaucracy may define effective work in terms of stability and conformity to house style, whereas specialists may define it in relation to the professional community outside the organisation. Differences have practical results in situations where notions of satisfactory work vary wildly and idiosyncratically, often with provocative and mutually-neutralising results.

The diversity of possible meanings is complicated further because feelings, perceptions, and assumptions are all implicated in the task of passing judgements and making decisions. As has been explored above (see Chapters 3, 6 and 7 above), the act of judging is impregnated with past implicit models, presuppositions and beliefs. We speak of 'adequate' work from Clive or Claire not merely because we know the lexicographic meaning of the word but because we have a schematic cognitive picture of adequacy at work. We have our own localised knowledge of the work place and what is considered appropriate and tolerable.

In a highly achieving environment, or to a high achiever, 'adequacy' is merely luke-warm or pejorative. Yet in given circumstances, it may be accorded more than faint praise: eg when even to attain average performance is difficult, or when it is known that all the organisation expects is average performance. For
a grudging and self-defensive staff member, the concept of adequacy may even come to entail just what the organisation deserves contractually, and no more.

It may be less emotive than this: many criteria used in work imply, simply by asking, that certain things should be so. For instance, asking someone about being outgoing or communicative in their work, we might ask how ready they are to share their ideas. The assumption is that it is good to share ideas and bad to be secretive. But a moment’s thought shows that many jobs are like that only some of the time, some jobs virtually none of the time, and that there are many competitive work situations where staff are temperamentally and politically undisposed to rate collaboration highly.

Given these points, it is possible to reflect at least some of them in the consensus table. Areas which lend themselves most to this more complex form of analysis tend to be those where meanings are more layered and susceptible to personal interpretation. Typical are 'soft' areas like human resource management, where notions of adequacy and performance have numerous circumstantial connotations (unlike the 'hard' definitions characteristic of domains like operational research: for instance, we could have differentiated between databases in terms of transactionally logged mistakes made by users, or percentages of specific citations obtained, or time delays experienced).

It is therefore typical for managers taking part in exercises at this level to ask what terms like 'satisfactory' mean, and for them to ask if they can design an array which represents that concept in terms intelligible to them and relevant to their work situation. To this end, then, it becomes possible for such managers to restructure the factors in new ways. For example, the original array of 'highly satisfactory', 'satisfactory', 'less than satisfactory', and 'poor', might be redesignated in the following manner:
highly satisfactory in the sense that...

(1) I believe that my work is essential to the firm

(2) I am working at peak capacity

(3) I thoroughly enjoy my work and don't mind putting long hours in

(4) Enables me to satisfy personal aims as well as serve the firm

(5) Working with the colleagues I have allows me sometimes to excel myself

These 'definitions' of 'highly satisfactory' are admittedly idiosyncratic, but this is natural if the factors are, in a comprehensive way, to reflect the meanings which participating managers decide they need in order to complete the table fully. It does mean, of course, that the simple structure of the consensus table gets more elaborate. At the same time, it means that the results are more sensitive to the actual characteristics of the work place under investigation, and more meaningful to the managers there.
In the same way, notions of 'satisfactory' might need to be defined. It may well entail prior survey work before carrying out the consensus table exercise. Typically, interviews with key managers, face to face or more remote in a Delphi style, as was carried out for both consensus table analyses discussed in this section, are found to elicit a lexicon of meanings from which appropriate ones can be taken and codified for use in a consensus table. Such meanings, let us say of 'satisfactory', included the following:

'satisfactory...'

(1) in relation to what other people here do

(2) in terms of what I am capable of doing

(3) bearing in mind what I get paid

(4) in terms of what I know I should be able to do

(5) considering the constraints I work under

(6) making a guess as to what my boss seems to want
There is a world of propositional debate contained in these options. Indeed, some might appear to imply criticism of particular elements of the organisation, or admit to personal shortcomings or guilt. Comparisons with other people and coupling work to reward would be typical, either as a defensive or coldly objective comment. Any one of these would, in all likelihood, cross the mind of any manager answering the simple form of consensus table. Such a manager might have too many qualifications of the simple form of the exercise to commit himself to the simply dichotomous (eg 'good'/ 'bad') judgements in such a table.

Paradoxically, the more elaborate versions may induce other forms of self-constraint, particularly if responses reveal sensitive or culpable aspects of work behaviour. For this reason, and to ensure reliability and validity for the researcher, it is important for the more elaborate form of the exercise to be carried out under certain conditions.

One of these presupposes that, where appropriate, agreement in advance has been established on what is going to be asked and meant. Another is that of complete confidentiality. For some forms of analysis, such as those using random sampling, total anonymity may be possible. Another is a clear idea, on the part of all participants, about why the test is being carried out and how the results are going to be used.

For instance, it may be that it is an investigation into ways in which life goals change with age among middle managers. Accordingly, it may be decided that the investigation will be carried out confidentially to determine what kind of staff development and job satisfaction programme might be introduced, or what kind of outplacement or staff down-scaling exercise attempted. Clearly such work cannot take place in a vacuum. A total view of personnel management
is required, taken in pay and manpower planning and appraisal, for such an investigation to be properly rooted in reality, and for it to be seen to be so rooted by all sides taking part.

In the same way as we can expand the factors, so we can 'explode' (ie expand) the items. Looking back at the staff appraisal consensus table, it is possible, and may be considered essential, under item 1 (ability to generate ideas), to differentiate between practical and theoretical ideas, or to place the generation of ideas into the context of the particular task or job. Separate analysis, taking account of the range of tasks an employee might fulfil, may become necessary. Likewise, it may become desirable to distinguish those situations in which the employee shows, or is prepared to show, qualities of leadership (item 4).

It is also possible to further differentiate the responses by asking if respondents, say, actually do get on with people as opposed to whether they think they should. Or even, it might be possible to ask a manager if he thinks that the people he works with think he gets on with them. In such circumstances, where the levels of conjecture are getting rather high, even though in examining perceived knowledge it is all wholly justifiable, it may be preferable to investigate staff individually.

In this way, direct comparisons between staff are not drawn, and information elicited is used in confidential appraisal and counselling situations afterwards. By extension, of course, it may be possible for the investigator to arrive at a clear idea of judgements across a number of staff, although overt decisions made on such grounds may pose ethical questions, however well-intentioned they may appear. Various ways in which factors and items can be extended have been recommended.
It is appropriate, after such discussion, to examine a complete consensus table incorporating some of the more complex elements described above. In the interests of clarity, only six facets of 'satisfactory' have been shown, although in a full table 'highly', 'less than', and 'poor' would also be required. By the same token, only two protagonists (the manager and his boss) have been included, allowing there to be three possible judgements (one of each, and consensus). There is, of course, nothing to prevent a manager using such an exercise for self-contained self-development, disclosing the findings to no one else!

The six factors are those indicated above for defining the concept of 'satisfactory', namely:

1. in relation to what other people here do
2. in terms of what I am capable of doing
3. bearing in mind what I get paid
4. in terms of what I know I should be able to do
5. considering the constraints I work under
6. making a guess as to what my boss seems to want

Suitable adjustments are needed when the respondent is not the person concerned: in consequence, (2) would read 'in terms of what he is capable of doing', (3) 'bearing in mind what he gets paid', (4) 'in terms of what he appears to know what he should be able to do', (5) 'considering the constraints he works under [if any!]', and (6) 'making a guess as to whether he knows what I want'. In the interests of clarity, it may be necessary to devise two separate forms for the two people involved, particularly if the investigator wishes to keep results privy one from another.
The six items are managerial competences, all widely used in current writing about the subject (see Chapter 5), three concerned with managing other people (1, 2 & 3), and three with managing yourself (4, 5 & 6). In the consensus table, they are, for reasons of space, represented as numbers. They are respectively:

**Managing other people**

(1) being sensitive to the needs of others  
(2) presenting yourself positively to others  
(3) obtaining the commitment of others

**Managing yourself**

(4) showing self-confidence and drive  
(5) managing personal emotions and stress  
(6) managing personal learning and development

We may interpret the finding of what we may call an elaborated consensus table (represented in Table 28) in the following manner. To guide the reader, an advance organiser will be provided encapsulating the profile that emerged.

**Advance organiser:** the manager appears to be sensitive to the needs of others, and presents himself positively. He believes that he is better than he is in getting commitment from others. Although the boss recognises the constraints inherent in the situation, he believes that the manager could develop greater drive, on the back of the fair encouragement already given. The boss believes that the manager controls stress well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management competences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. what other people here do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. what capable of doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. what get paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. what should be able to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. constraints worked under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. what boss (seems to) want(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(key x = manager  o = manager's boss  * = consensus of two)

Table 28: Managerial competences consensus table
The training and policy implications of this will be explored as the discussion proceeds. But for now, an explanation is required as to how this profile was derived.

To achieve this, we are obliged to analyse each item and factor. Looking at item 1 (being sensitive to the needs of others), we may conclude that the manager thinks he does as well as his peers, in terms of what he should be doing, considering the constraints of the job. All these are characteristic defensive stances, although they may also be true. The fact that only the manager judges this, rather than it being consensual between the manager and his boss, tells us that the boss does NOT agree with him, i.e. that there is NOT consensus. The absence of consensus is at least as important an indicator in this exercise as the presence of any judgement.

It may be inferred therefore that the boss thinks otherwise, and that these are areas for the manager to acknowledge and improve. On the other hand there is consensus on what the manager is capable of, and what the boss is prepared to accept. The boss is prepared to accept that superhuman qualities are not expected at that level of pay (hence his judgement for factor 3 of item 1).

Moving to item 2 (presenting yourself positively to others), the manager believes that he is doing satisfactorily in terms of what he is capable of and what he is paid, considering the constraints. There is consensus about his performance vis-a-vis his peers in the organisation, his capacity to demonstrate that competence, and what his boss wants.

As we move to the item on leadership (3, on obtaining commitment from others), we see things diverge: the manager goes on thinking he is doing satisfactorily, while the boss reveals that he feels the manager could be better as a leader.
and inspirer. For item 3 all entries are manager's judgements. The lack of consensus should be interpreted as disagreement on the part of the boss. From this we can conclude that the manager needs to develop better skills. It is easy to see this as an instrument of destructive criticism, but in fact already we have identified areas of staff development for the manager, areas of development responsibility on his behalf for the boss, and one or two areas of blindness for both.

With item (4) (on self-confidence and drive) we move from the domain of managing others to that of managing yourself. Consensus there reveals that both manager and boss believe the manager is satisfactory under the constraints, a rather back-handed compliment considering what a boss might positively feel about the performance of a manager. All other entries are those of the manager, and reveal again a perception by him that he is performing satisfactorily.

The lack of consensus is again important here, and reinforces the implied decision from item (3) that the manager needs development in the area of self-confidence and drive. It is clear, from previous information in the table, that he already has the ability to relate to people, and the boss recognises this. At the same time, there appears to be a need to develop the manager's skills here.

Item (5) (on the management of stress) opens up some more of the story. Although there is consensus on how the manager performs in relation to his peers and according to the salary, the boss believes that the manager is satisfactory is all other factors. The absence of consensus here, ie the absence of the manager's own judgements, indicates that the boss thinks that all is well. The truth may well be that it is not. By not declaring a judgement in four out of six entries, the manager gives us a broad hint that things are NOT well. We may conclude that the boss needs to recognise the truth of affairs. A look
at the completed consensus table should provide him with what he needs, just as it provides the researcher with an interpretation of the issues.

Finally there is item (6) on managing your own learning and development. Again, there is a notable absence of consensus, and in fact all the entries come from the boss. We may interpret this as evidence that the boss believes that the manager is performing satisfactorily across the factors on this item. We may also conclude that the manager himself does not. This is the broadest hint so far that, although the boss has recognised that leadership skills need to be developed in the manager, the boss has (a) under-estimated the extent to which the manager keeps his stress under control and (b) over-estimated the extent to which current arrangements for learning and development are helping the manager do his job.

We are now in a position to look back at the advance organising profile provided above. The consensus table investigation has

(a) elicited a range of judgements from the protagonists,
(b) identified specific areas of agreement (these tend to be overt),
(c) pinpointed specific areas of blindness (where there is not consensus, often because things tend to be hidden), and
(d) signposted the ways towards personal discussion, training and development, and organisational policy-making.

The profile emphasised that the manager had the makings of leadership. It needed to be developed. The boss saw that, but he was blind to the ineffectiveness of current training and development provision in the
organisation. The boss was also unaware of the extent to which the manager successfully hid stress.

These characteristics emerge clearly from analysis of the consensus table. It may be that the two participants provide information for such analysis independently, and that it is collated by the boss alone, perhaps as part of the preparation for an appraisal interview. What it has achieved is the elicitation of numerous important hidden aspects of their working situation, one in which, clearly, neither knows the full story, and where both need to be informed about a deeper truth that lies below the surface. An assumption is made that people can be persuaded to take part and that their responses are genuine.

Another assumption is made that, with prior preparation and discussion, items are discussed and commonly understood, as are the factors. This makes it possible for the investigator, researcher or practising manager, to argue that the results are both valid in themselves and relevant to the work situation examined. The final assumption is that, given this information, it is possible for policy decisions to be made in the organisation to put things right.

Conclusion

This section began by arguing that it is difficult to know what other people think in the work place, and that it is also important to know. Examples have been provided to show the range and versatility of the consensus table approach. It has been possible to show how possible applications are in simple and complex situations, and how various levels of meaning need to be acknowledged and handled carefully.
It has been argued that by this method it is possible to elicit knowledge and opinions of an objective and subjective, overt and covert type. It has been asserted that managers can be persuaded not only to take part, but to involve themselves committedly in the planning stages, as well as in the policy-making stages afterwards. Such exercises can, in other words, be tailored to the idiosyncratic characteristics and demands of particular situations and the knowledge and expertise domains of particular managers. Indeed, it was found that the introduction of this research testing instrument provided not only a way of gathering and eliciting research information but also an interestingly influential model for practising managers in its own right.

In eliciting and identifying information of interest and relevance to managers, about themselves and the process of management in which they are engaged, and then in enabling them to identify and make more informed and effective decisions about resource management, the use of consensus tables can offer a simple solution to a range of problems associated with knowing what to do, and what to base what we know upon, in the field of management.

In this way the broader aims of the ethnographic contextualistic and constructivistic research programme were developed and implemented, and insights obtained in the extent to which consensus existed and what kind of consensus it was in terms of meaning, knowledge, truth, and application.
The issues raised in sections 1 and 2 of this chapter, on goals and decisions and consensus, all form part of an over-arching search to make sense of managerial experience. Apart from pictorial and other images in the mind, the usual way in which this sense-making takes concrete form is in discourse. Putting aside conversation and speech acts, this consists of forms of text in which analysis, explanation, interpretation, understanding can be expressed, and where 'inner' perceptions and conceptions can be exteriorised.

The results may be for formal or informal use, for use by others or the manager him/herself, and may represent events and states in the past, present, or future. Many factors, from what a manager knows and believes to what he or she is prepared to say is true or likely, have a close bearing upon the process.

Zukier (Zukier, 1986) made a useful distinction (in section 1 of this chapter) to the effect that such discourse could take paradigmatic forms (and would explain, categorise, contrast, infer norms) or narrative forms (and would emphasise the connectedness of events, the intentionalities and beliefs of the characters, the idiosyncratic context of things). This distinction is useful, not only in reinforcing the connection between this mode of expressing ideas in discourse and general knowledge paradigms of the kind discussed in Part 2 of the thesis, but also in directing our attention to the ways in which managers actually do express many of their knowledge and beliefs textually.
Much management documentation, including materials generated by
organisations as well as materials written by writers on the subject of
management, demonstrates in practice a very hybrid range of methods for
expressing knowledge and beliefs. Often, principles schematically displayed
will use a 'story' to illustrate the 'truth' or 'appositeness' of an axiom
or viewpoint. Similarly, many case studies exist for the purposes of
analysis, decision making, and the inference of generalisable truths for
theory and practice. Theoria and praxis interfuse in complicated, and often
mutually sceptical, ways. Exemplification, speculation, rumour, gossip,
self-qualification, rationalisation, reticence, self-display, all abound in
the textual discourse of management.

This would remain a truism unless we were able to suggest that, because of
this, we can infer that managers have a versatile portfolio of discourse
skills when it comes to expressing and explaining experience. By this token,
it would appear unlikely that any one form of discourse would exclusively
satisfy the expressive requirements of managers. And this turns out to be
so. Context, intention, style and tone all serve to encourage managers to
experiment with many different forms of discourse in different situations.

From this we might suggest that some would serve better for certain purposes
than others: the clear objective 'clean linen' approach of the formal report
for shareholders to read, the high orality and consciousness of structure
and style for a talk with overheads, the search for stories which
encapsulate the organisational culture in an autobiography or study of life
or work (eg Zuboff, 1988; Peters & Waterman, 1982).

It is difficult to set a clear boundary line between the strictly
paradigmatic and narrative, in Zukier's terms, because of the existence of
many hybrids in real life. More than that, the distinction may even appear
to be based upon a falsehood, that paradigmatic discourse is ipso facto
better able to express the factualities of the workplace, while narrative
appears discursive, impressionistic, and merely anecdotal.

The remaining chapters of Part 4 argue that not only is narrative able, with
remarkable adequacy, to represent the diversity of knowledge and beliefs
among managers, and the ways in which they articulate and reflect upon them,
but that, in many cases, forms of narrative have much in common with the
ideational structures in exposition and can actually subsume paradigmatic
modes.

Because management draws on a wide variety of forms of discourse, it is
appropriate to use and develop eclectic and multi-purpose techniques to
analyse the process. Such techniques must be hospitable to (1) the range of
meanings managers use, (2) to the events and states from which managers
infer and imply goals and problems and decisions, and (3) to the kinds of
self-analysis and understanding for which they strive.

It is natural therefore systematically to consider how the forms of
discourse (paradigmatic or expository, and narrative) represent managerial
meanings, how different perspectives (of experts or novices, of managers
looking back or forward, of managers conducting an introspective evaluation
or engaging in various forms of consensual and interpersonal activity)
operate.

To that end a theoretical model of managerial knowledge representation will
be developed and tested empirically over the remainder of Part 4 of the
thesis. It will develop step by step by (a) discussing and testing ideas and
methods, theoretical and practical, pari passu (so that ideas are illustrated at the stage of being introduced); and (b) building in a sedimental manner from section to section and chapter to chapter, so that, in Chapters 11 and 12, the full scale and implications of the argument of the thesis will be displayed.

Two major strategies will be used.

(1) The first will be the development and testing of action mazes. These draw on both narrative and decision tree techniques, and contain opportunities for step-by-step decision making, alternately information-decision-information-decision and so on. Integrated within complex narrativised structures, and correlated to diverse forms of discourse (expository and storytelling), action mazes, it is argued, will provide a valid and original instrument for representing the knowledge and decisions of managers.

(2) The second major strategy will be the development of a theoretical model of knowledge representation in management, with particular reference to narrative methods, especially storytelling.

This model has already been introduced by early chapters of the thesis. It will be built up, consisting of key dimensions for managerial action and interpretation, dimensions which are compatible with both paradigmatic and narrative structures.
These will consist of the experiential, the axiological, the deontic, the teleological, and the epistemic dimensions. These refer respectively to what managers know as what happens, what teaches them lessons, what they would like to happen or think should happen, what they understand about causality from goals, and what they regard as real or true. These five dimensions will be extended by a sixth, that concerned with professional practice, called the praxiological. The model will be explained and tested pari passu with empirical evidence.

It is no coincidence that one of these major dimensions is teleological. A teleological viewpoint argues that things bring about certain goals, and that understanding actions this way makes them intelligible'. One role of the present chapter was to introduce and review some of the ways in which goals and decision making are part and parcel of this wider process of knowledge representation, ideas which will receive direct application and investigation in later chapters.

Goals, problems, and decisions can all be accommodated in narrative forms of discourse. Drawing on the work of Schank and Abelson (Schank's conceptual dependency is discussed in Part 2), Wilensky (Wilensky, 1980) suggests that the key aspect to understanding stories (which we need or try to do for reasons of coherence) is that they are goal-based.

A goal is 'some state of affairs that a character wishes to bring about'. Events are parts of plans, and goals are what plans are directed towards. Wilensky suggests that such goals as achievement and preservation characterise many areas of narrativised life. We might add that features of such a goal-orientation can be located in stories as different as folk tales
and tales of executive success. Goals may go in sequences or hierarchies, as some goals lead instrumental to further goals.

Wilensky's work stresses that, for a full understanding of stories, we must understand people's goals, we should have 'knowledge about the situations that intentional beings find themselves in, and understand how they can be expected to act in these situations'. Important too is the way he admits the existence of goal conflict: 'pursuing one goal may make it difficult for a character to fulfill some other goal'.

Reasons for goal conflict can include scarce resources (eg there is not enough funding to keep journal subscriptions up to the levels required by library users) or mutual exclusivity (eg a manager cannot discipline a persistently late subordinate and at the same time ignore his behaviour). Managers should recognise goal conflicts when they occur, as a way of resolving them: 'Once the reader understands the nature of a goal conflict, he can use knowledge about that type of conflict to explain a character's behaviour as part of a plan directed at eliminating the conflict'.

Goal competition may exist. This is when there are several characters (in the story or the referent reality) and each has goals which interfere with the fulfilment of the goals of others. In management the sharing of scarce resources is above all the situation which illustrates goal competition. There may be goal concord where people recognise that they have the same goal and work together for it. Characters and storytellers alike recognise that, when particular conditions apply, it becomes easier to fulfill goals (a condition which Wilensky calls 'goal subsumption').
The importance of this work lies not only in its imaginative application of Schank's ideas about cognition but also in its acknowledgement of the complex admixture of intentionality and alternativity in setting and achieving goals. Furthermore, Wilensky's investigation of goals in stories is thoroughly logical, since everyone uses and knows what stories are. Stories are a universal communication and sense-making device, and, although they can be simple, can contain rich complexities of experience and reflection.

More than that, it is possible to use stories for the identification of those causal sequences which lead to goals, and to that point when goal attainment was recognised (or when, even, the goal itself was identified clearly for the first time). Such procedures can be retrospective, as narrators look back through their experience and try to organise it in a connected way (e.g., through causality or a temporal sequence, often both).

Problems can be identified at particular points, and decisions rehearsed and re-rehearsed for full understanding of their validity, credibility, and consequences. Those decisions which led, through the wisdom of hindsight, to the non-fulfilment of the goal, or to the fulfilment of an alternative or erroneous goal, can be identified and reviewed.

Events and states can be identified and described. Attributions of causality or blame, to external events (e.g., the activities or attitudes of another manager) or internal states (e.g., a characterological trait such as weak commitment), can be built into the interpretation of what has happened, and to the explanation of why we are where we are now.
The implications of this search for understanding are that, first, managers begin to reflect upon the experiences, infer generalisations from particular events, and plan for the future, having as it were learned a 'lesson' from what they know or believe has happened, and are able to contrast what happened and what should have happened; and second, managers are able to create a 'virtual story' out of what happened PLUS what they said happened PLUS what happened to both the original events and themselves as narrator in representing things as discourse (often in front of, or with the awareness of, a third party).
PART 4

CHAPTER 9

ABSTRACT

The ways in which information is handled and decisions made in library management are difficult to elicit reliably. Textbook paradigms and the use of common sense are cited by managers, but the process is rarely that simple.

Managerial experience and viewpoints are expressed both in expository (e.g., report) and story (e.g., anecdote, parable, script, organisational story) forms. This tendency among managers to represent knowledge, experience, and beliefs in the form of narrative is called 'storying', and is discussed and analysed. Comparisons with the classical detective story are made in order to explain how close stories are management narratives, particularly when we consider case-studies.

Through using Action Mazes, it is argued that, presented with management situations, managers both expert and novice can be encouraged to record and represent their decisions, based on particular forms of information. The way in which the manager perceives a causal sequence in a story or a maze, and the warrants he or she appears to make when making decisions, are both important factors at this stage of the investigation into meanings and knowledge.
There are many situations which managers recognise immediately. Regardless of the domain of work, these are situations which are generic. Typically, they include those where alternatives present themselves and a decision has to be made about which to follow, or an opposition occurs between the viewpoints of two people where a resolution has to be found. The ways in which managers work through these situations vary greatly. How these situations are structured changes from one event and context to another, but what they have in common is a structure. If we can know more about this structure, then we have moved a little nearer to understanding how managers think about their work.

An assumption is made that the structure of these situations is coherent. This is to say that there is a rationale for carrying out things in that particular way, and that managers use it because they know it works. Knowing that, and knowing they they know, entails an awareness of coherence in the manager’s understanding. The actions are regarded as logical in the
circumstances. In order to do this, that should be done first. Doing this means that either this or that will follow. In managing, and in talking about the process of managing, coherence is an essential feature in making management intelligible to those who engage in it and those who analyse it.

Coherence is not merely based on how intelligible the sequence of actions and decisions happens to be. It also draws on the setting or context. Examples would include the following:

(a) exercising and analysing the exercise of a management style, which relies heavily on the task and the power interplays between the participants in the workplace;

(b) making management decisions, and then drawing back to talk about them, which relies heavily on the policy and financial regime within which the decisions are made, as well as on the amount of information available; and

(c) handling staff matters (like a dispute or job satisfaction), which will depend heavily on terms and conditions of employment, and perceived opportunities and fairineses in the workplace.

The structures of managerial situations such as these may differ in detail. What they have in common are stages or points when information is assembled and decisions made. For instance, it is decided to set up a team for a particular task. The organisation is traditionally structured by function. A team or matrix approach has perceived advantages and disadvantages. The
present situation (before change) is a stage of information where particular things are known, and other things known to be needed.

The step where people decide to change things, and introduce a new managerial structure to accomplish a task, is a decision point. The information will inform and precipitate the decision. The decision in turn will cause change, ie create a new information situation, out of which further decisions will be made.

At any decision point there may be numerous decisions. Often, decisions will demonstrate rivalry, and they may be mutually exclusive. For instance, in the example of team structures, there may be two decisions, one to introduce the team, the other not to do so; or to introduce the team for a finite task and then disband it, or to introduce it as a way towards a more broadly-based strategy of matrix management in the future.

True decisions

In addition to this, decisions arising from information situations may be regarded as preferred by management, or more effective in themselves than others. If they are preferred, the preference may rest on what is known about current practice, current diplomatic or financial or practical constraints or usage, or preferred ways of dealing with things and people. Through experience or sound reasoning, particular ways of dealing may be regarded as more effective and therefore as more 'true' for the situation.
Such 'truth' rests on a number of foundations. One will be the pragmatics of the workplace: 'the way to do that is...', 'what we usually do there is to...', 'If I were you, I would...'. This may be based on tried alternatives, some of which have customarily gone right or wrong in the past. Some may work with known situations or personalities.

Another view of this 'truth' is that it may not be the rational way of doing something, but nevertheless it works. This predicates a rational way of doing something, rational in the sense that Fayol or Taylor or Herzberg management theory is rational, and in turn suggests the extent to which even small acts or decisions predicate the existence and influence of an underlying paradigm. This suggestion sets up interesting resonances about the extent to which management is a shared reality between all the various managers, even within one organisation.

Thirdly there may be another kind of 'truth', based on the epistemology which managers as professionals (eg as lawyers, accountants, teachers) bring to the workplace, drawing in part on the ideological, beliefs and values elements of what is professionally and socially acceptable, as knowledge and action.

Warrants and storying

The model which we are constructing has two further elements. The first of these is an extension of the 'what-and-how' characteristics of the information-decision situation structure built up so far. The extension is founded on 'why', eg if managers have information about a situation and make
a decision there, why do they make that particular decision? On what factual and assumptive truths do they make it? Why do they know or think that it will work?

For instance, if a company decides to introduce quality circles, among the multifarious factors involved would be 'why they believed it would work that particular way'. Such a belief would be based on 'facts' (the objective warrant) and on 'beliefs and valuations' (the subjective warrant). It should be possible to elicit not merely the information and the decision, but also the warrant from the situation.

The final element which must be added to the model consists of the tendency to 'story'. This means that managers, when they are involved in situations (the pragmatic role), and when they are describing and discussing them (the analytical and meta-cognitive roles), use story-telling forms.

Many of these forms are narrative or even 'fictional', such as the personal anecdote, or gossip, or character portrayal (stereotype, assassination), or symbol, or a full-fledged story about the organisation. An example might be a manager drawing on an anecdote to illustrate and highlight a principle: like the company which wants to be known for never making a drama out of a crisis, or like the American firm which rewards high performers with a gold banana.

Storying can also express the informational or factual aspects of a situation, and 'tell' what, in other forms of discourse would appear as reports or memoranda or committee minutes. Such 'story' might set out a scenario in which performance or culture or morale are clearly laid out. Decisions can be built into 'story', not detached as abstract propositional...
statements, but as 'episodes' or 'scenes' or 'events' attributed to Bill or Jane at a meeting back in March when, after brain-storming and talking endlessly about superfluous matters, everyone suddenly took fire and had the 'aha!' experience which showed the way through the dilemma. Alternatively, it may be that Michael who, in discussing the decision-making, sardonically says that, although the idea was attributed to Jack, it really was his own idea.

Warrants, too, can be cast as stories, as when an objective warrant unfolds itself as a narrative. Discussions about the introduction of the market economy into formerly Communist Eastern bloc countries are often cast in this form. In a library, an objective warrant in story form might be a representation of how the local authority recently announced its plans to introduce performance-related pay. Subjective warrants can also take story forms, as when a manager is justifying himself for a decision which seemed right at the time, or explaining how a change of direction became necessary when he realised how much he was running counter to general company culture.

Such storying can operate in a present tense, 'in medias res', but usually operates in the past tense, as managers review what happened, and use traditional story structures to achieve this. Typically, a manager might describe a selection interview in this way: that he was there, with Ian and Susan, they saw six candidates that day in the room on the top floor, that they were impressed by Alec Thomson, the young man from Airdrie with the dark grey suit, and yet they were forced to admit that none of the candidates satisfactorily filled the conditions of the post. Reflective and even self-vindicating elements may be interpolated, such as how much better they would have been placed to select the right candidate if John had circulated the application forms in time.
There is often an explicit dimension of authorial self-projection, showing itself when the story-teller represents his own persona in the storyline ("I must say that at that point I thought..."). This feature can be retrospective and even take the form of an apologia ("Looking back on the decision, I felt that Susan was unfair to say I had been biased..."). There are many similarities between this form of organisational storytelling and the supervening author techniques of Henry Fielding, the eighteenth century novelist, and they tend to establish a direct relationship with the reader or hearer of the story which may be intentional or not.

The use of the past tense offers interesting comparisons with the art of story-telling and writing novels, where the author figure is often all-knowing, taking lids off people's heads, being invisibly and omnisciently 'there' when things happen, and organising the story in a logical past-tense narrative for the benefit of the reader. In this case, the researcher steps into the shoes of the listener, a form of textual participant observation.

Situations as sequences

Situations in management vary in complexity and controllability. Looking at situations generically from this structural perspective, we can start to apply the ideas developed above to a simple example. Later in this chapter, more complex applications will be introduced.

For some situations there is a recognised sequence of stages. It may arise from the way in which a task is accomplished, like the purchase and accessioning of a book in a library, or the entry of data input into a
management information system, or the assembly of parts of a machine on a
production line. It is possible, through job analysis or time and motion and
other techniques, to define the stages, allocate time and skills
requirements to each stage, and determine correct parameters for the task.
Other situations show how rules of the workplace, or legally established
procedures, can play an important part in deciding the sequence.

If we look the disciplinary procedures which exist in many organisations, we
tend to see the impact of legal requirements on them. For minor misconduct
the employee may receive a verbal warning, usually from the supervisor. If
the misconduct is repeated, or gets more serious, then a written warning is
received, often from the departmental manager. If no sign of improvement is
seen, a final written warning is received, from the departmental or
personnel manager. After that, there is transfer, demotion, or suspension,
which can lead to dismissal. Further steps, eg at industrial tribunal stage,
may follow that. Such sequences can be represented in the form of flow-
charts, and often are put together for the benefit and information of
employers and employees.

Even for relatively straight-forward situation sequences like this, analysis
can deceive us into believing in their essential simplicity. There are two
other major factors which apply.

The first of these is to do with the way in which the situation is handled
by the protagonists. This term, with its pedigree in drama and literary
criticism, is deliberately used here. We might say that, in their various
ways, we might say that Casablanca, Pride and Prejudice, and Anna Karenina
all deal with the basic situation of love. So the idiosyncratic manner in
which the organisation handles the situation gives it its uniqueness,
although there are generic (and, in the example of the warnings at work, legal) features which the situation has in common with many like it elsewhere. This individuality may derive variously from factors like company policy, organisational culture, management style, and individual relationships.

Such things work themselves through and out in the actual events themselves. These unfold as stories in the sense that people act out particular roles, say things to each other, commit themselves and each other to positions, deceive each other or themselves, admit or demonstrate ignorance of the facts or the rule, show insensitivity, apologise, wheel and deal, and decide out of fear or self-interest to follow particular paths. Any detailed observation of situations like the discipline sequence described above would reveal some of these characteristics.

The other major element which applies here consists of the beliefs and values of the protagonists. Typical beliefs may appear, explicitly or implicitly, in the form of views of the value of work (that it enhances the individual, that organisations manipulate individuals and cause alienation, and so forth), and typical values may appear in the form of the orientations members have to, say, rewards, leisure, leadership or fair play.

These underpin many of the manoeuvres defined above, and feature in many important domains of organisational behaviour, such as the exercise of authority and power, perceptions about loyalty to the organisation, beliefs about one's own career and lifestyle, and values held by employees and employers about the purpose of the organisation and the work it does. These factors may appear, for example, in the divergent ways in which employees might regard time-keeping, as important for the coordination of tasks and
the demonstration of commitment, or as mere rule-keeping in an environment where the quality and rhythm of professional work entail working hard and late one day and not the next.

Incompatible views may exist between professionals and managers in the same company. This aspect of the argument was introduced formally in chapter 3 and will be developed systematically in Chapter 11 when craftsman and gamesman managers' stories are compared. Typical of these differences may be those oppositional views held by traditional managers (who value service philosophies or product knowledge) and entrepreneurial managers (who value cost-effectiveness and capital value for themselves and their investors).

Employees may hold views at variance with those of their organisation (eg that the health service should be run on cost-effective lines, that schools should introduce vouchers), inducing role conflict. Many of these operate powerfully to shape why and how people act as they do at work. There is a clear association between this approach to managerial situations and the techniques of the storyteller, where motivation and atmosphere, and hidden aspects of character and plot are of crucial importance, and an analysis of meanings and knowledge reveals that it is in discourse (above all in story) that managers represent this association most clearly.

The analogy of the detective story

The analogy between the management situation and the story may have been pressed to hard too soon. Like all metaphors, it does not bear too much literalism. Metaphor assumes the existence of a perceived likeness, so that
the camel is called the ship of the desert because certain characteristics make that name appropriate. But the camel is not a ship, and no one is confused by this. That said, the act of using metaphor is widespread throughout language, most of us using metaphors of one kind or another, consciously or otherwise, much of the time. If a student is asked to unpack ideas, someone we don't like tells us to wrap up, we tell someone to get to the point or toe the line or come up to scratch, or we use windows on our hypertext system, we are using metaphors. Metaphorising characterises language.

We can develop the argument from another position, that of story. There is much to suggest that people like stories: the popularity of television soaps, the borrowing figures for novels from the public library, the magnetic appeal of stories and gossip in the pub. It is fair to take this one stage further, to say that people tend to think in stories of one kind or another, even if there is much else (facts, feelings, logical reasoning) incorporated in the storying situation / experience.

One approach to this would be that of cognitive psychology, where a dominant contemporary approach emphasises thinking as an information-processing activity. Working on the assumption that people try to make sense of events, and try to reconcile incompatible evidence with what they already know (the 'cognitive dissonance' view of writers like Festinger), then it is fair to suggest that coherence is a major element in making sense of the world as we know it. If coherence, however it is seen, can be found in the things that happen to and around us, then they can be defined, described, discussed, handled.
Story is not just about coherence. It is not primarily a vehicle intended to explicate coherence which stays merely an abstraction unless transformed in this way. Its role is also to entertain, explain, create wonder, mystify, cause fear and laughter, enhance self-knowledge, and much else.

Nevertheless, without coherence, stories are nothing. Coherence derives from the constructivistic experience of 'reading' the text which occurs when people pick up a book or watch a film or listen to a story, as much as from the essential grammatical and semantic structure of the story itself.

It is in this area of 'constructivistic understanding' that coherence operates critically, and it is this approach which was stressed as a major catalyst and engine of the research project in the opening chapters of the thesis.

When managerial situations are acted out, they have all the complexity of elaborated story, drawing on both fact and fiction, and refracted or mediated by the teller and influenced by the interpretations of the told (as well as complicated by interactions between the two).

When John Harvey-Jones brought ICI into profit, or when the franchise auction appeared to betray TV-AM, or when British Telecom are impugned under monopoly legislation, the facts and the interplay of personalities have all the complexity of a John Le Carre spy thriller. Often when such large storylines are broken down into their constituent parts, to the meeting between X and Y, to the interview to the press last Friday, to the results of a shareholders' meeting, the urge to clarify and highlight essentials makes the story appearsimple in structure, the issues and characters starkly contrasted, villains and good guys clearly distinguished, giving such stories the characterisation, morality and iconography of formula fiction.
The key factor in accepting and using the metaphor of story about management situations lies in the convincingness and flexible applicability of story to such situations. Stories are able to structure them, and managers able to represent situations coherently, communicate 'sense' and meaning to others and reflectively for themselves. This is what makes the analogy of the detective story appropriate in this discussion, since fiction, information, and decision making characterise both detective and managerial stories.

'As if' fictions and truth

It is not immediately obvious to argue that stories can provide an appropriate vehicle for what people do and think. Indeed, the view might be put that stories, as 'fictions', differ from the 'truth' objectively embodied in verifiable hypotheses and other positivistic devices.

The German philosopher Vaihinger suggests that hypotheses are directed toward reality, yet fictions are known to be false (Vaihinger, 1925). He argues that human beings supplement reality with idealised and simplified versions of the truth, finding fictions useful as ways of coping with problems in science, theology, and morality. People act as if such fictions were true, even if such fictions are known to be false.

He cites the Virgin Birth as a 'mythic fiction' devised in this manner, as a symbolic device to help mankind resist evil. It is important for us to realise that Vaihinger's fictions are known to be so by the people who use them, otherwise they would merely be subjective fancies. People use the
fictions as a means to an end, in this case, as a way of understanding and instantiating a metaphysical idea about good and evil.

Vaihinger claims that, as people become increasingly aware of logical factuality, and of the increasing implausibility of the fiction, then they increasingly treat the fiction as an 'auxiliary construct', and finally discard it. It may even be seen in the scale of human development, since myths seek to explain the origins of creation and other world-riddles when rational explanation could not. It is implied that rationalism eventually finds a way to explain such things, rendering fictions merely the things they are.

This 'as if' attribute of fictions is something which we must take on board when we argue that managers, who live in a practical real-life world, turn to stories as ways of expressing their views of that reality. First, managerial stories are not always fictions. The case-studies and organisational stories used by managers may have ritualised and fictional elements, but they are not intended to be fictions. Far from it: they are intended to encapsulate truths and insights of personalities and situations which managers find it difficult to express through traditional expository prose.

Such stories are used, and regarded, as ways of mediating the dilemmas, inner truths and intuitions as well as external factual circumstances, which directly concern the manager. Examination of a case study, which is a kind of story, in a field like marketing, would give proof of this.

Second, it may be that experienced managers use fictional modes when, for instance, escaping from the rigid constraints of the factual parameters of a
decision-making situation. Edward de Bono's lateral thinking is an example of how a block in logical thinking can be circumvented through using analogies which often start with the assumption that it is 'as if' a problem might be resolved a new way.

If we extend this to the many accounts of business practice in books which teach management, particularly those which teach 'success', the proposition is that, if the reader follows a course of action, accepts the fact that it is 'as if' he can do what Victor Kiam or John Harvey-Jones do, it will work for him. It will be 'as if' he has done it. Experience is shared, corroborating the claim that meaning in management is built up collaboratively. The storyteller's story is the reader's 'as if' mechanism.

Vaihinger’s view holds much truth because, just as managers appear to move into fictional modes of description in order to gain insights into and control over the plain facts of their lives, so they can readily move back into an expository mode (eg the rhetoric of the report, textbook, lecture, presentation, meeting agenda) when necessary. In such cases, stories, qua fictions, are regarded as auxiliary constructs, helping to give shape and feeling to a body of objective and subjective knowledge which ultimately gets packaged in forms other than stories.

In other words, there is much value in exploring how far 'as if' mechanisms are and can be used by managers, and in asking how far truths are expressed first (or informally) in stories and then later receive expression as professional artefacts like reports.
The Form of the Classical Detective Story

Detective stories in their classical form are essentially conundrums. They might follow what Julian Symonds calls the 'Mayhem Parva' tradition, with Aristotelian unities of time and place and action, and a cryptic dispensation of clues and red herrings to which there is a fair and ratiocinative solution. Even when the structure is freer, as in Maigret or Van der Valk stories, with their greater injection of psychological analysis and unpredictable vulnerability and involvement of the detective, the essential structure follows this paradigm.

Detective stories have an ideological status, too. This is to say that the ideologies in a culture, those systems of ideas and beliefs which form some kind of coherent and normative whole, say about nationhood or class or gender or masculinity, find expression through stories. The detective story form demonstrates this well, when we consider how (a) such stories often take the social fabric, particularly that part in a state of change or attack, and act out archetypal social dilemmas there, and (b) use a detective (eg Marlow, Holmes, Poirot, Fen, Dupin) both as an instrument for social justice and as a lens through which to observe and comment.

An assumption, too, is made that by the end of the action a satisfactory resolution may be found. A moral point is often made that 'character is destiny', and that actions committed by characters, in cold blood or in the heat of the moment, can be revealed, explained, condemned or excused. In other words, there is a fugal interplay of information and decision-making for the constructivistic reader.
Warrants are provided in ways 'psychological' (eg motivations, rivalries, hatreds) and 'circumstantial' (eg being at the scene of the crime, being seen, having an alibi, being an accessory before and after the fact). These are the story-telling boundaries implied in notions of bounded rationality, discussed in Chapters 1 and 2 when the rationality of management was explored.

Such bounded rationality forms part of the way in which authors and readers collaboratively 'construct' the 'reality' of the fiction. In principle, this is Schutz's constructed reality. Epistemic and causal sequences are characteristic of the narrative, very like what has been said to characterise the management situation.

The structures vary but demonstrate features such as these: a murder committed, a mysterious letter, a woman missing; a solver at work, an encounter with misinformation or danger; a number of plausible suspects, each with plausible motives and circumstantiality; a solution with denouement, incorporating poetic justice or not, an appropriate solution given the premisses, characters, and circumstances. Just like a management situation, which may follow through from the presentation of the problem, a solver at work, meeting opposition, misinformation, risk; a number of plausible courses of action depending on circumstance; a decision made which solves things or not, or a decision not to act, with consequences, appropriate or otherwise.

Another similarity exists in that both detective stories and management situations, when they take the form of stories or reports or accounts, need to have, and show they have, an authorial presence. Someone has to be the author - the committee secretary, the rapporteur, the writer of the memo,
the arguer of the case, the summariser of the appraisal interview, just like
the narrator in the fiction. In both managerial and fictional accounts,
autodiegesis may be common: this is where the narrator who tells what
happens, and the person to whom it happens, are one and the same person.

There may be several storytellers, each with their own version of the truth
- like the so-called 'relativistic' tetralogy the Alexandria Quartet of
Lawrence Durrell. The storyteller is the centre of consciousness, the lens
through which other interlocutors participate in the story or hear about
their own participation in the story. Typically, the rapporteur of syndicate
discussions at a conference is such an author, delegated to represent an
activity experienced collaboratively, where those other members have an
interest in what is said. Committee minutes, often working within very
formal procedural and discourse constraints, interestingly demonstrate
similar features.

When a storyteller is the centre of consciousness, his or her position shows
two, paradoxical, qualities. The first of these consists in the fact that,
by holding what might be called a hegemonic narratological position, he/she
decides the overall structure and approach and tone or the story. It may be
that he/she comes in at the beginning and works through chronologically. Or
goes in at a tangent, in medias res, or takes their own or another person's
viewpoint. Or chooses to reveal the story through reported speech or
dialogue (compare Dickens and Virginia Woolf).

He or she may choose to hold back certain points, for reasons of suspense or
subterfuge. Or claims or pretends to know all, and hopes that, through
telling the story, more truths will emerge, perhaps in dialogue with
fictionalised interlocutors (as in Fielding's Tom Jones, and more probably
in the implicit authorial dialogue, by way of the text, with the implied reader. John Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* perhaps illustrates this at an enigmatic fictional level, even to the point of allowing the dialogue to remain unfinished when the narrative formally concludes.

In detective fiction, it may be that a Holmesian character may hold the main clues and decide the fates of the other characters. Alternative solutions and culprits may be suggested throughout the narrative, but they exist in relation to the 'hegemonic narratoriality' of such a central character. This position is ultimately demonstrated by the way in which Holmes/ Poirot/ Maigret/ Dupin solve the crime and reveal the villain. Yet throughout the story there is a continual referral and deference to their position, even by their opponents, and this stance is induced not only in the characters but in the reader by the author, who in this way arrogates control over the fictive reality AND its referential reality.

The existence or possibility of alternative endings, too, finds a natural place in such fiction, as other characters, and as readers too, struggle to find plausible answers to the questions posed by the plot. It is not uncommon to find, as in attempts to complete *Edwin Drood*, several different and equally likely conclusions.

**Storytelling as the presentation of alternative meanings**

The second quality demonstrated by the storyteller is that he or she may not be, or claim to be, all-knowing. The hegemonic status may be more ostensible than real.
A narrative viewpoint (eg Henry James's *What Maisie Knew* or Richard Hughes's *A High Wind in Jamaica*) may consciously limit the perspective of the central consciousness in the novel (here to the viewpoint of a child) so that not all can be known or told. It may be more thorough-going than that, where the storyteller decides to open up a series of alternatives to the reader.

Such a method has become popular in fictionalised games in which protagonists journey through dark underground passages in search of treasure, make decisions at junctions, meet monsters, and are equipped with swords or lanterns. At each step of the story, readers choose, on the information they have and on that which they have been able to deduce or infer, which decisions to take, and suffer the consequences. These are most literal forms of constructivistic stories, and characterise many computer games such as 'Dungeons and Dragons' and other aleatory fictions.

For the storyteller of a novel, there are issues here of keeping suspension of disbelief in the reader, making sure that the thread does not come unstuck in the reader's mind through implausibility. This particular dilemma might appear to be absent from the management situation, but it is surely there. We can see this in the ways in which management is described and explained. For many managers, a theoretical exposition about principles (eg of the importance of control, or feedback, or budgetary policy) is vague unless specific instances can be cited.

In the workplace, specific instances are usually the focus of discussions: eg 'What has your department done to improve quality in customer service?', 'What shall we do with the marketing budget to remain in control for the rest of the financial year given the downturn?', and so forth.)
In other words, it is through the situation that managers come to describe and understand the principle. There is an inductive programmatic about this of representing meaning, based on the fact that, from the individual instances, storying managers are able (and probably set out to be able) to infer a typicality or larger warranting 'truth', by means of which they are able to encapsulate paradigmatic knowledge. In the two cases cited immediately above, such knowledge would relate to strategies and tactics by which departments improve quality in customer service, and sustain a marketing initiative despite financial constraints.

At one remove further, through the ethnographic examination of such instances of representing and extending instances, the researcher is able reliably to suggest how managers represent meanings and knowledge.

It is for this reason that case studies are widely used on management training courses. They can be used to draw general points of understanding out of the diverse experience of participants, and can be readily identified as useful by participants accustomed to specific instances in the workplace.

Case studies and the management of meaning

Case studies are basically 'stories', with scenarios, problems, participants, and alternative solutions. The story nature of a case study may take the form of a Chaucerian 'exemplum' (a parabolic instance of a moral point) or an anecdote, particularly when it demonstrates successful or unsuccessful examples of practice in the workplace (eg in handling personnel or coping with pressures on a production line).
There is also a highly participative or constructivistic dimension to case studies which makes them very similar to stories. The stories are acted out through discussion, group work, problem-solving and decision-making activities. The 'plot' or storyline of the case study is established hegemonically by the 'primary author' in the first instance (perhaps the originator of the study).

It may then be used as a narratological or polemic arena for accretions, rejections, extensions, as the story becomes understood, and as a multiple coherence gets established. Such a coherence is constantly negotiable and protean. The original may be regarded as a freeze-frame shot which is then taken by many perceptions in a variety of directions, consensually and adversarially, as participants deconstruct and reconstruct the storyline. The process is analogous to rashomon.

This is the collaboration and negotiation of meaning, not focused in the domain of storied discourse, which was introduced in Part 2 of the thesis, and which will form a seminal idea for an investigation into types of managerial story in Chapter 11.

With response to and reconstruction of the original storyline, of story or case study, it is possible that participants begin to reconstruct the original storyline, take it apart in order to make it make sense and make it their own.

An analogy of this process is when a small child, hearing a familiar story, takes over as storyteller and diverts the storyline into directions of his own choosing. For instance, by identifying with the central character, such a child might make himself the (new) central character, and people the story.
with characters from his own family, or explore incidents from his own life. This has classically been investigated when small children read stories like Maurice Sendak's *Where the Wild Things are*, and in discourse study terms is a perfect example of autodiegesis (we see what the speaker sees).

In the management situation or case study, a similar response can be seen. To take it through by stages: the first point worth making is that management, unlike mechanics, is not nomothetic (or deductively orientated towards the testing and confirmation of 'laws'). Rather, it operates on a multi-paradigmatic basis where managers choose to make meanings (eg the meaning of 'effective') out of the experiential semantic of their jobs. There is a continual reconstruction or negotiation of meaning, as managers, in conversation or analysis, define their meanings, illustrate them by instances, rebut and qualify meanings by others, and even deny the existence of consensual meanings (probably because of the ideological diversity that exists at this level)(see Chapter 3).

We may then extend the argument by suggesting that managers, distrustful of mere abstractions and propositions unrooted to perceived reality (eg we find that many managers have an unexpressed credo along the lines of 'I'll see it when I believe it!'), prefer to express their knowledge, and share their meanings, with reference to instances, often from their own working lives. These instances often take the form of stories, anecdotes or parables, gossip or full-scale narrative.

It is useful to recognise that managers have a tendency to use story in situations such as these, and to use the medium of storytelling as an opportunity to investigate, test, debunk, personalise, and debate the truths of their profession. Such a use of story characterises organisational
culture, in the sense that members often represent the organisation as a system or a maze or a brain, in which individuals and activities take on a metaphorical or symbolic significance. In this setting, it is natural for members to articulate, collate, compare, their interpretations of the enacted realities of the organisation from day to day, and over larger and more strategic time-frames.

In this setting, too, managers are able to explore and express what they regard as effective managerial actions and beliefs and truths, and reflect upon their own experience, including the experience of representing their experience as story. Later, it is also possible to reflect upon the experience of telling the story of the experience, and to share that metacognitive awareness implicitly or explicitly with a fellow manager or with an interlocutor like the researcher.

Individual interpretations form an important element in any individual's and any group's intellectual control of decision-making and problem-solving, and intellectual control is effectively real control, not just in actual situations (eg board-room and shop floor decisions) but in the annalistie or retrospective dimension too. These, respectively, concentrate on the simple 'account' of what happened sequentially, and on what happened in that period of the past under review from the position of the present (where the storying manager is situated, experientially and intellectually, at the time).

To summarise, the story elements consist not merely of the necklace of incidents which managers experience throughout a working day, but of the broader biographical characteristics of their lives, including what happens when they look at their own lives and at the forms of discourse which they
know they are using to represent the meanings of these lives (especially if they try to endow the apparent formlessness of their lives with the coherence of story).

There is a tendency, then, to manage meaning by exploring the meaning of management, for them, filling the generic storyline, however it appears (from textbooks, case studies, general conversation, reports in the business press, stories of their colleagues or passed round the organisation), with personal, interpretative, and truth-seeking meanings of relevance to them, their job, and their role as listener and paid-up club member. Meanings thus become common property, overtly shaped and re-shaped by and in the telling, adorned by a complex and protean rashomon of responses, and representing forms of meaning and knowledge in the intellectual, interpersonal, axiological, and epistemological arena of the workplace.

**Action mazes and managerial situations**

We have argued that many of the situations in the workplace can be regarded as structured sequences. It was suggested that two of the major elements of such structures were 'information' and 'decision elements'. This can be formally investigated with reference to action mazes.

Action mazes are devices widely used in management education and training to give participants experience of making decisions. In an action maze, each individual is given an information sheet which details the situation. The situation can be based on activities in an organisation, such as spending a book fund or carrying out a user survey in a library, or on interpersonal or
personnel management problems, like exercising leadership style or introducing a training programme. The information forms the starting point for the first stage of decision-making.

The participant is asked to make a decision based on the information at that stage. There may be many possible decisions. Some of these may be presented to the participant. Some may be regarded as workable, plausible, desirable, necessary; some not. For the designer of the action maze, it is usual to provide several such decisions from which a choice may be made. The particular choice leads the participant to the next piece of information, after which there are more decisions to be made.

Participants who have a good grasp of the principles involved can reach the final decision swiftly and surely. There are 'correct' or 'preferred' choices, the epistemic basis or warrant for which derives either from the validity of the argument (ie how logical particular decisions are) or, more likely, from the consensual professional 'wisdom' of actual or putative experts, ie from the known ways in which recognised experts or practitioners would read the information and make decisions. Unskilled participants will probably make eccentric or egregious decisions.

The action maze can be structured in such a way as to guide such participants eventually to the correct conclusion, although thought and self-examination may be necessary before they arrive. Through doing it, such participants absorb correct methods of reasoning and acting, and desirable attitudes to the subject in question. An objection to action mazes is that clever participants can chase through them to the correct answers without understanding the real reasons for them. The way round this problem is to present more complex action mazes, ones requiring greater levels of analysis.
or absorption, ones predating larger amounts of real life experience, or
drawing on more areas of ambiguity.

The initial situation may be presented as a problem which the manager will
easily recognise: eg a member of staff in a library department has been
persistently late without reasonable explanation; what should the
supervisor do about it? Decisions emanating from that information may
include 'correct' ones (like arrange a meeting where cards can be placed on
the table, like explain what the legal position is on discipline) as well as
'incorrect' ones (like threaten dismissal or simply do nothing).

It is intangible here that there are preferred 'routes' or 'sequences'
through this problem. The situation involves people, authority,
responsibility, law and diplomacy. If reduced to its skeletal shape, it
becomes more of a flow-chart, but if fleshed out fully (as in a case study)
it takes on the shape of a story. Characters can be named. The situation can
be described realistically. It might be intended as an indirect
representation of an actual problem for the manager (ie a fictional version
of a real-life situation).

Whatever its shape or role, such a situation can readily be seen to have a
storyline, in which coherence and plausibility matter. Coherence, as we have
already said, is essential if the story is to hold together structurally and
semantically, and if the reader/participant is to understand and be
motivated to take part. Plausibility may be regarded here as an epistemic
quality, taking in (a) the extent to which the storyline resembles, or
usefully sheds light on, the real-life situation of the manager, and (b) the
extent to which it is felt to hold together as a 'sub-creation' (to use
Tolkien's term) with an internal integrity as a fiction in its own right.
Learners, stories and action mazes

Given that situations have information and decision-making elements, and that coherent plausible stories are useful devices for the exteriorisation and expression of meaning in management, it is useful to investigate how learners react to action mazes, and to ask what researchers might learn from such reactions about the representation of managerial meaning.

It is argued that action mazes, when used by and for learners, tend to remain simple, but that, as participant expertise increases, the complexity of action mazes grows correspondingly. In such circumstances, it becomes more and more likely that the action maze take the form of a story, that several storytellers emerge, and that the meta-narratological dimension of warranting becomes more obvious to see. This development would suggest the existence of collaboration in storying, to represent meaning and knowledge, to help identify and impose coherence, and to enable reflection on experience.

It was emphasised earlier that managerial situations demonstrate structured sequences of events. The example of a workplace discipline was cited. Such events can be represented information events or decision events and as sequences of both when turned into a coherent narrative.

We can develop such ideas using the logic of an action maze. The theme of the action maze will be 'library efficiency', appropriate to the general theme of this investigation, effectiveness in library and information management.
The structure of the action maze will first be described and discussed. Then, in a discussion of developments and implications, the research design and findings will be described and evaluated. Comparisons will then be made between practitioner manager and student manager responses to and performance in the action maze.

The initial information takes the form of a 'scenario', and is an example of hegemonic authoring in that it establishes the imaginative locale of the collaboration. In this case, the scenario is a public library serving a community in the United Kingdom. The specific theme is that of the library's ability to meet increasing demands on its book-stock. An implied measure of such a library's efficiency is its ability to do this cost-effectively.

The reader is referred to Figure 2 which illustrates the structural characteristics of the action maze. The following discussion looks at the various components of the maze, identifying them, defining them in terms of information or decision, and suggesting the implicit warranting or assumptive knowledge that may be at work when participants engage with the maze.

Information is presented to the participants in this form:

A public library is trying to provide a good service for its community. Demands on its book-stock are increasing. Costs are going up. It is important for the library to continue providing its services.
FIGURE 2: ACTION MAZE
Consider the statement at the top of the chart. Ask yourself how you would deal with the situation represented there. Select one of the three decisions as being, in your view, the most likely. Then select the one statement in the row below which, in your view, would be most likely. Finally, select the one statement in the bottom row which in your view would be most likely.

- **Decision 1**
  - Reduce the service
  - Emphasis in placed on the most-needed books
  - It is useful to have a review even if we can make only a few changes
  - We should concentrate on priorities especially spending money on most needs

- **Decision 2**
  - Maintain the service
  - Emphasis in placed on the most-needed books
  - Current selection and expenditure patterns are continued
  - Priorities in this and other services are reviewed with the aim of identifying best uses for money vis-a-vis user needs

- **Decision 3**
  - Develop the service
  - Emphasis in placed on the most-needed books
  - Difficulties are ignored and services are expanded in the users' best interest and for reasons of local political popularity
  - Popular areas of book stock are identified and developed at the expense of less popular areas of book stock

A public library is trying to provide a good service for its community. Demands on its book stock are increasing. Costs are going up. It is important for the library to continue providing its services.

Select one of the three decisions above. (Assuming that you were in a group of three people, you would be best advised to select a decision. Then, make a careful note of which group you would most likely be able to support.)

Choose one of the three decisions as being, in your view, the most likely decision. Then select the one statement in the row below which, in your view, would be most likely. Finally, select the one statement in the bottom row which in your view would be most likely.

- **Statement 1**
  - Expand services because users deserve it and because politicians have to be satisfied
  - Difficulties are ignored and services are expanded in the users' best interest and for reasons of local political popularity
  - Popular areas of book stock are identified and developed at the expense of less popular areas of book stock

- **Statement 2**
  - Maintain the service
  - Emphasis is placed on the most-needed books
  - Current selection and expenditure patterns are continued
  - Priorities in this and other services are reviewed with the aim of identifying best uses for money vis-a-vis user needs

- **Statement 3**
  - Reduce the service
  - Emphasis is placed on the most-needed books
  - It is useful to have a review even if we can make only a few changes
  - We should concentrate on priorities especially spending money on most needs

**Action Plan**

- **Step 1**
  - Select the decision that aligns best with the library's long-term goals and user needs.

- **Step 2**
  - Develop a detailed action plan that includes specific strategies for implementing the decision.

- **Step 3**
  - Communicate the decision and action plan to all stakeholders, including staff, users, and local politicians.

- **Step 4**
  - Monitor progress and make adjustments as necessary to ensure the success of the decision.
Participants are then instructed to make a choice between three decisions. Each decision is plausible and feasible, making each a credible alternative. Participants are free to choose any one decision, but then have to live with the consequences which become clear as they go on through the action maze. The three decisions are as follows:

1. Reduce the service.
2. Maintain the service.
3. Develop the service.

The consequences which follow from these decisions are then introduced as a second level of hegemonically authored chunks of information. For decision 1, 'reduce the service', the following information alternatives appear:

1a. Emphasis is placed on the most-needed books.
1b. Emphasis is placed on the most-wanted books.
1c. Cuts are made in the hope that people won't notice.
1d. Cuts are made in the hope that people won't care.
1e. Cuts are made and users are informed that future selection will be based on a cost-effective search for the right mix between need and use.

For decision 2, 'maintain the service', the following information alternatives appear:
2a. Emphasis is placed on the most-needed books.

2b. Emphasis is placed on the most-wanted books.

2c. Current selection and expenditure patterns are continued.

2d. Current selection and expenditure patterns are reviewed and then continued.

2e. Priorities in this and other services are reviewed with aim of identifying best uses for money vis-a-vis user needs.

And for decision 3, 'develop the service', the following information alternatives appear:

3a. Difficulties are ignored and services are expanded in the users' best interest and for reasons of local political popularity.

3b. Popular areas of book-stock are identified and developed at the expense of less popular areas of book-stock.

3c. Services are developed by sharing resources more from other branches of the library.

3d. Extra funding is channelled into book-stock at the expense of other areas of the budget (eg staffing, A/V materials etc).

3e. A case, based on information about use, user opinion, and managerial judgement, is made for extra funding.

The next stage is a further information stage. The answers and suggestions made by them at this stage may be regarded as instances of collaborative authoring. We find that such collaborative authoring takes two forms: either
an expression of what to do and how to do it (viewpoints, preferences, courses of action), or an expression of why a particular thing should be done, or why the learner has chosen it (ie drawing on the assumptive level of the warrant, bearing in mind that such warrants may be based on known or inferred facts, or upon opinions and valuations based on them or brought to the exercise from outside).

Using this logic, therefore, possible authoring proposals might include:

(1) Costs are going up, and so the library cannot keep up. Select only what people want (D1b) [warrant + decision ('incorrect' in not being expert-preferred)]

(2) It is very difficult to decide, and so I think the status quo should prevail (D2c) [warrant + no decision]

(3) I believe that the library should maintain its services and give people what they want in the way of books (D2b) [warrant + decision (incorrect in not being expert-preferred)]

(4) In the current climate of financial restraint, I believe that decision 2 is most likely. Given that, I have selected decision D2e [warrant + decision (correct in being expert-preferred)]
It can be seen that, using such an action maze, participants can be monitored using information, making decisions, and drawing on warrants in the course of making decisions about information. The paths which they trace through the action maze are important indicators of their expertise in information-handling and decision making.

Before the warrants are examined in greater detail, it would be useful to review the decisions. Some decisions are regarded as 'preferable' to others on the grounds that, in the circumstances, according to the what experienced professionals would in all likelihood do, certain decisions are more likely and more feasible than others.

This leads to a 'preferred route' through the action maze, as better learners (ie those who have greater knowledge and/or those who reason out the problem more fully) follow preferred paths compared with those followed by less able learners.

There are assumptions here about the frames of meaning within which the learning is taking place, in particular the extent to which some forms of learning, on professional/vocation courses especially, such as those taken by the participants, load particular courses of action with greater credibility or desirability.

This in turn alerts us to the importance, both in using educational materials with students and in conducting ethnographic research, of developing reliable ways of distinguishing between 'right' and 'wrong', 'expected' and 'unexpected', 'exemplary' and 'non-exemplary', 'true' and 'false' ways of exhibiting meanings and knowledge.
Developments and implications of action maze analysis

Assumptions may be made that the greater the professional knowledge any respondent has the greater skill he or she will demonstrate in getting through the action maze 'correctly'. The notion of correctness is itself defined with reference, not to any semantically idiosyncratic or unreliable researcher-originated paradigm, but to consensual frames of meaning elicited from the respondent group itself. This approach characterises ethnographic, contextualistic and constructivistic research of the kind fully described in the introductory chapters of this thesis.

The consensual frames of meaning, built up earlier in the examination and elicitation of key concepts about what constituted 'effectiveness' (see Chapters 5, 6 and 7), along with the broader paradigmatic meanings and knowledge drawn from the various content analysis tests in the thesis, formed the basis on which the 'knowledge' of the action maze was based. The contention is that skill in handling the reasoning sequences of the action maze is dependent largely on prior experience of handling ideas, ie on knowledge primarily experiential in character, and from that we are able to predicate that practitioner knowledge, consisting of theoretical AND applied knowledge, is likely to indicate superior understanding of the meaning and truth of the information, and of the plausibility and feasibility of the decisions.

This does not, however, preclude the possibility of a learner showing some skill in the action maze with very much less (or even no) direct experiential knowledge. Action mazes can be constructed using different mixtures of theoretical and/or practice-based knowledge, and, because of
this, a variety of results are possible dependent on the programmatic built into the action maze used.

In this case, however, an action maze was constructed using information already elicited empirically by earlier research in the thesis, and was intended as a way not just of eliciting what choices managers took through the maze but what differences might be found between expert and novice manager participants.

To investigate the hypothesis that there would be such differences, and to elicit what these differences might be, a random sampling device, nested within a quota framework, was employed on two contrasting groups.

(1) Thirty practitioners were selected from various types of library (four types [public, academic, school, special]) and representative levels of management (top, middle, and junior / supervisory). (2) Thirty students were selected, the criterion being that they could be regarded as new to the formal study of library and information management. Again, randomly within a quota framework, they were taken from a first year cohort of the BA Degree Course and a similar cohort from a PG Diploma Course at the School of Librarianship and Information Studies in Aberdeen, where the researcher is a lecturer in management and statistics.

Participants, along with a short briefing about the aims of the research and the procedures of the exercise, were given copies of the action maze, with instructions to (a) indicate what path, above all, they would take in dealing with the issues, and (b) indicate the 'rationale' (ie the warrant) on which they made their choice. The results are reproduced in Table 29.
Rank order of preferred paths:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Responses (N=30)</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 d</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 c</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 e</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 e</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Action maze: practitioners' responses
These findings suggest that practitioners prefer paths which concentrate on the decision to 'develop the service'. Within that, the dominant path is that of 'develop - get extra funding - extra funding even at expense of staff'. The next path is 'develop - share resources - try to develop in this and other ways'. 80% of practitioner respondents opted for a development decision in answer to the initial information.

In this way, it is possible to elicit knowledge from such a group. It is not so much 'testing' the path-finding skills of the respondents as seeking to elicit, or even infer, the consensually preferred decisions, and, by extension, the perceived truth of how to deal with typical dilemmas such as that presented by the initial information.

At the same time, the divergence of responses confirms that, within any putative frame of meaning, there will be different interpretations. These indicate different meanings to the storyline initiated by the information, and give us an indication of the scope of collaboration implicit in the group meaning structure we can deduce from the evidence.

We turn now to the evidence from student respondents. Their responses were distinct from those of the practitioners in a number of ways. The dispersion of responses was greater, indicating less consensus of knowledge and probably experience and ability. The focus of choices was more dispersed, even though the dominant choice lay in the 'develop' domain of 3, like that of the practitioners. But only 12 of the 30 respondent choices lay in this domain overall (compare 24 out of 30 for the practitioners), while 10 responses lay in the 'maintain' domain and 7 in the 'reduce' domain. The reader is referred to the findings displayed in Table 30.
Rank order of preferred paths:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Responses (N=30)</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 3a D3a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2b D2b</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2c D2c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1c D1c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3e D3e</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3d D3d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1e D1e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3b D3b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3c D3c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Action maze: student managers' responses
Students' choices of paths reveal a preference for the path which advises 'develop - ignore difficulties because people need the service and expansion is for the best - development is justified on the grounds of people's needs and for political reasons'. Following these choices are two from the 'maintain' domain, and one from the 'reduce' domain. Reasons for these choices, and for those of practitioners, will be suggested when we look at warrants below. There are important differences between the group responses.

Re-introducing warrants and storying

Noticing differences of the type discussed above is an important stage in seeking to find reasons for them. Several external or researcher-orientated explanations may be provided, including (a) the different bases of experience brought by the two groups, (b) different sets of attitude brought by them, and even (c) the group members' (in)dependence from the Hawthorne effect of being asked by a researcher who also had perceived attributed authority.

The knowledge and attitude factors are likely to be of major interest, and it is hoped that, by examining the decisions from the point of view of their implied warrants, it may be possible to suggest some explanation for the 'why', and not just 'how and what', issues discussed in the earlier stages of this chapter.

The practitioners demonstrate a strong preference for the 'develop' domain, and their most preferred path is 'develop - get extra funding - extra funding even at the expense of staff'. Then comes 'develop - share resources
try to develop in this and other ways'; then 'develop - books above other areas - popular areas in preference to others'; and then 'develop - make a good case for extra funding - base this on both user needs and managerial choices'.

The implied warrant here appears to be that the best and most proven way to respond to the dilemma presented by the initial information is to make attempts to develop, rather than simply maintain or reduce. Solving the problem assumes, they say, that a manager will assume this. We might unpack this rationale by saying that, with demands increasing and costs going up, standing still is impossible.

This in turn appears to be based on the view that development can be achieved in a responsible way (the practitioners very notably eschewed path 3 3a D3a, which said in effect 'develop regardless of the consequences'). In turn, revealingly, only 4 respondents opted for path 3 3e D3e, which arguably might be said to be the most proactive and managerial choice, subsuming the others in domain three, and demonstrating the greatest degree of command over the economy of the organisation. It also appears likely that gritty realism is at work in the (minority) choices for the 'maintain' domain paths, the implied warrant there apparently based on the view that priorities are essential if you believe you are going to have little chance of development.

Turning to the students, their first four preferences are (1) 'develop - ignore difficulties because people need service and expansion is for the best - development is justified on the grounds of people's needs and for political reasons'; (2) 'maintain - get people the most wanted books - keep these above all, then look at others things'; (3) 'maintain - continue the
current selection and funding - the status quo appears best'; and (4)
'reduce - cut and hope that people won't notice - make cuts and tell as few
users as possible if they ask'.

It appears that a difference of experience and knowledge accounts for the
idealism of the first choice, possibly based upon notions of egalitarianism
or idealism, possibly influenced by the way in which respondents saw the
test as an academic test where 'they had to provide the right answers'. This
'game-playing' approach to the curriculum, and therefore to any similar
event, might in part account for this response. It is also possible to
allege that students who have recently opted for a course leading towards a
career which they have chosen are likely to be enthusiastic about it.

Whether these suggestions are true or false, the implied warrant for the
favourite response appears to be that library service is a given good, and
nothing should interfere with or undermine it. The conceptual basis on which
the 'develop' domain is chosen is different in kind from the basis of the
choice by practitioners: this is revealed by the students' choice of path '3
3a D3a' itself, with its lack of accountability and managerial planning,
characteristics so powerfully implied in its polar opposite, path '3 3e
D3e'.

Warrants for the other choices are equally interesting. The theme of keeping
service going regardless appears in this choice too, this time in the form
of getting most wanted books (not most needed books, interestingly), or
'keeping the show on the road', even if there may be times when the general
public might have to be deceived as to how bad things are.
Warrants for these choices appear to include assumptions about what the general public deserve by way of effective service, since they are paying, and notions of idealism that any public service like a library should do its very best for the public good. Another is that, at times of difficulty, it is better to keep hold of things and not be seen to retreat. Another is that there are times when managers might have to hide some of their problems, or, more probably, their apparent inability to deal with them. It is of interest, too, to notice that providing a good service and hiding the problems might work against each other as assumptive bases for practice, though it appears, in the naivety of learner knowledge, to be possible to reconcile the antinomy.

In this analysis, it is easy to see how, when the complexity and diversity of making decisions and choices are recognised, an examination of warrants for decisions take us into the realm of narrative. Narrative is known for looking at the motivations of characters, whether it is the motive of a character in a thriller to kill the victim, or more complex like why Anna Karenina chooses to die or Elizabeth Bennett to marry or Hamlet to kill his step-father.

In addition, the realm of narrative presents the reader/researcher with a diversity of narrative positions and angles, which represent themselves in the ways in which characters speak, interact, appear sometimes to address the reader, and how authors and authorial personae implicate themselves, or get implicated, in their own narratives (see Tristram Shandy or Brideshead Revisited or Remembrance of Times Past or What Maisie Knew or The Member of the Wedding or In Cold Blood).
Storying as instrumental analysis

It has been suggested that a major challenge to researchers is to elicit meanings from practising professionals, like managers of library and information services. It was stressed that such managers are likely to respond to situations which they understand, and to the information and decision-making features in them. They also understand how actions happen over time and demonstrate characteristics of causality and sequencing. Furthermore, when they are invited to examine their own activities and thinking processes, they are likely to be impatient unless the themes explored and methods used are demonstrably 'realistic', ie fit to their own knowledge and practice domain.

It was argued that realism can be built into testing through use of such storying devices as case-studies and action mazes, an argument based on the view that story, in the form of anecdote or gossip, parable or apologia, and other forms, forms a major element in the meaning-making textures of organisational activities.

The analogy of the detective story is apt in so far as it takes us towards narrative forms which are structural appropriate for understanding such causal sequences in management. They are appropriate also because they embody sets of values and even ideologies which typify managerial cultures.

The analogy of story has other relevant applications, notably the way in which hegemonic narratorial positions can be established: the comparison is that between the author in a novel and the effect of a command by a boss in a work situation, or, more generally, the dominant or consensual knowledge
paradigm in the organisation (eg the generally held view about how to do things, how to behave, how to enhance the firm's philosophy, etc).

These points are worth restating in view of the contentions of this chapter that narrative is an domain for the exploration and investigation of the representation of managerial meanings and knowledge. In this case, the focus has been on library management, and a contrast between 'expert' and 'novice' decision making and warranting was explored.

Stories are not, in any simple sense, a representation of sets of paths of choices, even though, through syntactical, morphological, and semantic analysis, stories can be seen to accommodate such reasoning strategies. That said, many stories do follow reiterative patterns, eg fairy stories and folk tales and epics, and recurring motifs and outcomes can be found in genre fiction (eg the encounter between good and bad in westerns and SF). Even in complex fiction, patterns are established as characters assert themselves, create dilemmas and extricate themselves, grow up painfully (as in the Bildungsroman), counterpoint their self-awareness against the otherness of their environment, attempt to interpret what they see and experience.

This structuralistic approach encourages the researcher to argue for an instrumental use of story as a way of understanding managerial meaning more adequately than hitherto. Research is further encouraged by the widespread use of story in management.

A fully instrumental use of storying arises naturally beyond the use of devices like the action maze. To elicit paths in an action maze is the first step of three, the second of which is to infer warrants, and the third to move to the more complex domain of story itself.
This might be demonstrated simply if we consider (a) asking a respondent to carry out a task in an action maze, (b) then investigating, explicitly or implicit, what assumptions and warrants underlie the choices, and (c) move into a fully complex and 'real life' interview situation in which the respondent is encouraged to discuss and describe the situation.

The last stage, it is assumed, can be (and arguably would be) tilted in the direction of story, by the researcher inviting explanations in that form, eg 'And then, what did you do...?' etc, but, more probably, developing spontaneously in forms incorporating story (eg 'What I said to him then was that it could not possibly have happened like that... His first response was...' or 'He seemed to be saying that I had not pulled my weight for weeks and so I felt I had to tell him of the hours I had put in over the marketing plan...').

The action maze appears to offer researchers intelligible and flexible devices for encouraging the elicitation of decisions about plausible and feasible courses of action, given realistic information. As such, they provide researchers and their respondents with a convenient deconstructing device for identifying and reflecting on the ways in which managers, experienced and novice, good and bad, in deciding what to do and why give us (and incidentally themselves) a clear indication of whether they are effective or not.

In drawing on the various kinds of knowledge, from theoria to praxis, and in encompassing reasoning (logical sequences, decision-tree paths, contingencies and consequences) and forms of narrative (chains of events, case-study scenarios and dilemmas, and more elaborated forms of story), the action maze approach has offered a number of interesting and important
insights into the character of managerial meaning, and, as we shall see, at its most complex (and therefore subtle and realistic), can be built into a comprehensive model of managerial meaning which draws on experience, beliefs and values, awareness of ends-means, and truth. It is from these elements that the discoursal model of managerial storying is constructed later in the thesis.
This chapter argues that managers' stories have both narrative and expository forms. An investigation is carried out into novice managers in which the stories they tell are analysed according to the ways in which characters are constructed, and how the stories are organised. The stories represent the ways in which staff in library and information services react to change and to each other in states of change.

It is suggested that the ways in which stories are organised can be better understood if reference is made to influential theories about story. Of major importance are the structuralist ideas of Levi-Strauss, Propp, Barthes and Bremond. Other approaches looking at causal-purposeful sequences of story events and event chains, drawing on the research of Omanson and Graesser, are used to evaluate and elucidate the kinds of meanings and knowledge implicit in the stories.

The investigation also examines the ways in which propositions are used in such stories, in particular to express expository or evaluative comments by the authors. It is suggested that stories and the propositions in them highlight the amount of decision making going on when managerial stories are told. It is logical to evaluate how Action Mazes help express and shape the decisions and information of such authors. Such mazes can be inferred from narrative structures, and are therefore intimately linked with stories in the construction of, and reflection upon, meaning.

It is concluded that such storying activities provide the researcher with a unique insight into how managers construct meaning and reflect upon it, and points forward to the systematic examination of the PETADE model in Chapter 11.
Many of the events and feelings which people experience at work leave an impression on them. They remain remembered and recallable. Very often such experiences are shaped, consciously or unconsciously, in the form of sequences. Perhaps the sequence is the person's memory of how things happened, one after another. Perhaps it is shaped in relation to the time patterns of the working day: what happened in the morning leading to what happened in the afternoon. Perhaps it incorporates the motivations and inferred feelings of the participants, so that the person remembering wonders if something was said in order to have a particular effect, or whether what someone did was done in ignorance or defiance of how other people felt.

The consequence of this patterning of experience is in effect the telling of stories, even if some of them never emerge from people's heads. The very act of looking back on what happened and trying consciously to shape it as a coherent entity is an act of narrative. This act of narrative usually has a deliberative author, the story-teller, sincerely trying to make sense of things, envisioning what other participants may have felt and could have intended, pretending that things had been otherwise and that the projected self 'back in the storyline' really held their own and came out quite well.
Or, morbidly, came out badly and so came to feature as a sad victim in a tale of misrepresentation and misunderstanding.

**Storying not just in fictions**

Narrative reconstruction of this kind, whether creative or compensatory, shows the characteristics of storying, that is shaping experience deliberatively in the form of story. Story is a form we all know from childhood – in the fairy and folk tale and the rest. It is recognised by having characters and a storyline, suspense and a climax, an outcome sad or happy (or merely appropriate). It often reflects and represents our own feelings and experience. It often follows a temporality with which we are very familiar since we live in, and remember events, in such a time-frame.

We use story in many ways. Most directly perhaps when we 'tell a story'. This might be a bedtime story to a child or an anecdote to a friend in a pub. It may have a 'once upon a time' beginning. If it works, it is likely to have a kind of structure which we recognise or accept, and fall in with readily. It may be picaresque ('There I was driving along this road in the dark when...') or mysterious ('You'll never believe what happened to me last night...') or humorous ('This one will make you laugh...'). Many stories contain far more than mere entertaining storylines, partly because of what authors put into them, and partly because listeners and readers construct meanings and interpretations for themselves. Horror stories evoke as much in the reader's mind (from their own raw feelings and residual lexicon of words and meanings) as anything printed on the page.
Many stories are used to teach (parables, allegories, myths and legends), to provoke wonder, wring sadness, highlight contradictions in human nature, deepen our knowledge of the human condition, enlighten and inspire. From this point it is easy to suggest that stories are not just for fiction. History is full of stories which are true - accounts of battles, revolutions, political change, technological development, conflicts between races and classes.

Such stories are ways in which we explain as well as unfold what we believe happened, and embed inside them our implicit and explicit views about causes and truths. However elaborate are the interpretations of historians, the thrust of many a historical event told is the thrust of a narrative, in which often character and circumstance come into fatal juxtaposition, events intended or fortuitous trigger off unexpected or inevitable consequences, which the storyteller himself tries to understand as his own story unfolds.

For, although there is usually a storyteller, a 'voice' recreating and shaping the events in words, such an act of storytelling is one of paradox. First there is the factor of power, of being in charge, as Fielding is in his novels, as Waugh is in Gilbert Pinfold, as the dispassionate and sardonic persona of Primo Levi dominates, an hegemonistic authorial role directly visible in authorial interventions or, more pervasively and less obtrusive, in the tone, irony, angle, choice of words. The domain, say, of Jane Austen or Anita Brookner.

Then there is the opposite factor of being a hostage to narrative fortune, for, in real-life storytelling, authors often get interrupted or ignored or deflected. Moreover, many of their stories will be known archetypally to readers, whose reception of narrative is interpretative, and many of their
characters take on lives of their own, representing contrary and other viewpoints from that of the author.

**Storying as a collaborative activity**

This deflection of the storyteller is more likely to occur in pragmatic settings, social encounters, like meetings, conversations, and the to-and-fro of chat at work or in the family. Often there are many voices at the same time, vying for a hearing, contesting versions of truth or merely wilfully seeking attention. At work, there are many 'stories' simultaneously in operation at any one time. Not only are there the different patterns of human behaviour which are consciously directed by the participants and observed by others, particularly those most affected (eg by the chatter of someone on the phone in the same office), but there are also internal or psychological storylines.

These weave in and out of our conscious behaviour, sometimes helping deliberative and intellectual activities like problem-solving by providing actual (eg recalled) or putative settings into which we might care to place our ideas or against which we can test them, sometimes adding valuable or distracting resonances to mainstream ideas by alerting us to possible dangers, recalling fears about what might happen or shame or guilt from what happened last time we attempted such a thing, or gearing us up to tackle the problem in a particular way (eg because we are intuitive about the way the boss will react if crossed, or the kinds of machiavellian trade-offs which will be necessary if we are to get agreement at the board meeting).
It can be argued that, with this variety of storying going on, knowingly and unknowingly, threading itself through factual and intellectual, imaginative and fantastic thinking, and that no sphere of human cognitive activity is entirely free from a tendency to convert things into story or represent them that way.

Psychologically, there is much to support this view, in the schemata of Rumelhart and Schank and other writers who suggest that we order our thoughts in terms of conceptual webs or networks, which have strong associative linkages consisting of both 'facts' and 'beliefs'.

It is one step from there to ask if such schemata have not merely structures which we can begin to make sense of but structures which we might also, to some extent, share. For instance, particular learning sequences taught to a number of students, or particular sets of behaviours or attitudes which we all use to cope with recurring situations like shopping or arguments or recognising stories.

From there we can pursue the argument further still. If we can accept that within such schemata particular sequences, heuristic or associative, can exist (so that, for instance, when we think of penguins or baby seals, we think of feeding scenes at the zoo), we are not merely generating mind-pictures or images, but 'ur-stories', kinds of scriptal formulations or folk tale motifs (to use Stith Thompson's terminology) out of which recognisable stories grow.

These, if we consciously ask ourselves, or are deliberately asked by others, we can rapidly and easily clothe with words and build up into personalised and unique fictions. Such words, as used, can easily evoke recognition
behaviours in others, and very soon the story can be corroborated to the extent that it becomes collaborative.

It is equally so when a group of people have had the same experience (eg seeing a car accident, going to a film, witnessing a disagreement at a meeting), and when one narrative sparks off a series of others.

The ideas we have been handling so far can be summarised in this way. Stories are a form of cognitive behaviour with which we are very familiar from an early age. We come to know the shape of story and regard it, like riding a bike, as virtually instinctive. Stories however do not restrict themselves to fictional forms of narrative. They may be found in historical explanation, anecdote, parable. They are an important way in which people represent daily experience (eg at work), both to other people and to themselves.

To the extent that many of these 'stories' are commonly experienced, or experienced in common, it is possible to suggest that we are all both able to recognise stories and use them, not only individualistically but collaboratively. Indeed, collaborative storying is a common activity in the workplace, as people construct, deconstruct and reconstruct public and private meanings, and use narrative as ways of understanding and reifying aspects of organisational culture (eg norms, rules, expectations, prejudices) as well as making sense of experience for themselves.
Managerial stories

The assumption that people use stories to make sense of experience should be testable in a Popperian sense if we are to use it pragmatically in social science research. To this end various methodologies can be devised to elicit and record information on managerial storying. In this chapter research is conducted into the storying characteristics of students of management.

Three extended essays from respondents are examined, all on the general theme 'staff training'. The setting is a library or information service, and the students are third year students of managerial applications in such services. Tests were carried out as part of a taught course in management during the academic session 1990-91. The entire sample consisted of thirty subjects. The sample was chosen on representative grounds (based on the way in which the three chosen best represented the thirty responses, and, with detailed analysis, could be used to represent typical responses beyond that sampling frame).

The emphasis here lies in (a) seeking to demonstrate some of the features of storying which can be revealed in academic exercises produced by students of management, and (b) seeking to suggest some critical and analytical approaches of relevance to such research.

The aim of this part of the research was to investigate a theme (in this case, staff training), base it around a central area of library and information service (in this case, training for automation), and evaluate how it might be achieved successfully. Implicit in the notion of 'success'
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was how the writer (ie the subject) dealt with the problem. At times several options were suggested or explored, reducible (as we shall see) to the configuration of an action maze.

Crucial to the task was to represent the major issues through a narrative episode or small story. This was to concentrate the general discussion on a plausible but imaginary scene in which two characters interacted and in some way coped with the issues. The ways in which this story was constructed and told were closely analysed, as were the logical linkages between the story and the factual matrix within which the story was placed. The intention was to observe how such stories were told and used, with a further intention of drawing conclusions on managerial storytelling in general.

The construction of characters

Subjects were instructed that they should represent the key issues of the theme (stall training) in terms of two central characters. This approach drew on the traditional features of story in representing characters. We can see this in folk tale and ballad, where recurring characterological motifs can be found - the youngest son, the stepmother, the evil giant, the joker, the cuckold, the idiot. It may be that, in psychoanalytical terms, such characterisations represent different aspects of the human spirit, and that readers subconsciously acknowledge this in reading. Certainly, some of Hans Christian Andersen's, Oscar Wilde's or George MacDonald's fairy tales, have their powerful basis in the Jungian subconscious or in Freudian repressions, and the characterological archetypes described by Jung will receive
recognition in an application of Mitroff's managerial types and story in Chapter 11.

For us here, however, the argument is that characters can very readily be accepted as viable for this purpose. It appears that no subject found difficulty in accepting the rationale of representing issues in and through characters in this way, and the researcher explained the procedures fully without attempting to influence the actual choice of character and situation.

This may reveal something of interest to research into managerial storytelling: that the three-dimensionality of character, in the sense that E.M. Forster talks about it, does not need to exist for characters to be perfectly instruments in managerial storytelling. It could be that such storytelling draws on easily and even universally recognised types, 'composites' or stereotypes - the hyperactive manager, the office bore, the company man, the career woman - and that full character portrayal is unnecessary. Particularly for those heavily impregnated with the culture and lore of a professional ambience (arguably third year students would come into this category), it might be suggested that such familiarity with stereotypes would exist.

Alternatively, there could be a practical reason, that subjects were deliberately creating characters who would represent issues, in the same way as Jesus told parables and John Bunyan, Norton Juster and Reiner Zimnik tell allegories. With the emphasis on USING character for this purpose, rather than to develop it in its own right, as might a writer like Saul Bellow or Isaac Bashevis Singer, it is likely that characters will be stereotypes.
Furthermore, subjects know that the main intention and remit of the exercise is managerial evaluation rather than literary creativity.

With these points in mind, it is interesting to discover what characterisations were used by the subjects writing on staff training. Perhaps coincidentally, possibly because all three subjects were males in their early twenties, the configuration was that of younger man and older woman. The older women had characteristics in common: all were much older than the man (one was fifty-four, another 'had twenty years experience', and the third had been 'in post since 1969').

Their common strengths were knowledge of the post they held, gained by experience, and resulting from having had a fair amount of freedom from interference. They all had 'a traditional view of library service', implying that effectiveness for them consisted of local knowledge and a good rapport with users of the library.

Their common dilemma consisted of the arrival of the young man on the staff. This coincided with, or was symptomatic of, the more profound upheaval for the status quo by the arrival, or imminence, of information technology in the form of automation. It took the specific form of computerising library procedures (eg the circulation of issues, or the acquisition of books). This was represented as 'an intrusion', threatening loss of control, even implying obsolescence.

This reaction to automation, in libraries and elsewhere in the workplace, is widely documented, and to an extent typifies the way in which it was possible for subjects to encapsulate a generic intellectual idea in a character.
The young man was represented as being 'twenty-eight', or 'young and ambitious', 'keen on automation' or 'computerate', wishing to impress others with his expertise, and with little fear of automation. Qualities built into such a character have strong analogies with those which drape heroes in any storying: Arthurian knights have bright armour and purity, Western heroes treat women nobly and are slow to anger. Ideologically such a character is diametrically opposed to the older woman, and it is through their interaction that the subject feels able to express the dilemma and suggest a solution.

Authorial voices

It is a truism to suggest that authors tell stories and at the same time, through the tone and manner of storytelling, reveal much of themselves. Flaubert's sympathy in *Un coeur simple* with the farmgirl's elemental earthiness, Jane Austen's ironic view of characters like Mr Collins or Frank Churchill, Sinclair Lewis' cold remoteness in *Babbitt*, show how this can be done. In the same way, but in a less literary vein, managerial storytelling can reveal much about the storyteller.

Typically we see this when managers tell office anecdotes or jokes about mutual acquaintances or business rivals. These class as meta-narratival features of storytelling in the sense that they operate 'above' the narrative, commenting explicitly or implicitly upon it, like a comedian laughing at his own jokes. Here such meta-narratival features include one subject's comment, made in one of the accounts, that the woman was 'blinkerened' as the result of 'her traditional approach to library work'.
Reasons are then swiftly found to underwrite such innuendo; eg with respect to her age, we read 'her more traditional background and approach to the work put her in a position where she felt insecure - even redundant - in terms of her current duties in the library'. As character analysis, in the sense that a personnel manager might evaluate a member of staff, there is little to differentiate this style of assessing character from that of a novelist. The parenthesis, with the deliberate rhetorical pause it suggests, emphasises this similarity.

There is something else which personnel management and novelists have in common and that is an interest in human motivation. The many theories devised by social psychologists like Maslow, Herzberg and MacGregor which can be applied to motivation in the workplace are well known. Many of them emphasise the way in which motivation is based on the satisfaction of need, and how needs range from material to self-actualisation needs. Negative factors invoke fear or insecurity, and people are motivated to avoid, repress, or cope with them.

Here the woman has to come to terms with her fears about automation: after the story is over and a kind of resolution found, we read that 'the introduction of a two-level training programme seems to have alleviated a lot of her fears in that she isn't "expendable"...and also in that she "isn't alone" in requiring training for the use of the system'. With this we spill over into plot.
Two ways of presenting the plot

We all learn as children what a storyline is. It is when the three little pigs build houses and only the third one withstand the puffs of the wolf. It is when Cinderella gets the prince after all, or when Shirley Hughes's little boy in *Dogger* gets his lost toy back. Later we learn to call stories novels and storylines plots. Yet the notion of the plot is wider even than this. Life is in fact full of plots and subplots. In management, plots might consist of marketing strategies to best a competitor, a planned cycle of activities to make sure that financial management comes out right at the end of the financial year, an ongoing agenda between two rivals in an organisation, a set of psychological knee-jerk reactions to pressure sustained by a manager, and so on.

What these have in common with storylines (eg in children's stories) or plots (in adult novels from Henry to P D James) is a recognisable and usable shape. It is recognisable because people know it when they see it, however many forms it appears in. It is usable because people rapidly personalise it, appropriate it for personal use, and enter the storying domain themselves as both understanders and shapers. Such is the closeness of the evaluation and the storytelling in the exercises under examination that it is fair to say that there are TWO ways of presenting the plot, in 'exposition' and in 'narrative'.

The expository way can be seen when subjects set the scenario and outline the dilemma as a problem in staff training in automation. It can then be analysed in terms of what is desirable or possible (eg getting agreement
from the older woman that training is preferable to redundancy) and conclusions and recommendations can then be made on how to implement change.

The narratival way is seen through the story. The characters represent the traits and issues we have described. Their interaction is represented novelistically, following conventions (e.g., time, place, unity) suggested as far back as Aristotle, using dramatic forms to express dialogic turn-taking (he states, she argues, he replies, and more indirectly, she infers, she does not appear to believe, he is convinced that, she knew that he knew that... etc).

The dialogue takes particular shapes, like dialogue in the work of Alice Walker or Ivy Compton Burnett. In the three management students' stories, the dialogue traces a curve from impasse (where the older woman tends to have mastery) through recrimination and exposure to enlightenment (where the older woman concedes, or is obliged to concede, defeat).

Chronology is innately observed as all subjects accept the progression of events from mention of automation and discussion of its likely consequences, to being forced to confront the consequences and bow to them. The narratival approach can be seen in authorial interpolations such as 'The meeting concludes with Mrs A (the older woman) being forced to concede that the introduction to information technology is unavoidable if the library is to maintain its position as an important part of the organisation'.

There appears to be no major difficulty for subjects in using the story form to get to their destination, an evaluation based on a full understanding of the dilemma, expressed through imaginary but plausible character
stereotypes. All progress easily from the expository mode at the start to the narratival in the story, and then back again for evaluation.

It may be that not only are there two modes of presenting the plot here, but in such situations of managerial storying *there have always been two such ways*. Such a contention would be based on the assumption that many of the devices and techniques used to explain and explore experience, in practical and in purely invented situations, appear to work in similar ways: issues distilled through character, a search for motivation, an assumption of causality and temporal shift, the dynamic of a dialectic as conflicting elements appear to seek resolution (and the implicit rejection of entropy as a solution), and a need to explain and confirm the ending in some definite manner.

Implicit too in both expository and narratival methods of representing plots is the final appeal to reason or rationality, not only in terms of sorting out the issues in a manner which a reader is likely to find convincing, but also in doing this in such a way that there is an appeal to a latent or underlying rationality in dealing with a situation 'that way'. This is captured in the statement made by one subject at the very end of the first story: 'She [the older woman] is of the belief that if the intention is towards greater automation in the library... the commercial training course is a necessary expenditure and may go a long way to solving part of the problem'.

The urge towards a satisfying resolution is demonstrated here, as is the urge to underpin it with, in this case a managerial, rationality. Deviants have been made to see reason, a course of action which is 'for the best' has been agreed, and a strong hallmark of authorial approval is placed on the
outcome. It is clear that the author assumes the reader is convinced. At that stage in the exercise, the subject is not so much the storyteller any longer, but the student again, arguing his case for a respectable mark.

Plots which end this way are probably highly manipulated, but no more than the happy endings at the end of romances, the victory of the good in science fiction operatics, and the pained states of knowledge in fictional autobiographies in the tradition of the Bildungsroman.

But a moment’s examination of the context, that of learning, and that of management, and that of both combined, should explain why a ‘neat’ ending is likely. Students are observant to the hidden curricula of academic activity, and the convincingness and organisational coherence of their work are recognised as being indicative of professional competence.

More than that, managerial situations in themselves are highly orientated towards problem-solving and decision-making. In this situation, staff training in automation, and the difficulties arising because there is reluctance and tension among members of staff, makes it highly eligible for being seen in problem-solving terms. Successful managers successfully solve problems.

Emma recognises at the end that there is only one woman who can marry Knightley, herself: in the same way, the older woman in the first management story recognises that there is only one thing she can really do, to stay in post and keep her self-respect, and that is marry herself to the new ideology of automation, and accept the changes that staff training in automation will inevitably bring.
Story morphologies

Analysis of the shapes into which stories can be turned has been the subject of research in several fields for some years, by this researcher as well as by others, like Wilkins, Smircich, and Mitroff, whose works are cited in the bibliographies. In this section we shall examine ideas deriving from the study of narrative and text, and suggest ways in which the subjects' managerial stories can be deconstructed in order to provide a clearer idea of their architecture and logic.

Later sections will take other approaches drawn from a combined approach using textual analysis and cognitive psychology to enable us to suggest ways of examining aspects of the internal workings of text (e.g., plot units and propositions). At that stage, too, we shall attempt to apply these ideas to both story and expository text, both of which appear (and interpenetrate) in managerial stories.

Elementary interpretations of story hint that they have to have a beginning, a middle, and an end. That said, the diversity of story is too large for this simply to be true. From *War and Peace* to *The Secret Garden*, from *Don Quixote* to *Othello*, *The Great Gatsby* to *Ulysses*, there are apparently many story shapes which start and finish but which conform in no predictable or generic way to this pattern. Deeper may be the view that patterns exist in story, setting out the scene and introducing the character, presenting a danger or a complication, taking a journey into an outer region or inner space, confronting heroes with decisions or points of no return, rewarding them or finding a suitable ending for their lives. Generic patterns exist in Westerns and SF and romance, laying out characters and plot in recurring
ways, ways which become a hallmark of the form: the threatened sod-busters, the winsome heroine's quarrel with her eventual lover, the life-threatening cloud from outer space.

The way in which story appears to have deeper levels of meaning, let alone response, has led critics to examine deep structures of narrative. Levi-Strauss' analysis of the morphology of myth is a classical statement of this approach. He speaks of oppositions in the Oedipus myth between exaggerating blood relations (Oedipus marries his mother) and under-acknowledging them (he kills his father). Other oppositions exist, as Oedipus denies his earth-bound origins (eg by killing the sphinx) but demonstrates them (eg by having the defect of a swollen foot). Greimas refers to 'semes' (or minimal units of sense), emphasising how they work oppositionally, as when black and white occur, or when characters are true or false (Greimas, 1987).

One way of speaking of story is that it is constructed upon an underlying text. The story thus is a kind of rendering or paraphrase, and there can be many versions, hence the variants in ballads and folk-tales, and plenty of opportunity for the analysis of the stories through which text operates.

Barthes's (Barthes, 1972) view is that stories are 'event labels' which help readers amass data under various labels for actions (eg stroll, murder, rendez-vous).

So the sound of a shot in a detective novel is labelled variously as 'he pressed a trigger', 'a homicide was committed', or 'she met her just and violent end'. Such labels are logical (so that when an event like a killing takes place the killer is in some way cruel or good, consistent with the reader's knowledge of the storyline) and in some way or other consistent
with an idea of temporality and causality without which such a storyline will lack coherence.

Events are things that happen. They often change things from one state to another. They play numerous roles, including advancing the action and confusing or delaying it. They often appear in sequences, based on time and causality. Even a story as simple as 'She was born, grew up hopefully but died young in childbirth' demonstrates the principles we have been discussing.

Propp (Propp, 1968) applied these ideas to folk-tales, abstracting recurring elements from a large number of Russian examples. Acts of character, 'defined from the point of view of its significance for the course of the action', are called functions. They are formed propositionally and occur in many different stories. So events like 'a prince gives a woman a ring' or 'the tsar gives an eagle to the hero' are functions, despite the differences between narrative contexts.

Bremond draws on functions, saying that they combine to form sequences which show themselves in stages of the story like possibility (where things are introduced, where a hero learns he has a job to do, when a tragedy strikes and revenge is required), process (the steps taken), and outcome (where we learn who wins the struggle, what happens in the end). Patterns of events and functions can be identified and represented, and reveal complex structures in which one thing happens and then another, things happen simultaneously, causality is wrongly assumed, tasks are achieved through particular means. Bremond suggests that balance or change, for good or bad, constantly occurs and is signalled by these patterns. Equilibrium can be
established (eg they married) or denied (eg he realised that it would always be like that, no matter what he did)(Bremond, 1977).

Character too has been given this attention. Burke suggests that we might visualise heroes as 'agents'. Such agents may embody personal qualities like fear or malice, intuition or a sense of humour, and these qualities show themselves through the action. Agents may get help from co-agents, and opposition from counter-agents. The activity draws in a variety of agencies (eg the villain gets into a country house using a crowbar, the hero arrives in the nick of time by wild but skilful driving through country lanes by night). This is done for a 'purpose' (eg to get to the heroine first, to escape the clutches of the villain, to establish an alibi), and is carried out in some place (the scene, such as the room of the murder, a fast-moving train, a remote island, a penthouse, or darkened cellar)(Burke, 1969).

Such analysis as this is a fertile mixture of literary and textual analysis, semiotics and linguistics. What emerges is a clear and important tradition in which story is not merely regarded as an entertainment, or even as a sociological artefact arising from an oral tradition, but as a many-formed representation of many underlying texts, texts about human thought and activity, which receive expression through narrative and become eligible for structural analysis.

We can apply these ideas to the managerial stories. There is an underlying text in all three – that of a character confronting change, regarding it as hostile, personalising it in the other character, and coming to see change both as inevitable and desirable. It may then be possible to apply Bremond's
structural model of the fairy tale to these stories and develop it until it adequately represents the major components and interactions of this text. We accept, of course, that there will be numerous stylistic and semantic idiosyncrasies in each story.

Bremond's structural model of the fairy tale is shown in Figure 3:

```
Deterioration of A -----> Improvement of A thanks to 
                                 |                                 |
                                 |                                 |
                                 |                                 |
                                 |                                 |
                                 |                                 |
                                 -----> Reward of helper C
                                 |
                                 |
                                 ↓
because of unworthy villain B -----> Punishment of villain B
```

Figure 3: Bremond's structural model of the fairy tale

In applying this model to the managerial stories, two important variants will have to be introduced. The first of these rests on the point that the 'villain' (ie the younger man) turns out to be (according both to the plot and the revealed value-system of the storyteller-evaluator) the 'helper'.
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The first variant therefore has to incorporate this. Other features, with appropriate definition, can remain: for instance, the 'deterioration' of A represents the reaction of A (i.e., the older woman) to change and the stress and hostility she feels and shows (see Figures 4 and 5).

---

Deterioration of A
\[ \downarrow \]
\[ \text{ostensible villain B} \quad \rightarrow \quad \langle A \text{ comes to see B as helper} \rangle \]
\[ \downarrow \]
\[ \text{Improvement of A thanks to worthy helper B} \]

**Figure 4: Variant 1 on structural model of the fairy tale**

---

The second important variant which needs to be built into Bremond's original model is psychodynamic. The true villain appears to lie INSIDE the character complex of A herself. Her deterioration is due to this. When she comes to regard B, and the change he represents, as worthy rather than unworthy, then it is possible for the villainous part of her character to undergo change. Change is regarded as good according to the revealed value-system of the storyteller-evaluator, and that part of the older woman's character which resists change is in consequence 'villainous' (see Figures 4 and 5).
Deterioration of A

\[ \downarrow \]

ostensible villain B \( \rightarrow \) (A comes to see B as helper)

\[ \downarrow \]

Improvement of A \( \rightarrow \) [true villain A(B)]

thanks to worthy helper B

**Figure 5: Variant 2 on structural model of the fairy tale**

There are two reasons why these variants to the model are essential if it is properly to represent the underlying text of the three managerial stories.

The first of these is because the character in the training context, unlike the fairy tale character facing dangers such as magic or monsters, has to deal with events that are as much internal as external. This compels both the storyteller and the analyst of the narrative to incorporate a dimension of inner space awareness of change.

The second draws on the storytelling context in management where there is a presupposition about 'good' management, in terms of showing certain character traits (adaptiveness, decision-making, rationality, self-
knowledge, professionalism), and accordingly an influential implicit curriculum exists about what any manager should do, what behaviours they should exhibit. In this case, the change of approach (heart?) shown by the older woman, induced externally by the younger man and more largely still by circumstances, conforms to this, and is given the seal of approval in the evaluation which follows the storytelling.

**Narrative analysis**

Omanson (Omanson, 1982) approaches narrative in a different way. Starting from the position that discourses, textual and conversational, imply and demonstrate a constructing principle at work, he suggests that narrative creates a world where the reader accepts, or chooses to accept, a series of sequential events. Often such acceptance is based upon understanding (imaginative and semantic) but also the prior existence of the preconceived expectancies deriving from the reader's experience of previous stories.

Kintsch (Kintsch, 1982) argues that understanding stories demonstrates how assimilation into the reader's knowledge structure takes place when readers encounter story. Events and characters in stories may surprise readers, but are seen to characterise real life causalities and categories. One of the main purposes of reading narrative is to explain the actions of the characters. In this respect the experience of reading stories is closely associated with Schank's view of schemata and scripts.

Omanson's thesis is that the reader's knowledge of social action enables him to identify the 'causal-purposeful sequence of story events' and
characterisation in such narratives, and that as a result particular kinds of content are better recalled. He tests this by dividing stories up into 'content units' made up from clauses (which consist of subject and predicate, and can be equated with a sentence as a grammatical unit). Often such units constitute actions (e.g., a character cries out 'Help!').

Such units identify, characterise, or act focally. 'Identifying units' introduce characters or describe where they live, 'characterising units' describe characters and settings and clarify previously depicted events, while 'focal units' show the action proper. This consists of the events (such as actions) and the states that cause, or are caused by, the events.

Focal units are then further classified into 'componential' (grouping events or states, as when a series of actions is summarised by a phrase such as 'the fox went into the wood'), 'purposeful' (connecting events and states, as when a character does something 'in order to' or 'so that' something results from that action), 'causal' (connecting events and states that are caused by other, or prior, events and states, connections which can be physical or psychological), 'disruptive' (connecting actions with subsequent events or states which prevent it taking place, as when the fox in the wood is forced to hide because of poachers), and 'enabling' (connecting events and states with prior events and states by which they are enabled, as when, by being in the wood, the fox is able to see the poachers).

These ideas have been described at some length in order to make them clear. It is now important to apply them, and particularly the idea about focal units, to the managerial stories. Because the approach is microscopic, part
of the story episode from the submission of one subject alone will be analysed.

Two features need to be emphasised. First, that the focal units have been selected from a series of naturally-occurring statements in the subject's account, and that nothing has artificially been changed. The second emerges in the form of strong evidence to suggest that external action is interpreted noticeably in terms of psychological or motivational factors, accounting for the fact that at least two focal units (the causal and the enabling) are psychological.

The situation in the story is this: Sarah is the older woman resisting change, while Alan is the younger man in favour of change. Cards have been put squarely on the table. Dramatically it is the 'peripeteia', that point in the story at which events can turn irrevocably towards tragedy or comedy, like Leontes's decision to admit his guilt in The Winter's Tale.

The subject demonstrates Omanson's focal unit structure clearly. We find evidence of a componential focal unit in the statement:

'Clearly, Alan had failed to establish a suitable rapport with Sarah, particularly in terms of getting his proposals across'.

It summarises the preceding interview where insecurity and intransigence had been expressed by the participants. We find a purposeful focal unit in the statement:

'... she was convinced that he wanted her out of the way in order to carry out the implementation of his system'.
where the consequences of Alan's actions, particularly as seen or imagined by Sarah, are suggested.

Then we find a causal focal unit in the following statement:

'Being older than the other members of staff, she felt at a distinct disadvantage regarding the new technology',

implying an inference or implicit view on the part of the storyteller, as well as a storytelling device to display and explain character and motivation. Its psychological role is clear.

There is a disruptive focal unit as the subject explores how Sarah reacted to the challenge of staff training for automation:

'Her lack of experience [with computers] seemed to bolster her fears regarding her job, and pushed her even further into a negative and uncooperative position regarding the implementation of the system as well as the training in its use'.

Disruptive focal units seek to pin down actions or states which constrain or prevent particular actions moving towards a successful outcome. Sarah's reaction here is of this kind, and the focal unit approach has allowed us to identify and define it. Finally, there is also an enabling focal unit, connecting events and states with earlier ones on which they depend in some way:
'Her more traditional background and approach to the work put her in a position where she felt insecure - even redundant - in terms of her current duties in the library'.

This approach, with suitable adjustments to accommodate the psychological complexity of the situation, allows for analysis of some important aspects of storytelling in this kind of managerial communication.

There is a further point of importance: the storyteller's relationship with the storytelling (because one is not the other, i.e., in Genette's terms it is heterodiegetic). First it should be stressed that, according to the terms of reference for the task, subjects were asked to direct their work on the theme of staff training for automation, and to use a story as an exemplum in the context of an evaluative study of the theme.

This meant that free storytelling was greatly constrained, applied as it was to the purposes of demonstrating a work situation which could be analysed and where any difficulties or misunderstandings could ostentatiously be sorted out. The subject was both storyteller and evaluator, a dual role affecting both style and approach.

It could be argued that much of the storytelling in management is of this type, that of telling stories in order to demonstrate or clarify a point, to support an argument, to argue for change or the maintenance of the status quo, to score against a rival, to characterise a quality of excellence or incompetence in the organisation.
It is no accident that Omanson’s focal units include two associated with causality. These are the causal and enabling units. An understanding of the sequential and causal structure of narrative, both events and states, is crucial to an understanding of the reading process itself. This is not just a matter of matching the contents of the story with the experience and expectancies of the reader, but an interactive venturing and de/reconstruction of text meanings and grammars between readers and writers. For this reason reading is well called a constructivistic process.

Story structures demonstrate many characteristics. The structure of temporality is an important one, whether it is literally chronological (as when the evil gradually takes hold in The Turn of the Screw) or refracted and time-shifting as in the works of John Fowles or William Mayne. The experiential and psychological base for this is obvious. Another structuring factor is the motivation or need, which often provides the momentum for crime in detective fiction, for heroism in sea stories, and love in romances. It is well said of popular fiction that sex, greed, and violence motivate both the characters and the readers. Events (in the form of actions) and states lead to outcomes, plausible or otherwise, as we know from Henchard’s envy in The Mayor of Casterbridge, Iago’s malice, Puss in Boots’ ingenuity, and Emma’s self-absorption.

Detailed story structures, along the lines which Levi-Strauss, Greimas, Propp and Bremond suggest, have been considered above. Omanson’s focal units showed us an example of a form of narratological analysis which emphasises both the shaping of the story and the response of the reader. Much has been
made of this response or 'reception' of text. Explicit connections between storytelling and psychology have been popular in recent years in writers such as Thorndyke (e.g. Thorndyke, 1977). He argued that stories have four components: setting, theme, plot, and resolution. Setting is character + location + time. Theme is event + goal, in a whole series of potential repetitions. The plot consists of episodes, each with its own structure, down to sentences and beyond.

Leaving aside the problems of deep grammatical and semantic structures, analogies have been made between the structures which can be exposed or revealed in stories and the linkages and logical patterns or schemata in human knowledge representation. Historiographically, we may say that structuralism and linguistics have been introduced into cognitive psychology.

Schematic knowledge, for instance, as far as it can be exteriorised, highlights linkages between nodal concepts and categorial instances, argues that such elements can be used or instantiated actively by people intending to mean (say, in speech acts), and that such schemata are hospitable to values and beliefs as well as recognisably cognitive entities. Many schemata are influenced by experience, e.g., our experience that fire burns or water quenches thirst or that smiles indicate friendship or that, if something is done, other things ensue.

Our knowledge of our knowledge, though partial, is adequate enough for us to be aware of its scope and continuous changingness. Such knowledge is changed and informed and reconstituted by real-life and imaginary experience (some of the latter from stories in books). A claim which can be made is that a comparison can be made between (1) the schemata or semantic networks
by which human beings represent their knowledge of, and react to, experience, and (2) the structures which exist in stories, particularly when we define stories to mean shaped structures drawing on and representing sets of events (actions and states) in fact and fiction, and extend the definition to include both intelligible storying structures in both narrative and expository forms.

A good example of this process at work is when we consider the 'if-then' structures of an expert system, an electronic attempt to reproduce the 'knowledge' or expertise (i.e., the organised information) of, say, a subject expert in medicine or law. Here causal structures, and our knowledge of them, are instantiated into patterns both reflecting and enabling decision-making to take place.

For instance, if [particular medical symptoms are observed], then [particular treatments are prescribed]. Drawing as it does on specialised medical knowledge, such 'if-then' structures have many similarities with the causal structures we find in storytelling. There, we might find a prince battling his way through thorns, and, if he gets through, if his love is true, then he will gain the princess, then she will awaken, then their love will be eternal.

The universality of this pattern is reinforced when we apply it to the praxis of work. In management, for instance, problem-solving and decision-making characterise the daily work of many middle and senior managers. Such activities often involve using knowledge of possible, likely, desired or undesirable actions and states, and their consequences. Omanson's purposeful, causal, disruptive and enabling focal units most interestingly shed light upon many of the actual decisions made by managers.
It is but one step more to suggest that such decisions usually take place within a web of other considerations, human and technological, and they take place in a practical situation at work which can very readily be characterised as a script in the process of working itself out. Thus, the contention that decisions based on 'if-then' structures, and our awareness of causalities and contingencies implied by such structures, exist in storytelling and decision-making, in fact and fiction, in story representations of experience, and real-life itself, is easy to sustain.

**Event chains in story and exposition**

Graesser and Clark (Graesser & Clark, 1985) suggest that discourse, and our attempts to make sense of it (inference and coherence), activate generic knowledge structures. Drawing on Rumelhart and Schank's ideas about cognitive schemata and conceptual webs, they argue that, in coming to understand text, readers pick out goals and chains of events. It is their view that much our response can be seen propositionally.

It is the purpose of this section to examine event chains, in the light of foregoing discussion, and then, in the next, suggest how propositional structures in stories, and in particular the managerial stories under examination, inform us on how subjects appear to structure their knowledge and beliefs.

Graesser and Clark's argument is that our understanding of text draws out the very structures that help our understanding - an ability to taxonomise, spot implications and infer from texts to other parts of the text and to our
our experience and back, to identify goals which events and characters reveal, and to use causality actively. Such causality shows itself as cause-oriented substructures, eg networks of events or states. They can be represented diagrammatically and have analogues in our generic knowledge structures. He cites a 'dragon' story structure shown in Figure 6:

1 State
Dragon is ugly

3 Event

- Dragon attracts attention of people
- People become scared
- People panic
- People scream

2 State
Dragon is a villain

Figure 6: Graesser and Clark's 'dragon' story structure

Apart from any archetypal mythic or sociological paradigm here, what we have is a way of representing not merely a series or sequence of events and states, but also a direct way of suggesting how knowledge structures might be instantiated in explicit textual forms, in this case in story. Causality
is built into the analysis, not just in terms of the temporal sequentiality, but in terms of the interplay between events and states, as one thing causes (or as Omanson might say, enables) another. The link between explicit text and implicit psychological meanings appears to be reinforced when we notice how much emphasis is placed on state in the event chain. This was a characteristic emphasised in the earlier discussion of managerial stories when Bremond's structure for a fairy story was applied (Bremond, 1977).

An important extension of this idea is that we can use such techniques to identify and analyse the propositional structures in the evaluation part of the submissions from the three subjects. Up to now, apart from noticing that evaluation took place, and that the subjects appeared to play various authorial roles as a result (qua storyteller and evaluator), this has been given little emphasis up to now.

The relevant stage of one subject's submission was chosen which demonstrates these factors well. The two protagonists are Ms Smith and Mr Richardson, the older woman and the younger man respectively. Difficulties have just started in the library because staff training for automation is being discussed. The subject has created a persona (of a third party senior librarian) and this persona directly intervenes (although this does not upset the event chain analysis). What is interesting to notice is how, as with Bremond's structure, we are obliged to supply two important variants to the original model.

The first of these is an acknowledgement that, in the storyline, such is dominance of the STATE over the event, ie the way the characters feel about the issue and about each other, that the event chain has to represent events
4 and 5 in terms of changes of psychological state, i.e., in terms of changes of state undergone by Ms. Smith.

The second variant focuses on the solution which the subject supplies to this stage of the narrative. It might be regarded as a meta-event in as much as it is a resolution supplied knowingly from outside the story by the author. It indicates an interesting narratival watershed between the two authorial roles of the subject, as storyteller and evaluator. The original text from the submission is given first, followed by the event chain analysis in Figure 7.

'When I came back to Ms. Smith on the possibility that the breakdown between herself and Mr. Richardson could be to do with the library automation plan, she eventually, with reluctance, admitted that it was. She said she felt vulnerable - having been in the job many years and becoming too familiar with the old ways of doing things. She felt there was no way she could cope with automation, having no knowledge or experience of such technological equipment, and that when automation eventually became fully operational her assistant, with his good knowledge and experience of on-line and computer work, would be able to take over and leave her without a job. I tried to allay her fears as much as possible, and promised something would be done and that her job was secure if she wanted it.'
It is one step beyond this to suggest that, in order fully to understand the ways in which subjects are using and evaluating managerial stories, we should examine the evidential assumptions on which they are working. This takes us back to the link between textual forms and implicit cognitive knowledge structures, and argues the case that, if we can locate some of the assumptions revealed ('instantiated') in the text, then we may have some hold on what this aspect of managerial storying means.

1 State
Ms S feels reluctant

3 Event
Disagreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>4 Event</th>
<th>5 Event</th>
<th>6 Meta-event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overt</td>
<td>Ms S feels vulnerable</td>
<td>Ms S feels she cannot</td>
<td>Solution is offered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2a State
Mr R a villain

2b State
Automation a villain

Figure 7: Event chain analysis of evaluation part of student's story
Evidence and assumption are such broad concepts that, in this context, we shall direct our attention at some of the explicit and implicit propositional structures which appear in the evaluation, that is at the meta-event or expository level of the submission.

Propositions and the storyteller-evaluator

Propositions are often associated with argument and clear reasoning. Thus, we might speak of the truth or falsehood of the proposition that ‘a truly democratic society will allow freedom of speech within the law’. Logicians would differentiate between whether such statements might be true or valid, a distinction which we do not propose to pursue here. However, an argument should certainly be made as to whether propositions do appear in a widespread and significant way in managerial discourse, and further how they are or might be used in managerial storying.

Managerial propositions appear in numerous forms in management practice and literature. They can be expressed through an organisation’s philosophy (eg John Lewis’s ‘never knowingly undersold’), or as axioms of good management practice (eg ‘control is an essential agent of efficiency’), or in the form of pragmatic and professional wisdom in the workplace (eg that particular processes or machines or personnel perform in particular ways under particular conditions).

An assumption can safely be made that many of these propositions are underwritten by experiential practice and are regarded as ‘true’ or ‘normative’ in terms both of day-to-day thinking and broader professional
and managerial paradigms (eg the view that, today, 'the pursuit of excellence' is better for a modern company than rigid observation of sets of rules from traditional, Taylorian or Fayolian management). The variety of implied norms and warrants underlying propositional thinking forms a subject for other research.

Typical propositions might be represented in the following form:

'organisations with a high degree of control are more efficient than organisations with a low degree of control'.

Price (Price, 1968) analysed many of these traditional managerial propositions, arguing that structurally propositions place 'variables' side by side (eg organisations with more X have more Y), and aim to represent 'functional relationships', good and bad. Such propositions contain 'linkages' of variables, so that one might say that the more of X the less of Y, another the more of X the more of Y, and so on. Relationships can be 'sequential' (eg if X then Y) or 'coextensive' (eg an organisation with X is almost certainly going to have Y). 'Contingency' may be implied, as when Y exists only when X exists.

All these variables, of course, represent actual factors in the workplace, like scale of investment, control, coordination, effective staff training, a suitable salary structure, job satisfaction among middle management, appropriate discipline procedures, and the like. And, ultimately, they can only be made to make sense in the pragmatic context or causal textures of the workplace. Such textures consist not just of propositional knowledge but also of beliefs and values, and of the awareness of both those factors.
Looking back at Omanson's componential focal unit, which assisted us to understand how, at various points in a narrative, the author provides summarising statements, and considering how close componential units like this are to meta-narratival events like when the storyteller turns into an evaluator, it is possible to suggest that propositional activity, in stories and exposition, are likely to occur when authors take stock of what they are doing, or when they decide to reveal their views about what shapes the narrative or what conclusions they themselves have reached about the events and states so far. We can see this phenomenon in the second subject's responses, part of which ends in the following manner:

"The future of the library hangs on its ability to circumvent the problems of lack of space and staff coupled with the increase in use. The Institute [in this case, the parent organisation of the library] must reconsider the place of the library in the day-to-day work of producing quality research, and invest planning and resources to ensure that the library is able to deal with these new demands upon it."

The stated propositions are, first, that the library will grow if certain things are done. This takes variables like 'an effective library' and 'problems/challenges', and converts it into a proposition which suggests that the more of the first, the less of the second. Second, this general proposition is then localised by restatement: that the parent body must see to it that library is effective, again two variables, 'proper concern from
the Institute', and 'this effective library', the more of the first, the
more of the second.

Third, the localised proposition is localised further in being applied to
library processes: the more planning and resources, the better response to
change. The work-context, as described by the foregoing evaluation and the
storytelling, makes it clear that there is an overarching proposition too:
that the more staff training in automation there is, the better will the
library achieve this effectiveness.

Such propositional knowledge not only suggests a great deal about the
assumptive and tacit knowledge of the writer (and probably the professional
cadre to which he or she belongs), but reveals much through the manner it
which it is deployed. It plays a summarising or summative role, for both the
story and the evaluation, and is given a strategic and normative function
for the text as a whole.

It addresses itself simultaneously to several distinct levels of
signification in this text, to a level of general implied wisdom, as well as
to the localised characteristics of the case-study. More than that, it is
constructed in an incrementally cumulative manner, various propositions
working in groups. This arises partly because of fortuitous juxtapositioning
in the text as written. But working on the assumption, discussed earlier,
that storying instantiates generic knowledge structures, and a fortiori that
things like this cannot (analytically) be dismissed as arising from chance,
then the incremental manner in which propositional knowledge is presented is
itself important.
This characteristic is visible in the example just quoted. It is even more clear in the third of the three submissions. The example cited here occurs when the two protagonists have declared their position and their suspicion about the other, and the writer decides to interpolate the following remarks:

'There are a lot of common myths concerning new technology, which can only inhibit a person’s integration with it. Be honest about what all the implications for the library and staff will be - lying or being evasive or vague about matters will not help. Stress to her [Ms Smith] the advantages to be gained by staff from the new system, and explain any expected improvements in working conditions and relationships. However...'
"However, do not lead her to believe that computers will be able to solve all problems. Some aspects of work will be faster, easier and cheaper, but other aspects may become time-consuming and expensive.'
'In fact, discussing the facts that technology is not all-powerful, does create problems and more workload in some areas, and needs humans to operate and use it effectively may encourage Ms. Smith, ridding her of myths she may have of technology and giving her extra confidence and a sense of challenge knowing they are not perfect and all-powerful.'

At this point in our propositional analysis we reach probably the most revealing part of that instantiated knowledge represented by the writer. As the propositions move from one to another, we move progressively further from the story. We move through the evaluation to a domain of near-direct declaration on the part of the writer, this time addressing the implied reader of the submission.

The propositions are structured in this way variable one (new technology) and variable two (its effectiveness) are bound together in propositional linkage which allows for both possibilities - the more of one, the less of the other, AND, the more of one, the more of the other. Both are allowed. Both by implication depend on the contingencies of context. The existence of paradox in two contradictory propositions is in itself a proposition: the existence of propositions in the workplace can mean we have to contend with contradictions.

This is interesting applied at the level of direct writer-reader discourse, but it is also, as meta-event, applied retrospectively to the foregoing story-evaluation. Such a paradox is for the teller (that authorial persona)
of Ms Smith to deal with too. Ms Smith, as a result of her dialogue with the authorial persona, has to come to terms with it as well (and her dilemma is complex enough with her fear of new technology). Finally, there is an implied proposition about how Ms Smith can best be helped to cope with this paradox, and a further proposition about the confidence she might acquire if she does this effectively.

This discussion about propositions is intended (1) to highlight the pervasiveness of propositional structures in both the story and exposition-evaluation components of submissions such as these, and (2) to define some of the role propositions play, in terms of meaning and structure. Clearly, variables are used to define actions and states in the workplace (or aspects or combinations of them), and linkages between variables are forged.

The propositional structures which result play an important role in establishing the kinds of thinking taking place in managerial storying, and particularly that transitional domain where writers are moving out of story but not leaving it behind, when commenting on story is taking over from telling story.

It is here that the presentational structures appear to change from, broadly, literary or semio-narrative ones (event, action, event-chain, character, state, motivation) to expository (or exegetical) ones, used to define and gloss what has already been said in story, and used as a rhetorical vehicle with which the writer addresses the implied reader direct.
Decision-making and Action Mazes

Action mazes are devices widely used in management to help people make decisions, and to record the decisions they make. They were introduced in Chapter 9. Participants are given an information sheet on which is detailed a situation which resembles one they are likely to know at work. This is the first information stage. The participants are asked to make a decision based on the information. There may be several decisions, some workable, some plausible, some eccentric. Spaces may be left for other decisions to be supplied by the participants. The designer of the action maze usually provides several decisions because they are interested to know which one(s) will prove popular. Each decision leads the participants on to another piece of information, after which there are more decisions to be made.

Some decisions are 'more likely' than others in terms of what a professional might regard as 'best' to do in the circumstances. Some of the likely decisions might suit particular circumstances alone, while others still might be regarded by anyone with practitioner or theoretical knowledge as unlikely to work. The action maze thus structures the routes taken by the participants in the same way as does a decision tree in probability theory.

Instead of supplying action mazes, they can be inferred from pre-existent narrative structures. In the case of the submissions under examination, two of the three reveal clear action maze structures. These will now be described and discussed. It may be of interest throughout the discussion to contrast the methodologies and insights of event chains and propositional analysis.
The first action maze is visibly dependent upon theory (ie upon book sources acknowledged by the respondent), making it an interesting exemplar of theoretical knowledge on display. The second more fully integrates both knowledge of practice and fuller evaluative skills into the action maze, making it more complex, and in fact supplying it with underlying warrants, themselves of great interest.

The structure chosen by the first subject was a structure designed to present recommendations for a solution to the problem of how to introduce staff training for automation. The 'characters' in the account were important: the older woman had expressed suspicion about change, while the younger man, though enthusiastic to introduced new technology, was conscious of the diplomatic and authority dimensions inherent in the relationship. This respondent overtly turns to the literature for options.

Suggesting a re-evaluation of the training programme and its implementation (the initial information), he states that there are three steps in achieving this: job analysis (A), employee assessment (B), and the identification of specific training needs (C). Implying mutual exclusivity by the arrangement, but not openly denying that combinations might be tried, the respondent presents the reader with a classic action maze structure.

Alternatives other than re-evaluation of training are offered - staff briefings (D), encouragement of staff participation (E), giving staff time to accept new ideas (F), and an emphasis on job security while training took place (G). These can be designated decisions and represented in the following manner in Table 31:
From this we can deduce from the text, both story and evaluation, what information can be supplied for the decisions. For some there will be scant information, while for others open clues will be found. In fact, the narrative elements of the story (events, states, characters) provide much useful material for this purpose. Here there is adequate information on all decisions, and this could be inserted into the action maze at the next level.

To demonstrate the kinds of material which can be relocated (and, where appropriate, redesigned) in this way, we may briefly examine examples. Looking at the story component of the submission, we find for A (job analysis) that the older woman felt threatened about what her job really was, what the duties were, and were they being changed: this could be represented in the action maze as information in the form of 'Scope and duties of job were unclear'. For B (employee assessment), there is similar mention about her feeling under appraisal for her lack of the right experience and her age.
For C (identification of specific training needs) we read 'When it became clear that she would have to use the [computer] system, and receive special training in order to do so, she was quite surprised'. Disregarding her state here, we can see that the writer considers this a credible part of one route through the situation, because he has reified it in narrative form at this point. Later, the younger man is seen to accept 'the problems of (specifically) Sarah', awkwardly expressed but clearly indicating the need to present training in a special way.

For D (staff briefings) little is mentioned in any narrative manner, but it receives clear approval in an expository statement accompanying the entry in the evaluation. For E (encouragement of staff participation), we read that an absence of this ('She claimed that Alan Parker had not informed her of the proposed training programme...and ...had gone behind her back'). An aspect of this can serve for F, giving staff time to accept new ideas. Finally, for G (an emphasis on job security while training took place), we find support in evidence like 'Over all, she [the older woman] felt that she was an expendable "asset", being kept on in order to ensure a smooth change of systems'.

In this way, then, it is possible to supply another layer (of information, second stage) to the action maze, and follow it with further decisions. For these final decisions we have to look to the evaluation, and its final stages. There we read that training was introduced, care was taken to tell everyone in advance and get their support, individuals like Sarah were reassured about their job security and told that training would be on a number of levels so that she could would not be discriminated against. At the end the younger man not only gets his way but has the humility to accept
that his manner had been abrupt and tactless, pointing to the subject's preferred way through the action maze (see Table 32).

Table 32: Action maze decision options and preferred routes

The asterisks represent preferred routes, C 13 being the most clearly preferred, followed by G 17 and then, apparently equal, E 15 and F 16. As evidence this example could be married with others for the purposes of systematic comparison, and even presented to other respondents in controlled conditions in order to elicit either (a) their preferred decision routes or (b) their view of the integrity of the action maze itself.
Turning now to the other submission where an action maze can be inferred from narrative text, we find that the subject has integrated the raw elements of the maze so fully into the storying that we have an action maze which is as much a representation of the narrative structures in the story as it is a representation of propositional decision-making in the evaluation.

The situation is again one of an older woman (Marjorie Smith) and a younger man (David Richardson). The problem has blown up: Ms Smith resents and distrusts Mr Richardson, and the underlying cause is the introduction of new technology. The subject suggests that, since Ms Smith is suspicious of Mr Richardson, despite his knowledge, there are 'two feasible options'. These are (A) 'encourage Ms. Smith to accept a large redundancy offer and make Mr. Richardson reference librarian', and (B) 'try to ensure that Ms. Smith got the fullest opportunity to become familiar with information technology'.

Having supplied these options, the subject then goes straight on to say that the second was chosen. A decision is made about the information. Moreover, the subject provides a WARRANT, a reason drawn from and applied to experience here for why the second decision was preferable: 'simply because Ms. Smith is still a first-rate reference librarian and I am of the opinion that Newby Public Library would suffer a great loss at her departure'. (12)

Now this information could have been supplied by the designer of the action maze: information at stage two in the maze (ie level 3: it would be I3) could have stated that Marjorie Smith was an excellent reference librarian, information which outsiders to the situation could not have known (but might have guessed).
Such information would be typical of an action maze, because (a) it is life-like, and (b) because decisions are based on information, and change because of new information, affecting the route through the maze which anyone might take. The implication here is that the traveller through the maze would be faced with the dilemma, if they decided, say, to make her redundant (even if that were possible and likely), of being told that she was a really good member of staff (despite her reaction to the present situation).

The rest of this action maze can be built up from other elements in the narrative: another route based on making Ms Smith accept the view that libraries are there to communicate information and so the introduction of new technology makes sense (C), discussing the changes 'honestly and realistically with Ms.Smith' (D), making it clear that she can have a generous redundancy settlement if she feels that she cannot continue (E), or assure her of 'direct employee involvement' (ie she and others would be involved in the planning of the training programme)(F).

The theme of redundancy is not lost, for it comes up again, and clearly the subject believes that it is a living option. Once again, the subject reveals his own preferences, and, using clues like this, drawn from the living narrative itself, it is possible again to deconstruct and then reconstruct the skeletal elements of the decision-making in the form of an action maze. This structure is indicated in Table 33.
In this case all the options were used and the situation was put right. This does suggest that, in action maze analysis, there will be occasions when the benefits (e.g., being able to elicit preferred ways of dealing with problems in the workplace) are very considerable, and can lead to other research applications. An example of this would be the use of this action maze with the original respondent in a follow-up session, perhaps open but structured interview, or its use with other respondents who can 'test' it as an instrument or simply 'do' it as a 'game' (in the management or game theory sense of the word). In this case, too, some drawbacks have to be acknowledged, one of them deriving from the choice of all the options by the subject. In real life, where decisions are often complex and where decisions may not be mutually exclusive, this is likely.

However, even here, it is possible to design the maze in such a way as to elicit which preferred combinations there are, to ask respondents which of
the constituent options in a combination they would regard as preferable, and ask them too why a combination at all. It may well be that some managers in some situations might choose a combination (say, here, because training is a complex issue and Marjorie Smith's situation was very tangled) rather than a simple solution, but other situations will demand single simple answers. It would be interesting to speculate what action maze might have arisen had the situation been one of discipline where an employee was clearly in the wrong, for instance.

Narrative, society and practice

In the discussion it has been suggested that storying has a natural place in our representation of our experience. Intrinsic in that naturalness is a close connection between revealed discourse, particularly in text, and the ways in which we use concepts and represent external reality in meaningful and coherent ways in our minds. Characteristic of it, too, is the assumption that everyone learns what a story is at an early age, and that it forms a universal and convenient vehicle, in situations of all kinds, for the representation of meaningful experience.

A distinction was made between narrative and expository text, partly based on the traditional 'fiction and fact' dichotomy. The evidence was structured deliberately in that way, but even there we saw many examples of where the divide is blurred, many instances of where structures in fiction are similar to those in fact. Some of these structures were examined, in particular event chains and propositions. In terms of structure too, tales and exposition have causalities and logical sequences in common, even though,
most of the time, readers would not confuse the factuality or fictionality of the structures.

The suggestion has been made that reading is a search for coherence, a constructivist activity. A key ingredient of the constructivism is decision-making, as much at work in story as in evaluation. Both can be represented in action mazes, and with them we are able to exteriorise inner schemata held by experts and novices about decisions and situations in the workplace, and investigate and compare the responses of a number of people in a research context.

It should be added that two other broad claims have been implicit in this chapter. First of all, it is possible that stories are not just narrative vehicles but representations of the ideology of an age or culture. To that extent, stories, whether they are great fictions or popular ones (often the ones best to reflect trends and fashions), accounts of how great discoveries have been made or wars fought or empires overturned or apartheid upheld or staff in a library helped to adjust to change, have a close association with the facts, norms, beliefs and values of an age. Or of part of an age, if they reflect a sect or a cadre, a professional elite or an influential minority.

Classically, the detective novel is the form which reflects the ideology of its age: Raymond Chandler's hard-boiled detective is both an outsider and a romantic, living his life in an urban shadow-land where crime is king. The resonances are clear about the social and moral tapestry of its culture, just as the relationships, the fates of the character, any notion of poetic justice and law are. In the same way, it may be suggested that such
managerial stories as have been examined here offer direct social and professional referentiality.

Another claim pervading the chapter can be expressed in terms of the semio-narrative interpretation of praxis. Praxis, or practice as seen from a professional viewpoint (say, being a lawyer, or, here, being a library or information manager), is paradigmatic and normative and ideological, with its own view of itself, its own standards and expertise, its own ways of representing its activities, successes and failures. Built into this praxis is a self-regarding view of its praxis, of how it does it job (its cases in court, the outcomes for clients, the reference interview, or, for a doctor, interviewing a patient).

It is easy to represent these activities in story form, particularly if they have a built-in storyline, as does a case in court or a research project for a student. Given this, the semio-narrative approach to praxis seeks to highlight the semiotic and semantic content of the narrative of practice, looking for significant signs and meanings by which, through forms of storying, professionals seek to make sense of their own professional activity and its impact upon the larger community.

It is always fair to ask whether any profession carries out its task properly, and how it knows whether it does or not. Reliable knowledge is not easy to elicit, particularly from those managers unsure of their ground. This chapter has attempted to provide the start of an answer to those questions. Chapter 11 takes the argument further by examining scripts and stories comprehensively using the parameters of the referential hierarchy, and analysing the key dimensions by which stories 'mean' for managers, and, at one remove, can be seen to 'mean' for them by systematic research.